

Comment Received to CommissionerRavel@fec.gov on Aug. 19, 2016

Commissioner Ravel. I believe your Commission has addressed a very cogent issue. The Citizens United decision has so many dangerous consequences. I believe that the secrecy is more dangerous than the money itself. If a citizen sees an account and knows its origin a judgement can be made

This issue is even more compelling if the money comes from foreign hands. Our founding principles sought to preclude foreign influence. Money is certainly a very powerful influence. Anonymous foreign money is an invitation to undermine public autonomy and create uncontrollable consequences I urge your commission to review this issue with the greatest care

Thank you. Susan Fuller

Comment Received to CommissionerRavel@fec.gov on Aug. 19, 2016

I agree with limiting or, preferably, disallowing campaign donations from US subsidiaries of foreign corporations. It's bad enough that US corporations are allowed to pour so much money into influencing elections, which effectively silences those of us who don't have much money.

But allowing foreign influence, even through corporations employing Americans, is surrendering a piece of our sovereignty, and should not be allowed. If a foreign corporation wants an advantage or a political favor, they should negotiate it out in the open, not buy it.

Thank you,

Dawn Wolfson

Comment Received to CommissionerRavel@fec.gov on Aug. 19, 2016

Danielle Ingrassia [REDACTED]@gmail.com

Hello my comment regarding the Sept 15 hearing is as follows:

Citizens United is a detrimental decision which has allowed for the democracy of the United States to become eroded and now the wealthiest people control the government's decisions. This is evidenced by the lack of congress to do anything what so ever in the people's interest and the Obama Administrations push to pass the TTP, which is highly unfavorable to the American people.

As If this problem was not bad enough, we now know that there has been influence on the US political system by foreign donors through Citizens United. This must stop! The entire Citizens United decision must be overturned to save the US democracy, until then at least make sure to close any loopholes and punish politicians who accept money from foreign interests. Please act on this issue and don't let our country be ruled by wealthy foreign investors.

Danielle

Sent from my iPhone

Comment Received to CommissionerRavel@fec.gov on Aug. 19, 2016

I am writing in support of the efforts to make changes to keep foreign money out of elections. The elections are supposed to be the voice of the American people. This is not a place for foreign influence through donations.

I also support getting all corporate money out of elections and for all money donated to campaigns be held to the same level of transparency so we, the people, know who is supporting candidates with money.

Sally Hillary
Huntington, Vermont

Comment Received to CommissionerRavel@fec.gov on Aug. 19, 2016

Commissioner Ravel,

Thank you for soliciting opinions about the influence of foreign money on U.S. elections. I am totally opposed to the Citizens United ruling, and even more opposed to the kind of influence over our government that the unbridled infusion of international money through U.S. subsidiaries can and will have. Our democracy is on life support as it is from within. We need to close off every avenue that will allow financial interests to overwhelm the common good. I hope you can close this gaping loop hole in our system.

Sincerely,

Marilyn Ferdinand

Skokie, Illinois

Comment Received to CommissionerRavel@fec.gov on Aug. 19, 2016

Ms Ravel,

I appreciate your efforts in discussing the role foreign money has in our politics here in the US. To me and a large majority of citizens here in the state of Oregon, as well as the country as a whole, foreign influence in our democratic process is a serious cause for concern. Please continue to address this issue, and propose new regulations to eliminate the role of foreign money in our politics. The influence of money, especially foreign money, is limiting the political freedom and equality for our citizens, and more people in our government should be concerned.

Kind regards,

Locke Bielefeldt

Comment Received to CommissionerRavel@fec.gov on Aug. 19, 2016

Commissioner Ravel,

I was referred to your article *Citizens United, Foreign Money, and Your Voice* from [an article by Jon Schwartz](#) of *The Intercept*, and was very glad to see your proposal to rescind Advisory Opinion 2006-15. I'd like to offer my complete support for this proposal, and I'm heartened to see the FEC pushing back on some of the more disastrous outcomes of the Citizens United decision.

Thank you for fighting to preserve the basic tenets of democracy.

Best regards,
Will Greenberg

Comment Received to CommissionerRavel@fec.gov on Aug. 19, 2016

Patty Froehle [REDACTED]@comcast.net

Dear Commissioner Ravel,

I enthusiastically support your effort to prohibit ANY contributions to campaigns and PACs from foreign entities. In our global economy, there is likely more and more pressure from foreign corporations with domestic subsidiaries to influence our elections. The FEC should do all in its power to prevent this.

Thank-you for making me aware of this potential (or maybe already existing) activity.

Comment Received to CommissionerRavel@fec.gov on Aug. 19, 2016

Dear Ms. Ravel,

Thank you for taking a stand against foreign influence over U.S. elections. Citizens United was, perhaps, the worst Supreme Court decision ever handed down; and any attempt by the FEC, or any other federal agency, to blunt its effects would have my strongest support. We are living in an oligarchy and unless the American people stand up and fight against not only foreign influence, but corporate influence, on our governmental institutions, I fear for the future of this country.

And while you're at it, maybe some changes need to be made to the FEC itself. With a virtual tie on any matter brought before it, the commission is ineffective in bringing about any meaningful reform to campaign finance laws.

Sincerely,

Carol Polos
Chicago, IL 60616

Comment Received to CommissionerRavel@fec.gov on Aug. 19, 2016

Commissioner Ravel,

I'm gravely concerned about the impact of foreign money being used to change the outcome of US elections. US elections are the foundation of our democracy and, should therefore be deemed sacrosanct (as far as foreign money is concerned).

The balance of power within the United States was designed by the Founders to be precarious. The Senate checks Congress, Congress checks the President, The President appoints the Judiciary, and the Judiciary stands guard against both President and Congress.

Foreign money threatens to corrupt and ultimately destroy this balance. In many cases our elections can be so close as to be the equivalent of a coin toss. In such a scenario, foreign money can decisively change the course of American history.

There is no place in American Political society for foreign money.

Respectfully,
Matthew Lawlor

Hello Commissioner Ravel,

Good morning and I hope this message finds you well. I can't thank you enough for your recent outspoken positions on the status of foreign money finding its way into the American electoral process. I further can't thank you enough for inviting us citizens to share our thoughts with you. My name is Marc, and I consider myself to be a pretty average American. I work hard, I try to stay informed, and I hope to someday find myself helping write laws on The Hill.

It's my belief that the greatest threat to our national discourse is this culture of unlimited, secretive donation to campaigns, and lobbying efforts once election season has ended. The wealthiest Americans are literally silencing my voice and the voice of millions of our fellow Americans by writing checks. It's easy to lob insults and accusations at groups like the NRA and members of the Wall Street community (i.e. CitiGroup's proposal basically being copy/pasted into Dodd-Frank), but really, the problem is as wide and varying as our great nation. Whether it is Pearson Education and what they've done to standardized testing, or the way companies like Tyson Foods are lobbying to a member of the House Appropriations Committee build language to strip the Dept of Agriculture of their ability to enforce violations in chicken farming, to the latest bit where Chinese nationals may have donated to a Bush SuperPAC (don't get me started on those). Our entire system of legislation and election is being destroyed by moneyed interests, and We the People are begging you and Congress to intervene.

My understanding of history is that it has been the consistent mission of the FEC to limit moneyed interests from influencing the outcome of elections; going back to Reconstruction. What has quietly evolved since the 1970's is truly frightening when you start to wrap your head around it.

John Adams often lamented in letters to Thomas Jefferson that he feared Americans would fail to respect the gravity of the sacrifice made on their behalf. That we would squander this beautiful republic which so many risked everything to provide for us. We've quickly become the embodiment of this fear.

Regardless of where a person finds themselves on the political spectrum, I'm confident that just about anyone besides Charles and David Koch would agree that dollars are not tantamount to free speech, and that being able to silence the voice of the electorate with money is fundamentally un-American. This citizen is begging you and your colleagues in Washington to please return our republic to us.

We may not always agree with one another, but if we can at least have a real discourse again, we may be able to start making meaningful progress towards addressing some of the real problems facing our nation today and moving forward.

I thank you for taking the time to read my thoughts, and I welcome a response or ongoing correspondence with your office. I pray that this letter is just one grain of sand in a storm which helps right our ship.

Wishing you and your colleagues all the best and have a terrific weekend.

Comment Received to CommissionerRavel@fec.gov on Aug. 19, 2016

Sincerely,
Marc Francois
San Diego, CA (district 52)

Comment Received to CommissionerRavel@fec.gov on Aug. 19, 2016

For a while I have known that the media plays an extremely influential role to shaping the results of our government. At the local level in Greenville SC it is difficult to know who is running for which office unless they put out signs or mail propaganda. As for nationally, I have given up cable tv and only watch Netflix or dvds. Charter has the DNC and others to thank for losing customers. Mainstream Media does not care about the publics interest. That was evident when one looked at who was donating to Hillary Clinton vs Bernie Sanders. She had Time Warner on her side while he had the American ppl who are already struggling to get by. I applaude your stand against Citizens United with a standing ovation placed in front of the musical cast for the Broadway stage play of The Lion King. I will urge those around me to email you their opinion as I'm sure most still watch the news religiously.

My grandmother, grandfather, dad and coworkers do not know anything about Jill Stein. I find myself doing the same research and education I did for Bernie. This 2 party systematic herding of the majority of Americans has got to end. Kennedy warned us this was going to happen and that it was of great importance the media remembers they are a service to the public and not the wealthy.

I am a 24 yr old black female with a BS degree in Psychology with 3/4 of my knowledge from USC-Columbia and the rest from USC-Upstate. Even though I was fortunate enough to have my family pay for my school, I feel it an obligation to awaken Americans to the facts of reality: we are relying on media stations who don't work in Our best interest. The Majority is not wealthy. We are slowly dying. And getting money out of politics is one big step in the right direction.

