

All political comments should have a disclaimer at the bottom of the ad as to who or what agency paid for the political ad on the internet. It should abide by the same rules as ads played on television.

Comments provided by :  
Abraham, Patricia J.

Yes you know you should create the same rules of disclosure for television political advertisements as you do for internet political ads for much needed transparency.

Comments provided by :  
Adams, DALE

In the 2016 election, 65 percent of Americans identified the internet, or an online platform, as their leading source of information. Yet our outdated transparency rules ? which still include references to telegrams and typewriters ? don't require adequate disclaimers for online ads.

More than three in four Americans ? 78 percent ? want full disclosure of who paid for political ads posted to social media platforms (according to a new Marist poll). That includes 80 percent of Republicans and 82 percent of Independents.

I call on the FEC to act immediately to update regulations and require online political ads to include disclaimers identifying who paid for them.

Teresa Allen

Comments provided by :  
Allen, Teresa

I am one of the three in four Americans who want to see full disclosure for political ads posted on social media.I ask that you require online campaign ads to state who is paying for them, just like what is already currently required for such ads on TV or in print. Thank you.

Comments provided by :  
Almaas, Pauline

In the 2016 election, 65 percent of Americans identified the internet, or an online platform, as their leading source of information.

Yet our outdated transparency rules ? which still include references to telegrams and typewriters ? don't require adequate disclaimers for online ads.

More than three in four Americans ? 78 percent ? want full disclosure of who paid for political ads posted to social media platforms (according to a new Marist poll).

That includes 80 percent of Republicans and 82 percent of Independents.

I call on the FEC to act immediately to update regulations and require online political ads to include disclaimers identifying who paid for them.

Comments provided by :  
Alston, Martha

TRANSPARENCY ! We have a right to know WHO or WHAT organization is paying for the political ad.

The 2016 election and our country was attacked by our biggest adversary! Facebook, Twitter, etc. MUST be held to a higher level of accountability to fully vet these political ads.

Comments provided by :  
Anderson, Janice

The FEC should require online campaign ads to include disclaimers about who is paying for them ? as is required for television and print advertisements. Americans have a right to know who is paying for online political ads. We need to use every lever at our disposal to ensure that Americans know the source of political messages.

Thank you.

SA

Comments provided by :

Anspach, Susan

Make internet advertisers/sponsors own their messages, just as do those on TV, radio, and in the press! The public has the right to know in order to make responsible decisions. Otherwise this country becomes more and more like a communist state or dictatorship.

( Incidentally, I had to provide more personal information to send you this comment than internet advertisers do to us,the public.)

Comments provided by :  
APPLETON, JUDITH



There used to be a concept of "truth in advertising" but like so many other examples of norms of decency that we had come to count on, the social media companies and the current administration have shattered expectations of truth and transparency in favor of anonymity and deceit. We must hold them to the same standards of behavior as all other media companies who have a responsibility to the public who license the airwaves to them. The social media companies may not use airwaves like radio and television but their entire business is built on technology that was invented and developed by the government which gives the citizens who funded that research an interest in how it is used and sold back to them. Advertising is advertising no matter where it is found. It is a commercial enterprise so we the people through our government have the right to demand rules and standards under which they can operate. They also derive special privileges by being endowed by our government with the ability to incorporate. In accordance with deriving these privileges they must meet certain responsibilities as well but in recent years corporations have ignored their civic duties as if they have no duty to anyone but their shareholders. This flies in the face of logic because why would we confer the many privileges of incorporation on companies but require nothing of them in return, particularly companies that have come to in great measure replace the traditional media companies whose responsibilities have long been legislated and defined. The public responsibility comes not from the definition of the delivery system but from the definition of the service being provided and how it relates to our public square.

Comments provided by :  
Armistead, Amy

It is difficult enough to discern fact from fiction these days, in the media and online. Requiring all internet political adds to expose the identity of the entity who paid for it is a step in the right direction.

Comments provided by :  
Arnold, Aimee

Beginning with the Bush-Gore debacle, presidential elections have been a mess. Citizens United then made things worse and the FEC's antiquated disclosure rules have compounded the problem. As reasonable people attempt to follow the "buyer beware" axiom, there is currently no way to find out who is actually behind the digital deluge of political emails and ads. The penchant for naming groups with innocuous designations (often diametrically opposed to their true intent) leaves us in the dark and unable to differentiate between supportive groups and blatant manure-shovelers. When we can put a face with a commentary, we can discover for ourselves the axes being ground. But we need your help in making those faces visible. Please update the disclosure rules to reflect the current digital communications paradigm.

Comments provided by :

Aros, Jorge

This is obvious and common sensical. To not identify who is funding a given add is to side on the behalf of foreign interests. We need the FEC to side on behalf of Americans, not foreign, and likely hostile, actors.

Comments provided by :  
Aurnou, Jon

It is vital that the American people know who is responsible for any political advertising or news feeds that are circulating in public media streams of any kind. Without this information, Americans cannot make informed decisions about the issues and our democracy is doomed. If crowds of people can be duped by rumors, fear mongering, and partisan smear campaigns without knowing the origins of these messages, we will soon become a totalitarian state. Our unregulated social media has become the source of most people's news, and it looks like we are well on our way to this state now. We need new laws for the new reality that social media has created in our country.

Comments provided by :  
Baehr, Sonya

Dear Sir or Madam,

I believe Americans have a right to know who is paying for political advertisements, whether it be organizations with ties to Russia or wealthy special interests here at home. There is strong evidence Russian actors used social media platforms like Facebook to interfere with the 2016 election. We need to use everything at our disposal ? including ending secret online political ads ? to prevent such interference from happening again, and most importantly to ensure that Americans know the source of all political messages.

Sincerely,

David Balan  
Concerned Citizen

Comments provided by :  
Balan, David

n the 2016 election, 65 percent of Americans identified the internet, or an online platform, as their leading source of information.

But transparency rules still include references to telegrams and typewriters and don't require adequate disclaimers for online ads.

78 percent of Americans want full disclosure of who paid for political ads posted to social media platforms.

Please update regulations and require online political ads to include disclaimers identifying who paid for them.

Comments provided by :  
Beattie, Jane

A large percentage of people get their news on the internet. In order for democracy to work, the citizenry must be well informed.

Print ads and TV ads are already required to state who is paying for the ad, and rightly so.

FCC is supposed to serve the greater good of this country and its citizens. In order for you to serve your country, you absolutely must require attribution of each and every political ad placed on the internet..

Comments provided by :

Beck, Jean



All donor information should be public knowledge. People should know this information to make informed decisions!!

Please support accountability!!

Sandra R. Beitler

Comments provided by :  
Beitler, Sandra

In the 2016 election, 65 percent of Americans identified the internet, or an online platform, as their leading source of information. Yet our outdated transparency rules, which still include references to telegrams and typewriters, don't require adequate disclosure for online ads.

Americans have a right to know who is paying for political advertisements?whether it be organizations with ties to Russia or wealthy special interests here at home.

There is strong evidence Russian actors used social media platforms like Facebook to interfere with the 2016 election.

We need to use every lever at our disposal ? including ending secret online political ads ? to prevent that from happening again, and to ensure that Americans know the source of political messages.

Our democracy depends on robust, transparent debate. The FEC is the agency charged with making sure campaign finance rules are followed ? they should start working now to require the same level of transparency for online ads as we have for political ads on television.

Comments provided by :

Belkin, Liliana

I ask you to update your disclosure requirements to end the online ad loophole.

There is strong evidence Russian actors used social media platforms like Facebook to interfere with the 2016 election. We need to use every lever at our disposal ? including ending secret online political ads ? to prevent that from happening again, and to ensure that Americans know the source of political messages.

Americans have a right to know who is paying for political advertisements?whether it be organizations with ties to Russia or wealthy special interests here at home.

Thank you.

Comments provided by :  
Bergstrom, Bo

There is strong evidence Russian actors used social media platforms like Facebook to interfere with the 2016 election. We need to use every lever at our disposal ? including ending secret online political ads ? to prevent that from happening again, and to ensure that Americans know the source of political messages.

In the 2016 election, 65 percent of Americans identified the internet, or an online platform, as their leading source of information. Yet our outdated transparency rules, which still include references to telegrams and typewriters, don't require adequate disclosure for online ads.

Americans have a right to know who is paying for political advertisements?whether it be organizations with ties to Russia or wealthy special interests here at home.

Comments provided by :  
Bleecker, Skip

In the 2016 election, 65 percent of Americans identified the internet, or an online platform, as their leading source of information.

Yet our outdated transparency rules ? which still include references to telegrams and typewriters ? don't require adequate disclaimers for online ads.

More than three in four Americans ? 78 percent ? want full disclosure of who paid for political ads posted to social media platforms (according to a new Marist poll).

That includes 80 percent of Republicans and 82 percent of Independents.

I call on the FEC to act immediately to update regulations and require online political ads to include disclaimers identifying who paid for them.

We need to update to this century!

Comments provided by :  
Bond, George

We must update our rules for political advocacy ads on the internet, so that they include who paid for them. We must be allowed to know who sponsors the ads and other advocacy messages posted online.

Comments provided by :  
Booz, Martha

The FEC should require online campaign ads to include disclaimers about who is paying for them ? as is required for television and print advertisements.

Americans have a right to know who is paying for online political ads.

We need to use every lever at our disposal to prevent meddling in our elections from happening again, and to ensure that Americans know the source of political messages.

In the 2016 election, 65 percent of Americans identified the internet, or an online platform, as their leading source of information.

Our transparency rules are outdated and should be updated to remove references to telegrams and typewriters and updated to include online advertisements.

78 percent of Americans want full disclosure of who paid for political ads posted to social media platforms. That includes 80 percent of Republicans and 82 percent of Independents.

Please act, our democracy may not survive another election influenced by a foreign government!

Comments provided by :  
Borgeson, Dean

In the 2016 election, 65 percent of Americans identified the internet, or an online platform, as their leading source of information. Yet our outdated transparency rules, which still include references to telegrams and typewriters, don't require adequate disclosure for online ads.

Americans have a right to know who is paying for political advertisements?whether it be organizations with ties to Russia or wealthy special interests here at home.

There is strong evidence Russian actors used social media platforms like Facebook to interfere with the 2016 election. We need to use every lever at our disposal ? including ending secret online political ads ? to prevent that from happening again, and to ensure that Americans know the source of political messages.

Our democracy depends on robust, transparent debate. The FEC is the agency charged with making sure campaign finance rules are followed ? they should start working now to require the same level of transparency for online ads as we have for political ads on television.

Comments provided by :  
Borie, Edith



All political ads on radio, TV, and print identify who paid for them, as well they should. It is only common sense that this also applies to the internet. Please act on this parity without delay.

Comments provided by :  
Boyd, Susan

This should be considered part of a "sunshine rule"; any political ad must clearly indicate its source, for as we should well know by now, democracy dies in darkness! The Russian government is not the only organization to hide its identity from "end users", but it is certainly the most significant one for the undeniable disruption of a fair and open national election.

Comments provided by :  
Boyer, David

There's a reason TV ads require a disclaimer to tell those who view those ads who is paying for it. The internet is no different and the same disclaimer should absolutely be mandatory for ads on the internet.

Comments provided by :  
Brenner, Patricia

With the current state of dark money and foreign intervention in our political campaigns it is absolutely essential that we have total transparency for the political advertising that we see. We the people need to know who is funding all political advertising in a way that know who is actually behind the add and not just the name of a front organization.

Comments provided by :  
Bromborsky, Alan

It is mind boggling that this is even a question. YES, I whole-heartedly support full on-line disclosure as to what individual or entity is asking for my vote. These rules need to be updated NOW to better reflect our dependence on the internet and technology. Update NOW.

Comments provided by :  
Brown-Eftychiou, Stacey

As a citizen of the United States, a voter and a taxpayer, I expect the FEC to protect our elections. That's your job. Please regulate political ads on the internet the same way as on TV. Make advertisers identify who they are. In 2016 election you failed us miserably. We don't want another phony election. I don't feel the 2016 was legitimate and if I could have a say in it, I'd say let's do the election over and without interference and gerrymandering.

Comments provided by :  
Brownell, Audrey

I believe it is very important for Americans to know who is behind ads they receive on websites. We then have the opportunity to evaluate and weigh these ads as to their content and biases.

Comments provided by :  
Brydges, Bonnie

The internet is definitely my primary source of information. Advertisers should be subject to the same disclosure rules as tv and other media ads.

Comments provided by :  
Bunge, Letitia



I have just read that you're considering rule changes that would affect political advertising. Bear in mind that voters need to know who paid for the ads they see, no matter what medium carries them.

Comments provided by :  
Burns, Kathryn

In the 2016 election, 65 percent of Americans identified the internet, or an online platform, as their leading source of information.

Yet our outdated transparency rules ? which still include references to telegrams and typewriters ? don't require adequate disclaimers for online ads.

More than three in four Americans ? 78 percent ? want full disclosure of who paid for political ads posted to social media platforms (according to a new Marist poll).

That includes 80 percent of Republicans and 82 percent of Independents.

I call on the FEC to act immediately to update regulations and require online political ads to include disclaimers identifying who paid for them.

Comments provided by :  
Burval, Peter

The best way to protect our democracy and ensure our elected officials represent their constituents is to have publicly funded elections. Barring that, the FEC should require full and complete disclosure on ANY political ad as to who paid for said ad. Be it network, print or digital we need to know who is behind and paying for political ads.

Comments provided by :  
Campbell, Meg

FCC seems bent on changing rules to benefit corporations. None of the current agenda Pai has put forth since his appointment is geared to benefit anyone except corporate bottom line. This recent issues follow in that same vein.

The internet is a unique place. It serves as Telephone, post office, file cabinet, library, office (home and work), commerce, educator and entertainment. Everyone in the world relies on the Internet for some basic NEED in there lives.

We pay for these services in various ways, one is to through advertising. All corporations sell their "wares" via online advertising. Most of it is legitimate, however, the underbelly of the world uses our trust of the legitimate ads to lie, manipulate, and sway us to a certain way of thinking for a specific agenda.

This practice is not limited to corporations, recently we've experience this from Russia, coercing political opinions, also Politicians manipulating facts to sway a constituency for votes or to there agenda.

The uneducated, under educated or easily manipulated fall victim to the malicious efforts, the effects aren't realized until it's too late and the damage is done. This is why all advertisement must be may transparent IN ALL FORMS, including the internet.

The FCC is responsible for governing the rules of Communication, they are beholden to American Citizens, not corporate greed, or political agenda. The FCC MUST do what is right for all of America.

I expect the FCC to do what is right and protect Americans from the malicious, politically motivated, and/or manipulative ad campaigns by forcing transparency.

Thank you.

Chris

Comments provided by :  
Caron, Chris

Our democracy is more imperiled now than at any time since the Civil War. Because of the disproportional influence of the unmonitored internet in people's gathering of information, we have elected to the most powerful post in this country, arguably in the entire world, a person of low intelligence, low character, and malicious intentions toward the country. With 65 percent of Americans identifying the internet as a leading source of "facts" we have important work ahead to create new cyber policies that will regulate the present flow of spurious data.

We the people (78 percent per a recent poll) want to know who owns this government we pay taxes to, because it's becoming clear that we are steadily losing control. Certainly first and foremost should be updating regulations to require disclaimers like the ones in print media and the slick flyers that arrive at our house for online political ads.

Comments provided by :  
Chamberlain, Jane

I am extremely upset. As a result of the

Illegal use of my information because of illegal tapping in my home, cell phone, computer, television, illegal two way radio, car and illegal tapping in other people's homes, while I am physically there, t.v. ads have been illegally using my life scenarios, my private conversations, their illegal camera observations of me, for their t.v. programming, movies and t.v. ads and radio advertising without my permission. I am angry and upset. I should be compensated for all illegal use of their illegally obtained data of me. This has led to illegal profits to ad companies, cable companies, and producers of t.v., movie and radio programming and their affiliates; whilst keeping unemployed and keeping court case with 2nd Circuit Court of Appeals closed illegally (Case # 13-752; Stephanie Christoff vs. IBM, Saturn Business Systems, Lou Siegel, George Pappas, Alan Krieger, IBM and their affiliates, City of White Plains). This is harrassment and fraud because these companies are effectively stealing my intellectual property. I have mailed court docket testimony re: this fraud and filed with the FBI as well. Year To Date, my court case remains illegally closed. I just filed a Notice of Obstruction of Justice with the FBI. Not only should those paying for the ads be listed on each ad, the producers of each ad should also be listed, so I can determine which company is stealing my intellectual property.

Comments provided by :  
Christoff, Stephanie

Recent information shows that 126 million Americans were exposed to internet sites that aired "news" and ads that were manufactured by Russian agencies, in order to influence our elections. Our democratic processes were being attacked. We had no idea, partly because we had no information about who was financing this content. Give us a fighting chance to protect ourselves from this type of attack from a hostile power.

Comments provided by :  
Cleary, Vanna

The Russian attack against the United States 2016 presidential election leaves no doubt that more transparency is required to reveal who is funding Internet advertising for all candidates and propositions. I urge you to implement strong requirements to inform the public of who is paying for all voting ads on the Internet.

Comments provided by :  
Collins, Ed



Truth is Treason in the Empire of Lies!

In the 2016 election, 65 percent of Americans identified the internet, or an online platform, as their leading source of information.

Yet our outdated transparency rules ? which still include references to telegrams and typewriters ? don't require adequate disclosure for online ads.

No matter if it's organizations with ties to Russia or shadowy nonprofits funded by the Koch Brothers, Americans have a right to know who is paying for online political ads.

More than three in four Americans ? 78 percent ? want full disclosure of who paid for political ads posted to social media platforms (according to a new Marist poll).

That includes 80 percent of Republicans and 82 percent of Independents.

The Federal Election Commission (FEC) must require online campaign ads to include disclaimers as to who is paying for them ? just as is done for television and print advertisements.

Act now to protect our elections. It's time for the FEC to make it happen.

Truth is Treason in the Empire of Lies!

Thanks, peace and be well,  
Clay G. Colson  
Resolution Manager  
Represent Pasco  
Transparency is the Cure for Corruption  
(813) 601-3391

Represent.Us  
American Anti-Corruption Act

"Corruption, the greatest single bane of our society today." Olusegun Obasanjo

"Our country is now taking so steady a course as to show by what road it will pass to destruction, to wit: by consolidation of power first, and then corruption, its necessary consequence." Thomas Jefferson

Comments provided by :  
Colson, Clay G.

Please update the regulations for political advertising on the internet (including social media such as Twitter and Facebook, as well as search engines such as Google) to match the existing requirements for broadcast and print media.

A large and growing proportion of adults obtain their "news" from such sites, and we now have plenty of evidence that an adversarial foreign government (i.e., Russia) exploited the lack of regulation to send propaganda and outright lies. At the very minimum, we have a right to know the sources of such advertisements.

Comments provided by :  
Coolidge, Jacqueline

Dear FCC,

It seems that our quick pace of communication that has afforded many the ability to share information, has a negative effect on the populations ability to discern who is behind each story, especially if there is no regulation requiring identification.

The FEC should require online campaign ads to include disclaimers about who is paying for them ? as is required for television and print advertisements. Americans have a right to know who is paying for online political ads, in the same way we see it on tv and hear it on the radio.

We need to use every lever at our disposal to prevent meddling in our elections from happening again, and to ensure that Americans know the source of political messages.

In the 2016 election, 65 percent of Americans identified the internet, or an online platform, as their leading source of information. Our transparency rules are outdated and should be updated to remove references to telegrams and typewriters and updated to include online advertisements, and news stories.

78 percent of Americans want full disclosure of who paid for political ads posted to social media platforms. That includes 80 percent of Republicans and 82 percent of Independents. I agree. Let's get to work!

Sincerely,  
Amanda Cordano

Comments provided by :  
Cordano, Amanda

Changes need to made to prevent future hacking/meddling of future elections. All official ads need some form of verification to prove authenticity.

Comments provided by :  
Costley, Jamil

We really need transparency about who is paying for ads on the internet. So many people are getting their information there--including me--and we need to know where that info is coming from. Our Democracy will be in real trouble if we don't apply the same rules to internet ads that we have on all other forms of media. More than three in four Americans ? 78 percent ? want full disclosure of who paid for political ads posted to social media platforms (according to a new Marist poll). That includes 80 percent of Republicans and 82 percent of Independents. This is something we ALL want. Thanks.

Comments provided by :  
Craven, Jessica

I strongly URGE FEC to act immediately to update regulations and require online political ads to include disclaimers identifying who paid for them.

Comments provided by :  
Culliton, Mitchell Lane

In the 2016 election, 65 percent of Americans identified the internet, or an online platform, as their leading source of information.

Yet our outdated transparency rules ? which still include references to telegrams and typewriters ? don't require adequate disclaimers for online ads.

More than three in four Americans ? 78 percent ? want full disclosure of who paid for political ads posted to social media platforms (according to a new Marist poll).

That includes 80 percent of Republicans and 82 percent of Independents.

I call on the FEC to act immediately to update regulations and require online political ads to include disclaimers identifying who paid for them.

Comments provided by :  
Cummings, Leslie

I am appalled by the effects that the Citizens United decision has had on our democracy. We are selling our democracy to the highest bidder! Internet ads must be transparent about who is funding them. The public must be made aware.

Comments provided by :  
Daftary, Bernadette



On line political ads should have disclaimers identifying who is paying for the ad.

Comments provided by :  
De Mirjian, Carolyn

I'm very concerned about individuals who get their news from social media without confirming, through more reliable sources, that the information is accurate and true. It's a very dangerous trend in this country, especially since we do not value or support the education of the citizenry. It is very important to our democracy that all online ads have a legible, easy to visualize note that identifies who paid for the ad. Maybe then people will more readily scrutinize the information they are being fed.

Comments provided by :  
Dean, M. Susan

Political adds on the internet should be published under the same rules as any other form of media. Who is paying for the add and the add's point of origin must be shown.

Comments provided by :  
DeFord, Rima

In the 2016 election, 65 percent of Americans identified the internet, or an online platform, as their leading source of information. Yet our outdated transparency rules, which still include references to telegrams and typewriters, don't require adequate disclosure for online ads.

Americans have a right to know who is paying for political advertisements?whether it be organizations with ties to Russia or wealthy special interests here at home.

There is strong evidence Russian actors used social media platforms like Facebook to interfere with the 2016 election. We need to use every lever at our disposal ? including ending secret online political ads ? to prevent that from happening again, and to ensure that Americans know the source of political messages.

Start working now to require the same level of transparency for online ads as we have for political ads on television.

Comments provided by :  
Detato, Susan

It is extremely important to know the source of a campaign ad. One must choose one's teachers wisely & know the perspective of the person or group offering the advice. There are two sides to everything & often more than that!

Comments provided by :  
Di Russo, Donald

U.S. elections should be about U.S. voters, not special interests ? and especially not about the secretive influence of hostile foreign governments and entities. We must use every lever at our disposal ? including ending secret online political ads ? to prevent meddling in our elections and to ensure that Americans know the source of political messages. More than three in four Americans ? 78 percent ? want full disclosure of who paid for political ads posted to social media platforms. That includes 80 percent of Republicans and 82 percent of Independents. Americans have a right to know who is paying for political advertisements?whether it be organizations with ties to foreign governments or wealthy special interests here at home.

