

Eddie Atkinson-Bukewihge
P O Box 10073
Newport Beach, California 90058
(949) 306-1356 E-mail: edie@voteedie.org

January 2, 2009

To: Honorable Stephen Gura, Deputy Associate General Counsel and Honorable Mark Shonkwiler, Assistant General Counsel, Office of General Counsel:

999 E Street, NW., Washington, DC 20463
(202) 694-1650 and (800) 424-9530 - E-mail: agencypro2008@fec.gov

**Re: Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971, as amended,
2 U.S.C. 431 et. seq. (“FECA” or “the Act”):**

Opening Comments:

“The **Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 (FECA)**, [Pub.L. 92-225](#), 86 [Stat. 3](#), enacted February 7, 1972, [2 U.S.C. § 431](#) et seq.) is a [United States federal law](#), which increased disclosure of [contributions for federal campaigns](#), which was amended in 1974 to place legal limits on campaign contributions. This amendment also created the [Federal Election Commission](#) (FEC).

This ‘Act’ was also amended in 1976, in response to the provisions ruled unconstitutional by [Buckley v. Valeo](#) and again in 1979 to allow parties to spend unlimited amounts of [hard money](#) on activities like increasing voter turnout and registration. In 1979, the Commission ruled that political parties could spend unregulated or "soft" [money](#) for non-federal administrative and party building activities. Later, this money was used for candidate related issue ads (ex: initiatives and referendums), which led to a substantial increase in soft money contributions and expenditures in elections. This in turn created political pressures leading to the passage of the [Bipartisan Campaign Reform Act](#) ("BCRA"), banning soft money expenditure by parties. Some of the legal limits on issuing and receiving "hard money" were also changed in the BCRA.”

If transparency is going to be an issue with the election process, a certain consequence of this transparency will have an effect on many contributors with respect to publication, whereas, the negative effect on the contributor, may be his or her loss of [employment](#). Public information and contributor-lists are widely available on the “Internet”, and, potential contributors will not contribute out of reluctances to the various hidden scrutinies of their employers. Their employer may find out about the contributions and issue pink-slips for a host of unrelated circumstances, therefore, it is possible that these contributions will be the cause of many adverse situations that will occur on the job due to this transparency. An employer can release an employee for any reason that would not relate to the contribution, and who is to say the contribution is the case, these are blanket issues and no one can prove what the employer did other than look at the nationwide stats and assume this is what is happening. An employees’ will, to survive his or her livelihood is the varied issue here, and good candidates will suffer.

Campaigns are not legally required to report contributions but are asked to make every attempt to retrieve information on its contributors if the contributions are \$200 and above on the Federal circuit and in the state elections, I believe \$100 and above; with respect to Article IV of the Constitution of the United States, and charging that the Constitution represents the work of aristocratic politicians bent on protecting their own class interests, I am inclined to sit with the Amendments 5 through 11 of the “Bill of Rights”, and would love to discuss and argue my points.

No matter what the proposal to coerce the judicial to put down the law as to whom can contribute to any campaign other than foreign contributions, and raising any amounts of contributions that are so stipulated in today’s rules and regulations that guide the FEC or the FPPC for that matter in the United States; in a free society it’s ludicrous. If anyone wants to contribute their entire life savings, they should be allowed to do so, for whatever drives them, and that no accounting other than a possible limit on what a candidate can raise in an election should be pursued by the FEC or any other agency, based on per capita within the areas covered in an election, and that reporting would be limited to twice in a calendar year no matter the election – provided the funds raised are not private funds of the candidate, whereas then, the candidate must prove where he or she earned their funds to contribute to their own campaign.

In addition, regarding to the Administrative Procedure Act, 5 U.S.C. 551 et seq. (“APA”), which does not require the agency to be subject to availing motions in non-adjudicative proceedings, whereas the Commission has reviewed motions on a case-by-case basis or not, I am against the waste of time and the audacity of such an action altogether; this is more cost to the tax payers and I am against judiciary actions being subjected to non-judiciary venues, it is not Constitutional to begin with. Though I believe such hearings are moot based on my previous statement it is equally wrong to not allow all defendants and plaintiffs before the Commission to speak, and should all have access to all documents in such meetings or hearings, based on everyone’s Constitutional right to fairness, and privacy is also a right for any of those involved in these hearings, however, whereas the candidates are seeking public office, that venue in which they sought office and all voters voting in such an election should be privileged to view all documents as well. Transparency is obliterated by the clicks in government and at some point, the elected officials need to understand that they work for the People of this country and they are not elected to nobility, pointedly I respect everyone, but enough of the craftiness, and even this event is a sign of someone wanting transparency and I agree.

I, Edie Atkinson-Bukewihge am asking to discuss and argue my points, on January 14, 2009, and would appreciate a response if you are inclined to believe that my statements are worthy to be heard. Please notify me, if you are going to comply with my wishes, that I can plan to attend and be heard. If I am not invited, allow me the privilege of acknowledging my peers who are addressing my issues.

Sincerely,

Edie Atkinson Bukewihge

Edie Atkinson-Bukewihge