Shawnese Bennett

Comment Received to CommissionerRavel@fec.gov on Aug. 19, 2016

Citizens United marginalized we "rank and file" Americans. The two party system, in th US, has become a legislative arm of huge corporations and is unresponsive to the needs of the citizenry. The last thing we the people need is foreign influence usurping what little influence we have left over our elections.

Thank you for recognizing the issue and being willing to discuss its perils.

Sincerely,

Steven Gilbert

Comment Received to CommissionerRavel@fec.gov on Aug. 19, 2016

Hamish Gowans [REDACTED]@gmail.com>

Please get money out of politics both foreign and domestic. I consider the corporations that want to donate to our politicians as foreign entities because their real goal is to write laws that give them special privileges and institute a separate country where they get to live and operate. I have almost no confidence that my vote matters anymore and I would ask you to review the study showing that the US is effectively an oligarchy . Please act accordingly so that democracy is returned to its rightful place of power and the voice of our citizens is actually what determines the direction the country goes in.

Thank you

Comment Received to CommissionerRavel@fec.gov on Aug. 19, 2016

Dear Commissioner,

Thank you for inviting input from the general public on this very important issue. I wish you the best in attempting to address the issues with this Supreme Court ruling and its impact on our political system.

Although I am not a policy professional nor a lawyer I was deeply alarmed with what appeared to me to be a blatant open door for foreign intervention into our political system, when the ruling came down.

With revelations of Panama Papers showing the vast amount of wealth being hidden behind very expensive tools of the powerful all around the globe, what prevents this from pervading and influencing our political system? We neither fund the needed investigations, nor apparently have the political will to stop these secret benefits to the powerful and wealthy and this influence will just continue to ramp up. Already there is so much shadow influence that it almost feels pointless to write you this email.

It needs to stop. And if any of the inference of this morning's news is even a hint of what truly goes on, then there is a big uphill battle. Politicians accepting cash off the books from foreign political entities to lobby DC firms for beneficial purposes. And I'm sure it goes on on both sides. Is there any hope?

Good luck. Again, appreciate the invitation to comment. I saw it via The Intercept, Glenn Greenwald.

Deborah

Deborah Attarian

Comment Received to CommissionerRavel@fec.gov on Aug. 19, 2016

P Waldroop [REDACTED]@satx.rr.com>

An interested citizen squeaking up.

1. OVERTURN CITIZENS UNITED
2. Investigate the Clinton Foundation foreign money
3. We need complete transparency on who's giving what to where

Thanks for listening.

Comment Received to CommissionerRavel@fec.gov on Aug. 19, 2016

Please stop foreign money from being accepted by political candidates. And all corporate money while you are at it. America has become one big money making scam for the corporatists running this so called government.

Sincerely,
Angela Bailey

Comment Received to CommissionerRavel@fec.gov on Aug. 19, 2016

Dear Commissioner Ravel:

Thank you for asking for input. The state of elections in the United States is a shambles. Not only in the foreign money coming in as evidenced by American Pacific International Capital, to which you referred, but in our system as a whole. Or rather the 50 plus systems which vary from state to state, district to district, and even intra-district. Example of the Wasserman Schultz - Canova primary where Miami/Dade Counties have a week more early voting than Broward County. What is going on?

Now it isn't that I'm unaware of the Constitutional issues involving state running of elections, but it is also true that the citizens of this country are facing impediments to voting, voter role purges, lack of trust in the machinery at the polls, polls closing, polls running out of ballots, etc., etc. The idea that this is a functional democracy is beyond imagination. This country, which holds itself out as "exceptional" and "above international law," is in reality, a cruel joke on all.

And you are a laughingstock, to be head of it all.

With no due respect,
Robert Schwartz

Comment Received to CommissionerRavel@fec.gov on Aug. 19, 2016

Dear Commissioner Ravel,

Please get foreign interests out of our elections. It is so frustrating getting like the voices and needs of the people are trampled out by special interests. We can't fight this alone we need people like you to be an advocate for us whose voices are silenced.

Thank you for everything you do,

Bryan Casselman

Nursing student, millennial, very concerned

Ms. Ravel,

Thank you for the opportunity to hear the public's concerns on the FEC's campaign finance laws regarding foreign corporate money influencing elections.

As an advocate of political engagement and founder of a political action committee myself, I know first hand how arcane and convoluted the laws governing money in politics appear to the average voter. I also know the rules I had to follow engaging in the political process, making sure to dot all my i's and cross my t's. I am a citizen, not a corporation, and was disheartened when learning the rules of the game concerning federal election and campaign finance law. There are enough shell companies, dark money, and bad actors out there to drown out the voice of the average voter.

I met a Pennsylvania House rep in a bar one night, on my birthday this year. I only found out he was a congressman after our conversation, but he heard me talking about my grassroots pac. On the topic of money in politics, he asked me a question. "Do you know what the richest neighborhood in the United States is?" I guessed incorrectly. "Fairfax." He said. "That's where all the lobbyists live."

My point is that Citizen's United has been a slippery slope. Now the question of foreign money influencing elections is being asked by the FEC. This seems like a path towards wholesale theft of democracy. Not that we haven't seen it before, with corporate money and wealthy families and individuals, and even PACs and official campaigns, skirting FEC rules to make the electoral process work for them. And I'm certain foreign money has already influenced elections - one need only to look at the Clinton Foundation, or UBS America, or Astra Zeneca, or Anheuser Busch to see the outright on-the-books spending.

Globalism is an inevitability. And American corporations have the same rights as individuals, more so in some circumstances. The FEC's job is to make transparent the influence of money in elections, and to make sure that money is donated or fundraised legally. The idea that foreign spending in elections could become a reality feels like some sort of arch-libertarian corporate Mad Max wonderland, where outside influence could hold sway much stronger than the average person's voice. We already have enough dark money in our electoral process.

Let me put it this way. If Federal election law allows a US citizen to vote and donate to political campaigns, but not their foreign spouse, how is that different than a company owned in part or whole by foreign interests being allowed to influence elections through their spending?

Last, I will say I have great respect and admiration for the FEC. You do good work with the laws you have. I wish you the best of luck in making the right decisions for the American people.

Best,

Steven Panovich
Writer/Editor
NY, NY

Comment Received to CommissionerRavel@fec.gov on Aug. 19, 2016

The output in a democracy is determined by the input. When the input is financially unequal, so will the output be financially unequal. There should be only public funding of elections.

Arnold McMaon

Comment Received to CommissionerRavel@fec.gov on Aug. 19, 2016

Citizens United should have never gone this far. Corporations are not citizens. Remove all corporate money from politics and starting with foreign money is good.

Thank you for starting the process.

David Watkins

Comment Received to CommissionerRavel@fec.gov on Aug. 19, 2016

Dear Cmr Ravel:

It must be said there is little left of American democracy, what with the multitudes of millions of dollars spent to influence our politicians. And yet the entry of foreign persons into the corruption fray is a particular affront. Not only does it influence policy in ways against the interests of Americans, but it also undermines Americans' confidence in the political system.

Clearly, both domestic and foreign campaign contributions should be reigned in. We should have publicly funded elections. Reversing the decision to allow foreign entities to contribute to political campaigns is but a small step in the right direction.

Thank you.

Mohammad Sa'id Shukairy

Comment Received to CommissionerRavel@fec.gov on Aug. 19, 2016

Good Evening Commissioner,

I sincerely hope your request for comments is not a smoke screen that poses as concern followed by inaction.

Any fool can tell you allowing foreign \$ in US politics is a recipe ripe for pay-to-play, as is being done via The Clinton Foundation, Hillary Victory Fund, Hillary For America & Obama For America. Our country has been sold out to foreign governments & corporations (who also should not be permitted to donate to political parties/candidates, or to be legally called "people").

We The (living, breathing) People say: THIS MADNESS MUST END. We serfs are being taken advantage of & forced into poverty, debt, slave wages, inadequate healthcare, a polluted earth...all for WHAT?! So our narcissistic "leaders" can control money & usurp our power? NO.

Removing foreign money from US politics is a no brainer & should never have been allowed in the first place. We The People understand that globalism is here to stay, but we will NOT stand for foreign governments & corporations having more say over what happens to us than we do. End this madness IMMEDIATELY, for the sake of Democracy (which we no longer are, by the way. Even President Carter said so).

We are AWAKE. We are taking back Democracy, but we desperately need those of you OSTENSIBLY REPRESENTING US in Government to back us up. We want ACTION on this. We don't believe anyone's pretty words anymore. Show us you've got some backbone & that you actually, really, truly care about Democracy.

I do. We The People Do. Do YOU???

I urge you to immediately take every step at your disposal to remove foreign money from US politics as soon as is humanly possible.

Thank you.

Sent from my iPad

Comment Received to CommissionerRavel@fec.gov on Aug. 19, 2016

Thank you, Commissioner, for your work on this issue and for the very interesting interview on the Thom Hartmann show day before yesterday. I enjoyed it very much.
Again, thank you for attempting to do what badly needs doing!

P. Mendenhall
Minnesota

Comment Received to CommissionerRavel@fec.gov on Aug. 19, 2016

@Ann Ravel

Thank you for working towards reducing campaign donations by foreign owned corporations. Since the Citizens United decision occurred it has been made clear that judicial and other elected officials are having to compete unfairly against PAC supported campaigns. Clarifying the language to exclude donations by foreign owned corporations seems feasible and might exclude some dark money.

But if someone really just wanted to get money spent in an election it seems like they could easily give it to a middle man.

But getting the language in the legal documents in the first place would help show that we would prefer they didn't do that.

Thank you.
Jennifer Depew, R.D.

Comment Received to CommissionerRavel@fec.gov on Aug. 19, 2016

Jeff Skaggs [REDACTED]@hotmail.com>

Dear Commissioner Ravel,

I am very much against foreign money being used to influence our elections. It shouldn't even be an issue. It should just not happen!

Comment Received to CommissionerRavel@fec.gov on Aug. 19, 2016

Dear Commissioner Raval,

Thank you for your call for public comment with regard to eliminating foreign owned corporate money in U.S. elections. I vehemently oppose domestic subsidiaries of foreign corporations being allowed to make donations to U.S. political campaigns.