In the 2016 election, 65 percent of Americans identified the internet, or an online platform, as their leading source of information.

Yet our outdated transparency rules ? which still include references to telegrams and typewriters ? don't require adequate disclosure for online ads.

Thank you,  
Loretta Di Tocco

Comments provided by :  
DiTocco, Loretta

It is vital to a fair and DEMOCRATIC election that ALL political ads are identified by source.

It is required for TV and Radio ads, it MUST be identified for internet ads as well.

Most citizens now receive most , if not all of their news and information from the internet. The information they access MUST be made clear as to it's source.

No more spurious ( and incendiary) ads.

The truth must be clear and accessible.

Comments provided by :

Dods, Suzanne

In 2016, more than half of Americans identified the internet as their primary source of information. Current rules do not require the same disclosure of information for internet advertising which is required for other political advertising. The FEC must adopt rules applying the same disclosure requirements for internet advertising which apply to other types of advertising. In the current environment of runaway political spending the need for such disclosure is all the more compelling. If our democracy is for sale we at least have the right to know who it is being sold to.

Comments provided by :  
Doering, David



Americans now get a large fraction of their information from the internet, and our transparency rules must be updated to reflect this. The FEC should require online political ads to be labeled as such, and to reveal who paid for them.

Comments provided by :  
Doubleday, Charles

If we can see who funds which political ads we see on TV, it only makes sense that their online counterparts get the same transparency.

Comments provided by :  
Dunbar-Boston, Kamali

Sixty-five per cent of Americans indicate they see political advertising on Facebook. These political messages must contain disclosure information stating their sponsors.

Comments provided by :  
Dunkle, Doug

We, as american citizens, have a right to know who is paying for the political advertisements we see in our TV screens. It may be big money Corporations or other country nationals, but we must be informed. There has been so much influence in our decisions to vote one way or another based on the adds so often totally untrue. Smear campaigns have to stop.

Comments provided by :  
Dutton, Donna

In the 2016 election, 65 percent of Americans identified the internet, or an online platform, as their leading source of information.

Yet our outdated transparency rules ? which still include references to telegrams and typewriters ? don't require adequate disclaimers for online ads.

More than three in four Americans ? 78 percent ? want full disclosure of who paid for political ads posted to social media platforms (according to a new Marist poll).

That includes 80 percent of Republicans and 82 percent of Independents.

I call on the FEC to act immediately to update regulations and require online political ads to include disclaimers identifying who paid for them.

Comments provided by :  
Eldredge, Kathy

US citizens should be able to see who paid for online political ads. Outdated regulations need to be updated to include internet content.

Comments provided by :  
Elmore, Jeanne

In the 2016 election, 65 percent of Americans identified the internet, or an online platform, as their leading source of information.

Yet our outdated transparency rules ? which still include references to telegrams and typewriters ? don't require adequate disclaimers for online ads.

More than three in four Americans ? 78 percent ? want full disclosure of who paid for political ads posted to social media platforms (according to a new Marist poll).

That includes 80 percent of Republicans and 82 percent of Independents.

I call on the FEC to act immediately to update regulations and require online political ads to include disclaimers identifying who paid for them.

Comments provided by :  
Epstein, Colin

The rules regarding disclosure of who pays for ads on the internet are insufficient in regards to today's technology and the fact that a majority of Americans gets their news and pertinent election information online now. Language referring to typewriters and telegraphs is outdated. The public deserves to know in online advertising who pays for the ads that they see the same way as this information needs to be disclosed as to TV ads.

Comments provided by :  
Esposito, J



In the 1940's when I regularly attended Sunday School we often were advised: "Know ye the truth and the truth will make you free." I thought it made a lot of sense. It still does, in particular concerning how open our government is to sharing all the pertinent facts with its citizens. Whoever wants to influence us politically **MUST BE REQUIRED** to share their name and affiliations--even Russians.

Comments provided by :  
Evans, Tom

In the 2016 election, 65 percent of Americans identified the internet, or an online platform, as their leading source of information. Yet our outdated transparency rules ? which still include references to telegrams and typewriters ? don't require adequate disclaimers for online ads. More than three in four Americans ? 78 percent ? want full disclosure of who paid for political ads posted to social media platforms (according to a new Marist poll).

I call on the FEC to act immediately to update regulations and require online political ads to include disclaimers identifying who paid for them.

Comments provided by :  
Ferguson, Scott

We are entitled as citizens to know who is sponsoring ads to us to influence our opinions on public issues. Online ads must carry disclaimers as to who is paying for them.

Comments provided by :  
finstein, Arthur and Lois

More than three in four Americans ? 78 percent ? want full disclosure of who paid for political ads posted to social media platforms (according to a new Marist poll).

That includes 80 percent of Republicans and 82 percent of Independents.

I call on the FEC to act immediately to update regulations and require online political ads to include disclaimers identifying who paid for them.

Comments provided by :  
Flagle, Amanda

Please enact a rule that applies to all paid or donated political ads and correspondence on the internet that support or oppose any candidates for public office and any legislative matters.

For ads sponsored by a corporation, the corporate name shown with the ad shall be the name of the parent company that controls a subsidiary company's activities.

The rule should require the name of the ad's sponsor to be shown in large enough font for a person with 20/40 vision to read it easily.

Comments provided by :  
Fleming, Bill

Sixty-five percent of Americans get their news from online sources including social media sources, where there is currently a total lack of transparency concerning the actual source of information. I urge the FEC to impose clear rules concerning the identification and labeling of the actual sources of all online advertising and political messaging, so that citizens will be less subject to manipulation by foreign operators or U.S. special interests.

Thank you.

Comments provided by :  
Frank, Edith

In the 2016 election, 65 percent of Americans identified the internet, or an online platform, as their leading source of information.

Yet our outdated transparency rules, which still include references to telegrams and typewriters, don't require adequate disclaimers for online ads.

More than three in four Americans ? 78 percent ? want full disclosure of who paid for political ads posted to social media platforms (according to a new Marist poll). That includes 80 percent of Republicans and 82 percent of Independents.

I call on the FEC to act immediately to update regulations and require online political ads to include disclaimers identifying who paid for them.

Comments provided by :  
Fredericks, Colin

Transparency is crucial to our democracy, that's why political ads on television must disclose who is funding them. The online world should have the same rules. There's no difference between TV and online media, so they should have to abide by the same rules.

It's even more important for online ads to disclose who is funding them because so many more people are exposed to them. Some 150 million Americans saw ads from Russia during the 2016 election!

It's time for the FEC to update these regulations.

Comments provided by :  
Fried, Rona



I call on the FEC to act immediately to update regulations and require online political ads to include disclaimers identifying who paid for them.

Comments provided by :  
geiser, b

In the 2016 election, 65 percent of Americans identified the internet, or an online platform, as their leading source of information. Yet our outdated transparency rules ? which still include references to telegrams and typewriters ? don't require adequate disclaimers for online ads. More than three in four Americans ? 78 percent ? want full disclosure of who paid for political ads posted to social media platforms (according to a new Marist poll). That includes 80 percent of Republicans and 82 percent of Independents.

I call on the FEC to act immediately to update regulations and require online political ads to include disclaimers identifying who paid for them.

Comments provided by :  
Geltman, Richard

I'm submitting this comment because I'm very concerned that future elections will be subject to hacking or influence from a foreign agent. Please strongly consider regulations that require advertisers on social media sites to provide full information or a disclaimer of who is funding them. Please protect our democracy!

Thank you!

Lizbeth Giletto

Comments provided by :

Giletto, Lizbeth

Since so many Americans use social media to obtain their news and other information, it would be extremely important to advise the consumer the source of any political ad.

Comments provided by :  
gilson, ann

A democracy cannot function without transparency. We need to know who is paying for the content we are exposed to in order to make informed voting decisions. For this reason I urge you to require disclaimers on internet and all other relevant political communications. Thank you.

Tom Givone

Comments provided by :  
Givone, Tom

The FEC is the agency charged with making sure campaign finance rules are followed ? you should start requiring the same level of transparency for online ads as we have for political ads on television. We have a right to know who is paying for political advertisements?whether it be organizations with ties to Russia or wealthy special interests here at home.

As you know, Russians used social media platforms like Facebook to interfere with the 2016 election. We need to use every means at our disposal ? including ending secret online political ads!!!!? to prevent that from happening again, and to ensure that Americans know the source of political messages.

YOU UNDERSTAND HOW IMPORTANT THIS IS, RIGHT???

Comments provided by :  
Glover, Julie

Please update outdated transparency rules to require online campaign ads to include disclaimers, specifying exactly who paid for them.

The internet, and specifically social media, have had a powerful influence on politics and that influence is increasing.

We need to introduce every measure we can to make consumers aware of who is trying to influence them, and why...and we should make special efforts to ensure that interest groups, including foreign governments and terrorist organizations, cannot meddle in our elections and political process.

Thank you.

Allison Goodwin

Comments provided by :  
Goodwin, Allison

Our democracy depends on a robust, transparent debate. You are the agency charged with making sure that campaign finance rules are followed; therefore, please start working immediately to require the same level of transparency for online ads as we have for political ads on television. This loophole must be closed for the sake of preventing Russia or other foreign countries from interfering in our 2018 and subsequent elections. Thank you.

Comments provided by :  
Gordon, Rose



Nothing is more fundamental to a democracy than fair and honest elections. People's opinions can be swayed by information in favor of or in opposition to a candidate - this the primary purpose of a political campaign - to convince the voter that your candidate is preferable to the opponent. Under existing campaign rules, candidates and their committees must include a disclaimer when putting out information so that the public can take into consideration the source of the information. There should be no exemption from such disclosures when the information comes by way of the internet or social media. Information that comes from paid individuals, whether directly affiliated with a campaign or indirectly as from a 501(c)(4) group should be required to include such disclaimer. We know that campaigns sometimes distort information to make their candidate look good and the opponent look bad. Sometimes, there are outright lies. Being able to know the source of information allows the public to carefully examine information that is clearly designed to influence their attitude about a candidate. For example, I was shown an on-line video prior to the election of an african-american man who was claiming to be Bill Clinton's illegitimate son and was attacking Hillary Clinton for refusing to acknowledge him. Nothing about this video was true, but it was clearly designed to influence people's attitudes towards Mrs. Clinton. It matters a great deal whether this video was prepared and disseminated as part of the Trump campaign or his allies, or whether it was simply someone trying to grab attention for themselves. Disclaimers matter and should matter no less on electronic information systems,

Comments provided by :  
Gregg, Dennis

In order for us to actually have a democracy, we need know who is saying what. The identity of anyone proffering an opinion must be clear. Without this knowledge, we can have hate groups and foreign government influencing our elections.

Comments provided by :  
Griffith, Nancy R.

All political ads on the internet must have identifying information included and plainly visible as regards to the organization responsible for the content and reveal who is paying for the ad.

Comments provided by :  
Grosso, Kenneth

Please update the FEC's disclosure requirements to end the online ad loophole. American people have a right to know the source of online ads. These have an impact on people's thinking and there is disturbing evidence of Russian activity in Facebook and other electronic messaging sources interfering with our 2016 elections.

Please require the same level of transparency for online ads as we have for political ads on television.

Thank you.

Comments provided by :  
Gunderson, Anne

Please require that all online ads be required to identify the names of all persons paying for the ad. Americans have a right to know who is paying for political advertisements?whether it be organizations with ties to Russia or wealthy special interests here at home.

?There is strong evidence Russian actors used social media platforms like Facebook to interfere with the 2016 election. We need to use every lever at our disposal ? including ending secret online political ads ? to prevent that from happening again, and to ensure that Americans know the source of political messages.

Comments provided by :  
Gurley, Grant

Just as assignation is required for political ads on television or in the newspaper, so it should be with political ads online. It is common sense that the person or corporation paying for a political ad should be named on any political ad that can be viewed on an electronic device.

Comments provided by :  
Gustafson, Marcia

The internet has allowed for a free exchange of information we have never seen before. Any person or group with a connection to the online world can become a publisher of information and by extension a member of the media with no regards or legal requirements for journalistic integrity. It is imperative that the public be informed as to the source of their information so they can make decisions as to the accuracy or correctness of that information. With any brand of advertising or journalism there is ownership of the content. This is a requirement not only for integrity but for legal responsibility with regards to the content and it's impact on the public.

Comments provided by :  
Haggard, Paul

More than three in four Americans ? 78 percent ? want full disclosure of who paid for political ads posted to social media platforms (according to a new Marist poll).

That includes 80 percent of Republicans and 82 percent of Independents.

I call on the FEC to act immediately to update regulations and require online political ads to include disclaimers identifying who paid for them.

Comments provided by :  
Hamby, Barbara



In the 2016 election, 65 percent of Americans identified the internet, or an online platform, as their leading source of information.

Yet our outdated transparency rules ? which still include references to telegrams and typewriters ? don't require adequate disclaimers for online ads.

More than three in four Americans ? 78 percent ? want full disclosure of who paid for political ads posted to social media platforms (according to a new Marist poll).

That includes 80 percent of Republicans and 82 percent of Independents.

I call on the FEC to act immediately to update regulations and require online political ads to include disclaimers identifying who paid for them.

Comments provided by :  
Hanna, K

I am requesting that the FCC require on line political ads include disclaimers that identify who paid for the ads.

We must protect our democracy with this transparency so on line viewers can be informed and knowledgeable as to who is promoting the advertising.

Comments provided by :  
Harper, Barbara

For the health of our democracy, I call on the FEC to act immediately to update regulations and require online political ads to include disclaimers identifying who paid for them.

Comments provided by :  
Hawthorn, Pat

To Whom It May Concern:

I am writing in response to your request for comment about the matter of online political advertising.

I believe the FEC should require online campaign ads to include disclaimers about who is paying for them, just as it does for television and print advertisements. Americans have a right to know who is paying for online political ads. Our transparency rules are outdated; they should be updated to remove references to telegrams and typewriters and include online advertisements.

Such transparency not only informs us about the entities backing our candidates, but also allows us to identify platforms that have foreign backing. We need to use every lever at our disposal to prevent meddling in our elections from happening again and to ensure that Americans know the source of political messages.

In the 2016 election, 65 percent of Americans identified the internet or an online platform as their leading source of information. Furthermore, 78 percent of Americans have expressed a desire for full disclosure of who paid for political ads posted to social-media platforms. That includes 80 percent of Republicans and 82 percent of Independents.

Thank you for your consideration of this issue.

Sincerely,

Katherine Heins  
US Citizen and Voter

Comments provided by :  
Heins, Katherine

Freedom of speech requires identification of the speaker. Otherwise it easily becomes propaganda, as in many dystopic novels, or perhaps in North Korea.

The best weapon we have against propaganda is truth; the simple truth of knowing who is talking.

Comments provided by :

heinz-sader, nancy

Our transparency rules are outdated. They have not kept up with internet and social media. We deserve to know who is paying for political ads on line. Full disclosure should be required on all social media as it is for TV and print mediums. Without this information, we cannot have the surety that our elections are not being manipulated by foreign entities. WE also deserve to know whether an ad is being pushed at us by a conservative or liberal group so that we can evaluate more clearly the bias that twists the truth, as all political ads do.

Comments provided by :  
Helbraun, Madeline

Since the Russians medaled in our election system by using Facebook and other internet platforms, we need to know who is paying for all ads bought. Americans need to have the truth not false information by foreign or American companies. I am tired of my kids and grandkids being exposed to profane and mean spirited comments. All the terrible things said in this past campaign season divided the country more than I have seen since my first election I could vote in which was 1976.

Comments provided by :  
Hemphill, Miriam

With the Internet being such an all-powerful and all-invasive form of communication in most Americans' lives, and for many people their main source of information, we must pass up-to-date laws governing campaign advertising on-line, as we updated them for TV ads; and one of the first laws must be that all on-line political ads have their source identified before any Internet company/platform accepts payment, and then this source must be clearly identified with the ad itself. Second, if ad sources are identified as coming from a foreign government directly or agents acting on behalf of a foreign government, the FBI must be immediately informed before such ads are allowed to air and any payment accepted.

Comments provided by :  
Hewitt, Maev



The FEC should require online campaign ads to include disclaimers about who is paying for them ? as is required for television and print advertisements. Americans have a right to know who is paying for online political ads. We need to use every lever at our disposal to prevent meddling in our elections from happening again, and to ensure that Americans know the source of political messages. Our transparency rules are outdated and should be updated to remove references to telegrams and typewriters and updated to include online advertisements.

Comments provided by :  
Hill, Sarah

I STRONGLY support a rule that would require all internet political ads to identify the source of the funding, just as is required for TV political ads. The recent election has made it clear that online social media and news outlets are capable of being leveraged to spread misinformation. If the source is traceable, it will be a step toward online accountability.

Comments provided by :  
Hill, Sarah

We the public should know who has made the comments we see online. Comments that are made anonymously may mislead the unwary.

Comments provided by :  
Hoskinson, Marjorie

It is likely that foreign governments and foreign money shifted votes in the 2016 presidential election through online ads. There was zero transparency, so it is difficult to tell how much impact they had. The current system is broken, and it may have helped choose our president. This is a crisis that needs to be fixed.

Comments provided by :  
Hutmaker, Kyle

Political ads are political ads and influence voter choices - increasingly in recent years and now primarily via the Internet. The disclosure rules regarding these ads should be the same regardless of how the ads are disseminated. It's just common sense. The existing status quo constitutes a massive loophole which is being heavily exploited by parties who use it to disguise their true agenda and alliances. This must change!

Comments provided by :  
Isaacson, Matthew

In the 2016 election, 65 percent of Americans identified the internet, or an online platform, as their leading source of information.

Yet our outdated transparency rules ? which still include references to telegrams and typewriters ? don't require adequate disclaimers for online ads.

More than three in four Americans ? 78 percent ? want full disclosure of who paid for political ads posted to social media platforms (according to a new Marist poll).

That includes 80 percent of Republicans and 82 percent of Independents.

I call on the FEC to act immediately to update regulations and require online political ads to include disclaimers identifying who paid for them.

Comments provided by :  
Jailer, Todd

I am in favor of online advertisements requiring disclosure of the party paying for ad.

Comments provided by :  
jarrett, susan

The Federal election laws must apply wherever political ads are shown. This includes the internet as well as television. It is only right that readers and viewers of all advertising know the sources of the ads. Anything to the contrary constitutes deceit and deception of the public.

Comments provided by :  
Jenner, Paul



During the congressional hearing yesterday, it was made abundantly clear that Facebook, Google services, and Twitter were overtaken by political ads placed by foreign actors.

Many people get most of their news from these sites - political advertisements lacking information about who paid for them are unacceptable. There are too many stupid people in America that believe anything their friends forward them.

Make it mandatory that all political advertisements disclose who paid for them. It's required on every other media outlet - it is time to require the same for online platforms.

Comments provided by :  
Jensen, Jessica

ALL paid political announcements, ads, or advocacy should be required to list exactly who is paying for it.

Comments provided by :  
Jerome, Maynard

I call on the FEC to act immediately to update regulations and require online political ads to include disclaimers identifying who paid for them.

Thank you,  
Shawn Johnson

Comments provided by :  
johnson, shawn

In the 2016 election, 65 percent of Americans identified the internet, or an online platform, as their leading source of information.

Yet our outdated transparency rules ? which still include references to telegrams and typewriters ? don't require adequate disclaimers for online ads.

More than three in four Americans ? 78 percent ? want full disclosure of who paid for political ads posted to social media platforms (according to a new Marist poll).

That includes 80 percent of Republicans and 82 percent of Independents.

I call on the FEC to act immediately to update regulations and require online political ads to include disclaimers identifying who paid for them.

Comments provided by :  
Johnston, Philip

The medium for political ads has changed but the need for accountability is still crucial in a democracy. We were evidently manipulated by ads placed by a foreign government. Online political ads should only be allowed when who is paying is stated clearly.

Comments provided by :  
Joseph, Maggi

According to a new Marist poll, 78% of Americans want full disclosure of who paid for political ads posted to social media platforms.

Comments provided by :  
Kasmai, Rose

Online political advertising must include the name and address of the payor.

Comments provided by :  
Kast, Kenneth

“In the 2016 election, 65 percent of Americans identified the internet, or an online platform, as their leading source of information.

Yet our outdated transparency rules don't require adequate disclaimers for online ads. Essentially, anyone can tell any lie, safely and anonymously. It's hard enough to separate the truth from lies in any political campaign. But if we know the source of the so-called information, we can at least look up their agenda and make some informed judgment regarding their trustworthiness.

At stake is the credibility of our democracy. Whether or not it is TRUE, the fact that more and more people BELIEVE that our government is for sale, that everyone involved in government is lying, is itself poisonous. It's already clear to the most level-headed that that money can buy a LOT of misinformation.

More than three in four Americans ? 78 percent ? want full disclosure of who paid for political ads posted to social media platforms (according to a new Marist poll).

That includes 80 percent of Republicans and 82 percent of Independents.

We call on the FEC to act immediately to update regulations and require online political ads to include disclaimers identifying who paid for them.

Comments provided by :  
Katz, John



The only way we can stop the influence from special interest groups is to make sure all private and PAC donations going directly to a campaign go through a "black box" so that the representatives cannot legally know who contributed to their campaign. A black box would have to be managed by an agency bound to secrecy so all contributions are anonymous. Violators (Representatives and contributors) who violate the law would be prosecuted just like insider trading is now. Unwitting disclosure would require that the donation be put into the general election fund to be distributed equally to qualified candidates.

Comments provided by :  
Keck, Peter

In the 2016 election, 65 percent of Americans identified the internet, or an online platform, as their leading source of information.

Yet our outdated transparency rules ? which still include references to telegrams and typewriters ? don't require adequate disclaimers for online ads.

More than three in four Americans ? 78 percent ? want full disclosure of who paid for political ads posted to social media platforms (according to a new Marist poll).

That includes 80 percent of Republicans and 82 percent of Independents.

I call on the FEC to act immediately to update regulations and require online political ads to include disclaimers identifying who paid for them.

Comments provided by :  
Kelly, J

We need full disclosure on online political ads. Must be visible and clear who's paying for them. FEC needs to step up on this important issue!

Comments provided by :  
Kermiet, Chris

In the 2016 election, 65 percent of Americans identified the internet, or an online platform, as their leading source of information. Yet our outdated transparency rules, which still include references to telegrams and typewriters, don't require adequate disclosure for online ads.

Americans have a right to know who is paying for political advertisements?whether it be organizations with ties to Russia or wealthy special interests here at home.

Please require disclosure during the ad of who funds the ad.

Comments provided by :

Kerr, Zachary

As we have seen during the 2016 Presidential campaign, social media ads and campaign material can be disseminated without the public knowing the real source.

We have now learned that most of these ads were produced in and by Russian entities, with the goal of disrupting our elections and possibly skewing the election results, resulting in Trump's election. Online Political ads and campaign materials by groups that aren't clearly identified can no longer be acceptable in our election processes. It is time to demand that online ads and other materials have their sources clearly identified, so that voters and online users know who posted the ads, their purpose and what they stand for.