Sincerely,

Sara Sanders-Buell
Vienna, VA

Comment Received to CommissionerRavel@fec.gov on Aug. 20, 2016

Abhay Khosla [REDACTED]@yahoo.com>

Commissioner Ravel,

Thank you for inviting the public to comment in your Medium Article "Citizens United, Foreign Money and Your Voice." I am writing to register my strong support for your efforts in rescinding Advisory Opinion 2006-15 (TransCanada) and/or taking any other actions sufficient and necessary to insure that domestic subsidiaries of foreign corporations are not permitted to make contributions or donations, directly or indirectly, in connection with federal, state or local elections.

Your reasoning seems consistent with common sense and other long-standing efforts to safeguard the electoral process. I believe that it will strengthen the American public's belief in the value of their vote, and does not appear driven by any undue or improper xenophobia.

Thank you for your efforts.

Comment Received to CommissionerRavel@fec.gov on Aug. 20, 2016

Dear Commissioner Ravel,

I am responding to your request for citizen comment on election campaign finance regulation. I am a 66 year old retired high technology executive with global experience and a broad exposure to the norms of other countries.

I am strongly in favor of limiting campaign contributions. This includes exclusion of contributions from foreign owned entities as well as limiting the total value of contributions from citizens as well as the corporate contributions. I would also advocate for eliminating completely corporate contributions and requiring identification of donors to any form of PAC.

Best Regards,

Frank Shinneman

Aptos, CA

Comment Received to CommissionerRavel@fec.gov on Aug. 20, 2016

I read your article on Facebook and you are correct and right on about all of it. Citizens United is one of the worst and most dangerous pieces of legislation that has happened. I am super worried about its affect on our lives and the structure of our government. It opens the door to a whole different structure of our country, a structure we as citizens will have no way to control. Thank you for being concerned.

Terri Nighswonger

Commissioner Ravel,

I have read your article soliciting the American public for their opinions on the implications of foreign money influencing elections in the United States and am writing to give my opinion on the matter. I am against the Citizens United ruling on principal because it has allowed many sources (corporations, wealthy individuals and now foreign donors) undue influence over American politicians and our electoral process. As you may be aware a Princeton study by Professor Martin Gilens of Princeton concluded that the US is no longer a democracy but is actually an oligarchy. When you have a supreme court declare that money is free speech you in essence give those privileged with vast wealth a much louder voice than the rest of us. This is bad enough when those voices originate from our own country as one would like to hope a domestic donor is motivated by greed or some other form of self-interest and regardless of the overall outcome of their influence the goal of the donor was not to undermine the US. Please note I am not advocating for domestic donors to be able to donate vast amounts of money but merely pointing out that in comparison to foreign donations, domestic donations are the lesser evil. A foreign donor may not have that same shared interest in the US succeeding that a domestic donor may have and may give to a politician hoping to influence their actions on legislation that the donor knows is harmful to the US but if passed would be profitable to the donor. An example of this sort of thing happening outside of the Chinese owned American Pacific International Capital donating to Jeb Bush's Right to Rise PAC would be the Uranium One deal overseen by Hillary Clinton while Secretary of State that resulted in US based Uranium mines ending up in the hands of Russian interests. I am sick of the corruption rampant in my countries government. I feel that the interests of all humanity are being forced to be subservient to the greed of the corporations. If there is anything you can do to fight this corruption given your position of FEC commissioner I urge you and your fellow commissioners to do so. Any victory you can secure against the corrupting influence of money in politics would give hope that things can change. Thank you for carrying on the fight and I support your efforts to curb the corrupting influence of money in politics.

In Solidarity,

Hugh Crosmun

Comment Received to CommissionerRavel@fec.gov on Aug. 20, 2016

Commissioner Ravel,

Thank you for hearing the Bells toll; for they toll for U.S.!

Okay, sorry; you asked:

Give the Inversion Corporatists almost what they want. And in the process, freeing U.S. forever from foreign, domestic special interest, & foreign special interest 'electioneering' funds "contributions".

It's a given the previous 2004 repatriation amnesty did not go as purported by the Corporatists and their lackey operatives in Congress -

Smarter people than myself seem to have a handle on this:

Repatriation Tax Stats

WASHINGTON -- The 15 companies that benefited the most from a 2004 tax break for the return of their overseas profits cut more than 20,000 net jobs and decreased the pace of their research spending, according to report from the Democratic staff of the Senate Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations released Monday night.

The report warned against repeating the tax break, calling the 2004 effort "a failed tax policy" that cost the U.S. Treasury \$3.3 billion in estimated lost revenues over 10 years and led to U.S. companies directing more funds offshore. U.S.-based multinationals often defer bringing back profits earned abroad to avoid paying U.S. taxes on them.

The 15 companies that repatriated the most after the 2004 tax break on the return of overseas profits later cut a net 20,931 jobs between 2004 and 2007 and slightly decreased the pace of their spending on research and development, found the report surveying 19 companies' activity.

When Congress passed the repatriation tax holiday in 2004, the legislation specified that the funds should be earmarked for activities like hiring workers or conducting research and prohibited using the money for executive compensation or buying back stock. Companies that brought back profits earned abroad saw them taxed at roughly 5%, instead of the top 35% corporate tax rate.

"There is no evidence that the previous repatriation tax giveaway put Americans to work, and substantial evidence that it instead grew executive paychecks, propped up stock prices, and drew more money and jobs offshore," Sen. Carl Levin (D., Mich.), chairman of the subcommittee, said in a statement Monday night. "Those who want a new corporate tax break claim it will help rebuild our economy, but the facts are lined up against them."

The survey comes less than a week after Sens. John McCain (R., Ariz.) and Kay Hagan (D., N.C.) introduced a proposal for another repatriation tax holiday that would lower the tax rate on repatriated funds to 8.75%, with the opportunity to see that decrease to 5.25% if a company

expanded its payroll. In the House, Rep. Kevin Brady (R., Texas) introduced a similar bill in May.

However, repeating the 2004 repatriation tax break has already come under criticism from skeptics, including the conservative think tank the Heritage Foundation, who have argued that companies aren't low on capital and the tax break won't nudge them into making any investments they wouldn't already make.

The five companies that benefitted the most from the 2004 tax break included Pfizer Inc., Merck & Co. , Hewlett-Packard Co. , Johnson & Johnson and International Business Machines Corp. , repatriating \$88 billion, or 28% of the total amount brought back to the U.S., according to the report. In total, 843 companies brought back \$312 billion, the Internal Revenue Service has assessed.

The report noted that Pfizer had the single largest share of the repatriated profits, bringing home \$35.5 billion in foreign earnings, while also cutting 11,748 U.S. jobs between 2004 and 2007. Similarly, IBM brought back \$9.5 billion, but cut 12,830 jobs, the report stated, citing answers from the companies in response to its questions.

Meanwhile, the top 15 repatriating companies also accelerated their spending on stock buybacks and executive compensation after the tax break. The top five executives at those 15 companies saw their compensation rise 27% from 2004 to 2005 and then another 30% between 2005 to 2006.

The tax break gave a boost to a narrow slice of U.S. multinationals, with pharmaceutical and technology companies reaping more of the benefits and provided "no benefit to domestic firms that chose not to engage in offshore operations or investments," the report found. Companies brought back funds held in areas that the Government Accountability Office has labeled tax havens, including Switzerland, the Bahamas, Bermuda, the Cayman Islands and Ireland. Of the 19 companies surveyed by the committee, seven repatriated between 90% and 100% of their funds from tax havens.

The 2004 repatriation tax holiday further motivated companies to keep even more of their earnings overseas, the report found. With the exception of Pfizer, the 10 companies that repatriated the most money after the 2004 tax break have stashed increasing funds offshore every year since the 2004 tax break, the survey noted.

For example, Coca-Cola Co. brought back "nearly all" of its qualified earnings from a unit in the Cayman Islands that had no Cayman employees and functioned to provide "legal insulation" for its U.S. assets, the company answered in the survey.

The "negative effects" of the tax break "create unfair tax advantages for a narrow sector of corporations with damaging economic impacts on the U.S. economy as a whole," the report concluded. Supporters of another repatriation tax holiday Monday night said the report was one-sided and didn't reflect the stimulating effect an influx of funds could have on the struggling U.S. economy.

"Unfortunately, Senator Levin believes that Europe and Asia can do better things with the money than America," said Win America, a coalition backing the tax break, in a statement. "The real question is, should we allow American companies the freedom to deploy this money here or risk it being spent overseas?" Mr. Levin and Sen. Kent Conrad (D., N.D.), chairman of the Senate Budget Committee also sent a letter to the Joint Select Committee on Deficit Reduction urging the 12-lawmaker panel not to support a repatriation tax break in its proposal to reduce the federal budget deficit.

Yet by listening to the once again misnamed Corporatist spin doctors at "Win America" ? (Oh come on!) Cui Bono? Those that want to continue to manipulate and attempt to control our supposed free and fair election process, that's who!

On stopping Corporatist inversion tactics -

With formulary apportionment, it wouldn't matter how many subsidiaries and departments corporations had scattered all over the globe, and which "earned" their profits where. Instead, a formula (based on a combination of a corporation's sales, payroll and capital stock) would determine what proportion of the corporation "belonged" to each country. Then the corporation's overall profits would be allocated according to that proportion, and the corporation would pay that country's tax rate on that proportion.

This would be good for the U.S. overall, given that we're a huge market that accounts for a large proportion of most multinationals' sales. It would be good for domestic business, making it possible to raise the same amount of revenue at a lower corporate tax rate. And it would make companies compete based on who made the better product, not who has the better lawyers and accountants. But it would make it far more difficult for multinational corporations to play governments off each other and evade taxes, so don't look for it anytime soon.

My proposal -

(Apologies on this being so long)

It is sadly turning out that the true threat to world peace and stability is not the 'World Communism' Corporatists for decades put forth as the ultimate evil. The real threat under all of our noses and in our respective countries for forty years running needs to be unmasked for what it is - 'World Corporatism'; giving capitalism a bad name. Please don't make me list here the so called "Marxist" states that we went and "saved" from themselves. Just look to the CIA fact book for that march of tears, all the way to the Corporatist banks, with U.S. tax dollars as fodder for "globalization" at the expense of citizens everywhere! And where are these same 'patriotic' 'American' companies now? Partners with the CCCP, that's where! Growing the largest middle class in the world; in China. Creating the most Billionaires; In CHINA! The fastest growing millionaire class the world has ever seen; IN CHINA!!!! Continued subsidies and rebates on clean vehicles through 2020; where? IN CHINA!!!! Ready to jump (the 'SS America') ship further with the secretive and mislabeled TPP!!!

Comment Received to CommissionerRavel@fec.gov on Aug. 20, 2016

Yet we can, all of U.S.!, fix all of the Corporatist machinations! Here's a good start:

Make 1% Great Again!

The RePATRIOT Tax Act of 2016 -

Regarding the 1% figure so talked about during the current election cycle; let's help the 1% bring their Corporatist offshore profits back into the country with a 1st out, RePATRIOT Tax, solely designated and non-transferable nor assignable for any other purpose than creation and use for a election superfund from repatriated Corporate and offshore tax haven profits.

Tax the repatriation of the over \$4.1 Trillion in estimated Corporate profits at only .01%, (\$40 Bil +), and it gives well over the estimated \$6B cost of the 2012 Federal Election that can be applied to a non publicly funded 2020 U.S. Federal election. More than enough to fund over six (6) Federal & State midterm election cycles in this country. Think of all of the money average people can save or put back directly into the economy from having to attempt to fund and support candidate(s) against the Corporatist operatives masquerading as politicians backed by (dark/grey/'legal' PAC) money? No need for 'Citizens United' v FEC, and McCutcheon v FEC! Once the people know that this plan is fundable without any increase in taxes, FOR ANYBODY, even to the repatriation-applicable funds, the country and the world wins!

No longer would our elected officials be forced to spend upwards of 25% of their 'on-the-clock' time raising money for re-elections, nor focusing this unproductive time and effort mostly on donors who can afford \$500 or \$1000 donations at a time. Talk about streamlining Government to a more efficient model? (Here is the answer and plan to expedite all you Libertarian savants out there)

A true eye opener here would be the Corporatists NOT wanting to follow this sensible plan and withdrawing the request to repatriate Corporatist profits. (Back to the Win America murky jargon and pretzel logic) This single act, once and for all, will finally show the American people the true lack of concern these Corporatists hold for the American people, the system of taxation, and Governmental safeguards. 'Out' the Corporatists for the greedy manipulative people they are, hiding in other countries as well as here in America, behind the so-called unassailable 'Corporate Veil'. Extra! Extra! Read all about it in the "Panama Papers"!

Governments the world over cannot simply duplicate the actions of the Catholic Pope and French King on Friday, October 13th, 1307 if Corporatists don't wise up, play ball, and work with a sense of civitas and common good, in lieu of for-profit-only-motives? Or can they? Should they?

We could use our heads and VOTE! their Corporatist operatives masquerading as politicians out of office. For good. (At least for the time being, with no worthless obstructionist Corporatist Republicans hurting our Government by the people, of the people, for the people any further this election cycle.)

Yet go further and ask why elections seem to cost too too much in this the so-called 'freest

country on earth" in the first place? Why? So much more than necessary due solely to Corporatist media manipulation and collusion in the current election process. Period. Corporatist 'elections-for-profit' motive goes the way of the dinosaur once this plan is enacted. Election costs decrease, with 'saved' spending doing just that, or directly back into the economy for the stimulus needed. Look to the English election model or similar cost effective solution(s)?

Why cannot we the people get behind legislation regulating what media can charge for political content during election cycles? The rich owners and shareholders of the media outlets should not be allowed to charge premium prices for political content advertising in this country. Corporate tax break requested? Sure thing, loyal and patriotic American company; just discount your election pricing and you got it! How much more simple can it all be? Forever going forward?!?! Profit motive has to be taken out of elections in every nation on earth. Corporatists be darned in tarnation!

These Corporatist propagandists are all but influencing and misrepresenting the process. What? Here in America? Come on! (lol sigh ugh) (Les Moonves coming to mind? "Who would have thought that this circus would come to town?" CBS President Les Moonves told investors at the Morgan Stanley Technology, Media & Telecom Conference. "It may not be good for America, but it's damn good for CBS. The money is rolling in" to the company's local TV and radio stations." Thanks for that Les! (CBS.com) Rupert Murdoch, on HIS deathbed of old age, won't utter "Rosebud"; instead he'll gasp "idiot Americans, it was all Entertainment, wheeze, ugh...."

When is enough, enough here? When WE THE PEOPLE SAY, not the biased media conglomerates? Up to U.S. here, and not the Corporatist operatives masquerading as politicians in our Legislature, or our supposedly unbiased Judicial (appointed or elected) officials?

Bi Partisan victory here folks! Only losers (for once) are the Corporatists and their Foreign & Special Interest backers and those in collusion. Once in forty years!

How do we know the Quids force in Iran aren't contributing to a Super PAC due to Citizens United v FEC Corporatist Judicial ruling? How do we know drug cartels aren't contributing to a Super PAC due to McCutcheon v FEC Corporatist Judicial ruling? How many billions of campaign finance contributions from average U.S. Citizens could go directly back into the economy, and not into the coffers of the biased and collusionist Corporatist run media conglomerates, who in turn skew editorials, and possibly again contribute financially to Super PAC's and eligible (secret) non-profits created and designed solely to buy and influence election outcomes?

This plan also leaves ample funding for the remaining repatriation tax amount decided upon (19? - 24%? - 29%? vs 2016 Federal Corporate Tax Rate @ 35%) for needed National Infrastructure costs, paying down our National Debt, and other worthwhile social programs. 1% for free and unencumbered elections; the remainder for the rest of what this country needs. Hold this minimalist Tax Amnesty prior to every Federal Election year. Wake this country up to the Corporatist reality surrounding U.S.!

The RePATRIOT Repatriation Tax Act of 2016 works perfectly in fixing our misguided and

Comment Received to CommissionerRavel@fec.gov on Aug. 20, 2016

misaligned election process. Shine that "Beacon of Light" for the rest of the world to see that here in America we can stand up to Corporatist excesses, graft, corruption, collusion, and chicanery. If we can't or won't do it, who can?

There is a YUGE (thanks Bernie!) difference in a Corporatist with no allegiance to anything or any nation other than for-profit-motive, and a Capitalist who understands "Responsible Business is not Impossible Business" and the ideals that Citizen, Community, City, County, Country all matter, along with Corporations. So why continue to play a fixed, rigged game here? Who says we have to? The Corporatists and their biased media conglomerates profiting off of this flawed election process in America, that's who! There's that pesky negative 1% again!

We have been 'saddled' with Corporatist rhetoric, propaganda, and policies since the "Corporatist Cowboy" Ronald Reagan came to office in 1980. Take the last forty years of Corporatist out-and-out assault on modern Global society, and come to terms with the legacy of Ronald (see Nancy) Reagan. The Corporatist's "Manchurian Candidate"? Sad but true?

Reign in these Corporatists before it's too late for all of the rest of us. Wait! I just remembered; there are Corporatist Democrats as well in the mix here.

Add (3) Independents on each regulatory and oversight committee and break the two-party deadlocks strangling our good Governance.

Besides, why don't these Corporatists ever remember their Samuel Johnson (Boswell)

"Patriotism is the last refuge of a scoundrel"?

Or Georges Danton -

"Tis better to be a poor fisherman than meddle in the government of men!"

Thank you for your time in review and discussion amongst your staff and colleagues. And please don't be too perturbed by any of this response to your prompting.

Thank you once again,

John Paul

Comment Received to CommissionerRavel@fec.gov on Aug. 20, 2016

Commissioner Ravel,

Thanks for the opportunity to make comments on this issue. I recently wrote a paper for my Political Science class where I argued that the ability of foreign nationals and foreign corporations to inject money into our political process actually poses a huge national security threat. I quoted from the FEC's own website that specifically states that election spending by foreign nationals and foreign corporations is prohibited. Would overturning Citizens United be enough to get us to where we need to be in order to enforce this statute?

This is a very important issue. We just saw an example with the Chinese couple donating to Jeb Bush's Super Pac.

Sincerely,

Kenneth McClintic

Comment Received to CommissionerRavel@fec.gov on Aug. 20, 2016

Yes, we need to take foreign money out of elections even if that money comes from domestic subsidiaries! A parent company in a foreign country disqualifies a domestic subsidiary from contributing to US elections.

Also, Hillary Clinton is encouraging illegal immigrants to vote! It's my understanding this is against federal election rules. Why can't the FEC require voter ID? Why should judges rule on this when we have the FEC to enforce the rules?

Please fight for Americans to have control over who is elected to the highest positions in our own country! Foreigners shouldn't decide who runs our country!

Thank you,
A citizen of the US
Geraldine Candelaria
New Mexico, USA

Comment Received to CommissionerRavel@fec.gov on Aug. 20, 2016

I do not believe that foreign corporations should be allowed to contribute to US elections. Furthermore I believe that today elections are not really democratic. One of the ways to address this is through campaign finance reform. I don't know how to do this but candidates should all have the same amount of money to spend on campaigning and there should be a loose format that requires the issues and past political actions, rather than accusations, to be stated. Only an educated public can vote wisely!

I also think that the electoral college should be abolished. I believe elctions should be determined by the popular vote.

Thank you for giving me a chance to state my views!!!