Comments provided by :  
King, Wendy

To Whom It May Concern,

I am writing this letter to urge the commission to update the disclaimer requirement for political ads posted on the internet and on social media platforms like Facebook, YouTube, Twitter and Google.

We all deserve to know where information is coming from. Especially in the context of political campaigns: we must be able to make informed choices.

Our 2016 Election was hijacked by a foreign enemy. The seriousness of this cannot be overstated.

Please help your country and it's citizens by requiring disclaimers on all political advertising, including internet and social media.

The freedom of our citizens depends on it!

Thank you for your time and consideration,

Kimberly Koch  
Nehalem, OR

Comments provided by :  
Koch, Kimberly

All internet ads should clearly identify who actually paid for the ad as the California Disclose Act that was recently enacted does.

Comments provided by :  
Kolbert, Richard

The freedom of the press, on which our democracy depends, ultimately depends on the public responsibility of journalistic SOURCE PUBLICATIONS to maintain a firewall between advertising and editorial content. This was already being eroded by the systemic defunding of traditional journalistic, news gathering source publication through flak-packaged news stories being sent out to run as if they were news and the resultant closing of news bureaus and divestment from investigative reporting. Now the unregulated rise of radical, libertarian, property-supremacist, social media organizations has compounded that problem by re-sourcing unattributed stories and shirking the responsibility AS a journalistic source publication for protecting the PUBLIC franchise of press freedom through editorial transparency. This demands public transparency of sourcing and editorial evaluation of re-sourced/sampled stories and notice of advertising provenance. It also requires social media, if it wishes to continue to be publicly licensed to profit off the public, to assume its responsibility AS a journalistic source publication, like any other, and accordingly to invest in expanding news gathering bureaus rather than shrinking them. It requires them to invest in investigative journalism if they are going to continue to be allowed "free" access to the public's information. This reform must begin by demanding transparent identification of sourcing, but it should develop, and social media companies should "grow up" through their commitment to hiring the necessary editorial labor to monitor and evaluate the "feed," and finally through investing in the PUBLIC infrastructure of sound, empirically based news-gathering.

Comments provided by :  
Kongshaug, Erik



In the 2016 election, 65 percent of Americans identified the internet, or an online platform, as their leading source of information.

Yet our outdated transparency rules ? which still include references to telegrams and typewriters ? don't require adequate disclaimers for online ads.

More than three in four Americans ? 78 percent ? want full disclosure of who paid for political ads posted to social media platforms (according to a new Marist poll).

That includes 80 percent of Republicans and 82 percent of Independents.

I call on the FEC to act immediately to update regulations and require online political ads to include disclaimers identifying who paid for them.

Comments provided by :  
Kreger, Keith

In the 2016 election, 65 percent of Americans identified the internet, or an online platform, as their leading source of information.

Yet our outdated transparency rules ? which still include references to telegrams and typewriters ? don't require adequate disclaimers for online ads.

More than three in four Americans ? 78 percent ? want full disclosure of who paid for political ads posted to social media platforms (according to a new Marist poll).

That includes 80 percent of Republicans and 82 percent of Independents.

I call on the FEC to act immediately to update regulations and require online political ads to include disclaimers identifying who paid for them.

Thank you for considering this.

Comments provided by :  
Kroeber, Ann

Please require all campaign ads, including all those posted online, to disclose their source. This is simply a case of the regulation lagging behind modern technology. It's time to catch up! Thank you for your consideration and your work to rectify this increasingly dangerous loophole.

Comments provided by :  
Kruger, Kaitlyn

In light of current events and a general lack of current or forthcoming standardized oversight by internet and social media giants (e.g. those at this week's Congressional hearings), to protect our democracy, FEC should receive adequate funding and pursue partnerships with federal law enforcement agencies. Americans work hard and have limited time to devote to current affairs and their decisions in their polling places. The internet and social media giants must be uniformly regulated and held accountable for allowing criminal activity to occur on their sites, and for profiting from such activities. FEC should also work to better promulgate, or partner with others to promulgate standard information about political status (e.g. current names, political affiliations, and terms of office of elected officials), government functions (e.g. the three branches of government), and basic political history (e.g. former elected official's names, political affiliations, and terms of office), given the lack of public knowledge about these very basic matters due to failures in our education system and the downfall of traditional media. Finally, FEC should require political parties to better promulgate, throughout the campaign season, their officially adopted party platforms on all media, so that information - coupled with timely information on campaign financing - will allow the American public to know where prospective elected officials stand.

Comments provided by :  
Kulis, Kirsten

**\*\*The FEC should require online campaign ads to include disclaimers about who is paying for them ? as is required for television and print advertisements.**

**\*\*Americans have a right to know who is paying for online political ads.**

**\*\*We need to use every lever at our disposal to prevent meddling in our elections from happening again, and to ensure that Americans know the source of political messages.**

**\*\*In the 2016 election, 65 percent of Americans identified the internet, or an online platform, as their leading source of information.**

**\*\*Our transparency rules are outdated and should be updated to remove references to telegrams and typewriters and updated to include online advertisements.**

**\*\*78 percent of Americans want full disclosure of who paid for political ads posted to social media platforms. That includes 80 percent of Republicans and 82 percent of Independents.**

Comments provided by :

Lake, Lizaveta

Especially in light of the revelations around interference in the 2016 presidential election, U.S. citizens need to know who is behind political advertising so that we can try to know how trustworthy or reliable the funding source is or what its bias may be. This should also help winnow opinion from fact in the information we are presented.

Please insist on disclaimers identifying the entity purchasing political advertising.

Ann Lamb

Comments provided by :  
Lamb, Ann

I call on the FEC to act immediately to update regulations and require online political ads to include disclaimers identifying who paid for them.

Comments provided by :  
Lampkin, Olga

In the 2016 election, 65 percent of Americans identified the internet, or an online platform, as their leading source of information.

Yet our outdated transparency rules ? which still include references to telegrams and typewriters ? don't require adequate disclaimers for online ads.

More than three in four Americans ? 78 percent ? want full disclosure of who paid for political ads posted to social media platforms (according to a new Marist poll).

That includes 80 percent of Republicans and 82 percent of Independents.

I call on the FEC to act immediately to update regulations and require online political ads to include disclaimers identifying who paid for them.

Comments provided by :  
Lamport, Richard



The FEC plays a special role in making sure our elections are run in an open, transparent, and accountable manner. To that end the FEC needs to take all possible steps to ensure that advertisements and other media are held to the strictest possible standard regardless of where they are displayed.

Rev. Nat Latos  
Tumwater, WA

Comments provided by :  
Latos, Nat

In the 2016 election, 65 percent of Americans identified the internet, or an online platform, as their leading source of information.

Yet our outdated transparency rules ? which still include references to telegrams and typewriters ? don't require adequate disclaimers for online ads.

More than three in four Americans ? 78 percent ? want full disclosure of who paid for political ads posted to social media platforms (according to a new Marist poll).

That includes 80 percent of Republicans and 82 percent of Independents.

I call on the FEC to act immediately to update regulations and require online political ads to include disclaimers identifying who paid for them.

Comments provided by :  
Lazenby, Morgan

During the 2016 election, 65 percent of Americans identified the internet, or an online platform, as their leading source of information.

Yet the FCC has outdated transparency rules ? which still include references to telegrams and typewriters ?which don't require adequate disclaimers for online ads.

More than three in four Americans ? 78 percent ? want full disclosure of who paid for political ads posted to social media platforms (according to a new Marist poll).

That includes 80 percent of Republicans and 82 percent of Independents.

I call on the FEC to act immediately to update regulations and require online political ads to include disclaimers identifying who paid for them.

Comments provided by :  
LeBeau, Barry

More than three in four Americans ? 78 percent ? want full disclosure of who paid for political ads posted to social media platforms (according to a new Marist poll).

California has just adopted full disclosure of who pays for political ads.

With Russian trolls creating thousands of Facebook and Twitter accounts influence 2016 voters, it's a no-brainer that full disclosure is absolutely necessary to protect our Constitution.

Buckley v. Valeo and Citizens United identify full disclosure as essential.

Time for full disclosure of who pays for political ads.

Comments provided by :  
Lee, Esq., Virginia

Today most Americans are getting their information online. It is urgent that we update our laws to reflect that. We need regulations that require full disclosure of who paid for political ads posted to social media platforms!

Comments provided by :  
Lee, Kathleen

Times have changed. Requirements must be extended to current methods of advertising. Online political ads, which reach millions of people, should carry "paid for" notices like ads in other media.

Comments provided by :  
LeMay, Nancy

I want online ads to include a statement about who is paying for the ad, just like print and television.

Comments provided by :  
Lieber, Rand

Free speech is for people. Citizens need to at least know who is talking. Free speech is about the free exchange of viewpoints among people. This is at the core of democratic process, as are elections.

Speech by one person with no chance for discussion is dictatorial. Anonymous speech that is slickly produced, and spread far and wide, as no ordinary individual can do, is propaganda.

In democracy, we need to be able to respond, and so we need to at least know who is talking. Anything less than full disclosure of the individuals sponsoring political messages is sinister, underhanded, and corrupt; it rots the core of democracy.

Political ads are powerful tools aimed at influencing the democratic process, and their sponsors must be immediately identifiable. No political ad should be allowed without identifying the individuals paying for it. Out of practicality, they may group themselves under one banner specific to them, but there must at the same moment be a way for people to immediately access the list of individuals paying for the ad.

The Federal Election Commission should require online ads - and all other political speech that is published or mailed or otherwise put forth - to reveal the individuals who pay for them. This will make them speech rather than just propaganda.

Tim Lillard  
Newfield, NY

Comments provided by :  
Lillard, Timothy



As a registered voter who votes in every election, I want to know who is promoting messages either for or against candidates. There are, unfortunately, many players in politics; some of them have a lot of money but hardly any principles other than "win at all costs". That being so, I want to know whether an ad, essay, "public service message", Facebook or Twitter post, discussion, web site, or re-direct is paid for and/or endorsed by a candidate, his or her campaign, a named supporter, a real grass roots organization, or an opponent or an astroturf organization. It should be hard to avoid seeing who paid for or originated the message - a little fine print or a barely audible mumble will not suffice. Therefore I support - no, I demand - disclaimers identifying who paid for online political ads.

Comments provided by :  
Limburg, David

It's time to take money out of politics. In order to do that, we need to know where the money comes from. To do that we need to know who is paying for what ads. Especially with the Russia investigations on fake ads, we need the context of ads and the entities behind them.

Comments provided by :  
Lindsay, John

Especially in the context of the current investigation into Russian meddling with the elections, and with the prevalence of online ads, I am alarmed that we don't know who paid for these ads. The American people have a right to know who spent the money on these ads.

Thank you in advance for your consideration on this important matter.

Comments provided by :  
Lobinske, Louise

Why should the internet allow stuff not otherwise allowed? It makes no sense. We need to tamp down the lies, the half-truths, and the hyperbole in a desperate attempt to get a more civil discourse.

Comments provided by :  
Lokensgard, Alan

A great many people in the US get their news and follow political issues via the Internet. Internet providers who post ads and comments need to be covered by the same regulations as print and TV media. A viewer of online ads or comments needs to know the original source for that material. This type of transparency is vital and necessary to preserve our democracy.

I want the FEC to act immediately to update regulations and require online political ads to include disclaimers identifying who paid for them.

Comments provided by :  
Lourekas, Peter

In the 21st Century, the internet has become our leading source of information and entertainment. Our outdated transparency rules don't require adequate disclaimers for online ads. 78 percent of Real Americans want full disclosure of who paid for political ads posted to social media platforms (according to a new Marist poll). That includes 80 percent of Republicans and 82 percent of Independents.

The FEC must act immediately to update regulations and require online political ads to include disclaimers identifying who paid for them. Real Americans have a right to know who is targeting them with the propaganda that inundates social media and other online destinations.

Comments provided by :  
Luther, John

Just as the FEC requires disclaimers for campaign ads seen on TV and in print, the ads that appear online should also say who is paying for them.

Most Americans are getting their information about candidates from internet sources. Internet ads should clearly state the funding source.

78 percent of Americans want full disclosure of who paid for political ads posted to social media platforms. That includes 80 percent of Republicans and 82 percent of Independents.

Comments provided by :  
Madden, Jense

In the 2016 election, 65 percent of Americans identified the internet, or an online platform, as their leading source of information.

Yet our outdated transparency rules ? which still include references to telegrams and typewriters ? don't require adequate disclaimers for online ads.

More than three in four Americans ? 78 percent ? want full disclosure of who paid for political ads posted to social media platforms (according to a new Marist poll).

That includes 80 percent of Republicans and 82 percent of Independents.

I call on the FEC to act immediately to update regulations and require online political ads to include disclaimers identifying who paid for them.

Comments provided by :  
Manning, John



Americans have a right to know who is paying for online political ads.

We need to use every lever at our disposal to prevent meddling in our elections from happening again, and to ensure that Americans know the source of political messages. Thank you.

Comments provided by :

Martin, Deb

Please act immediately to update regulations to require online political ads include disclaimers identifying who paid for them. Without transparency, readers are unable to gauge the intent of the advertiser. In our current culture, this opens the door to misrepresentation, false information, and the entire worm-bag of fake news.

Everything posted on the internet should be easily traceable.

Thank you.

Comments provided by :  
Martin, Linda

In the 2016 election, 65 percent of Americans identified the internet, or an online platform, as their leading source of information.

Yet our outdated transparency rules ? which still include references to telegrams and typewriters ? don't require adequate disclaimers for online ads.

More than three in four Americans ? 78 percent ? want full disclosure of who paid for political ads posted to social media platforms (according to a new Marist poll).

That includes 80 percent of Republicans and 82 percent of Independents.

I call on the FEC to act immediately to update regulations and require online political ads to include disclaimers identifying who paid for them.

We have a right to know who is paying for these ads.

Comments provided by :  
Masiello, Betty

Dear FEC:

To avoid misrepresentation and misspeak in political ads on the Internet, I believe that those who fund such ads must be apparent or visible to the viewer and potentially be held accountable to the FEC for what they advertise.

sincerely,

Samuel Matos

Comments provided by :  
Matos, Samuel

I call on the FEC to update regulations and require online political ads to include disclaimers identifying who paid for them.

Comments provided by :  
Mayou, Christine

The FEC should act immediately to update regulations and require online political ads to include disclaimers identifying who paid for them -- not just the name of some front group, but the actual organization and individuals who paid for the ads, and the currency in which they were paid (e.g., rubles).

In the 2016 election, 65 percent of Americans identified the internet, or an online platform, as their leading source of information.

More than three in four Americans ? 78 percent ? want full disclosure of who paid for political ads posted to social media platforms (according to a new Marist poll). That includes 80 percent of Republicans and 82 percent of Independents.

We need full disclosure of who pays for on-line ads -- as well as full disclosure of ads for TV and print media.

Thank you for your attention to this important matter.

John McCarthy  
Berkeley, CA

Comments provided by :  
McCarthy, John

Our democracy depends on robust, transparent debate. The FEC is the agency charged with making sure campaign finance rules are followed. They should start working now to require the same level of transparency for political ads on the Web as we have for political ads on television.

During the 2016 election, 65 percent of Americans identified the internet or an online platform as their leading source of news and information. Yet our outdated transparency rules, which still include references to telegrams and typewriters, don't require adequate disclosure for online campaign ads.

Americans have a right to know who is paying for political advertisements -- for or against any candidate and any issue -- in any medium. The FEC must use its authority to enforce disclosure requirements, for the health and future of our nation.

Comments provided by :  
McClendon, Angela

The FEC must require online political ads to show who is paying for them. In order to make the informed decisions required for democracy to function effectively, voters must know who is trying to influence their decisions. A majority of voters now use online sources as their primary source of information. Advertising on these platforms must meet the same requirements for transparency as broadcast and print media. FEC rules need to be revised to require that online ads include disclaimers identifying who paid for them.

Comments provided by :  
McKosky, Lucy



We have witnessed the recent affect on our election from the use of these advertisements , and spreading of false information, by Russian entities. With so many people now getting their news, and ideas, from the various sources via the Internet, there must be new requirements, for the providers , and for the entities placing these advertisements; same as currently required for television. We can not allow foreign governments, and their trolls, bots, etc to feed these users false, misleading, information to either stir up trouble or sway the thoughts regarding the candidates , in order to affect our elections and/or our Government!

Comments provided by :  
McMahon, Carol

Our outdated transparency rules ? which still include references to telegrams and typewriters ? don't require adequate disclaimers for online ads.

More than three in four Americans ? 78 percent ? want full disclosure of who paid for political ads posted to social media platforms (according to a new Marist poll).

That includes 80 percent of Republicans and 82 percent of Independents.

In the 2016 election, 65 percent of Americans identified the internet, or an online platform, as their leading source of information.

I call on the FEC to act immediately to update regulations and require online political ads to include disclaimers identifying who paid for them.

Comments provided by :  
Menn, E.

The FEC should require online campaign ads to include disclaimers about who is paying for them ? as is required for television and print advertisements. It is in the public interest that ALL advertisers be held accountable for content and the public should be aware of who is behind those ads.

Comments provided by :  
Menzel, Judith

Since most American citizens get their primary source of information from the internet, please update the Federal Election Commission's rules to require full disclaimers for online ads beginning with next year's elections.

Comments provided by :  
Meservey, RoseMarie

We have a right as Americans to know who is paying for political ads. A disclaimer should be placed showing that information on EVERY ad moving forward.

Comments provided by :  
Miller, Sharon

In the 2016 election, 65 percent of Americans identified the internet, or an online platform, as their leading source of information, yet outdated transparency rules - which still include references to telegrams and typewriters - don't require adequate disclosure for online ads.

Americans have a right to know who is paying for political advertisements?whether it be organizations with ties to Russia or wealthy special interests here at home.

Strong evidence shows Russian actors used social media platforms like Facebook to interfere with the 2016 election. We need to use every lever at our disposal ? including ending secret online political ads ? to prevent that from happening again, and to ensure that Americans know the source of political messages.

Fact is, American campaign regulations have a long way to come to improve election stability and reduce the impact of outside influences.

Comments provided by :  
Minnick, Michael

In the 2016 election, 65 percent of Americans identified the internet, or an online platform, as their leading source of information.

How can we know where that information came from, especially in light of significant foreign use of Facebook, etc. to interfere with our election process and sway the vote.

Yet our outdated transparency rules ? which still include references to telegrams and typewriters ? don't require adequate disclaimers for online ads.

More than three in four Americans (78%) want full disclosure of who paid for political ads posted to social media platforms, according to a new Marist poll. That includes 80 percent of Republicans and 82 percent of Independents.

The FEC MUST act immediately to protect our democracy by updating regulations and requiring online political ads to include disclaimers identifying who paid for them.

Comments provided by :  
Moss, Helen

The Internet is a publicly accessible outlet for news and entertainment, and includes advertising that should follow appropriate disclosure guidelines about their funding, much like television and radio. The funding sources for each advertisement on the Internet, whether on social media platform or any other platform, should be disclosed in obvious and readable fashion, with links to further information about the funding sources on which such funding sources should be required to post details for public reference about their funding sources and ownership. Every reasonable effort to identify the sources of funding, information and management should be available for public scrutiny, with severe financial penalties for failures to do so or inaccurate or misleading information.

Comments provided by :  
Naylor, Arthur



One of our most cherished ideals as a democracy involves full participation by an educated, well informed citizenry. In order to make that ideal a reality, we must insist on complete transparency in all our affairs. For citizens charged with such an awesome responsibility, the necessity of accurate, reliable information is crucial. Our government must do all it can to ensure that citizens can ascertain where information originated, and who is the actual source. Only with full transparency, can individuals make value judgments necessary to a free society.

Comments provided by :

Nelson, Gary

Because more and more newspapers are being bought out and there are fewer local options, it is more important that the internet be freely available to all and everyone is treated equally. The internet is increasingly the source of information. Please do not allow special status for a few sources to have a priority on the internet.

Comments provided by :  
Neuse, Elizabeth

There is a chance here to make sure people are better informed, and accurately informed, about advertising that may impact their decision making. I think it's an important step to add disclaimers on the internet the way we've learned to do so in television and print. The ever evolving internet has the ability to be an amazing tool for education, inclusion and unity. It also has the ability to do the opposite. The choice of adding disclaimers should not be a difficult one to make when considering what is at stake. Each day we learn more about the unscrupulous behaviors that have impacted our lives in many ways. This should be an easy choice to make considering what is at stake.

Comments provided by :  
Newkirk, Daniel

The present dysfunction and chaos in the Federal Government owes in gigantic measure to the misrepresentation and distorted propaganda bombarded at a largely gullible and fear-laden segment of the American populace. In other words, Russia chose our president, undercutting our electoral process, and Trump and his co-conspirators were all too delighted to help them. Had there been appropriate revealing of the sources of the "fake news" on-line, as there is in other media outlets, we might have been spared the horrible and unbelievable blight and plight of our present situation.

Comments provided by :  
Norton, James

Americans are Sick of having big money influencing our Elections! One Person - One Vote seems to be a thing of the past because of hidden, corporate and/or PACs Buying Millions of votes in our elections. At least on TV, the people funding ads can be identified. The American People Demand to have names of the entities paying for these ads on the Internet. It's essential for our democracy.

Comments provided by :  
O'Brien, Bruce

The FEC should require online campaign ads to include disclaimers about who is paying for them ? as is required for television and print advertisements.

Americans have a right to know who is paying for online political ads.

We need to use every lever at our disposal to prevent meddling in our elections from happening again, and to ensure that Americans know the source of political messages.

In the 2016 election, 65 percent of Americans identified the internet, or an online platform, as their leading source of information.

Our transparency rules are outdated and should be updated to remove references to telegrams and typewriters and updated to include online advertisements.

78 percent of Americans want full disclosure of who paid for political ads posted to social media platforms. That includes 80 percent of Republicans and 82 percent of Independents.

Comments provided by :  
ODear, Elizabeth

In the 2016 election, 65 percent of Americans identified the internet, or an online platform, as their leading source of information. Yet our outdated transparency rules ? which still include references to telegrams and typewriters ? don't require adequate disclaimers for online ads.

More than three in four Americans ? 78 percent ? want full disclosure of who paid for political ads posted to social media platforms (according to a new Marist poll). That includes 80 percent of Republicans and 82 percent of Independents.

I call on the FEC to act immediately to update regulations and require online political ads to include disclaimers identifying who paid for them.

Comments provided by :  
Packheiser, Jen

The internet is the medium that a majority of people get their information from especially for elections. For the vitality of our democracy, it is necessary that Americans know who is paying for online political ads. It is our right. More than three in four Americans ? 78 percent ? want full disclosure of who paid for political ads posted to social media platforms. It is now up to the FEC to act immediately to update regulations and require online political ads to include disclaimers identifying who paid for them.

Comments provided by :  
Pathania, Samrat



We've seen what happens when people vote in ignorance.

Comments provided by :  
Pavao, James

In the 2016 election, 65 percent of Americans identified the internet, or an online platform, as their leading source of information.

Yet our outdated transparency rules ? which still include references to telegrams and typewriters ? don't require adequate disclaimers for online ads.

More than three in four Americans ? 78 percent ? want full disclosure of who paid for political ads posted to social media platforms (according to a new Marist poll).

That includes 80 percent of Republicans and 82 percent of Independents.

I call on the FEC to act immediately to update regulations and require online political ads to include disclaimers identifying who paid for them.

Comments provided by :  
Pavlic, Anne

It is important that the FEC take action to require transparency and truth in online political advertising.

Americans have a right to know who is paying for online political ads.

We need to use every lever at our disposal to prevent meddling in our elections from happening again, and to ensure that Americans know the source of political messages.

In the 2016 election, 65 percent of Americans identified the internet, or an online platform, as their leading source of information.

Our transparency rules are outdated and should be updated to remove references to telegrams and typewriters and updated to include online advertisements.

78 percent of Americans want full disclosure of who paid for political ads posted to social media platforms. That includes 80 percent of Republicans and 82 percent of Independents.

The FEC should require online campaign ads to include disclaimers about who is paying for them ? as is required for television and print advertisements.

Please act now, this is a non-partisan and vitally important matter.

Comments provided by :  
Pearce-Reece, BJ

In the 2016 election, 65 percent of Americans identified the internet, or an online platform, as their leading source of information.

Yet our outdated transparency rules ? which still include references to telegrams and typewriters ? don't require adequate disclaimers for online ads.

According to a new Marist poll, more than three in four Americans ? 78 percent ? want full disclosure of who paid for political ads posted to social media platforms.

That includes 80 percent of Republicans and 82 percent of Independents. This issue clearly has bi-partisan support.

I call on the FEC to act immediately to update regulations and require online political ads to include disclaimers identifying who paid for them, just as is required for radio and television ads.

Comments provided by :  
Pease, Julie

In the 2016 election, 65 percent of Americans identified the internet, or an online platform, as their leading source of information.

Yet our outdated transparency rules ? which still include references to telegrams and typewriters ? don't require adequate disclaimers for online ads.

More than three in four Americans ? 78 percent ? want full disclosure of who paid for political ads posted to social media platforms (according to a new Marist poll).

That includes 80 percent of Republicans and 82 percent of Independents.

I call on the FEC to act immediately to update regulations and require online political ads to include disclaimers identifying who paid for them.

There's no reason for people to be in the dark about the source of/funding behind internet content. We need TRANSPARENCY!

Thank you for listening to me.

Comments provided by :  
Pelton, Judy

In the 2016 election, 65 percent of Americans identified the internet, or an online platform, as their leading source of information.

Yet our outdated transparency rules ? which still include references to telegrams and typewriters ? don't require adequate disclosure for online ads.

No matter if it?s organizations with ties to Russia or shadowy nonprofits funded by the Koch Brothers, Americans have a right to know who is paying for online political ads.

Please require online ads to include disclosures saying who paid for them. More than three in four Americans ? 78 percent ? want full disclosure of who paid for political ads posted to social media platforms (according to a new Marist poll).

That includes 80 percent of Republicans and 82 percent of Independents.

It is time to make that happen. FEC, please fix these rules NOW!

Thank you for considering my comments.

Comments provided by :  
Perkins, Sandra

We need more information to judge whether something we read on the internet is "fake" news. We should know the source.

Comments provided by :  
Peterson, Mary

The internet and social media have given candidates unprecedented methods of communicating with voters - and they have given voters an unprecedented method of communicating with them. These communications, however, are still political campaign communications and are, as such, under the purview of the FEC. It is of vital importance to the health of our democracy that the communications be regulated in similar ways to other forms of communication such as print, radio, and TV. I would urge the regulation to create a framework within which it can regulate this form of political campaigning.

Comments provided by :  
Phillips, Harold



During past elections I found myself often refusing information false information or emails that people had found on the Internet. Often the source of this information was from ads people had sen on Facebook or while using Google for information. These negative ads were strongly influencing people in their voting decisions. They were being effectively used and the sourced information was not verifiable.This is NOT an ethical part of the American political system.

Comments provided by :  
Piercy, Jack

I'm writing to urge the FEC to update regulations and require online political ads to include disclaimers identifying who paid for them.

Thank you and best regards,  
Paul Poisson

Comments provided by :  
Poisson, Paul

The FEC should act immediately to put forward updated regulations that require online campaign ads to include disclaimers letting people know who is funding them, just like television and print ads.

Americans have a right to know who is paying for online political ads, especially those with ties to foreign governments or wealthy special interests in this country.

Comments provided by :  
Polan, Nancy

In the 2016 election, 65 percent of Americans identified the internet, or an online platform, as their leading source of information.

Yet our outdated transparency rules ? which still include references to telegrams and typewriters ? don't require adequate disclaimers for online ads.

More than three in four Americans ? 78 percent ? want full disclosure of who paid for political ads posted to social media platforms (according to a new Marist poll).

That includes 80 percent of Republicans and 82 percent of Independents.

I call on the FEC to act immediately to update regulations and require online political ads to include disclaimers identifying who paid for them.

Comments provided by :  
Power, Clifton

This is a truthfulness, fairness, and transparency issue. This good for both parties. We need to catch up to the times as technology is a major factor through the social media platforms.

It In the 2016 election, 65 percent of Americans identified the internet, or an online platform, as their leading source of information.

Yet our outdated transparency rules ? which still include references to telegrams and typewriters ? don't require adequate disclaimers for online ads.

More than three in four Americans ? 78 percent ? want full disclosure of who paid for political ads posted to social media platforms (according to a new Marist poll).

That includes 80 percent of Republicans and 82 percent of Independents.

I call on the FEC to act immediately to update regulations and require online political ads to include disclaimers identifying who paid for them.

Comments provided by :  
Quintana, David

I recently learned on NPR radio that the Russians have played a role in our last election by posting adds on the internet, such as FACEBOOK and appear to have played a not insignificant role in influencing the election. We must we find a way to require all such posting reveal their sources. This is critical because a large percentage of Americans identify the internet, or an online platform, as their primary source of gaining information.

Outdated transparency rules don't require adequate disclaimers for online advertising - this is appalling!

According to a new poll, Americans do want disclosure; in fact, 78 percent full disclosure of who paid for political ads posted to social media platforms.

It is extremely important that the FEC act immediately to update regulations and require online political ads to include disclaimers identifying who paid for them.

Comments provided by :  
Ramsay, David

The FEC should require online campaign ads to include disclaimers about who is paying for them ? as is required for television and print advertisements.

Americans have a right to know who is paying for online political ads.

Most Americans want full disclosure of who paid for political ads posted to social media platforms. This include Democrats, Republicans and Independents.

Our transparency rules are outdated and should be updated to include online advertisements.

Comments provided by :  
Ramsey, George

Dear Fec,

I'm extremely alarmed to hear that due to antiquated rules we do not have full disclaimers regarding ads that might be political in nature I call on you

To act Asap to update regulations that will allow full disclosure as to where these ads are originating

Fran Ransom

Lakewood Nj

Comments provided by :

Ransom, Fran



I strongly urge the FEC to reevaluate their rules and regulations regarding online advertising. A majority of Americans want online advertising labeled as such with clear information on who paid for said advertising. This has long been the standard in print and television advertising. There is no reason such rules shouldn't govern online advertising the same way.

Comments provided by :  
Raska, Leaha

It's well past time that the FEC regulations caught up with current technology. Political ads on the internet should be handled with the same level of transparency and diligence given to TV and radio ads. The fact that foreign governments can and likely have used the internet to sway public opinion during election season should be enough to prompt action from the FEC in this matter.

Comments provided by :  
Reed, Jason

I am asking you to require disclaimers for on-line ads.

We need to use every lever at our disposal to prevent meddling in our elections from happening again, and to ensure that Americans know the source of political messages. I want to know who is behind an ad.

Comments provided by :  
Richards, Joanne

I am in favor of full disclosure of source of funding for political ads.

Comments provided by :  
Rosales, Eddie

As the internet becomes more and more the way information is disseminated, it is critical that the REC require online campaign ads to include disclaimers as to who is paying for the ads. Please update the transparency rules so that it is made mandatory.

Comments provided by :  
Rose, Jane

In the 2016 election, 65 percent of Americans identified the internet, or an online platform, as their leading source of information.

Yet our outdated transparency rules ? which still include references to telegrams and typewriters ? don't require adequate disclaimers for online ads.

More than three in four Americans ? 78 percent ? want full disclosure of who paid for political ads posted to social media platforms (according to a new Marist poll).

That includes 80 percent of Republicans and 82 percent of Independents.

I call on the FEC to act immediately to update regulations and require online political ads to include disclaimers identifying who paid for them.

Comments provided by :  
Rucker, Rebecca

This is a simple and logical way to cut back on some of false information that gets transmitted online! Not perfect, but very helpful. Thank you for taking action !

Comments provided by :  
Samuelson, Kristin

In the 2016 election, 65 percent of Americans identified the internet, or an online platform, as their leading source of information. It is extremely important that the origin and creators of public information developed to direct peoples attention toward a specific outcome be identified. We can not have a functioning democracy without knowledge of who and what is directing a discussion. The inevitable outcome of such a situation reminds me of lemmings or animals running over a cliff because they did not know it was their. This is not the direction I want to go.

I call on the FEC to act immediately to update regulations and require online political ads to include disclaimers identifying who paid for them.

Comments provided by :  
sanford, Ken



In the 2016 election, 65 percent of Americans identified the internet, or an online platform, as their leading source of information.

Yet our outdated transparency rules don't require adequate disclaimers for online ads.

A strong majority of Americans want full disclosure of who paid for political ads posted to social media platforms (according to a new Marist poll).

I call on the FEC to act immediately to update regulations and require online political ads to include disclaimers identifying who paid for them.

Comments provided by :  
Saxton, Tom

I believe the FEC should should do everything they can to prevent meddling in our elections from ever happening again. Most Americans get their news from online websites as their leading source of information. We should know who is paying for political ads posted on social media platforms. We have a right to know who is paying for online media ads, just like television and print advertisements. Let's update the rules FEC.

Comments provided by :  
Schmidt, Kathleen

Our transparency rules are outdated and should be updated to remove references to telegrams and typewriters and updated to include online advertisements. It is time to take action.

Comments provided by :  
schneeberger, sharon

Make transparency in online ads by adding and requiring a declaration or disclaimer as to the author or sponsor name and address. No more secrecy or media manipulation of true statements. If ads are grime Russia or the NRA it should say so.

Comments provided by :  
Schutz, Ron

It is imperative, and in the interests of both the public in general and defense of democracy in particular, that the FEC requires disclosure of funders and sponsors of campaigns/campaign ads and that candidates be required to state that they are informed about and approve the content of campaign ads.

This helps to keep the process clear, accurate and more honest; it prevents candidates from claiming (often falsely) that they were unaware of the contents or lies embodied in ads. And helps to discourage attack ads because the perpetrators are identifiable.

Keep in mind the words of Supreme Court Justice Louis Brandeis:

Sunlight is said to be the best of disinfectants; electric light the most efficient policeman.  
--Other People's Money?and How Bankers Use It (1914).

The abuse of corporate power and money--especially cloaking those abuses by hiding them from view--is even more pronounced at present:

Through size, corporations, once merely an efficient tool employed by individuals in the conduct of private business have become an institution-an institution which has brought such concentration of economic power that so-called private corporations are sometimes able to dominate the state. The typical business corporation of the last century, owned by a small group of individuals, managed by their owners, and limited in size by their private wealth, is being supplanted by huge concerns in which the lives of tens or hundreds of thousands of employees and the property of tens of hundreds of thousands of investors are subjected, through the corporate mechanism, to the control of a few men. Ownership has been separated from control; and this separation has removed many of the checks which formerly operated to curb the misuse of wealth and power. And, as ownership of the shares is becoming continually more dispersed, the power which formerly accompanied ownership is becoming increasingly concentrated in the hands of a few... [and] coincident with the growth of these giant corporations, there has occurred a marked concentration of individual wealth; and that the resulting disparity in incomes is a major cause of the existing depression.  
--Dissent, Liggett Co. v. Lee, 288 U.S. 517 (1933), at 565-67.

It's also a major cause of the disenfranchisement of voters, and changing the current requirements seeks to use ignorance to further the destruction of democracy in favor of totalitarian oligarchy.

Comments provided by :  
Semorile, Trina

Enough with the tasteless, vulgar, mostly exaggerated or more likely untrue and unreasonable attack political advertising being allowed to make a municipal dump of our TV screens to suit someone's tantrum-like political propensities and bad taste and dishonesty. It's a pollutant, and uninformative, not an expression of free speech, but a permitted assault.

Given that, I insist that we be told exactly and I mean exactly who is responsible for this bad and uncivil behavior masquerading as political information we are barraged with. Let these horrible and obnoxious messages, now without either responsibility, truth, or consequences, be tightly attributed and attributable to specific organizations and individuals and their excessive money chasing disinformation and misinformation.

Online political advertising, like Television and Print advertising, must be attributable and attributed to the exact and exactly named party or parties paying for them, and responsible for them.

Thank you,

Comments provided by :  
Sharfman, William

Advertisements should be identified as advertisements, and who paid for them should be noted. Period.

Comments provided by :  
Shaw, Jordan

It should be made clear in any political ad exactly what entity is paying for it. Why? - the very same reasons that this is required for television and print advertisements.

Comments provided by :  
Shaw, Nancy



BECAUSE WE THE PEOPLE HAVE THE RIGHT TO HONESTY IN ALL OF OUR ELECTIONS FOR AS LONG AS WE LIVE FOR ALWAYS BECAUSE AS THE UNIVERSALLY KNOWN SAYING GOES, "HONESTY IS THE BEST POLICY!"

Comments provided by :  
SHIFFRIN, JOYCE

In the 2016 election, 65 percent of Americans identified the internet, or an online platform, as their leading source of information.

Yet our outdated transparency rules ? which still include references to telegrams and typewriters ? don't require adequate disclaimers for online ads.

More than three in four Americans, including me ? 78 percent ? want full disclosure of who paid for political ads posted to social media platforms (according to a new Marist poll).

That includes 80 percent of Republicans and 82 percent of Independents.

I call on the FEC to act immediately to update regulations and require online political ads to include disclaimers identifying who paid for them.

Comments provided by :  
Shutkin, Sara

The FEC should require online campaign ads to include disclaimers about who is paying for them, the same as is required for television and print advertisements.

Americans have a right to know who is paying for online political ads.

We need to prevent meddling in our elections from happening again, and to ensure that Americans know the source of political messages.

In the 2016 election, 65 percent of Americans identified the internet, or an online platform, as their leading source of information, and it seems much of that info was propaganda from a foreign government. Our transparency rules are outdated and should be updated to remove references to telegrams and typewriters and updated to include online advertisements.

78% of Americans want full disclosure of who paid for political ads posted to social media platforms. That includes 80% of Republicans and 82% of Independents.

Please rewrite online campaign ad rules.

Comments provided by :

Slaughter, Kathy

We take pride in our Democracy and yet we allow groups to donate so much money to individuals and organizations without transparency. We The People should Know who and where moneys are coming into our election process. Free and open elections are the foundation of our Democracy and we must do all we can to keep them open and free.  
Thank you

Comments provided by :  
Strollo, Michael

Purchasers for political ads must be declared.

Comments provided by :  
Sucklal , Sirina

With online activity so prevalent today, the source of so much of our information, it is critical that political ads contain the same type of disclaimer that television ads do so that we can decipher who is responsible for the message. We saw in the 2016 election 10s of thousands of messages that were delivered through Facebook, Twitter, YouTube, and Google we now know were sent by foreign governments and activists. That kind of infection of our election process is very dangerous and if we won't move to stop the messages at least we should know where they come from. Please make sure ALL messages, regardless of delivery medium are identified with the name of the responsible party offering up the message. Thank you.

Comments provided by :  
Suminski, James

Keep the Internet free! But if you're paying for an advertisement, tell me who you are. Russian sneak-thieves stole the last election. Are you their enablers?

Comments provided by :  
taishoff, lewis

Sadly, news and views can come to readers of online content without attribution. It is imperative that the rules on political ads placed in social media or online be the same as applied to newspapers or radio.

I am one of the vast majority who want full disclosure of political ad funding when it's posted online. I want my fellows who use the internet, whether Facebook or other platforms to understand the source of the ads they will view in an election.

It is my understanding that 65 percent of Americans identified the internet, or an online platform, as their leading source of information during the last election. .

Please update your regulations to include online political ads and identify who paid for them.

Sincerely,  
Catherine Thomasson, MD

Comments provided by :  
Thomasson, Catherine



This change in FEC rules is long overdue. I hope they act on it quickly so that it will be in place for elections coming up in November.

Comments provided by :  
Traupe, Robert

Americans have a right to know who is funding online political ads to influence their votes ? whether Russian operatives or shadowy billionaires. Online political ads should not be exempt from transparency rules!

Comments provided by :  
Turk, Lawrence

Political advertising in other media indicate who paid for the advertisement. It is ridiculous that the same requirement is not applied to political advertisement found on the internet. As we saw in our last presidential election, there was significant advertising paid for by a hostile foreign government. Might its effect not been mitigated if voters had known that "this ad was approved by and paid for my Vladimir Putin?"

Comments provided by :  
Van Buer, Michael

I want transparency in election funding across the board.

Comments provided by :  
Vargas, Vicente

The American people deserve to know the bias behind each political ad. Toward this end there must be transparency and full disclosure of all contributions which lead to the creation or support for each political advertisement. This financial disclosure must be easy to see within the body of the advertisement, of a font size equal to or greater than the font size of the body of the ad. Where front organizations or entities which consolidate smaller contributions for the purpose of funding political advertisements are placing ads, then those front entities must disclose all of the individual donors and the amount of each contribution by each donor.

Comments provided by :  
Vermillion, James

The US democracy is an essential aspect of our lives as US Citizens. Keeping this democracy "clean" and uncorrupted by outside influence is a key component of the democratic process. Communication disclaimers a helpful protection for all citizens.

Thank you.

Comments provided by :  
Wang, Deane

In the 2016 election, 65 percent of Americans identified the internet, or an online platform, as their leading source of information.

New information coming out just this week indicates over 120 million Americans were subjected to foreign propaganda during last year's presidential election.

Yet our outdated transparency rules ? which still include references to telegrams and typewriters ? don't require adequate disclaimers for online ads.

More than three in four Americans ? 78 percent ? want full disclosure of who paid for political ads posted to social media platforms (according to a new Marist poll).

That includes 80 percent of Republicans and 82 percent of Independents.

I call on the FEC to act immediately to update regulations and require online political ads to include disclaimers identifying who paid for them.

Comments provided by :  
Warner, Chris

I strongly believe that the American public be able to discover just who is behind the internet campaign ads that we see on a daily basis, just as we are able to see on print and television ads. I am saying this as an independent voter and someone very concerned about the state of our democracy right now. Please change the rules so we can be a better informed public. It is hard for me to imagine a good reason not to do this rule change.

Thank you for your consideration of my request.

Terry Webb

Comments provided by :  
Webb, Terry



In the 2016 election, 65 percent of Americans identified the internet, or an online platform, as their leading source of information.

Yet our outdated transparency rules ? which still include references to telegrams and typewriters ? don't require adequate disclaimers for online ads.

More than three in four Americans ? 78 percent ? want full disclosure of who paid for political ads posted to social media platforms (according to a new Marist poll).

That includes 80 percent of Republicans and 82 percent of Independents.

I call on the FEC to act immediately to update regulations and require online political ads to include disclaimers identifying who paid for them.

Comments provided by :  
Weedman, Ruth

In the 2016 election, 65 percent of Americans identified the internet, or an online platform, as their leading source of information.

Yet our outdated transparency rules ? which still include references to telegrams and typewriters ? don't require adequate disclaimers for online ads.

More than three in four Americans ? 78 percent ? want full disclosure of who paid for political ads posted to social media platforms (according to a new Marist poll).

That includes 80 percent of Republicans and 82 percent of Independents.

I call on the FEC to act immediately to update regulations and require online political ads to include disclaimers identifying who paid for them.

Comments provided by :  
Weems, James

One of the major things that separates the United States from the rest of the world is our 241 year old democracy. If we cannot be transparent about stealth political ads, what are we? Who calls the shots? What control have we given up? Please, please, please pass the Reg. 2011-02 Internet Communication Disclaimers and let us start to take back our democracy.

Comments provided by :  
Weinlich Miltenberg, Anne

Much of the problem with foreign influence in social media advertising online is due to the fact that anyone can anonymously buy online advertising without disclosing who they are, or, if they are even allowed to participate in the US elections process. This is a huge loophole, one that has clear consequences.

All political advertising should be required to disclose who paid for the advertising.

Even better, PACs and any organizations who indirectly campaign on behalf of an individual should be required to disclose who the organizers and principals are in the PAC or other organization, just as individuals should be required to disclose who they are online if they are paying for political advertising.

Comments provided by :  
Weitzel, Tim

Our whole system of government is now rigged, geared towards the 1%, for the 1% and BY the 1%.

Enough is enough.

Cap campaign contributions.

Identify ALL campaign contributions.

Stop letting only the 1% run for office. Any and all should have the opportunity WITHOUT being rich.

Thank you.

Comments provided by :

Werner, Sandra

It feels ludicrous and very outdated to not require the same disclosure info on electronic media campaigns as is presently required for print and TV.

Bring this policy into the 21st century, especially in light of the news of manipulation, foreign sourcing and deliberate intervention in our democratic election processes.

Thank you.

Comments provided by :  
Wheatley, Margaret

When I see a political ad on the internet or anywhere else I want to know who put it there, aka what's in it for the person or group financing the ad? Free speech is important but it is also important for the people who hear the speech to know exactly who is speaking and what is the real point behind the speech. Rules for advertisements on tv, radio, newspapers from the 20th Century need to be updated to include the internet in the 21st Century.

Comments provided by :

Wilker, Donna

I am receiving much more of my news/information online. I want to know who is financing the ads I see..which show up whether or not I am interested. We need transparency in advertising so we can weigh the motives that may be behind the ads.

Our rules are far behind the technology. We need to update them now!

Comments provided by :

Williams, Ann



As someone who served 30 years in uniform to support and defend our Constitution, I see it unconscionable in this era not to require online political advertising to have the same attribution of source as is required for any TV, radio, or printed campaign material. Our democracy has clearly been under attack using social media. Having served as staff for the Navy's Global War Game 25 years ago when what's now called cyber warfare was a main topic, I see no excuse for any delay or reluctance to impose these minimum kinds of measures to protect our nation from subversion by foreign and domestic forces that take advantage of well-known vulnerabilities through this technology. I urge you to take prompt, effective measures. To do less would be culpable negligence.

Comments provided by :  
Williams, James

Advertisements on the internet, specifically political ads, absolutely should contain the name(s) of the organizations or people who are paying for those ads. There is no justification to keep that a secret. They must be revealed on television and in newspapers; the internet is no different. It is a major source of information for many people, therefore, it should be accurate and transparent. This doesn't matter if it's an American person/organization or an international. Given that the Russians spent money targeting many different groups on the internet through advertisements during the last presidential campaign, often misleading many groups, it is imperative that there be transparency. If they, or anyone else, organization, government, or individual, does not want to publicly state that they are sponsoring an ad, it should NOT be published on the internet. We have enough problems in this country with one group pitting itself against another group, often because of misinformation. It's time to stop. Transparency is essential. It's important for America and its future.