Mary Lou Carlson

Comment Received to CommissionerRavel@fec.gov on Aug. 20, 2016

It's bad enough to allow domestic corporations to donate to politicians. Foreign money is unthinkable....CR

--

Clint Ritter - Austin, TX

Comment Received to CommissionerRavel@fec.gov on Aug. 20, 2016

Dear Commissioner Ravel,

I wholeheartedly support your proposal to rescind Advisory Opinion 2006–15 (TransCanada).

I also support any and all amendments to other advisory opinions that need to be changed.

The Citizens United decision is bad enough, but this influx of foreign money to our elections is intolerable.

Glen Rickerd NO6W

Comment Received to CommissionerRavel@fec.gov on Aug. 20, 2016

This must stop. Money given to foundations is laundered into campaign cash, but the strings of obligation are still there.

Any foundation or organization accepting foreign money should be barred from making campaign contributions or in-kind donations for a period of five years. Violations should be punished as serious felonies and CEO's imprisoned with fines of 10x the amount of the donation.

When are you politicians going to realize that you are driving centrist Americans to the radical fringes? You'd better wake up soon or the trouble that is already brewing won't be easily overlooked or forgotten.

C.V. Spawr
American Citizen and Veteran

Comment Received to CommissionerRavel@fec.gov on Aug. 20, 2016

Deborah Krisanda [REDACTED]@scarsdaleschools.org>

Hi Commissioner Ravel! I absolutely support you in ending international monies contributions into the US political system - we have enough bad money influencing our citizens ...! Thank you and take care! Deb

Comment Received to CommissionerRavel@fec.gov on Aug. 20, 2016

Matt Hough [REDACTED]@icloud.com>

Hello,

Please take a stand against foreign money in our elections! This is a great step forward in revitalizing our democracy.

Matt

Comment Received to CommissionerRavel@fec.gov on Aug. 20, 2016

Joan Accardi [REDACTED]@comcast.net>

Sat 8/20/2016

Citizens United now allows multi-national US companies, with interests all over the world, to give unlimited amounts of money in US elections. Our elected officials no longer represent the American people but global corporatist interests. Please help!

Sent from my iPhone

Comment Received to CommissionerRavel@fec.gov on Aug. 20, 2016

Dear Commissioner Ravel,

I wholeheartedly agree with your proposal to prohibit foreign spending in our elections. Thank you so much for attempting to limit the damage done to our system by the wrongheaded Citizens United decision.

Bob Montgomery
Iowa City, IA

Comment Received to CommissionerRavel@fec.gov on Aug. 20, 2016

Dear Commissioner Ravel,

Thank you for fighting to remove foreign money from our electoral process.

Best regards,

Matt Schlegel

Comment Received to CommissionerRavel@fec.gov on Aug. 20, 2016

Dave Zimmerman [REDACTED]@yahoo.com>

Citizens United ended democracy in the US. Not only foreigners, including foreign governments, but anybody with a billion dollars can influence the elections and get laws passed the the public doesn't want. In my opinion they can buy political offices at all levels. People like the Koch brothers who contribute to politicians expect those politicians to pass laws that make them money and give them special powers. You see that when the issue of global warming comes up in politics. Global warming is a proven fact. But politicians who get money from the Koch brothers deny science in favor of receiving unlimited amounts of money from them. This in fact does get them elected to office and the power they are looking for. In turn they pass laws the public doesn't want, but they still get unlimited funding and reelected. This is one example. Our government is as corrupt or more corrupt than it was in the Robber Barron era. The ruling of Citizens United must be over turned to get our democracy back.

Dave

Comment Received to CommissionerRavel@fec.gov on Aug. 20, 2016

Get it Out and Keep it Out, Any Way possible!

Thomas van de Steeg

Comment Received to CommissionerRavel@fec.gov on Aug. 20, 2016

Commissioner Ravel

I must first thank you for notifying the public about the status of these issues. I do as well share your concerns about the effect of foreign money in campaigns and elections. We could ultimately be controlled by foreign money and with the potential of the TPP the threat looms even larger. My concern is that the US citizens will one day find themselves citizens of China, Indonesia or other country, that at this time, holds beliefs antithetical to ours.

Thank you, again for speaking out. I think we as US citizens need to be constantly aware of all the potential incursions to these frightening ways of thinking.

Rosie Bachand
Stockton, CA 95219

Comment Received to CommissionerRavel@fec.gov on Aug. 20, 2016

Connie Tolleson [REDACTED]@gmail.com>

Sat 8/20/2016

Citizen's United needs to be repealed. Corporations are not people. Corporations should not be allowed to participate in competitions, especially economic and political competitions, that disrupt the lives of actual human beings. Corporations must be made to justify their existences by serving human purposes.

I would like to suggest the creation of an alternate currency that excludes all fictitious people and is based on human-style labor.

Care giving is an all volunteer field. The dues we pay for being human beings. Our planet is a living cohort, and we humans the designated "brains." So how do we maintain this fragile mantle of life on our little rock of a planet? We each take care of the life around us. We have lots of technology to help, but most care giving can't be done without loving, human hands to do the most disgusting of tasks. (Poopy diapers, anyone?). Necessary, thankless, disgusting and unpaid! What if humans could get credit for all of that unpaid labor and turn it into a usable currency?

Here is A Suggestion on how to do that.

<http://therosewoodcrone.blogspot.com/2016/02/a-digital-fiat-currency-for-service.html>

Comment Received to CommissionerRavel@fec.gov on Aug. 20, 2016

Dear Commissioner,

I wholeheartedly support the removal of foreign money and influence in and on our elections. The disastrous Citizens United decision has not only contaminated our elections in the context of foreign money, but also the by the deluge of dark money from within our country.

I applaud you for taking this position and I will continue to write to my representatives voicing these same concerns.

Thank you.

Brian Danks

Vallejo, CA

Comment Received to CommissionerRavel@fec.gov on Aug. 20, 2016

Dear Commissioner Ravel,

Thank you for taking a brave stand against money in Politics. Until this connection is broken, along with the revolving door, it will not be possible to have elected representatives actually represent the needs of the people. We no longer have a representative democracy - if in fact we ever had one: money has always dominated the discussion and the outcome. Please continue the struggle. Donations to candidates should be limited to registered voters - as in one person, one vote. Corporations are not registered voters, and therefore should be prohibited from ANY contributions - either directly to candidates or to PACs.

Thank you for your service,

Ed Protas
Sisters, OR 97759
(Retired)

Comment Received to CommissionerRavel@fec.gov on Aug. 20, 2016

Commissioner Ravel,

My name is Jon Koenigs and I read an article on the website, the Intercept which prompted me to write a short note to you. I thank you for your courage in speaking on behalf of concerned citizens prior to the meeting in September. Election spending has been out of control for years and is destroying the country. I believe this issue is something both the Dems and GOP should agree on...they waste too much time fundraising. Best of luck.

Jon Koenigs

Comment Received to CommissionerRavel@fec.gov on Aug. 20, 2016

Dear Commissioner Ravel,

I just finished reading *The Intercept's* article by Jon Schwartz posted August 19, 2016 entitled "*FEC Commissioner Wants Help Getting Foreign Money Out of U.S. Elections*".

I fully support your proposal to have the FEC take a stand against foreign money in U.S. elections by rescinding the Advisory Opinion 2006-15 (TransCanada).

I was appalled to read the recent report (also In The Intercept) regarding the ability of the Chinese owned APIC to donate \$1.3 million to the Jeb Bush Super PAC "Right to Rise USA".

Since 2010 we have seen our election process corrupted beyond imagination by the passage of Citizen's United and it's effect on the earlier TransCanada Advisory Opinion.

Justice Steven's dissent was more than prescient when he predicted the involvement of multinational corporations in our political process. I don't think most citizens were aware of how rapidly and significantly those floodgates would be opened!

We see it here at the local level in Wisconsin where foreign corporations are intent on controlling our pipelines and mining regulations through the political process.

As a voting citizen of the USA, I wish to see the end of Citizen's United concomitant with the public financing of our elections. In the interim, and at the very least, I would like to see foreign monies excluded from influencing our elections.

Thank you for your good work.

Jennifer McKnight-Lupes
Blair, Wisconsin

Comment Received to CommissionerRavel@fec.gov on Aug. 20, 2016

Joshua Warren [REDACTED]@gmail.com>

|
It's bad enough having corporate money skewing our elections, allowing foreign influence just seems completely insane!

Rescind the opinion, please.

Comment Received to CommissionerRavel@fec.gov on Aug. 20, 2016

Not only should you stop foreign money, but those funds should be confiscated in its entirety as a penalty. Because for every dollar you find, there's bound to be several dollars you don't find.

Alex Zima

Newark, CA

Comment Received to CommissionerRavel@fec.gov on Aug. 20, 2016

Robb-V [REDACTED]@protonmail.com>

Dear Commissioner Ravel,

On August 12th, in response to the article written in "The Intercept" I reached out to Chairman Peterson and Vice Chair Steven Walther and urged them to support your motion. Unfortunately I did not receive a response- but in lieu of the motion going forward, and in direct response to your calling for public opinion here are my two cents.

Ethics is not a partisan issue and no side- neither democrats nor republicans hold a monopoly on morality. As a citizen who works as an engineer for a foreign fortune 500 company I know I do not want my company to influence my life outside of work. To quote Joseph Stiglitz this is becoming a country "Of the 1% by the 1% and for the 1%." I hope that you council can not only come to a conscientious, but a unanimous decision in support of your motion.

I look forward to reading about a bit of progress being made in this period of regress.

Thank you for your service

-Robb

Comment Received to CommissionerRavel@fec.gov on Aug. 21, 2016

Dear Commissioner Ravel,

Please remove foreign influence on our US Election system. Our democracy is at stake.

--

Regards,

Kim Barrington

Comment Received to CommissionerRavel@fec.gov on Aug. 21, 2016

Joseph Spinden [REDACTED]@totb.us>

Of course you are right. But good luck getting anything past the Republicans. They have no interest in what's good for the country -- it is strictly party politics.

JS

--

"Sunlight is the best disinfectant."

-- Justice Louis D. Brandeis, 1913.