Comments provided by :  
Winchester, Monika

There should be full disclosure of who paid for political ads posted to social media platforms. Especially since the Citizens United decision, the American public needs to know who paid - it could be an organization with ties to foreign governments or wealthy special interests here at home.

In the 2016 election, 65 percent of Americans identified the internet, or an online platform, as their leading source of information. TV and print ads require disclaimers; it is ridiculous that the FCC's outdated rules don't require disclaimers for online ads.

Comments provided by :  
Wright, David

In the 2016 election, 65 percent of Americans identified the internet, or an online platform, as their leading source of information.

Yet our outdated transparency rules ? which still include references to telegrams and typewriters ? don't require adequate disclaimers for online ads.

More than three in four Americans ? 78 percent ? want full disclosure of who paid for political ads posted to social media platforms (according to a new Marist poll).

That includes 80 percent of Republicans and 82 percent of Independents.

I call on the FEC to act immediately to update regulations and require online political ads to include disclaimers identifying who paid for them.

Comments provided by :  
zale, madalene

Increasingly, Americans identify the internet, or an online platform, as their leading source of information. Yet our outdated transparency rules, which still include references to telegrams and typewriters, don't require adequate disclosure for online ads. All political advertisements, no matter the medium, should require clear and legible disclosure of the funding source. Based on the testimony from the leading major Internet companies yesterday, it is clear that we need stronger rules to address and provide disclosure of funding for ads.

Comments provided by :  
Acebo, Ryan

PLEASE HELP!!

A democracy requires transparency to be genuine. Requiring disclosure of financial contribution in political advertisements is fundamental to preventing an oligarchic defacto coup.

Comments provided by :

Adams, M

I would like the FEC to require ads on social media to be identified as to who is the sponsor for that ad. I want to know who is paying for an ad that I or anyone else is reading on line.

Comments provided by :  
Albin, Audrey

We need TRANSPARENCY in our Democracy in all advertising, including online, TV, & radio. The public has a right to know who is putting forth messages of influence to our electorate.

I am appalled that in the 21st Century, we still have dark forces behind the scenes misrepresenting themselves to voters without complete honesty.

Please note my objection to this practice and I urge your committee to correct this as soon as possible.

Our Nation depends on clarity in elections and online subterfuge is the antithesis of a FREE country guided by our Founding Father's Constitution!

Sincerely,

Joe Armel, DDS

Comments provided by :  
Armel, Joe



Americans have a right to know who is paying for political advertisements whether it be organizations with ties to Russia or wealthy special interests here at home.

Comments provided by :  
Babb, Gary

In the 2016 election, 65 percent of Americans identified the internet, or an online platform, as their leading source of information, in spite of the fact that its content is often unreliable and most lack the critical thinking skills to evaluate information sources.

Yet our outdated transparency rules ? which still include references to telegrams and typewriters ? don't require adequate disclaimers for online ads, while they do for similar ads using other media.

More than three in four Americans ? 78 percent ? want full disclosure of who paid for political ads posted to social media platforms (according to a new Marist poll).

That includes 80 percent of Republicans and 82 percent of Independents.

I call on the FEC to act immediately to update regulations and require online political ads to include disclaimers identifying who paid for them.

Comments provided by :  
Baker, David

I want to know exactly who is sponsoring all online political ads including the attack ads. I want to know if a foreign government is involved and sponsoring election ads online so I can investigate them myself. I want disclaimers like it is done on National TV. I want to insure that our elections are not being compromised. Thank you.

Comments provided by :  
Balasko, Deborah

In the 2016 election, 65% of Americans identified the internet, or an online platform, as their leading source of information. Yet our outdated transparency rules, which still include references to telegrams and typewriters, don't require adequate disclosure for online ads.

Americans have a right to know who is paying for political advertisements?whether it be organizations with ties to Russia or wealthy special interests here at home.

There is strong evidence Russian actors used social media platforms like Facebook to interfere with the 2016 election. We need to use every lever at our disposal ? including ending secret online political ads ? to prevent that from happening again, and to ensure that Americans know the source of political messages.

Our democracy depends on robust, transparent debate. The FEC is the agency charged with making sure campaign finance rules are followed ? they should start working now to require the same level of transparency for online ads as we have for political ads on television.

**MAKE POLITICAL ADS TRANSPARENT SO WE KNOW WHO IS PAYING FOR THEM!!!**

Comments provided by :  
Bates, Gina

We need to know who is funding political ads. on the internet. WE NEED DISCLOSURE. This is a democracy.

Comments provided by :

Bauer, Alwen

In considering online political advertisements, there is no reason that any one person should not know who paid for the advertisement. It would be really nice if there was a simple way to follow the trail back to the money source, but I know you scrooges will not make that possible.

Comments provided by :  
Berger, Josh

Our ability to confer clarity, or 'transparency', in campaign-related political matters will never outstrip the efforts of various interests to cloud, or obfuscate. Nevertheless, we must try, and if we cannot issue a 'True' or 'False' badge for every claim made, or advertisement shown, we must at least be able to know whose money paid for an ad, and who it's for.

If it is proper that political advertising on 20th century's media -- TV or radio -- should be clear concerning source and attribution, then it is proper that such should be clear concerning source and attribution for 21st century's media.

Comments provided by :  
Berman, Benjamin

This small regulation could secure our democracy from outside influences and agendas.

Comments provided by :  
Bird, Lori



Dear Sir and/or Ms,

I want to know who is responsible for putting up "information" on line because knowing who is paying for an ad may reveal much about the truth of the ad aka "information" itself. Foreign Countries are influencing American citizens with fake news. Many citizens need help in determining who is sending the information. Lying and fake information done with an ulterior motives on the Internet can erode confidence and end up with bad decision making. Some nefarious people are pitting one American against another with fake propaganda.

Comments provided by :  
Blackley, William

The public deserves to know who is funding all politically relevant advertising, whether it is on the internet, in print media, or on the airwaves. Only by knowing the source of the advertising are individuals able to check on whether such advertising is profit-motivated or ideologically driven. Please force all advertisers to reveal their sources!

Associate Professor Emily Blank  
Economics Department  
Howard University

Comments provided by :  
Blank, Emily

Given the extremely high probability of Russia continuing their aggression on the US and democracy in general, it is critical that every thing that can be done to counter their interference be implemented. The obvious first step is to require the source of any advertisement to be displayed. It is also obvious that the source be traced back to a person and a country of origin- whether that be the owner of a business or the chief officer of an organization.

Comments provided by :  
Bloom, Stephen

In the 2016 election, 65 percent of Americans identified the internet, or an online platform, as their leading source of information.

Yet our outdated transparency rules ? which still include references to telegrams and typewriters ? don't require adequate disclaimers for online ads.

More than three in four Americans ? 78 percent ? want full disclosure of who paid for political ads posted to social media platforms (according to a new Marist poll).

That includes 80 percent of Republicans and 82 percent of Independents.

I call on the FEC to act immediately to update regulations and require online political ads to include disclaimers identifying who paid for them.

Comments provided by :  
Blumenthal, Rena

In the 2016 election, 65 percent of Americans identified the internet, or an online platform, as their leading source of information. Yet our outdated transparency rules, which still include references to telegrams and typewriters, don't require adequate disclosure for online ads.

Americans have a right to know who is paying for political advertisements?whether it be organizations with ties to Russia or wealthy special interests here at home.

There is strong evidence Russian actors used social media platforms like Facebook to interfere with the 2016 election. We need to use every lever at our disposal ? including ending secret online political ads ? to prevent that from happening again, and to ensure that Americans know the source of political messages.

The internet must also be kept open and free of tiered communication speeds. Corporations provide access but they do not own the internet. The neutrality of the net must be upheld and enforced. Companies should not be allowed free data when keeping data limits in place for accessing other websites.

Comments provided by :  
Bovee, Duncan

Close the loop hole!

Comments provided by :  
Bowen, Lee

The Internet and Web should not be an open platform for unaccountable propaganda.

Require transparency for sponsors of paid ads on the internet!

Comments provided by :

Bowen, Normajeane

The majority of Americans today identify The Internet as their leading source of information. Existing transparency rules, which still include references to telegrams and typewriters, don't yet require adequate disclosure for online ads - this is a terrible oversight.

We have a right to know who is paying for political advertisements?whether it be organizations with ties to Russia or wealthy special interests here at home.

The strong evidence Russian actors used social media platforms like Facebook to interfere with the 2016 election comes as a wake-up call. We need to use every lever at our disposal - including ending secret online political ads - to prevent that from happening again, and to ensure that Americans know the source of political messages.

Thank you for your time,

Comments provided by :  
Boyd, Tobias



Informed consent is essential to a properly functioning election process and a truly representative government. Please act promptly and decisively to ensure that voters are informed of who's trying to sway their vote. Please require that all campaign ads be accompanied by disclosure of who's paying for the ad.

Comments provided by :  
Boyer, Richard

The FEC should require online campaign ads to include disclaimers about who is paying for them ? as is required for television and print advertisements.

Americans have a right to know who is paying for online political ads. We need to use every lever at our disposal to prevent meddling in our elections from happening again, and to ensure that Americans know the source of political messages. In the 2016 election, 65 percent of Americans identified the internet, or an online platform, as their leading source of information. Our transparency rules are outdated and should be updated to remove references to telegrams and typewriters and to include online advertisements. We have a right to know who is behind what we see and hear, so that we can make informed decisions. Otherwise, we fall prey to brainwashing and manipulation.

78 percent of Americans want full disclosure of who paid for political ads posted to social media platforms. That includes 80 percent of Republicans and 82 percent of Independents.

Comments provided by :  
Bradley, Kathy

We have a right to know who is paying for the ads we see

Comments provided by :  
Brenner, Jeri

It is just plain common sense to update our disclosure requirements to encompass the Internet and online advertisements. Most American citizens get their news from and are highly influenced by online news and advertisements. We cannot continue to allow outside influences to manipulate our country's elections in an anonymous manner.

Comments provided by :  
Brock, Samson

In the 2016 election, 65 percent of Americans identified the internet, or an online platform, as their leading source of information. Yet our outdated transparency rules, which still include references to telegrams and typewriters, don't require adequate disclosure for online ads.

There is strong evidence Russian actors used social media platforms like Facebook to interfere with the 2016 election. We need to use every lever at our disposal ? including ending secret online political ads ? to prevent that from happening again, and to ensure that Americans know the source of political messages. Americans have a right to know who is paying for political advertisements?whether it be organizations with ties to Russia or wealthy special interests here at home.

Comments provided by :

Brown, Gregory

IT IS VERY IMPORTANT THAT INTERNET COMMUNICATION APPROPRIATELY IDENTIFY SOURCES AND FUNDING SO WE AVOID THE RECENT AND CONTINUING PROBLEMS WITH RUSSIAN ADS AND OTHER FALSELY SOURCED "NEWS".

Comments provided by :  
Brown, Kathryn

According to an Oct. 30th story in the New York Times, more than 126 million users of Facebook were exposed to messages created by Russian agents, in an attempt to influence the 2016 presidential election. Still more messages were sent through other social media sites, such as Twitter and YouTube.

We no longer live in an age when traditional media is the go-to source for news. Increasingly, people get their news through social media. And we must be able to trust the news wherever we get it - print, radio, broadcast media, or social media - as well as know who created or reported the news and who sponsored the stories.

Social media must be scrutinized the same as other media sources, and must be held to the same standards as other media sources. We need to know who is the source of the information we use to choose our elected leaders. We need to be fully informed about sources, funding and who benefits from the news we rely on.

I urge you to implement the Internet Communication Disclaimers rule.

Thank you.

Comments provided by :

Brown, Virginia

It is critically important that you act to ensure that ALL online campaign information, or indeed all politically partisan material sent to the American public online, must include the name and contact information of the individual, advocacy group, corporation, lobby, PAC, or foreign government that is sponsoring and/or submitting the information or material for online distribution. Our American democracy depends on voters having accurate information, and on knowing the sources of that information. Commissioners, please act to do this immediately! If you do not act, you will, by omission, be opening a back door to the ascendance of unchecked tyranny in our nation.

Comments provided by :  
Bruckner, Victoria



It is VITAL any ads online be required to show who paid for the funding. VITAL. As we see today, countries that wish to influence our elections are posting lots of DISINFORMATION online, seeking to separate and poison the political atmosphere here in our country. If you do not require that ads show who paid for them, you are paving the way for more and more disinformation, from adversarial nations like Russia and organizations, being spread on our social media and elsewhere. Such disinformation only serves to further divide us as a nation and cause great damage to our democracy. Therefore please require all ads to be certified as NOT from adversarial nations or enemy nations, and require that all ads show the source of their funding.

Comments provided by :  
Buchman, Geoffrey

Please make it mandatory for advertisers online to identify themselves. We can look at the authors of articles, make judgements about how reliable they are, and then decide whether to read the article. We should be able to do the same about ads, especially political ads. There is no legitimate reason for political advertisers to be anonymous. Please make it mandatory for them to identify themselves. Thank you.

Comments provided by :  
Cantrell, Sandra

It is time that we know exactly who is contributing to politicians and paying for their ads. Make this happen!

Comments provided by :  
Capps, Julie

In the 2016 election, 65 percent of Americans identified the internet, or an online platform, as their leading source of information.

Yet our outdated transparency rules ? which still include references to telegrams and typewriters ? don't require adequate disclaimers for online ads.

More than three in four Americans ? 78 percent ? want full disclosure of who paid for political ads posted to social media platforms (according to a new Marist poll).

That includes 80 percent of Republicans and 82 percent of Independents.

I call on the FEC to act immediately to update regulations and require online political ads to include disclaimers identifying who paid for them.

Comments provided by :  
Caracci, Gina

Please take action to make online communication material as transparent as other ads. It is outrageous that internet platforms can be taken over by agents of enemy powers and provide false information and instigation to anti-democratic behaviors without any accountability whatever. Free speech should not include the ability to lie with impunity.

Comments provided by :  
carlson, carol

Online political ads should have the same disclosure requirements and broadcast and print ads. The people deserve to know who is responsible for the content.

Comments provided by :  
Carlson, Mark

As our government investigates foreign influence within our election systems, it remains imperative that we continue to clarify the sources of political discourse and expression. Therefore, the FEC should certainly work to clarify and vet the source of information, as well as its validity, when running ads with the intention of influence political discourse.

Comments provided by :  
Chamberlain, Joshua

I assume this is just a case of technology creeping up on us all, but it seems like just common sense to me to require that any political ad, in any medium, to have any endorsee's approval and be clear about who's paying the tab for it.

Comments provided by :  
Chance, Nathan



In the 2016 election, 65 percent of Americans identified the internet, or an online platform, as their leading source of information. Yet our outdated transparency rules, which still include references to telegrams and typewriters, don't require adequate disclosure for online ads.

Americans have a right to know who is paying for political advertisements?whether it be organizations with ties to Russia or wealthy special interests here at home.

There is strong evidence Russian actors used social media platforms like Facebook to interfere with the 2016 election. We need to use every lever at our disposal ? including ending secret online political ads ? to prevent that from happening again, and to ensure that Americans

Comments provided by :  
Cobb, Sandra

As we are finding out, great mischief can be done by lack of identification of ads on social media. We need sensible and EFFECTIVE rules now to stop the insidious misinformation and ads from people who wish the country and our political system harm. Also, in political contests, we need to know who is paying for ads that seek to influence voters. You can't do this soon enough. Get with it!

Comments provided by :  
Cochran, Susan

As you must know, in the 2016 election 65 percent of Americans identified the internet, or an online platform, as their leading source of information - and still do!

Our transparency rules are outdated: They still include references to telegrams and typewriters. And they do NOT require adequate disclaimers for online ads.

More than three in four Americans ? 78 percent ? want to know who paid for political ads posted to social media platforms (according to a new Marist poll). This includes 80 percent of Republicans and 82 percent of Independents!

I expect the FEC to act immediately to update regulations so that online political ads have to include disclaimers identifying who paid for them.

Thank you

Comments provided by :  
Cohrs, Ursula

Simple: I have a right to know who's buying these wanna be elected officials, secret donors have become a waking nightmare for this country. Citizens need to be informed on who is trying to gain control of our government.

Comments provided by :  
Coley , Cynthia

We need transparency in our elections and election results such as disclosure in who sponsored campaign adds.

Comments provided by :  
Colfer, Brian

Americans have a right to know who is paying for political advertisements?whether it be organizations with ties to Russia or wealthy special interests here in the USA.

Comments provided by :  
Comini-Sherrod, Katherine

Please require disclosure of sources for political advertisements on the internet. We rely on such identification for ads on television and radio, and believe the same requirements should apply for internet advertising as well.

Comments provided by :  
Crane, Harriet

More than three in four Americans ? 78 percent ? want full disclosure of who paid for political ads posted to social media platforms. That includes 80 percent of Republicans and 82 percent of Independents.

I urge you make this happen.

Comments provided by :  
Crozier, Don



There is strong evidence Russian actors used social media platforms like Facebook to interfere with the 2016 election. We need to use every lever at our disposal ? including ending secret online political ads ? to prevent that from happening again, and to ensure that Americans know the source of political messages.

In the 2016 election, 65 percent of Americans identified the internet, or an online platform, as their leading source of information. Yet our outdated transparency rules, which still include references to telegrams and typewriters, don't require adequate disclosure for online ads.

Our democracy depends on robust, transparent debate. The FEC is the agency charged with making sure campaign finance rules are followed ? they should start working now to require the same level of transparency for online ads as we have for political ads on television.

Comments provided by :  
Csaszar, John

Especially when I see an ad, no matter where it appears, and I think it's making false claims or actually lying, I try to find out the source. When I'm on the internet and see a suspicious ad, and I try to find its source, I sometimes find myself caught in a loop and never find the source.

Ads that intend to interfere with legitimate sources of information or lie about events or people, should be eliminated from all forms of social networking on the internet. That can happen only when their sources can be identified.

Comments provided by :  
Dahlk, Elizabeth

Americans have a right to know who is paying for political advertisements?whether it be organizations with ties to Russia or wealthy special interests here at home. In the 2016 election, 65 percent of Americans identified the internet, or an online platform, as their leading source of information. Yet our outdated transparency rules don't require adequate disclosure for online ads.

Americans need to know the source of political messages. The FEC is the agency charged with making sure campaign finance rules are followed. They should start working now to require the same level of transparency for online ads as we have for political ads on television.

Thank you.

Comments provided by :  
Davis, Jean

To Whom It May Concern: Please accept my comments:

In the 2016 election, 65 percent of Americans identified the internet, or an online platform, as their leading source of information.

Yet our outdated transparency rules ? which still include references to telegrams and typewriters ? don't require adequate disclaimers for online ads.

More than three in four Americans ? 78 percent ? want full disclosure of who paid for political ads posted to social media platforms (according to a new Marist poll).

That includes 80 percent of Republicans and 82 percent of Independents.

We call on the FEC to act immediately to update regulations and require online political ads to include disclaimers identifying who paid for them.

Comments provided by :  
DeBey, Kenneth

In the 2016 election, 65 percent of Americans identified the internet, or an online platform, as their leading source of information.

Yet our outdated transparency rules ? which still include references to telegrams and typewriters ? don't require adequate disclaimers for online ads.

More than three in four Americans ? 78 percent ? want full disclosure of who paid for political ads posted to social media platforms (according to a new Marist poll).

That includes 80 percent of Republicans and 82 percent of Independents.

I call on the FEC to act immediately to update regulations and require online political ads to include disclaimers identifying who paid for them.

Comments provided by :  
Desousa, Sarah

In the 2016 election, 65 percent of Americans identified the internet, or an online platform, as their leading source of information. Yet our outdated transparency rules, which still include references to telegrams and typewriters, don't require adequate disclosure for online ads.

Americans have a right to know who is paying for political advertisements?whether it be organizations with ties to Russia or wealthy special interests here at home.

There is strong evidence Russian actors used social media platforms like Facebook to interfere with the 2016 election. We need to use every lever at our disposal ? including ending secret online political ads ? to prevent that from happening again, and to ensure that Americans know the source of political messages.

We need to take steps now to rein in this unethical interference in our elections. Please update your rules to make sure that online content is subject to the same standards as political ads through other media.

Thank you for your consideration.

Comments provided by :  
Di Benedetto, Rainbow

Please require the same disclosures in all the media.

Comments provided by :  
Diekroeger, Ned

In the 2016 election, 65 percent of Americans identified the internet, or an online platform, as their leading source of information.

Yet our outdated transparency rules ? which still include references to telegrams and typewriters ? don't require adequate disclaimers for online ads.

More than three in four Americans ? 78 percent ? want full disclosure of who paid for political ads posted to social media platforms (according to a new Marist poll).

That includes 80 percent of Republicans and 82 percent of Independents.

I call on the FEC to act immediately to update regulations and require online political ads to include disclaimers identifying who paid for them.

Comments provided by :  
DiFeo, Jenna



"Alternate facts" and downright false statements already play much too large a part in our political discourse. At very least we should know who is paying for the message, and what candidate or party that source is associated with.

--Pete Doyle

Kansas City, MO

Comments provided by :

Doyle, R Peter

Dear Commissioner's;

If we have to allow political advertising at all, then all political advertising, no matter the format or medium, need to include disclaimer's about who paid for them. This includes all online advertising, in addition to television, radio, and print ads.

Sincerely,

R. D.

Comments provided by :  
Duerr, Ruth

The FEC should require online campaign ads to include disclaimers about who is paying for them ? as is required for television and print advertisements. Americans have a right to know who is paying for online political ads and we need to use every lever at our disposal to prevent meddling in our elections from happening again, and to ensure that Americans know the source of political messages.

In the 2016 election, 65 percent of Americans identified the internet, or an online platform, as their leading source of information. Our transparency rules are outdated and should be updated to remove references to telegrams and typewriters and updated to include online advertisements.

78 percent of Americans want full disclosure of who paid for political ads posted to social media platforms. That includes 80 percent of Republicans and 82 percent of Independents.

U.S. elections should be about U.S. voters not special interests ? and especially not about the secretive influence of hostile foreign governments and entities. We must use every lever at our disposal ? including ending secret online political ads ? to prevent meddling in our elections and to ensure that Americans know the source of political messages.

Comments provided by :  
Dumas, Lorraine

In the 2016 election, 65 percent of Americans identified the internet, or an online platform, as their leading source of information. Yet our outdated transparency rules, which still include references to telegrams and typewriters, don't require adequate disclosure for online ads.

Americans have a right to know who is paying for political advertisements?whether it be organizations with ties to Russia or wealthy special interests here at home.

There is strong evidence Russian actors used social media platforms like Facebook to interfere with the 2016 election.

We need to use every lever at our disposal ? including ending secret online political ads ? to prevent that from happening again, and to ensure that Americans know the source of political messages.

Our democracy depends on robust, transparent debate. The FEC is the agency charged with making sure campaign finance rules are followed ? they should start working now to require the same level of transparency for online ads as we have for political ads on television. Thank you for your consideration of this very important matter.