Comment Received to CommissionerRavel@fec.gov on Aug. 21, 2016

Commissioner Ravel,

I was heartened to read about your concern over foreign money affecting national, state, and local elections in the US. This should not be allowed and stopping it should be a priority for the FEC.

Hopefully you will be able to modify rules to prevent such donations in the future. It would be great if you could prevent not just money from foreign companies with subsidiaries in the US but also from companies that have inverted, opening a small office overseas, such as Ireland, and then claiming themselves to be an Irish company and paying taxes accordingly. If they want to be a foreign company and pay those taxes they should not be allowed to affect US elections. Let them donate to election in the other country instead.

Thank you for your efforts in putting a stop to this practice.

Sincerely,

Philip A Goldinger
New Cumberland, PA 17070

Comment Received to CommissionerRavel@fec.gov on Aug. 21, 2016

Dear Commissioner Ravel,

Thank you for taking the time to reach out and inform US voters about your concerns and efforts to issue a new advisory via Medium. I really appreciate and value you doing so, since it has given me concrete background on the issue and a clear way to contact you and voice my concerns.

For context, I'm a voter who lives and works in Santa Clara County, CA.

I've been concerned for some time with the effects of Citizens United and how it decreases the power and voice of citizens from influencing and guiding our elected politicians. Many corporations have access to resources that ordinary citizens do not. In many situations, I believe that those corporations cannot act in the interests of less influential citizens, citizens who are disenfranchised, citizens who have less economic power and less access to platforms that can disseminate their concerns.

There are many examples, but to present one I'm particularly concerned about: many corporations pollute the environment and consume scarce natural resources at a rate far faster than individual consumers. Many environmental protection laws and regulations put additional costs and requirements onto corporate activity, which directly benefits citizens who will grow old and raise children in an increasingly polluted and compromised government. If corporations are allowed too much influence in how environmental protection laws are authored, I really believe it will compromise how influential those laws can be, and how much they can protect the environment for future citizens.

To the point you brought up in your post, I'm very concerned as well about how foreign political concerns and foreign commercial concerns could end up influencing our governance in the United States. I'm in strong agreement with your August 9 memo discussing rescinding the Trans-Canada advisory opinion. It concerns me enormously that, in a changed political and legal environment, the opinion could be used to legitimize and support campaign finance activity by foreign corporations that aren't in the spirit of the original advisory opinion's goals.

I personally feel that corporations owned by companies headquartered internationally can and will often have policy goals that clash with what American corporations want, and even more crucially—what American citizens (without the power of a huge lobbying budget and a large number of employed lawyers and advisors) want out of politics.

I would love to see your office issue a revised advisory opinion that reflects the changes in Citizen United and has stronger, updated guidelines on how corporate campaign finance should work, in order to not suppress the votes, voices, and concerns of the American people.

Thanks,
Celine Viet Mai Nguyen

Comment Received to CommissionerRavel@fec.gov on Aug. 21, 2016

All due respect, Commissioner Ravel, but the FEC is useless. Your proposal is lipstick on the pig that is Citizens United and will have no real effect. When you and the Harvard/Columbia/AEI hotshots have an actual fix for corporate control of elections, and not weak tea from a compromised and corrupt system, I'm all ears! Until then? Yawn.

To be specific, I care far more about the massive contributions from the wealthy individuals and corporations that control US elections, from Federal to State and more recently even local contests. Foreign contributions pale in comparison and your campaign is a distraction from the real problem. Get big money out of elections, period.

Sincerely,
Brad Mowrey

To the Federal Election Commission
c/o Ann Ravel

Thank you for seeking the concerns and opinions of ordinary individuals like myself regarding the most crucial criteria of our democracy, the individual vote, the power of individual citizens to participate and determine the course of governance of our country.

Academics may find pleasure in hair splitting semantics that perage discourse about the right to vote and who has the right of free speech in the political campaigns. Lawyers love to argue technicalities. I am a simple man. I try to understand issues from a common sense perspective.

First, regarding the right to vote in the United States political process, I was taught in my civics class many years ago in my public junior and senior high school years that in America it was one man, one vote. (Sexist language back then was not an issue. This phrase, one individual, one vote is the cornerstone of democracy, especially the "American" version of democracy. My opinion rests on this simple and very clear foundation upon which our democracy was built.

It is the individual citizen that has the fundamental responsibility and consequentially the power of governance of our country via that one vote cast by that one individual. When that vote is then counted collectively, America becomes the country so defined with the words, "We, the People..." It is not 'we, the corporations of America.' Corporations are not individuals. This country was not built upon the voting rights of corporations, nor was it founded upon the voting rights of any formed group of citizens. This country was founded and is rooted in the vote of the individual citizen.

Thus, in my simple but clear understanding, it is the protection of the individual citizen's one vote that is of the utmost to be protected from any and all attempts to minimize, marginalize or outright subvert that individual vote.

Therefore, when it comes to campaign contributions, it is for individual citizen to contribute to campaigns individually just as it is for the individual to cast that individual vote during the while in the voting booth. A corporation does not enter the voting booth to cast a vote or 50 vote or what ever number for a candidate for office. The individual citizen is paramount in this process of American democracy. The individual citizen shot remain so through the process of electing our governing officials.

Since the individual vote is paramount to our democratic process, then only individual citizens should be able to contribute to campaigns. If corporations or other groups (unions,etc.) want to express their opinions they can purchase the media of their choice and exercise free speech, but that free speech promoting that opinion must be identify the voice (company named, union named, organization name, etc.

Again, keeping it simple, it is easy to determine if an individual is a U.S. citizen as opposed to some hidden individual who runs a multinational organization.

Comment Received to CommissionerRavel@fec.gov on Aug. 21, 2016

Absolutely, multination organizations should be barred the campaign process. One, they are not an individual. Two, being a multination, they have a conflict of interest — their international well being over the well being of the citizens of the United States. This is a simple understanding. Its clarity is obvious. When the powerful want to manipulate and direct, the communication becomes “complicated” and the message is muddied with a vast array of interconnected minute details.

Ward Jarman
Maine

Comment Received to CommissionerRavel@fec.gov on Aug. 21, 2016

I'm all for keeping it out. While some parts of the world may indeed be impacted by our domestic politics, they have the ability to address these issues by dialogue with our elected officials....they DO NOT have a right to help ELECT THEM, by donating to their election funding. This is part of the outright bribery that Citizen's United allowed, and needs to be stopped.

Thank you for your efforts on this issue.

Sincerely,
Mike Barrett

Comment Received to CommissionerRavel@fec.gov on Aug. 21, 2016

Dear Commissioner Ravel,

Thank you for requesting the public's input on FEC policy. The implications of Citizen United for undermining the integrity of U.S. elections has been widely recognized. However, the fact that *foreign* money now has the same "free speech" rights as U.S. citizens has the potential to undermine the integrity of U.S. elections altogether. However, if this influence is recognized and banned, then the integrity of current elections could actually be improved.

It should be FEC policy to ban any political contributions (campaign contributions, gifts, etc.) from entities which *in any way or to any extent* are owned by foreign nationals or governments.

A list of these entities (millions of them) banned from contributing should be produced and updated regularly so that political campaigns and parties know upfront who they cannot receive money from. This would in no way preclude prosecuting said campaigns or parties if they took money from a new or previously undocumented, foreign-owned entity. Proof of U.S. citizenship or incorporations papers proving U.S. citizen ownership should be required in order to *receive* any campaign contributions.

Thank you again for considering my thoughts in carrying out your responsibility for the integrity of U.S. elections.

Sincerely,

Stuart Dickey Summer
Hillsdale, NY

Comment Received to CommissionerRavel@fec.gov on Aug. 21, 2016

Commissioner Ravel,

I am so over whelmed, as a regular American middle class citizen, regarding how the U.S. will ever help the ordinary person with employment, security, and some hope for happiness. Foreign money influencing American elections just makes it more clear that average citizens and their vote mean NOTHING in this country. It seems to me we are completely lost and stand for nothing anymore. Please do what you can to stop Foreign corporations from influencing our elections. It is bad enough that American corporations now run this country. When foreign corporations are allowed to run it also, it seems to me democracy is a lost cause. I am to the point where I have no pride in being an American anymore.

Thank You,
Julie Oehme

Comment Received to CommissionerRavel@fec.gov on Aug. 21, 2016

Thank you, Commissioner, for asking for U.S. Citizens' input on foreign money. It's hard enough to get fair elections with secret unlimited amounts of U.S. Corporation money buying politicians, but foreign influence is even more dangerous. The possibilities seem unlimited. For instance, an offshore banking system could get laws passed to make it easier to move money around...to subvert IRS laws. Or, drug dealers from other countries could get Congress to somehow ease import restrictions. The same scenario could apply to an organization who is peddling used weapons.

It's naive to think that foreign money backing U.S. PoliticalCandidates is coming from altruistic motives.

Peggy Midling

Comment Received to CommissionerRavel@fec.gov on Aug. 21, 2016

Scott Siegel [REDACTED]@gmail.com>

I completely agree with your concerns and hope that you will be able to convince the other members of the FEC that action must be taken. To not take action is to knowingly allow foreign money to be involved in US elections which is inarguably a terrible thing. Please help save our democracy.

Comment Received to CommissionerRavel@fec.gov on Aug. 21, 2016

Dear Commissioner Ravel,

I am writing in response to your call for citizen input concerning Citizens United and the consequent rise of foreign money in US elections. My name is Joseph Tracy and I live in Stamford, Vermont.

I thank you for your courage in representing our shared national interest in untainted elections. Neither corporations nor foreign citizens are US citizens with citizenship rights. Neither a corporation nor a citizen of another country can vote in US elections. They are not citizens and as such should have no role in US elections. This should be restricted to naturally born individual citizens of the US.

We should not allow ourselves or elected representatives to be ruled by corporate or international bribery. The public good should be determined by the informed citizens of a democratic republic and not bribes thinly disguised as campaign contributions.