Comments provided by :

Dzubak, Cheryl

I use the internet for a good deal of my News gathering.

We (the American people) need (and deserve to have) the FEC to act NOW to update regulations, & require the political ads online to include disclaimers identifying who paid for the ads .

Thank you for respecting our rights.

Comments provided by :

Egger, mary

I support a regulation that would require on-line ads to be transparent with regard to who paid for them. We deserve this information to protect our democracy.

Comments provided by :  
Elliott, Jennie

Given the Russian efforts to influence the 2016 presidential election, the public needs to be able to identify who is paying for an add that is posted on the internet. Without this type of disclouser the public will be unable to make any informed decisions re. these types of messages.

Comments provided by :  
Ellison, Martha

There is strong evidence Russian actors used social media platforms like Facebook to interfere with the 2016 election. We need to use every lever at our disposal ? including ending secret online political ads ? to prevent that from happening again, and to ensure that Americans know the source of political messages. It is critical that the FEC update its disclosure requirements so that situations like this will not happen ever again.

Thank you for your consideration.

Comments provided by :  
Emery, Susan



In the 2016 election, 65 percent of Americans identified the internet, or an online platform, as their leading source of information.

Yet our outdated transparency rules ? which still include references to telegrams and typewriters ? don't require adequate disclaimers for online ads.

More than three in four Americans ? 78 percent ? want full disclosure of who paid for political ads posted to social media platforms (according to a new Marist poll).

That includes 80 percent of Republicans and 82 percent of Independents.

I call on the FEC to act immediately to update regulations and require online political ads to include disclaimers identifying who paid for them.

Don

Comments provided by :  
erway , don

We need stronger transparency with online ads. The deceit and obfuscation are dangerous and un-American.

Comments provided by :  
esposito, shelly

There is strong evidence Russian actors used social media platforms like Facebook to interfere with the 2016 election. We need to use every lever at our disposal ? including ending secret online political ads ? to prevent that from happening again, and to ensure that Americans know the source of political messages.

Comments provided by :  
Fenczik, Peter

The internet cannot and should not be exempt from laws and standards that safeguard the public. Being online is not a luxury for most, but a necessity for employment, education, and community access. People deserve the same protections online as they do in non-digital spaces. You must ensure that online political ads are held to the same standards as any other mode of dissemination.

Comments provided by :  
Floyd, Molly

In the 2016 election, 65 percent of Americans identified the internet, or an online platform, as their leading source of information. Yet our outdated transparency rules, which still include references to telegrams and typewriters, don't require adequate disclosure for online ads.

Americans have a right to know who is paying for political advertisements?whether it be organizations with ties to Russia or wealthy special interests here at home.

There is strong evidence Russian actors used social media platforms like Facebook to interfere with the 2016 election. We need to use every lever at our disposal ? including ending secret online political ads ? to prevent that from happening again, and to ensure that Americans know the source of political messages.

Comments provided by :  
Foreman, Randall

Especially due to Russian meddling in the 2016 elections and "fake news," Americans have a right to know who is paying for political advertisements? be it wealthy special interest groups, private U.S. citizens, or foreign entities.

Comments provided by :  
Forte, Daniel

I want to see all political advertisements on social media to abide by the same laws as news stations on the television & radio. And show who is paying for the ads.

Comments provided by :  
Franklin, Mercedes

Please represent me (U.S. citizen) by requiring online campaign ads to include disclaimers as to who is paying for them. This is the case with TV/print advertisements and should be the case for online ads. Thank you,

Don Franks

Comments provided by :  
Franks, Don



We are in a fog. Political advertising is chock full of agendas from unknown parties. We need to know the source of the information to discern the truth. Knowing who is funding an advertisement will help clarify public discourse.

Comments provided by :  
Garcia, Manuel

The current outdated transparency rules don't require adequate disclosure for online ads.

Americans have a right to know who is paying for political advertisements?whether organizations with ties to Russia or wealthy special interests here at home.

The FEC is the agency charged with making sure campaign finance rules are followed ? they should start working now to require the same level of transparency for online ads as we have for political ads on television.

Comments provided by :  
Gardner, Susan

Please consider updating rules to require campaign ads to disclose who paid for them. Today's internet appears unregulated when it comes to campaign finance disclosure; a very important failure to disclose.

Comments provided by :  
Garland, Stephen

In the 2016 election, 65 percent of Americans identified the internet, or an online platform, as their leading source of information. Yet our outdated transparency rules, which still include references to telegrams and typewriters, don't require adequate disclosure for online ads.

We need transparency in online and social media based advertising, moreso than anywhere else.

This is a nonpartisan issue that hurts our republic and constitutional law more than almost any such issue in the last 40 years. Please act!

Thank you,  
-Erik Geiger  
Portland, OR

Comments provided by :  
Geiger, Erik

Americans deserve to know who is paying for the political ads we're so inundated with! Democracy requires transparency!

Comments provided by :  
Gelb, Stan

These days the majority of Americans identify an online platform or the internet as their leading source of news about the world. However, regulations regarding online ads have not been keeping up with times and are grossly inadequate. Americans NEED to know who is paying for a political ad, whether it is a local organization or a foreign political actor, to properly contextualize the message in the advertisement.

I call on the FEC to immediately act to update regulations on online political advertisements and to require disclaimers regarding who is funding various advertisements!

Comments provided by :  
Genaus, Elisabeth

In the 2016 election, 65 percent of Americans identified the internet, or an online platform, as their leading source of information. Yet the thoroughly outdated transparency rules still includes references to telegrams and typewriters, and don't require adequate disclosure for online ads.

Americans have a right to know who is paying for political advertisements?whether it be organizations with ties to Russia or wealthy special interests here at home.

There is strong evidence that Russian actors used social media platforms like Facebook to interfere with the 2016 election. We need to use every lever at our disposal ? including ending secret online political ads ? to prevent that from happening again, and to ensure that Americans know the source of political messages.

Our democracy depends on robust, transparent debate. The FEC is the agency charged with making sure campaign finance rules are followed. The FEC should start working now to require the same level of transparency for online ads as we have for political ads on television.

Comments provided by :  
Gigliello, Ken

Americans have a right to know who is paying for political advertisements?whether it be organizations with ties to Russia or wealthy special interests here at home, or just people selling spas.

Comments provided by :  
Godmilow, Jill



Americans have a right to know who is paying for political advertisements?whether it be organizations with ties to Russia or wealthy special interests here at home, or just people selling spas.

Comments provided by :  
Godmilow, Jill

I now get most of my information from the internet. I need to know who is paying for that information so that I can judge what is the objectivity or the bias of that information. I can only make that judgement by knowing who is paying to cast the information. Knowledge is the basis of my freedom of judgement, of my freedom to choose. I must know who pays for the information that I obtain on the internet.

Comments provided by :  
Gonzalez, Rafael J.

I call on the FEC to act immediately to update regulations and require online political ads to include disclaimers identifying who paid for them.

Influence is Influence is Influence.

Comments provided by :  
Gosling, Fred

? In the 2016 election, 65 percent of Americans identified the internet, or an online platform, as their leading source of information. Yet our outdated transparency rules, which still include references to telegrams and typewriters, don't require adequate disclosure for online ads.

? Americans have a right to know who is paying for political advertisements?whether it be organizations with ties to Russia or wealthy special interests here at home.

? There is strong evidence Russian actors used social media platforms like Facebook to interfere with the 2016 election. We need to use every lever at our disposal ? including ending secret online political ads ? to prevent that from happening again, and to ensure that Americans know the source of political messages.

Comments provided by :  
Graver, Chuck

In the 2016 election, 65 percent of Americans identified the internet, or an online platform, as their leading source of information. Yet our outdated transparency rules, which still include references to telegrams and typewriters, don't require adequate disclosure for online ads.

Americans have a right to know who is paying for political advertisements?whether it be organizations with ties to Russia or wealthy special interests here at home.

There is strong evidence Russian actors used social media platforms like Facebook to interfere with the 2016 election. We need to use every lever at our disposal ? including ending secret online political ads ? to prevent that from happening again, and to ensure that Americans know the source of political messages.

Comments provided by :

Green, Parker

For years, the FEC has required that political messages include specific messages regarding their source when on print, television, and radio. For quite some time, the internet has a primary method of political advertising, and is long past time for the FEC to include the internet in all relevant regulations regarding disclosure and financing.

Comments provided by :  
Greenspan, Stuart

Americans have a right to know who is paying for political advertisements?whether it be organizations with ties to Russia or wealthy special interests here at home. The FEC is the agency charged with making sure campaign finance rules are followed ? you should start working now to require the same level of transparency for online ads as we have for political ads on television. We should not be faced with another round of having been manipulated by Russians and others without our awareness.

Comments provided by :  
Greff, Jacqueline

Please update your rules so that online political ads are required to disclose who paid for them.

Whether in print, on TV or radio, or online, we Americans have a right to know who is paying for political advertisements?whether it be organizations with ties to Russia or wealthy special interests here at home.

There is very strong evidence that Russian actors used social media platforms like Facebook and Twitter to interfere with the 2016 election. We need to use every lever at our disposal ? including ending secret online political ads ? to prevent that from happening again, and to ensure that we know the source of political messages.

Comments provided by :  
Guggemos, Cynthia



To Whom it May concern,

I am writing to urge the FEC to regulate online political ads. These ads are one more loop hole in which anybody, including foreign governments can influence the outcome of the United States elections. In order to maintain the integrity of our elections we need to show who the ad provider is, whether or not they are receiving money from any political group, think tank or advocate and prosecute any and all entities that disrupt our elections through false facts and outright lies.

Thank You,  
Jon Hager  
Riverton, Utah

Comments provided by :  
Hager, Jon

In the 2016 election, 65 percent of Americans identified the internet, or an online platform, as their leading source of information.

More than three in four Americans ? 78 percent ? want full disclosure of who paid for political ads posted to social media platforms (according to a new Marist poll).

I call on the FEC to act immediately to update regulations and require online political ads to include disclaimers identifying who paid for them. We DESERVE to know where our information is coming from.

Comments provided by :  
Hall, Holly

Please make sure that in political ads, the person(s) who paid for the ads are known. We need as much transparency as possible on this subject.

Cordially,  
Sterling Hamm

Comments provided by :  
Hamm, Sterling

Consideration of the facts: 65% of Americans, including myself, use the internet and connected devices for their primary news source; 78% of Americans want disclosure of political ads on social media platforms (including 80% Republicans and 82% Independents).

Our country has been sideswiped by partisan politics, but this one issue is where we all agree:

**THE FEC SHOULD REQUIRE ONLINE CAMPAIGN ADS TO INCLUDE DISCLAIMERS ABOUT WHO IS PAYING FOR THEM.**

This is the same rule as what is required for television and print advertisements. There is no possible reason why this rule shouldn't apply to the primary source of news for the majority of the people.

In light of the recent facts exposed on foreign ads that could possibly have influenced our 2016 election, not to update the rules to standards required for any and all form of news dissemination is unacceptable. The right to free speech is being threatened in the most extreme way if the people are not allowed to see all relevant facts to be able to make decisions that will greatly affect their lives.

Thank you for recording my comments.

Comments provided by :

Hansen, Nancy

The citizens of the United States deserve an election free of political big business influence. The voice of the citizens of United States should be heard in their entire set of voice and not condensed to ignore those who are not the majority in their region of residence. The citizens of the United States are not safe when their supposed 'president' is not worthy of the office and his actions before as well as since are proof of this statement.

Comments provided by :  
Harrison Jr., Mark

In the interests of fair elections, American People need to know who is responsible for the constant barrage of advertisements that flood their computer and smart phone screens endlessly. We have the absolute Right to know where these messages originate.

I urge you to make disclaimers that identify those influencing our elections mandatory.

Comments provided by :

Hasselbrink, Bob

The Internet should be freely available to all people. It should, similar to a utility be reasonably regulated, but for individuals to use. It should not be privately owned or run by corporations simply for making money. It should be open to educational systems, communities and associations. It must include the disclosures as to whose agenda the information is promoting.

Comments provided by :  
Hayes, Sharon

Please ensure that online political advertisements are required to display their true funder so that people know who is trying to influence them politically. This is the way other political ads work, and is even more important in the online world.

I would also suggest that since online political ads can be targeted to very small groups so that most people don't see them that you require that all online political ads be made available for people to view so that they can see what the ads are regardless of whether they are targeted to them or not.

Both of these improvements are crucial to the survival of our democratic process in an uncorrupted way.

Thank you very much.

Sincerely,

Don Hayler

Comments provided by :  
Hayler, Don



We have all seen lately that much information on the internet is deceptive. Requiring political ads to identify sponsors would help reduce that deception.

Comments provided by :  
Helm, Tom

Over sixty-five percent of Americans have identified the internet, or an online platform, as their leading source of information.

Yet our outdated transparency rules ? which still include references to telegrams and typewriters ? don't require adequate disclaimers for online ads.

More than three in four Americans ? 78 percent ? want full disclosure of who paid for political ads posted to social media platforms (according to a new Marist poll).

That includes 80 percent of Republicans and 82 percent of Independents.

I call on the FEC to act immediately to update regulations and require online political ads to include disclaimers identifying who paid for them.

Thank you for your consideration.

Comments provided by :  
hendricks, judith

Outdated transparency rules do not require online political campaign ads to include disclaimers as to who is paying for them, unlike print and television ads. Americans have a right to know who is paying for political ads, no matter what the source is, especially since a greater number of people are using the internet as a major source if not their leading source of information.

It just makes common sense to require this disclosure for all sources of political ads, so people will know their sources of information. I urge the FEC to act immediately to update regulations and require online political ads to include disclaimers identifying who paid for them.

Comments provided by :  
Heys, Ed

I am writing regarding the current hearings going on in the Senate and the news about the information war Russia waged to influence the last presidential election. I believe Americans have the right to know who is paying for political advertisements. We need to know if a foreign country or a wealthy special interest group is attempting to falsely influence our elections. Considering that 65 percent of Americans used the Internet as a major source of information about the 2016 election, the transparency rules need to be updated. Please update the transparency rules NOW.

Comments provided by :  
Hoffman, Nancy

The FEC should require online political ads to display the identity of those paying for the ad.

Comments provided by :  
Housel, Jen

In the 2016 election, 65 percent of Americans identified the internet, or an online platform, as their leading source of information. Yet our outdated transparency rules, which still include references to telegrams and typewriters, don't require adequate disclosure for online ads.

Americans have a right to know who is paying for political advertisements?whether it be organizations with ties to Russia or wealthy special interests here at home.

There is strong evidence Russian actors used social media platforms like Facebook to interfere with the 2016 election. We need to use every lever at our disposal ? including ending secret online political ads ? to prevent that from happening again, and to ensure that Americans know the source of political messages.

Comments provided by :  
Icreverzi , Amalia

In the 2016 election, 65 percent of Americans identified the internet, or an online platform, as their leading source of information. Yet our outdated transparency rules, which still include references to telegrams and typewriters, don't require adequate disclosure for online ads.

Americans have a right to know who is paying for political advertisements?whether it be organizations with ties to Russia or wealthy special interests here at home.

There is strong evidence Russian actors used social media platforms like Facebook to interfere with the 2016 election. We need to use every lever at our disposal ? including ending secret online political ads ? to prevent that from happening again, and to ensure that Americans know the source of political messages.

Our democracy depends on robust, transparent debate. The FEC is the agency charged with making sure campaign finance rules are followed ? they should start working now to require the same level of transparency for online ads as we have for political ads on television.

Comments provided by :  
jessler, darynne

The American public deserve to know the people who are producing the information that we see in our communications. There is an over abundance of questionable statements being made and we need to be able to sort out where the original product was sourced. And, the disclaimers should be in a font that is easily read.

Comments provided by :  
Kanter, Linda



In the 2016 election, 65 percent of Americans identified the internet, or an online platform, as their leading source of information. Yet our outdated transparency rules, which still include references to telegrams and typewriters, don't require adequate disclosure for online ads.

Americans have a right to know who is paying for political advertisements?whether it be organizations with ties to Russia or wealthy special interests here at home.

There is strong evidence Russian actors used social media platforms like Facebook to interfere with the 2016 election.

We need to use every lever at our disposal ? including ending secret online political ads ? to prevent that from happening again, and to ensure that Americans know the source of political messages.

Our democracy depends on robust, transparent debate. The FEC is the agency charged with making sure campaign finance rules are followed ? they should start working now to require the same level of transparency for online ads as we have for political ads on television.

Comments provided by :

Kasparian, Laurie

In the 2016 election, 65 percent of Americans identified the internet, or an online platform, as their leading source of information. Yet our outdated transparency rules, which still include references to telegrams and typewriters, don't require adequate disclosure for online ads.

Americans have a right to know who is paying for political advertisements?whether it be organizations with ties to Russia or wealthy special interests here at home.

There is strong evidence Russian actors used social media platforms like Facebook to interfere with the 2016 election. We need to use every lever at our disposal ? including ending secret online political ads ? to prevent that from happening again, and to ensure that Americans know the source of political messages.

Comments provided by :

Katz, Sara

At the MINIMUM federal law for political advertisements should require that the actual top three funders be disclose prominently ON THE FACE of the ads -- just as California's new law (signed by Governor Brown in October 2017) does. The people of California and their legislators worked for SEVEN LONG YEARS to craft legislation that shines sanitizing sunshine on the cesspool that has become political "free speech" since the Citizen's United decision of the Supreme Court. No more hiding behind phony names! If you want to sway voters with a super costly advertising campaign, step into the sunshine and speak your piece! Voters have the right to know WHO is speaking with NO SUBTERFUGE like some PAC's name or some committee's name or some ALIAS.

Comments provided by :  
Keith, Cheryl

There is too much dark money in political advertisements. I want to know who is responsible for the ads to see if there is a reason why they want to advertise.  
this way there is accountability for the messaging.

Comments provided by :  
Kippen, James

In the 2016 election, 65 percent of Americans identified the internet, or an online platform, as their leading source of information. Yet our outdated transparency rules, which still include references to telegrams and typewriters, don't require adequate disclosure for online ads.

Americans have a right to know who is paying for political advertisements?whether it be organizations with ties to Russia or wealthy special interests here at home.

There is strong evidence Russian actors used social media platforms like Facebook to interfere with the 2016 election. We need to use every lever at our disposal ? including ending secret online political ads ? to prevent that from happening again, and to ensure that Americans know the source of political messages.

After the thousands of Russian accounts/messages posted on social media, we should need no further prompting to demand open, transparent identification of information being posted on social media and where/who it is coming from. **WE NEED TO KNOW THIS INFORMATION!!** It is becoming apparent that our democracy is at stake in these info wars and cyber attacks. Do not delay on these actions. Transparency now!!!

Comments provided by :  
Kjono, Pamela

It should be required for all online political ads be required to provide the information about the name of the entity who paid for it, and where more information can be obtained about who or what they are. The best cure for deception is **SUNLIGHT!**

This should be the standard for all political advertising. Information about who is paying for this should be required to be available, not merely a cryptic name! We need to know who is doing what so that it can be brought to light, if the need arises. In this day and age, hidden actors can be state (affiliated) actors, and we, the American public, need to be better informed.

Times are rapidly morphing and the FEC needs to act to enable everyone to have the most information they can have about who all political actors are that wish to influence and inform. **PROTECT THE AMERICAN PUBLIC!!!! DO YOUR JOB!!** No country is immune from the possibility of dictatorship!

Comments provided by :  
Klein, Michael

We have given transparency to print and tv and radio ads, but the internet is quickly surpassing those outlets with messaging. If anything, these ads and messagings should be required the same transparency.

Comments provided by :  
knohl, lee

In the 2016 election, 65 percent of Americans identified the internet, or an online platform, as their leading source of information. Yet our outdated transparency rules, which still include references to telegrams and typewriters, don't require adequate disclosure for online ads.

Americans have a right to know who is paying for political advertisements?whether it be organizations with ties to Russia or wealthy special interests here at home.

There is strong evidence Russian actors used social media platforms like Facebook to interfere with the 2016 election. We need to use every lever at our disposal ? including ending secret online political ads ? to prevent that from happening again, and to ensure that Americans know the source of political messages.

Thank you for your consideration of my opinion.

Sincerely,

Karl Koessel

Comments provided by :

Koessel, Karl



In the 2016 election, 65 percent of Americans identified the internet, or an online platform, as their leading source of information. Yet our outdated transparency rules, which still include references to telegrams and typewriters, don't require adequate disclosure for online ads.

Americans have a right to know who is paying for political advertisements?whether it be organizations with ties to Russia or wealthy special interests here at home.

There is strong evidence Russian actors used social media platforms like Facebook to interfere with the 2016 election. We need to use every lever at our disposal ? including ending secret online political ads ? to prevent that from happening again, and to ensure that Americans know the source of political messages.

Comments provided by :

Kramer, Laura

More than three in four Americans ? 78 percent ? want full disclosure of who paid for political ads posted to social media platforms (according to a new Marist poll).

That includes 80 percent of Republicans and 82 percent of Independents.

I call on the FEC to act immediately to update regulations and require online political ads to include disclaimers identifying who paid for them.

Comments provided by :  
Kuljian, Robert

In the 2016 election, 65 percent of Americans identified the internet, or an online platform, as their leading source of information. Yet our outdated transparency rules, which still include references to telegrams and typewriters, don't require adequate disclosure for online ads. Americans have a right to know who is paying for political advertisements? whether it be organizations with ties to Russia or wealthy special interests here at home.

There is strong evidence Russian actors used social media platforms like Facebook to interfere with the 2016 election. We need to use every lever at our disposal ? including ending secret online political ads ? to prevent that from happening again, and to ensure that Americans know the source of political messages.

Our democracy depends on robust, transparent debate. You are the agency charged with making sure campaign finance rules are followed?you must start working now to require the same level of transparency for online ads as we have for political ads on television. This is critical to efforts to maintain open, fair and free elections. We are at a tipping point with misinformation, lies & distortions affecting our elections and public and political discourse.

Comments provided by :  
lafond, david j.

In the 2016 election, 65 percent of Americans identified the internet, or an online platform, as their leading source of information.

Yet our outdated transparency rules ? which still include references to telegrams and typewriters ? don't require adequate disclaimers for online ads.

More than three in four Americans ? 78 percent ? want full disclosure of who paid for political ads posted to social media platforms (according to a new Marist poll).

That includes 80 percent of Republicans and 82 percent of Independents.

I call on the FEC to act immediately to update regulations and require online political ads to include disclaimers identifying who paid for them.

Comments provided by :  
Lambert, kathleen

In the 2016 election, 65 percent of Americans identified the internet, or an online platform, as their leading source of information.

Yet our outdated transparency rules ? which still include references to telegrams and typewriters ? don't require adequate disclaimers for online ads.

More than three in four Americans ? 78 percent ? want full disclosure of who paid for political ads posted to social media platforms (according to a new Marist poll).

That includes 80 percent of Republicans and 82 percent of Independents.

I call on the FEC to act immediately to update regulations and require online political ads to include disclaimers identifying who paid for them.

Comments provided by :  
LaPorte, Candace

In the 2016 election, 65 percent of Americans identified the internet, or an online platform, as their leading source of information. Yet our outdated transparency rules, which still include references to telegrams and typewriters, don't require adequate disclosure for online ads.

Americans have a right to know who is paying for political advertisements?whether it be organizations with ties to Russia or wealthy special interests here at home.

There is strong evidence Russian actors used social media platforms like Facebook to interfere with the 2016 election. We need to use every lever at our disposal ? including ending secret online political ads ? to prevent that from happening again, and to ensure that Americans know the source of political messages.

Comments provided by :

Lara, Greg

Your outdated transparency rules, which still include references to telegrams and typewriters, don't require adequate disclosure for online ads. Please correct this important loophole.

Americans have a right to know who is paying for political advertisements?whether it be organizations with ties to a foreign power or wealthy special interests here at home. Thank you.

Comments provided by :  
Lawrence, Daniel

It is the FEC's responsibility to ensure that the campaign finance laws already in place are adequately implemented and enforced. The Russian intervention in the 2016 election revealed that far too little is being done. I have a right to know what interests are spending money to influence my vote and to have my elections protected from illegal foreign interference. The FEC should be MUCH doing more, both to ensure transparency and to protect the integrity of our elections. The FEC can start by writing clear rules to provide disclaimers for online political ads.

Comments provided by :  
Lent, Kelli



I was shocked to learn that on-line comments were not subject to the general laws of disclosure and truth. That explains a lot. It's high time for the Internet to be subject to them!! The Internet is infamous for wild, irresponsible, statements, rumors, gossip and all kinds of lies, errors, poor judgment... to a degree that is disgusting... OPINIONS are one thing. LIES are another.

There will be some strong opposition, I'm guessing. Thanks for alerting me!

Comments provided by :  
Lieder, Cecilia

I urge the Commission to require full disclosure of who is funding ads on social media. Social Media is used by the majority of people these days for information. It is disingenuous not to provide the source of the information and funding so that we can be aware of the source of the information. The current revelation that Russian sources provided information and calls for political demonstrations is a perfect example of the need for identifying the source of funding and information.

Comments provided by :  
Lindley, Martha

Big money political ads are very influential (certainly the people who pay for them think so). As a significant source of influence, we should know who is behind those ads. This should include ads that are placed on the Internet, where more and more people (like me) get their political information.

The source of an ad can sometimes tell us more about the ad's intent than the ad. We need to consider the source.

Comments provided by :

Long, Douglas

In the 2016 election, 65 percent of Americans identified the internet, or an online platform, as their leading source of information. Yet our outdated transparency rules, which still include references to telegrams and typewriters, don't require adequate disclosure for online ads.

Americans have a right to know who is paying for political advertisements?whether it be organizations with ties to Russia or wealthy special interests here at home.

There is strong evidence Russian actors used social media platforms like Facebook to interfere with the 2016 election. We need to use every lever at our disposal ? including ending secret online political ads ? to prevent that from happening again, and to ensure that Americans know the source of political messages.

Comments provided by :

Machado, Susie

Transparency for online political ads must be instituted. I strongly urge the FEC to implement rules to make it mandatory for those who bought political ads to be transparent on who is the buyer of the ads. It has been established that a foreign entity purchased numerous ads in our last election in order to hijack our election.

Comments provided by :  
Madoshi, Diana

In the 2016 election, 65 percent of Americans identified the internet, or an online platform, as their leading source of information. Yet our outdated transparency rules, which still include references to telegrams and typewriters, don't require adequate disclosure for online ads.

Americans have a right to know who is paying for political advertisements?whether it be organizations with ties to Russia or wealthy special interests here at home.

There is strong evidence Russian actors used social media platforms like Facebook to interfere with the 2016 election. We need to use every lever at our disposal ? including ending secret online political ads ? to prevent that from happening again, and to ensure that Americans know the source of political messages.

Our democracy depends on robust, transparent debate. The FEC is the agency charged with making sure campaign finance rules are followed, please start working now to require the same level of transparency for online ads as we have for political ads on television.

Comments provided by :  
Malcom, William

I will make it short. We live in an era that is moving quickly and at times we don't have a chance to know who is contacting us and for what reason. FCC as an entity who we would expect to protect the US public from as much as it humanly possible from misleading media ads. Truth and valued principles of telling the truth is the most desired. Please, you best to insure that the US public is not misled.

Comments provided by :

Marinez, Juan

I would also like all of the social media providers to be required to show all of the ads created and purchased by any foreign governments or individuals acting on behalf of their states.

Comments provided by :  
Martin, Debbie



In the 2016 election, 65 percent of Americans identified the internet or an online platform as their leading source of information. Yet our outdated transparency rules, which still include references to telegrams and typewriters, don't require adequate disclosure for online ads.

Americans have a right to know who is paying for political advertisements  
? whether it be organizations with ties to Russia or wealthy special interests here at home.

There is strong evidence that Russian actors used social media platforms like Facebook to interfere with the 2016 election. We need to use every lever at our disposal ? including ending secret online political ads ? to prevent that from happening again and to ensure that Americans know the source of political messages.

Comments provided by :  
Mason, Marty

the internet has become a major player in campaign marketing, and should be included in any efforts to regulate anonymity in political advertising. These regulations are clearly outdated, as they reference technology such as typewriters and telegrams. They desperately need to be updated, and internet advertising should be included in technologies and media regulated by campaign advertising rules and regulations.

Thank you,

Adam Matar

Comments provided by :  
Matar, Adam

In the 2016 election, 65 percent of Americans identified the internet, or an online platform, as their leading source of information. More than three in four Americans ? 78 percent ? want full disclosure of who paid for political ads posted to social media platforms (according to a new Marist poll). That includes 80 percent of Republicans and 82 percent of Independents.

Yet our outdated transparency rules ? which still include references to telegrams and typewriters ? don't require adequate disclaimers for online ads.

I call on the FEC to act immediately to update regulations and require online political ads to include disclaimers identifying who paid for them.

Comments provided by :  
McCorry, Eileen

We must take the dark money out of our political system, else we may as well just throw the keys to our country to the oligarchs!

Comments provided by :  
McCulloh, Gordon

The American people deserve to know what entity sponsors an online political ad. Please require that this information be disclosed clearly for all ads.

Comments provided by :  
McGonagill, Jamie

Dear Decision Maker,

I am an American voter who is appalled at the foreign bought political ads that were published online in the 2016 election. I am also aware of the fact that so many Americans obtain their news from online outlets and spend more time on the internet than any other form of input.

Televised political ads are required by your agency to disclose their source of funding. I am requesting that you make that same requirement apply to online political ads.

I feel that your doing so will help greatly to restore America's trust in the transparency and validity of what they are receiving. I am making the same request to those Congresspeople who are representing me and those who are investigating the 2016 electoral interference.

Thank you for you time and attention.

Sincerely,

Ellen M McLaughlin

Comments provided by :  
McLaughlin, Ellen M

There's no reason online political ads should be exempt from the transparency and accountability requirements all other political ads are subject to. The FEC needs to revise its rules and regulations to catch up with the 21st century. More people are getting their news online than ever before, and with news comes advertisements. Given the role that foreign-sponsored ads and propaganda played in confusing and disinforming voters during the 2016 presidential election, our need to know where the money behind political ads comes from has never been more acute. Online ads should be subject to the same rules as ads in all other media.

Comments provided by :  
McNair, Linda

As a voting US citizen from Illinois 14th Congressional District I depend on the FEC to assure free and fair elections. This means that you monitor and regulate campaign advertisements and contributions to make sure that no foreign interests interfere.

Social media requires oversight. These new media forms must be required to conform to the same rules as the "older", conventional forms of advertising. The paid advertisers/influencers are a different platform than print or TV ads but paid advertising just the same. Require social media to be transparent by stating the source/funder of the ads. And also, require social media companies to refuse ads from foreign sources. Our democracy depends on this.

Comments provided by :  
McVay, Rosalie



In the 2016 election, 65 percent of Americans identified the internet, or an online platform, as their leading source of information.

Yet our outdated transparency rules ? which still include references to telegrams and typewriters ? don't require adequate disclaimers for online ads.

More than three in four Americans ? 78 percent ? want full disclosure of who paid for political ads posted to social media platforms (according to a new Marist poll).

That includes 80 percent of Republicans and 82 percent of Independents.

I call on the FEC to act immediately to update regulations and require online political ads to include disclaimers identifying who paid for them.

Comments provided by :  
Mierisch, George

In the 2016 election, 65 percent of Americans identified the internet, or an online platform, as their leading source of information.

Yet our outdated transparency rules ? which still include references to telegrams and typewriters ? don't require adequate disclaimers for online ads. It's bad enough...actually intolerable...that shadow fake nonprofit organizations hide the REAL source of the funds that pay for TV, radio, and newspaper ads. But the total absence of sponsors' identity in online ads still stands out glaringly.

More than three in four Americans ? 78 percent ? want full disclosure of who paid for political ads posted to social media platforms (according to a new Marist poll), which includes 80 percent of Republicans and 82 percent of Independents. I believe the same would be true for ALL campaign ads if polled.

We the People call on the FEC to act immediately to update regulations and require online political ads to include disclaimers identifying who paid for them. Make the regulations require disclosure of the actual source of the funds, not just an obscure organizational name devoid of a money trail.

The FEC must make elections fair and transparent. Otherwise you assist those at war with our democratic principles.

Comments provided by :  
Mihaly, Robert

Between corporate interests trying to swing elections in their favor and the Russians trying to subvert the whole process, our democratic processes are in sore need of support and defense. What is needed here is MUCH MORE TRANSPARENCY than has been extant to this point. That means no more anonymous donors and safeguards put in place to disallow the kind of election trolling which too much characterized the 2016 presidential election.

Comments provided by :  
Miller, Loren

Most Americans use on line news for information in today's world. We need protections this information is correct. Please make rules for on line ads and information like the ones that exist for TV ads and information.

Comments provided by :  
Miller, Pamela

Any political ads should have a disclaimer on it so we know if it is fake news or not. Political ads should not be allowed on the social networks Facebook, Twitter and Google as there is no control over the content of the ad and fake news is spread to millions who believe what they are reading is true.

Comments provided by :  
Mitchell, Sara

Our outdated transparency rules, which still include references to telegrams and typewriters, don't require adequate disclosure for online ads. Frankly, this is self-evident.

But in the 2016 election, 65 percent of Americans identified the internet, or an online platform, as their leading source of information. So not only are the disclosure rules out of date, but this obsolescence really matters.

There is strong evidence that Russian actors tried to use social media platforms like Facebook to influence the 2016 election. We need to use every lever at our disposal ? including ending secret online political ads ? to prevent that from happening again. At the very least, Americans need to see who is trying to influence them.

Comments provided by :  
Montgomery, William

Americans have a right to know who is paying for the ads that we're subjected to all the time.

Comments provided by :  
Monti, John

In the 2016 election, 65 percent of Americans identified the internet, or an online platform, as their leading source of information. Yet our outdated transparency rules, which still include references to telegrams and typewriters, don't require adequate disclosure for online ads.

Americans have a right to know who is paying for political advertisements?whether it be organizations with ties to Russia or wealthy special interests here at home.

There is strong evidence Russian actors used social media platforms like Facebook to interfere with the 2016 election.

We need to use every lever at our disposal ? including ending secret online political ads ? to prevent that from happening again, and to ensure that Americans know the source of political messages.

Our democracy depends on robust, transparent debate. The FEC is the agency charged with making sure campaign finance rules are followed ? they should start working now to require the same level of transparency for online ads as we have for political ads on television.

Thanks for all you do,

Comments provided by :  
Moore, Veronica



65 percent of Americans identify the internet, including political ads, as their primary source of information. The emerging facts about Russia's attack on our election and information systems makes it a national security imperative to strengthen all our defenses against further attacks, which our intelligence services assure us are sure to come. I, therefore, call on you to bring your online ad disclosure rules into the 21st Century, applying them equally to the internet as well as to traditional broadcast sources. Thank you.

Comments provided by :

Mora, Thomas

In the 2016 election, 65 percent of Americans identified the internet, or an online platform, as their leading source of information. Yet our outdated transparency rules, which still include references to telegrams and typewriters, don't require adequate disclosure for online ads.

Americans have a right to know who is paying for political advertisements?whether it be organizations with ties to Russia or wealthy special interests here at home.

There is strong evidence Russian actors used social media platforms like Facebook to interfere with the 2016 election. We need to use every lever at our disposal ? including ending secret online political ads ? to prevent that from happening again, and to ensure that Americans know the source of political messages.

Comments provided by :

Moyer, Stephen

In the 2016 election, 65 percent of Americans identified the internet, or an online platform, as their leading source of information.

Yet outdated transparency rules, which still include references to telegrams and typewriters, don't require adequate disclosure for online ads.

Americans have a right to know who is paying for political advertisements?whether it be organizations with ties to Russia or wealthy special interests based in the US.

There is strong evidence Russian actors used social media platforms like Facebook to interfere with the 2016 election. We need to use every lever at our disposal ? including ending secret online political ads ? to prevent that from happening again, and to ensure that Americans know the source of political messages.

Comments provided by :  
Mullen , Edna

In the 2016 election, 65 percent of Americans identified the internet, or an online platform, as their leading source of information.

Yet outdated transparency rules, which still include references to telegrams and typewriters, don't require adequate disclosure for online ads.

Americans have a right to know who is paying for political advertisements?whether it be organizations with ties to Russia or wealthy special interests here at home.

There is strong evidence Russian actors used social media platforms like Facebook to interfere with the 2016 election. We need to use every lever at our disposal ? including ending secret online political ads ? to prevent that from happening again, and to ensure that Americans know the source of political messages.

Comments provided by :  
Mullen , Timothy

We need a new and up to date transparency rules that go into effect now.....

Comments provided by :  
Murray, Felza

I am writing as a concerned citizen regarding election advertising and disclosure requirements. With the mounting evidence that Russian (and perhaps other foreign) actors paid for online advertisements in attempt to meddle with the 2016 election, I am concerned about how the integrity of U.S. elections can be protected in the future.

A number of troubling points are at issue:

(1) In the 2016 election, 65 percent of Americans identified the internet, or an online platform, as their leading source of information. Yet our outdated transparency rules, which still include references to telegrams and typewriters, don't require adequate disclosure of sources of funding for online ads.

(2) Americans have a right to know who is paying for political advertisements?-whether it be organizations with ties to Russia or wealthy special interests here at home.

(3) There is strong evidence Russian actors used social media platforms like Facebook to interfere with the 2016 election. We need to use every lever at our disposal-?including ending secret online political ads-?to prevent that from happening again, and to ensure that Americans know the source of political messages directed at them.

Our democracy depends on robust, transparent debate. The FEC is the agency charged with making sure campaign finance rules are followed. I would ask the FEC start working now to require the same level of transparency for online ads as we have for political ads in the broadcast media.

Finally, this should not be seen as a partisan issue. Although their actions may appear otherwise, foreign adversaries are not typically partisan in their aims. They are seeking to undermine American democratic institutions for their own benefit. At any given time, they are acting in a way that they judge most effective for achieving their goals.

In closing, I would request that the FEC use the powers at its disposal and redouble its efforts to ensure that our elections are fair and that Americans are aware of the sources of funding for election advertising.

Thank you for your consideration of my request.

Comments provided by :  
Myra, Eric

In the 2016 election, 65 percent of Americans identified the internet, or an online platform, as their leading source of information. Yet our outdated transparency rules, which still include references to telegrams and typewriters, don't require adequate disclosure for online ads.

Americans have a right to know who is paying for political advertisements?whether it be organizations with ties to Russia or wealthy special interests here at home.

There is strong evidence Russian actors used social media platforms like Facebook to interfere with the 2016 election. We need to use every lever at our disposal ? including ending secret online political ads ? to prevent that from happening again, and to ensure that Americans know the source of political messages.

Our democracy depends on robust, transparent debate. The FEC is the agency charged with making sure campaign finance rules are followed ? they should start working now to require the same level of transparency for online ads as we have for political ads on television.

Comments provided by :  
Nardell, Jason

I am disabled and unable to work. I cannot afford to pay the high prices for the Online Services if the Net Neutrality Rules are destroyed.

Comments provided by :  
Nash, Ellen-Cathryn



In the 2016 election, 65 percent of Americans identified the internet, or an online platform, as their leading source of information.

Yet our outdated transparency rules ? which still include references to telegrams and typewriters ? don't require adequate disclaimers for online ads.

More than three in four Americans ? 78 percent ? want full disclosure of who paid for political ads posted to social media platforms (according to a new Marist poll).

That includes 80 percent of Republicans and 82 percent of Independents.

I call on the FEC to act immediately to update regulations and require online political ads to include disclaimers identifying who paid for them.

Comments provided by :  
Netti , Steve

To the Federal Election Commission:

In order to be transparent as possible, I sincerely believe that the public be informed about who is placing an advertisement for or against a political person, idea or anything that may be voted on. This is in the public's interest.

Thank you for listening.

Sincerely,  
John Neubauer

Comments provided by :  
Neubauer, John

You required my name, address, and contact information before I could submit this comment, and you will make this public. I request you require similar identifying information - organization name, contact person, address and email - be made public for all political advertising, including online.

Comments provided by :  
Nordgren , Peter

I strongly feel that the origin of campaign funding should be made known!

Comments provided by :  
Norton, H.Toni

In the 2016 election, 65 percent of Americans identified the internet, or an online platform, as their leading source of information. Yet our outdated transparency rules, which still include references to telegrams and typewriters, don't require adequate disclosure for online ads.

Americans have a right to know who is paying for political advertisements?whether it be organizations with ties to Russia or wealthy special interests here at home.

There is strong evidence Russian actors used social media platforms like Facebook to interfere with the 2016 election. We need to use every lever at our disposal ? including ending secret online political ads ? to prevent that from happening again, and to ensure that Americans know the source of political messages.

Our democracy depends on robust, transparent debate. The FEC is the agency charged with making sure campaign finance rules are followed ? you should start working now to require the same level of transparency for online ads as we have for political ads on television.

Comments provided by :  
O'Brien, Dennis

In the 2016 election, 65 percent of Americans identified the internet, or an online platform, as their leading source of information. Yet our outdated transparency rules, which still include references to telegrams and typewriters, don't require adequate disclosure for online ads.

Americans have a right to know who is paying for political advertisements?whether it be organizations with ties to Russia or wealthy special interests here at home.

There is strong evidence Russian actors used social media platforms like Facebook to interfere with the 2016 election. We need to use every lever at our disposal ? including ending secret online political ads ? to prevent that from happening again, and to ensure that Americans know the source of political messages.

Comments provided by :

Olivo, Peter

In the 2016 election, 65 percent of Americans identified the internet, or an online platform, as their leading source of information. Yet our outdated transparency rules, which still include references to telegrams and typewriters, don't require adequate disclosure for online ads. Americans have a right to know who is paying for political advertisements? whether it be organizations with ties to Russia or wealthy special interests here at home. There is strong evidence Russian actors used social media platforms like Facebook to interfere with the 2016 election. We need to use every lever at our disposal ? including ending secret online political ads ? to prevent that from happening again, and to ensure that Americans know the source of political messages. Our democracy depends on robust, transparent debate. The FEC is the agency charged with making sure campaign finance rules are followed ? they should start working now to require the same level of transparency for online ads as we have for political ads on television.

Comments provided by :  
Owen, Shawn

Most voters rely on Internet information to make informed decisions regarding candidates. However outdated rules have not kept up with technology and therefore the funding for campaign ads is not disclosed.

All citizens have a right to know who pays for political ads. Disclosure of funding sources allows citizens to consider the motives of campaign donors and identify false and misleading claims.

It is critical that rules require disclosure of these sources, whether they be from foreign origins or organizations concealing their true purposes behind misleading titles. We must preserve and protect the integrity of our democratic election process.

Comments provided by :  
Parker, Doug and Jan



In the 2016 election, 65 percent of Americans identified the internet, or an online platform, as their leading source of information. Yet our outdated transparency rules, which still include references to telegrams and typewriters, don't require adequate disclosure for online ads.

There is strong evidence Russian actors used social media platforms like Facebook to interfere with the 2016 election. We need to use every lever at our disposal ? including ending secret online political ads ? to prevent that from happening again, and to ensure that Americans know the source of political messages.

Americans have a right to know who is paying for political advertisements?whether it be organizations with ties to Russia or wealthy special interests here at home.

Comments provided by :  
Pfister, Joe

To whom it concerns:

We must keep transparency within the democratic process of election. In order to better ensure this we must know where campaign fundraising is coming from. That's the only way we can understand whose interests are being truly represented. The United Citizens has enabled covert campaign contributions in the billions of dollars from corporate interests, now without requiring ads to state where funds came to create them foreign political sway is imminent and must be stopped.

It is your departments responsibility to protect our democratic process among several other entities. Please do you your part and stand up for what is protecting it, even if your short-staffed and the only department making a stand, it has to start here.

I appreciate your time and hope that you will help with this important work.

Sincerely,

Kary Pierce  
MBA, CPA, CGMA

Comments provided by :  
pierce, kary

If it is required to disclose funding sources for print political adds it should also be required of online political advertisers.

We should be able to judge the content based on the funding behind that content.

Comments provided by :

Powell, Warren

? In the 2016 election, 65 percent of Americans identified the internet, or an online platform, as their leading source of information. Yet our outdated transparency rules, which still include references to telegrams and typewriters, don't require adequate disclosure for online ads.

? Americans have a right to know who is paying for political advertisements?whether it be organizations with ties to Russia or wealthy special interests here at home.

? There is strong evidence Russian actors used social media platforms like Facebook to interfere with the 2016 election. We need to use every lever at our disposal ? including ending secret online political ads ? to prevent that from happening again, and to ensure that Americans know the source of political messages.

Our democracy depends on robust, transparent debate. The FEC is the agency charged with making sure campaign finance rules are followed ? they should start working now to require the same level of transparency for online ads as we have for political ads on television.

Thanks for all you do,

Comments provided by :  
Prata, Bruno

The people need to know who's paying for political ads on the internet.

Comments provided by :  
racine, dave

People I know and love shared political ads and fake news leading up to the 2016 election and argued with me it was real. These notifications of who is paying exist so the burden isn't on individual people to expend the effort but provides transparency to us all to not be manipulated.

In the 2016 election, 65 percent of Americans identified the internet, or an online platform, as their leading source of information. Yet our outdated transparency rules, which still include references to telegrams and typewriters, don't require adequate disclosure for online ads.

Americans have a right to know who is paying for political advertisements?whether it be organizations with ties to Russia or wealthy special interests here at home.

There is strong evidence Russian actors used social media platforms like Facebook to interfere with the 2016 election. We need to use every lever at our disposal ? including ending secret online political ads ? to prevent that from happening again, and to ensure that Americans know the source of political messages.

Comments provided by :  
Rast, Megan

All advertisements for political purposes should require WHO (what group etc) is behind them. It should include online ads as well as TV, print etc. We the people are being bombarded with lies from groups who want to manipulate. We, the voters, have a right to know who is trying to manipulate us. Without knowing exactly who, or what group is sponsoring an ad, we cannot check the policies and positions of these groups- which is not a good method for learning about positions and forming a decision about a vote or a policy.