There must be full public disclosure of all campaign contributions and severe penalties for skirting campaign finance laws.

Joseph Tracy
Stamford VT 05352

Comment Received to CommissionerRavel@fec.gov on Aug. 21, 2016

Dear Commissioner Ravel:

Thank you for advising the public about an opportunity to comment on foreign interest funding and influencing of political campaigns in this country.

I believe all forms of such funding and influence, direct or indirect, must be prohibited. Clear and effective laws, regulations and agency advisory opinions must speak with one voice on that matter.

Foreign ownership, at any level (e.g., subsidiary, parent, affiliate) within a corporate organization or other type of business entity, that is significant enough to be an influential factor in an entity's decision to make a contribution to a candidate or any organization supporting a candidate should bar that entity from making any such contributions. Independent expenditures and electioneering communications should also fall within the ban. All facts and circumstances should be considered in determining whether the foreign ownership is significant; majority ownership should not be the standard.

In addition, there should be no such thing as "dark money" in U.S. campaigns. All contributions from all sources should be a matter of public (and easily accessible) record. Knowing who is funding a candidate is important information in making voting decisions and analyzing the actions of those elected to office. Dark money undermines democracy as it diminishes the ability of the people to hold their representatives accountable.

I appreciate your consideration of my views, and I urge the Commission to promulgate rules to ensure that foreign and unidentified interests are not permitted to fund and influence U.S. political campaigns.

Sincerely,

Heather Henthorne
Bluemont, VA 20135

Comment Received to CommissionerRavel@fec.gov on Aug. 21, 2016

Dear Commissioner Ravel,

I strongly oppose foreign donations into any form of campaign regardless of dual citizen status.
Thanks for your call for public input .

Sincerely,
Eric Sanders

Comment Received to CommissionerRavel@fec.gov on Aug. 21, 2016

Dear Commissioner Ravel,

I support your effort to get foreign money out of US politics.

In a better world, we'd have 2 month (at most) campaign season at all levels and a few debates hosted via public television. Then we'd vote, and that would be that.

With regards to the presidential election, the idea that both Clinton and Trump will continue to spend millions on their campaigns despite every American knowing nearly everything there is to know about them boggles my mind. At some level, these seems more about marketing and campaign firms making huge business off the candidates, while the candidates, to feed that machine, fall deeper into the debt of their contributors both domestic and (apparently) foreign.

Tim Hammack
St Charles, MO 63303-6353

Comment Received to CommissionerRavel@fec.gov on Aug. 21, 2016

Dear Commissioner Ravel,

I was horrified when SCOTUS came up with the Citizens United decision. It wouldn't take a Supreme Court Justice, or even a high school civics student, to immediately realize that this decision would open up a 'can of worms' and was in direct opposition to all the years of trying to clean up campaign fund raising policy.

I think this decision was the beginning of the loss of confidence in our entire governmental system by people like me, not just the "Tea Party" and conservatives.

It leads to a reasoning that I support: money in a campaign is there to influence the outcome of an election, and the more money, the bigger expectation of influence that continues into the office of the elected.

When this concept is unleashed to allow unlimited amounts by unidentifiable individuals as in Citizens United (after all who can speak to or hear directly from the corporate entity itself), the devolution of our electoral trustworthiness results.

As most people believe, money is power. Therefore, those with money can wield an unacceptable power over those who are supposed to represent all of us.

The money/power wielded to both influence elected officials and to publish skewed information through mass communications enormously overpowers the efforts of grass-roots voter efforts, which is the duty of every citizen of these United States.

Unless the Citizens United decision is overturned by Congress or reined-in by anything the FEC can do, we will have already turned our Democratic Republic into an **Oligarchy**.

Sincerely,

Nicky Neau

"And we know now that government by organized money is just as dangerous as government by organized mob" - Franklin Delano Roosevelt (1930's)

Commissioner Ravel,

Thank you for the invitation to participate in discourse regarding foreign donations in American elections. I was encouraged by your responsiveness to The Intercept's work on how *Citizens United* has affected the current election, and wish to communicate my own grievance concerning the denigratory effects of subsequent campaign finance jurisprudence on our democracy.

In your letter to the people on [Medium](#), you aptly cited Justice Stevens' dissenting opinion in *Citizens United*, where he correctly predicted that the ruling opened the door for foreign-controlled multinational corporations to spend in US elections. To say that I find the court's 2010 decision to disenfranchise American voters in favor of foreign lobbying interests disconcerting is an understatement. It is immensely disheartening that the Supreme Court has ruled to create a campaign finance system that caters the interests of wealth -- foreign and domestic -- rather than the citizens the Court purportedly serves.

This became especially apparent following the court's 2014 *McKutcheon v. FEC* ruling, where Chief Justice John Roberts eliminated limits on corporate expenditures in political campaigns, and wrote for the majority,

"For the past 40 years, our campaign finance jurisprudence has focused on the need to preserve authority for the Government to combat corruption, without at the same time compromising the political responsiveness at the heart of the democratic process, or allowing the Government to favor some participants in that process over others..."

That foreign-controlled multinational corporations might be the participants whose right to "responsiveness" in the American political process Government might favor is nothing short of illegal. For, while the Supreme Court derives the power to interpret the law from the US Constitution, the same document contains explicit language (the *Emoluments Clause*, Article 1, Section 8, Clause 9) precluding government officials from receiving presents, titles, or otherwise profiting at the hand of any "King, Prince, or foreign State". It is unfathomable that such verbiage could be interpreted to permit foreign businesses to pay millions into presidential election campaigns without consequence.

The Emoluments Clause was interpreted in a [Department of Justice memorandum](#) from February 24, 1982, where the DOJ declared that government officials were permitted to receive payments from foreign entities in exchange for lawful services rendered. However, the memorandum explicitly forbade the receipt of "gratuities" by any holder of office from any foreign entity.

Under even the narrow definitions of corruption in campaign finance imposed by *Citizens United* and *McKutcheon*, any service rendered in exchange for a political contribution constitutes an illicit *quid pro quo* exchange. While I understand that foreign-controlled multinational corporations might technically be construed as domestic entities under the auspices of our arcane tax code, it appears deeply misguided that the Supreme Court and FEC would disregard an integral anti-corruption clause of our nation's Constitution to accommodate the award of such "gratuities" by foreign entities in American political campaigns.

Comment Received to CommissionerRavel@fec.gov on Aug. 22, 2016

Such policies erode trust in government, and undermine the notion that we live in an America where all are equal before the law.

With due sincerity,

Thomas Madison Glimp
Chicago, IL

Comment Received to CommissionerRavel@fec.gov on Aug. 22, 2016

Thank you for asking our opinions on foreign donations for our political campaigns.

My opinion is that **foreign donations** should be allowed **only by individuals who are citizens, or non-profit corporations or charities solely chartered within globally neutral nations** (Sweden, Norway, Vatican, and like countries/nations) that are not politically involved in anything but humanitarian endeavors, and are not for-profit corporations, banking or governmental agencies and only if their nation does not harbor terrorists or known to harbor terrorists or exiled leaders of other nations who are not globally neutral.

Of course, U.S. citizens who live abroad should also be able to donate.

I feel that any foreign donation should be directed to the FEC for vetting *prior* to the donation being distributed to the intended campaign in order to avoid double the work on both ends of the reporting and campaigns who receive the donation, with the FEC retaining .005% of the donation to help with the vetting process.

Cathy Cross
Fort Wayne, IN 46816

Comment Received to CommissionerRavel@fec.gov on Aug. 22, 2016

Dear Commissioner Ravel

I am extremely alarmed that Foreign Money is coming into our election funding

Please add my name to those concerned.

Keep up your efforts in this regard and your diligence.

Thank You

Peter R Long

Abstract: regarding the upcoming meeting, an **OUTRIGHT BAN on foreign money** is the best idea.

1: Simply barring all US subsidiaries from making donations would save the taxpayers anywhere from tens of millions to several billion dollars per year.

Having to craft, review, and enforce the (hopefully soon to be made) laws regarding US subsidiaries will cost an exorbitant amount of money, time and political will. And that is not taking into account how **every** US subsidiary will challenge **every single** challenge to their ability to donate; costing even more money, time and political will that the FEC does not have. Or how every senator will haggle and nag to have the rules be written in ways that favor their donors. A nice, clean, simple "outright ban" would be the cheapest, most efficient and fair way to proceed.

2: The American people will not accept anything other than an "outright ban".

People are furious at the US government which has record low approval ratings. So many millions of Americans have fought and died in wars, and for the FEC to just throw away our democracy and freedom for **LITERALLY no good reason** will result in further distrust of the government. The FEC not being willing to outright ban foreign money is akin to a McDonald's cashier refusing to take your cash. Failing to do the most basic, obvious and **easiest** part of your job shows not only inexcusable incompetence but outright contempt and scorn for the American people who will remember this till the day they die. Americans are angry right now and them seeing the FEC sell out to foreign powers will only make them angrier and potentially violent.

3: The US Constitution does not apply to foreigners in the same way as citizens thus the 'free speech' claim is invalid. The US government (through the FEC) has the legal power (and moral duty) to block all foreigner money.

4: It was stated that "the foreign ownership alters the thinking of Americans who run the U.S. subsidiary". This is obviously true. And when government officials say it is not true, **it is dangerous** and can lead to people becoming violent. Also: employees in the US subsidiary have a **fiduciary duty** to help their parent company. If an employee is not helping their parent company through all legally allowed means (including donations) then they are **breaking the law**.

5: Foreign money leads to terrorism.

What is to stop a terrorist organization like ISIS or Boko Haram from creating/violently taking over a foreign company, creating a subsidiary in the US and then donate to politicians? I am being entirely serious, what is stopping them? Terrorist groups will try over and over to create subsidiaries and the FEC might not be able to vet every subsidiary fully. Terrorists are proficient at hiding their finances, and when a terrorist back subsidiary gets caught donating money (and it will, it is just a matter of time) the political fallout on the FEC will be cataclysmic.