Please ensure that ALL advertisements are required to disclose the person/group that is behind it. It is important to our democracy that the people know who is trying to sway you and for what reason. Then a proper decision can be made by the voter.

Comments provided by :  
rauch, stacy

While Facebook, Twitter and other sites have taken voluntary efforts to address Russian influence, these efforts are not a substitute for FEC action, Voluntary action can vary from company to company, with some sites doing nothing at all. Without disclaimers, online ads provide a haven for well-funded interests to anonymously influence elections.

The FEC cannot simply defer the problem to Congress. It is the FEC's responsibility to ensure that the campaign finance laws already in place are adequately implemented and enforced. The Russian intervention in the 2016 election revealed that far too little is being done. American voters have a right to know what interests are spending money to influence their votes and to have their elections protected from illegal foreign interference.

The FEC should be doing more, both to ensure transparency and to protect the integrity of our elections. The FEC can start by writing clear rules to provide disclaimers for online political ads.

Comments provided by :

Reback, Mark



The FEC must require that online ads must include disclaimers identifying who sponsored and paid for them. The majority of Americans identified the internet or an online platform as their leading source of information. Without the knowledge of who sponsored these ads many Americans may confuse them as facts and will be fooled into believing nonsense.

Comments provided by :  
Reichert, Duane

Americans have a right to know the source of political advertisements and articles.

Comments provided by :  
Reichow, Debbie

It's time to acknowledge that political speech happens on the internet, and the same rules governing political speech offline should apply to political speech online.

Comments provided by :  
Reuter, Seth

As an American, I am deeply concerned by the use that the Russian government and dark money has made to influence our elections.

In the 2016 election, 65 percent of Americans identified the internet, or an online platform, as their leading source of information. Yet our outdated transparency rules, which still include references to telegrams and typewriters, don't require adequate disclosure for online ads.

Americans have a right to know who is paying for political advertisements?whether it be organizations with ties to Russia or wealthy special interests here at home.

There is strong evidence Russian actors used social media platforms like Facebook to interfere with the 2016 election. We need to use every lever at our disposal ? including ending secret online political ads ? to prevent that from happening again, and to ensure that Americans know the source of political messages.

Our democracy depends on robust, transparent debate. The FEC is the agency charged with making sure campaign finance rules are followed ? they should start working now to require the same level of transparency for online ads as we have for political ads on television.

Comments provided by :  
Reyes, Joan

Ads placed on the internet and social media should identify who is paying for them and who is behind them. And they should be clearly identified as ads. There is so much misinformation being disseminated and often in "false flag" operations that it is difficult to evaluate what is being presented. An opinion or a "claim" can be presented as a fact.

Knowing who is behind something helps determine how much weight if any should be given to the information being presented.

Comments provided by :  
Reynolds, Bob

Our outdated transparency rules, which still include references to telegrams and typewriters, don't require adequate disclosure for online ads. Voters have a right to know who is paying for the political ads they see, whether it be domestic parties or foreign. There is ample evidence that Russian actors used social media platforms like Facebook to interfere with the 2016 election. We need to do everything we can to prevent that from happening again, and to ensure that Americans know the source of political messages.

Please update disclosure requirements for political ads to end the online ad loophole. Thank you.

Comments provided by :  
Rhudick, Ivan

In the 2016 election, 65 percent of Americans identified the internet, or an online platform, as their leading source of information.

Yet our outdated transparency rules ? which still include references to telegrams and typewriters ? don't require adequate disclosure for online ads.

No matter if it?s organizations with ties to Russia or shadowy nonprofits funded by the Koch Brothers, Americans have a right to know who is paying for online political ads.

Comments provided by :  
Richards, Carrie

I receive the majority of my 'news' from online sites that I visit every day. Often, those online sites will carry sidebar items that have to do with political campaigns, assorted candidates or voting issues.

I believe the FEC should require online ads must specifically name the individual(s) or group(s) who is/are responsible for the ad. This is especially necessary since an adversarial nation has been given free rein to interfere in our elections, to foment protests, and to sabotage our voting machines - all being permitted without any corrective measures being studied or put in place by the party who currently 'owns' all four branches of our government.

It appears that the GOP/KKK/American Taliban Fascist Party members are so delighted with the outcome from the first meddling in 2016 that they have decided it will be in their best interests to allow that meddling to continue unabated.

Is the FEC 'on board' with that decision of the GOP/KKK/American Taliban Fascist Party members? I do wonder.

ALL ads, robocalls, and other published items having to do with elections or voting issues of any kind should be required to carry identifying language that informs the reader, listener, etc., of the identity of the individual(s) or group(s) that is/are responsible for the message shown.

Isn't that part of your job? If not, it should be.

Comments provided by :  
Ridenour, Patty



In the 2016 election, 65 percent of Americans identified the internet, or an online platform, as their leading source of information. Yet our outdated transparency rules, which still include references to telegrams and typewriters, don't require adequate disclosure for online ads.

There is strong evidence Russian actors used social media platforms like Facebook to interfere with the 2016 election. We need to use every lever at our disposal ? including ending secret online political ads ? to prevent that from happening again, and to ensure that Americans know the source of political messages  
Americans have a right to know who is paying for political advertisements?whether it be organizations with ties to Russia or wealthy special interests here at home.

Comments provided by :  
Rikard, Bradley

Americans have a right to know who is paying for political advertisements. With the proliferation of on line, social media, and other methods of receiving news it has proven to be very difficult to tell if the news is the truth or is presented skewed by a personal bias. One way to help mitigate all of this divisive propaganda and help our democracy continue to maintain integrity is to require that people know who is paying for and therefore putting forth their agenda in online advertising. Our democracy depends on having open, transparent media. One way to ensure that is to make sure campaign finance rules are followed. Having online advertising follow the same rules as political ads on television and in other media is an essential part of keeping our politics above board and that is essential in today's world.

Comments provided by :  
Rinegar, M

I demand to know who is paying for advertising and buying government representation.

Comments provided by :  
Rissberger, MaryJane

In the 2016 election, 65 percent of Americans identified the internet, or an online platform, as their leading source of information. Yet our outdated transparency rules ? which still include references to telegrams and typewriters ? don't require adequate disclaimers for online ads. More than three in four Americans ? 78 percent ? want full disclosure of who paid for political ads posted to social media platforms (according to a new Marist poll).

That includes 80 percent of Republicans and 82 percent of Independents. I call on the FEC to act immediately to update regulations and require online political ads to include disclaimers identifying who paid for them.

Comments provided by :  
Roberson, Alisea

Online communication is becoming more important than print or television. We deserve the right to know who is paying for online political advertising just as we do for other media.

Comments provided by :  
Rosenblum, Stephen

It's time to update FCC's transparency regulations to require full disclosure of the funding and funders behind all on-line campaign ads.

This is especially critical as 65 percent of Americans identified the internet, or an online platform, as their leading source of information in the 2016 election.

I call on the FEC to act immediately to update regulations and require online political ads to include disclaimers identifying who paid for them.

Thank you.

Comments provided by :  
Rottenberg, Robert

In the 2016 election, 65 percent of Americans identified the internet, or an online platform, as their leading source of information. Yet our outdated transparency rules, which still include references to telegrams and typewriters, don't require adequate disclosure for online ads. Americans have a right to know who is paying for political advertisements? whether it be organizations with ties to Russia or wealthy special interests here at home. Living in a world of easy misinformation, we need all the honesty and transparency in our political system, so people are able to make their choices based on facts.

Comments provided by :  
Sasso, Allison

I call on the FEC to act immediately to update regulations and require online political ads to include disclaimers identifying who paid for them.

Comments provided by :  
Schaack, Elizabeth



All political adds should list who is paying for the ad and not be hidden by varying methods of subterfuge.

Comments provided by :  
Schaefer, Dennis

I want to know who is behind the information I see online. How else will I be able to assess its credibility?

Comments provided by :  
Schramm, Cathi

Many ads play over and over on social media and over the radio and television.

These ads repeat over and over again what might or might not be the truth just to drum them into the heads of anyone half listening.

I want to know who is paying for these ads so I can make an informed choice and double check the facts. To allow great monies to dictate what's said is a takeover of our democracy.

Comments provided by :  
Schreiber, Pat

It is important that we know the sponsors of all the ads that flood our communications, so we can make an informed decision as to the veracity of their claims.

Comments provided by :  
Shafer, Wynn

Americans have a right to know who is paying for political advertisements?whether it be organizations with ties to Russia or wealthy special interests here at home.

Comments provided by :  
sheggeby, stan

It is very important that people know who is behind political ads, whether they be print ads, mailings, emails, or social media posts. While that might appear to be stating the obvious, unfortunately, some people and entities prefer to hide who they really are, who they represent, and who will benefit with a particular election result. It is definitely a factor in who I decide to vote for and whether or not to support or oppose a ballot initiative. Please implement policies in place to make sure this is in effect as soon as possible. Please let me know what the FCC decides to do. Thank you very much for your time.

Comments provided by :  
Shepherd, Jeri

I fully support disclosure in identifying sponsors of paid political ads online. We need to know who is influencing our Democracy!

Comments provided by :  
Sherwood, Kate

pls protect our internet

Comments provided by :  
SHUKLA, Jayprakash



Russian interference in our election is no longer in doubt - it happened. AS facebook and twitter have revealed to Congress, there were many more ads purchased and proliferated online than previously admitted.

Social media MUST be required to reveal the buyers of their ads, just like in print media and TV. We MUST have fair and open elections and knowing where the money came from is a critical element in that.

You MUST require online ads, no matter what platform, to identify their REAL funding source.

Comments provided by :  
Sidaris, Cindy

In the 2016 election, 65 percent of Americans identified the internet, or an online platform, as their leading source of information.

And it's beyond obvious that foreign countries are using the internet in an effort to undermine and affect our democracy and country !!

Yet our outdated transparency rules ? which still include references to telegrams and typewriters ? don't require adequate disclaimers for online ads.

More than three in four Americans ? 78 percent ? want full disclosure of who paid for political ads posted to social media platforms (according to a new Marist poll).

And, supposedly, government is to represent the ideas/concerns of the populace.

That includes 80 percent of Republicans and 82 percent of Independents.

I call on the FEC to act immediately to update regulations and require online political ads to include disclaimers identifying who paid for them.

Comments provided by :  
sims, bruce

In the 2016 election, 65 percent of Americans identified the internet, or an online platform, as their leading source of information.

Yet our outdated transparency rules ? which still include references to telegrams and typewriters ? don't require adequate disclaimers for online ads.

More than three in four Americans ? 78 percent ? want full disclosure of who paid for political ads posted to social media platforms (according to a new Marist poll).

That includes 80 percent of Republicans and 82 percent of Independents.

I call on the FEC to act immediately to update regulations and require online political ads to include disclaimers identifying who paid for them.

Comments provided by :  
Sims, Millicent

It is becoming clear that we are being misled in so many ways. Transparency must mean transparency.

Comments provided by :  
Sipes, Laura

Americans have a right to know who is paying for political advertisements?whether it be organizations with ties to Russia or wealthy special interests here at home.

Comments provided by :  
smith, lindsay

In the 2016 election, 65 percent of Americans identified the internet, or an online platform, as their leading source of information.

Yet our outdated transparency rules ? which still include references to telegrams and typewriters ? don't require adequate disclaimers for online ads.

More than three in four Americans ? 78 percent ? want full disclosure of who paid for political ads posted to social media platforms (according to a new Marist poll).

That includes 80 percent of Republicans and 82 percent of Independents.

I call on the FEC to act immediately to update regulations and require online political ads to include disclaimers identifying who paid for them.

Comments provided by :  
Spurr, Charles

the 2016 election, 65 percent of Americans identified the internet, or an online platform, as their leading source of information.

Yet our outdated transparency rules ? which still include references to telegrams and typewriters ? don't require adequate disclaimers for online ads.

More than three in four Americans ? 78 percent ? want full disclosure of who paid for political ads posted to social media platforms (according to a new Marist poll).

That includes 80 percent of Republicans and 82 percent of Independents.

We call on the FEC to act immediately to update regulations and require online political ads to include disclaimers identifying who paid for them.

Comments provided by :  
Starkel, Scott

In the 2016 election, 65 percent of Americans identified the internet, or an online platform, as their leading source of information. Yet our outdated transparency rules, which still include references to telegrams and typewriters, don't require adequate disclosure for online ads.

?Americans have a right to know who is paying for political advertisements?whether it be organizations with ties to Russia or wealthy special interests here at home.

?There is strong evidence Russian actors used social media platforms like Facebook to interfere with the 2016 election. We need to use every lever at our disposal ? including ending secret online political ads ? to prevent that from happening again, and to ensure that Americans know the source of political messages.

Comments provided by :  
Stawinoga, Greg



People need to know who is behind political ads. We should have that right to know!!!!!!!!!!!!!!

Comments provided by :  
Stein, Marc

Before retiring, I often taught classes in critical reasoning, required in universities in the California State University system. A crucial element in evaluating the credibility of information is its source. Among other things, we need to know who, if anyone, stands to gain by convincing us of the positions advocated. This is clearly relevant in the context of political ads and many issue ads addressing public policy. It is also important to know whether claims are put forward by people who have relevant expertise and access to relevant information. To answer these questions, we must be able to tell who is paying for political and issue ads.

Comments provided by :  
Stern, Cindy

In the 2016 election, 65 percent of Americans identified the internet, or an online platform, as their leading source of information. Yet our outdated transparency rules, which still include references to telegrams and typewriters, don't require adequate disclosure for online ads.

Americans have a right to know who is paying for political advertisements?whether it be organizations with ties to Russia or wealthy special interests here at home.

There is strong evidence Russian actors used social media platforms like Facebook to interfere with the 2016 election. We need to use every lever at our disposal ? including ending secret online political ads ? to prevent that from happening again, and to ensure that Americans know the source of political messages.

Comments provided by :  
Stern, Richard

California recently passed the California Disclose Act, AB 249. It requires that all political ads in California, clearly show in the ad itself, who are the top three donors paying for that ad. And most importantly, the donors CANNOT hide behind organization names. If a top donor is a corporation, a Union or an individual, their name would clearly appear in the ad. Contact the California Clean Money Campaign for more details. [www.CAclean.org](http://www.CAclean.org)  
That would be a good model to follow when establishing these new regulations.

Comments provided by :  
Stetson, Ben

In the 2016 election, 65 percent of Americans identified the internet, or an online platform, as their leading source of information. Yet our outdated transparency rules, which still include references to telegrams and typewriters, don't require adequate disclosure for online ads.

Americans have a right to know who is paying for political advertisements?whether it be organizations with ties to Russia or wealthy special interests here at home.

There is strong evidence Russian agencies under Kremlin control used social media platforms like Facebook to interfere with the 2016 election. We need to use every lever at our disposal ? including ending secret online political ads ? to prevent that from happening again, and to ensure that Americans know the source of political messages.

Such cowards should be revealed to the citizenry.

Comments provided by :  
Struble, M.

Over two hundred plus years ago our founding Fathers worked tirelessly while under the eyes of the Royal British forces to assure a new land, that will cherish the values of freedoms, democracy, justice and equality since 1776 and the future. The internet is a technological marvel that can will provide the continuation of the cherish values of the Founding Fathers and the US. To assure free access for all its US citizens. thank you

Comments provided by :  
sturino, angelo

We rely on the internet for everything nowadays, and online ads are no exception. Americans have the right to know who is paying for political advertisements and where they come from.

There is strong evidence Russian agents used social media platforms like Facebook to interfere with the 2016 election. We need to prevent this from happening again, and use every lever at our disposal, including ending secret online political ads, to ensure that Americans know the source of political messages.

I believe transparency is essential to maintain our democratic principles.

Comments provided by :  
Swan, Yol

Please require all Internet political advertising to include a disclaimer that identifies who or what organization or company paid for the ad. This is very important for election fairness and for our democracy to work as intended. The Founders didn't anticipate the Internet, but we need to account for it now to keep full disclosure a part of our political campaign system. Everyone needs to know who paid for the ads they see. Please make this happen.

Comments provided by :  
Swett, Katharine



Our democracy depends on a robust, TRANSPARENT debate. The FEC is the agency that SHOULD make sure campaign finance rules are followed-you should start now to require the same level of transparency for online ads as is required for political ads on the TV.

Americans HAVE THE RIGHT to know who is paying for political advertisement-whether it be organizations with ties to Russia or WEALTHY SPECIAL interests here at home.

This MEANS all political ads should have the disclaimer of WHO is paying for it, whether they be on TV, Radio or online.

Comments provided by :  
Szot, Patricia

Our democracy depends on robust, transparent debate. To do that, we have a right to know who is paying for political advertisements?no matter where we see those ads. Whether it be an individual candidate, an organization with ties to Russia or a wealthy special interest group in the US, we need to know the source of all political messages. I ask the FEC to require the same level of transparency for online ads as we have for political ads on television. Please work diligently to make sure source transparency has the highest priority. Thank you.

Comments provided by :  
Talley, Ruth

It is absolute crucial to have full transparency of the source of election messages sent via electronic means. Our democratic principles demand nothing else.

Thank you.

Jay Tarler

Comments provided by :  
Tarler, Jay

We Americans want full disclosure of who paid for political ads posted to social media platforms. To do otherwise is to help subvert our democracy.

Comments provided by :  
Thurow, Dave

Please don't mess with our internet connections.

Comments provided by :  
toscos, karen

set aside your cocaine & hookers for a moment AND DO YOUR JOB. Solving an issue such as this is precisely the ostensible reason for your creation.

Comments provided by :  
Trippet, Will

It is logical and for to disclose who is paying for online ads. I cannot believe there?s any question about this issue. Other forms of media do it. You must play fairly. You must disclose information about who pays for online ads.

Comments provided by :  
Troxell, Shawn

More than once, I traced various email requests for funds for "Conservative" Candidates like Kid Rock and the like back to a single address in Colorado. And with known Russian masquerades on various social media, what's to stop them or another foreign power (there are many) tries to influence our elections.

We demand transparency.

Thank you.

Comments provided by :  
Van Blargan, Joseph



I urge the FEC to require online advertisements to carry disclaimers identifying who paid for them. The current regulations were written in the age of telegrams and typewriters and need to be updated for the digital age.

Comments provided by :  
Versenyi, Adam

I urge the FEC to update the disclosure requirements for political advertising. Online ads should identify the person or group who paid for the ad. I am an engaged citizen who follows elections at local, state, and national levels. Through online applications, I keep in touch with friends and relatives from across the country and around the world.

During the 2016 presidential election, I saw educated and intelligent people repeating false, misleading, or misdirective statements because of on-line advertisements. Voters need to know if information is trustworthy. Disclosure is essential. Thank you.

Comments provided by :  
Viehmann, Martha

ALL those posting information on the internet should be REQUIRED to abide by the same ethics/laws required by the print, video and radio industry. Posting "gossip" ( i.e. unverified information) should be banned and severely punished (i.e. fine or imprisonment)!

Comments provided by :  
VODA, WILLIAM

Commissioners:

Vast numbers of Americans used the internet or an online platform as their primary source of information in the 2016 election--some surveys say upwards of 65 percent. However, the transparency rules governing election advertising do not require online ads to disclose their source of funding sufficiently.

Americans need to know who is paying for political advertisements if they are to exercise judgment in interpreting their content. We need to know who thinks their interests will be served by electing a particular candidate or approving a particular proposal. Considering the source is the first step in critical thinking. Right now, Americans cannot do that with respect to online political ads.

I urge you to apply the same transparency standards for online ads as you do for television ads. This is a common-sense update in consideration of changing technology and information consumption trends.

Thank you for your serious consideration of this issue.

Cheryl Walsh

Comments provided by :  
Walsh, Cheryl

I was exposed to clickbait ads promising dirt on H.R. Clinton's bogus health crisis. Those ads were everywhere. I never clicked on them, but they were an obvious attempt to spread fake news by either Republicans, Trump, the Russians or all three working in concert. I want all Americans to be protected from this nonsense, false information. We deserve to hear correct, accurate information about our politicians running for office, not insane conspiracy theory bullshit.

Comments provided by :  
Watrous, Amy

We should all know who is paying for the political ads we said. That means every political ad in every medium, including the Internet.

Comments provided by :  
Wehr, Steve

In the 2016 election, 65 percent of Americans identified the internet, or an online platform, as their leading source of information.

Yet our outdated transparency rules ? which still include references to telegrams and typewriters ? don't require adequate disclaimers for online ads.

I believe Americans should have full disclosure of who is running political ads because as was proven Russia tampered with our 2016 Presidential election and we must make sure this never happens again.

I call on the FEC to act immediately to update regulations and require online political ads to include disclaimers identifying who paid for their political ads.

Comments provided by :

Weisel, Jan

Being able to know who is paying for political ads is an important as the ad content in my opinion. We are only being given half the relevant information right now. An informed republic requires transparency.

Comments provided by :  
Weitz, Stephen



Our outdated transparency rules (which still include references to telegrams and typewriters) don't require adequate disclaimers for online ads.

More than three in four Americans ? 78 percent ? want full disclosure of who paid for political ads posted to social media platforms (according to a new Marist poll).

That includes 80 percent of Republicans and 82 percent of Independents.

I call on the FEC to act immediately to update regulations and require online political ads to include disclaimers identifying who paid for them.

Thank you,

Ms. Lisa Whalen

Comments provided by :  
Whalen, Lisa

We need protection from Russia interference. This is very important to protect our democratic system. Russia is very dangerous and they will use any possible means to destroy our freedom and our way of living. Also we need protection from special interests, corporations and rich, selfish people.

Comments provided by :  
Wolfinger, Hanna

In the 2016 election, 65 percent of Americans identified the internet, or an online platform, as their leading source of information. Yet our outdated transparency rules, which still include references to telegrams and typewriters, don't require adequate disclosure for online ads.

Americans have a right to know who is paying for political advertisements?whether it be organizations with ties to Russia or wealthy special interests here at home.

There is strong evidence Russian actors used social media platforms like Facebook to interfere with the 2016 election. We need to use every lever at our disposal ? including ending secret online political ads ? to prevent that from happening again, and to ensure that Americans know the source of political messages.

Comments provided by :  
wolfman, jarret

Any type of influence or impact on our democracy by any entity, but particularly a foreign one, must be blocked, stopped, prevented. Always.

Furthermore, we must have protections in place to not only quickly identify the source, but there needs to be serious teeth (i.e., legal consequences) as well.

A casual or lassie fair approach is not sufficient. We must not allow 241 years of democracy to fail.

We must instead put processes into place that protect it for all Americans now, and in the future.

Comments provided by :  
WOODRUFF, LK

The Internet is fast becoming the major source of news for a majority of Americans. Some polls show this is already the case.

While older methods of communication on political matters require a funding source identification, that is not required for Internet communications.

Just as in the case of traditional communications, potential voters are entitled to know who is trying to influence their vote.

Please require equal disclosure rules on Internet advertisers.

Comments provided by :  
Wooldridge, John

All political ads on all media must disclose who paid for them. It is essential to our democracy.

Comments provided by :  
Younger, Kristina