Signed,

Brian Montes (owner of a degree in Political Science from UCI).

Dear Commissioner Ravel:

I thank you greatly for the work you are doing to try to negate the Citizens United ruling. I am wholeheartedly with you and your effort.

When President Obama stated during his State of The Union address that the Citizens United ruling opened the door to foreign money in our elections, I remember one of the Supreme Court Justices (forgive me, I don't remember which) shaking his head in total disagreement. Yet I knew that President Obama was not only correct, but that the influx of corporate funds into our election system would most certainly drown out the right of us "little guys" to be able to be heard.

Ideally, we should have publicly financed elections. No one candidate would be able to "out talk" any other candidate. But I don't see that in our immediate future. As President Lincoln stated, we are a government of the people, by the people and for the people. We are not a country of corporations, we are a country of people. And people -- individuals -- should be the only ones to have a say in the political system. My husband is a retired IBEW union member and I understand what the ramifications are for the labor groups, but that is still a group of people. They may be united in one cause, but they are still individual people who approve where the money goes and who gets supported. However, if worse gets to worse, I would rather take away the ability of unions to donate to political causes than for corporations (who are NOT people) to be able to give at all. And at the crux of that (presently) is the ability to know who is giving, how much they are giving, and to put limits on the giving. The bylaws of my HOA specifically state that no one member may have a greater voice than any other member. That is the way our political system should operate, too.

The equation of money and speech as set forth in Citizens United is such an anathema to the founding of this country that it shows itself as nothing more than a legal representation of the ability of greed to take over everything and everyone. It negates completely the declaration that all men [and women] are created equal.

I hope you are successful in your attempts to overturn Citizens United. I, myself, have protested publicly against this ruling. Thank you very much.

Respectfully,

Carolyn Brooks
Shelton, WA 98584

Comment Received to CommissionerRavel@fec.gov on Aug. 22, 2016

Hi Ann,

Thank you for asking for public opinion. Few in government attempt that.

My opinion: Get all foreign money out of politics. Do whatever it takes to do it. And when that is done, don't stop there. Get all corporate money out of politics. And when that is done, don't stop there. Get all money out of politics. All elections and campaigns should be 100% publicly financed, without exceptions. Anything else is undemocratic and corrupt.

Thank you so much.

-Austin Irish

Comment Received to CommissionerRavel@fec.gov on Aug. 22, 2016

Commissioner Ravel,

Foreign spending has no place in American elections.

Further, my opinion is that the simplest way to control election spending is to allow only those eligible to vote to spend for American elections. It is eminently logical as only citizens have an impact on American elections with their vote, not artificial entities like corporations or any other association, who do not have a vote. Those belonging to such artificial entities will still have a voice, an individual voice and a single vote, so are not shut out of the process. Place a spending limit on individual citizen spend, as it is now, and the field is fully level for all.

Respectfully,
Peter Jensen
Benson Vermont

Comment Received to CommissionerRavel@fec.gov on Aug. 22, 2016

Commissioner Ravel,

I'm a United States citizen who is deeply concerned about funding of our political candidates via domestic outposts of foreign corporations. Foreign nationals should have no say in our elections. There have to be changes made legislatively to prevent this sort of thing but in the meantime any FEC advisory on such matters should reflect the will of the vast majority of Americans who do not want foreign nationals influencing our elections.

Sincerely,

Sohrob Tahmasebi
Glendale, CA

Comment Received to CommissionerRavel@fec.gov on Aug. 22, 2016

Gail McDonough [REDACTED]@nwi.net>

Mon 8/22/2016 8:02 PM

Dear Commissioner Ravel: I am very much in support of your efforts to have the FEC ban foreign corporations, with or without business interests in the US, from contributing to any US legislation, election or candidacy whatsoever. While I am sure that such entities wish to influence our state, local and Federal governments to accommodate their views and wishes, I firmly believe that this violates our democratic process and exacerbates the problems most exemplified by the Citizens United decision. Democracy is an ideal that has always been difficult enough to achieve- and lately, even to approximate- without adding foreign interference in our governmental processes to the burden.

Thank you for standing up on this issue, and thank you for opening the conversation/debate to all of us.

Comment Received to CommissionerRavel@fec.gov on Aug. 22, 2016

Randall Bakken [REDACTED]@gmail.com>

Mon 8/22/2016

I believe no corporation, foreign or otherwise should be allowed to sway our elections so please make every effort to stop said donations.

Sent from my iPhone

Comment Received to CommissionerRavel@fec.gov on Aug. 23, 2016

Dear Commissioner Ravel,

I am a staunch supporter of your suggestion to revisit how foreign money may influence elections in the United States, at the federal, state and local levels as I feel that America's sovereignty could be severely compromised as a result. It is an outrage that so many of our legislators are so worried about proof of individual citizenship during our elections yet seem to carelessly and/or conveniently ignore this even greater threat to the integrity of our democracy.

It is bad enough that the TPP is being jammed down our throats! Global trade is good, global rule is not!

Thank you for sounding the alarm!

Most Sincerely,
Dona LaSchiava
Tucson, AZ

Comment Received to CommissionerRavel@fec.gov on Aug. 23, 2016

Hello Ms. Ravel,

I read that you want to keep money flowing from other countries away from people running for election in the U.S. I completely support you in that effort.

I believe that too many politicians are ruled by who funds them, and that who funds them needs to be transparent as well as local to the U.S.

Thank you for your efforts,

Angelica Engel

Comment Received to CommissionerRavel@fec.gov on Aug. 23, 2016

Dear Commissioner,
I totally agree with you. Thank you for taking on this issue.
Sincerely,
Susan Yewell
Marble Falls, TX

Comment Received to CommissionerRavel@fec.gov on Aug. 23, 2016

We don't need foreign money influencing our elections. Such practices could harm the sovereignty, security and stability of our nation. Not to mention the economic ramifications of foreign influence on our policies. Thank you for bringing this issue to the forefront. Our elections are the most important tool of democracy we have. We want representatives that will reflect the will of the citizens not the will of our enemies or other entities that seek to influence our policies to the detriment of our sovereignty or economic stability. The American taxpayers have been used, abused and taken for granted for far too long. Thank you again and good luck. Sincerely,
Mrs. Hall, Iva, SC 29655

Comment Received to CommissionerRavel@fec.gov on Aug. 23, 2016

Thank you, Commissioner Ravel, for your work to limit the corrupting role of foreign money in our elections.

Please continue to do so. An even greater threat to democracy is the dominance of the big money PACs and other organizations that operate seemingly without any regulation and with immunity from the clear spirit of the Supreme Court decision in Citizens United. I hope you will pursue this problem with even more vigor.

Sincerely,

John

John Atkeison

Comment Received to CommissionerRavel@fec.gov on Aug. 24, 2016

Vickie Irish [REDACTED]@gmail.com>

Wed 8/24/2016

Please, someone, anyone, needs to stop the corruption of foreign donations into political campaigns! Why anyone would think that this is democratic is lying. Elections are for the people, not all peoples. The people of the USA are supposed to choose who they want, and support, not anyone else, from anywhere else.

This has to stop. It's corrupt.

Vickie

Comment Received to CommissionerRavel@fec.gov on Aug. 24, 2016

Commissioner,

I am very concerned about the money from foreign subsidiaries, like all the huge donations, have already done immense harm to the USA and its citizens. I acknowledge money is not the only problem with our elections. I am offended by all the dollars taking control of not just the elections but our representatives, as well. Money from here and abroad easily override my concerns and all those I collaborate with; taking away my power as one citizen. I will go to vote this November for only one person I am happy to support: Jill Stein. In my opinion the little influence we had as citizens has diminished to a point that is unbelievable. Even with letter writing, emails and one on one discussions (not to studies and scientific evidence) what I have to say and the groups I support get no recognition.

Thank you for taking a stand in the citizen's defense.

Christina Petty Krauz
Grand Marais, MN 55604

Commissioner Ravel:

I was very pleased to learn of your proposal to rescind the Advisory Opinion 2006-15 through the FEC. A few years ago, I proposed to my Federal Representatives and Senators, legislation that could resolve both your concerns as well as others. None of those in the House or Senate who represented me at the time responded to my suggestion as follows:

“A Bill to Provide Single District Campaign Contributions”

“No member of the United States Congress may accept campaign contributions in any form from any person or entity legally residing outside the territory or district that the Member represents and that are not legal residents or entities in the United States of America.

No declared candidate for the Office of Representative or Senate may accept campaign contributions in any form from persons or entities that legally reside outside the district or territory that the candidate may represent and that are not also legal residents or entities in the United States of America.

No declared candidate for the Office of President or Vice President of the United States of America, may accept campaign contributions from persons or other entities in any form that are not also legal residents or entities in the United States of America.”

This legislation would make it impossible for organizations, persons or other entities to contribute funds or services to candidates outside the district they represent, including outside the United States. The idea is to lower the costs of campaigns for all who run for office at the Federal level, make each campaigner compete on a level playing field and provide for campaign funding only at a local level for whom they may represent.

This legislation must be kept as simple as possible with a clear message that no representative of the people of the United States may accept a campaign contribution in any form from any legal person or entity outside of the district they may serve. The contents of the bill should not be complex, must conform to language that is easily understood and must be clear to any reasonable and literate person.

I'm certain that you fully understand what I mean by this proposed legislation as it is a simple way of limiting campaign contributions to only those who represent people in the Congress or Executive Branch.

I believe that the legislation could be passed and signed into law and would benefit the United States.

Thank you,
Barry Humphus
Lake Charles, LA.

Comment Received to CommissionerRavel@fec.gov on Aug. 25, 2016

Dear Commissioner Ravel,

Thank you for your work on getting foreign donations out of US elections campaigns. The only way for Democracy to thrive is for citizens to be well informed about what is in their best interests. This is impossible with a flood of corporate money funding campaigns. The sooner this issue is remedied, the better for our children and grandchildren.

Irene Heitsch
Austin, Texas