

Comment ID	Commenter	Comment
USCIS-2025-0003-0002	Anonymous	In SUPPORT of this proposed regulation.
USCIS-2025-0003-0003	Anonymous	This is absurd, racist, bigoted, and completely unnecessary government overreach.
USCIS-2025-0003-0004	Anonymous	This proposed collection of social media-related information will delay adjudications of applications and petitions for immigration benefits, is not likely to yield any relevant information due to the inherent unreliability of social media, and inappropriately requests personal information. DHS should not proceed with this unnecessary collection of social media-related information.
USCIS-2025-0003-0018	Anonymous	The collection of social media handles is not necessary for the Department of Homeland Security's function, and will only impose unnecessary burdens onto the agency in terms of information collection. In fact, this will reduce the clarity of information gathered and increase the burden for respondents. This policy change fails to meet any of the reasons proposed for the change in standard on this page. Social media handles are in no way relevant to immigration or citizenship concerns, and are not regular identifiers necessary identifiers for the government to consider in either of these processes or beyond. I would like to implore the agency to reconsider implementing this change.
USCIS-2025-0003-0040	Anonymous	Corporations in the United States forbid their employees from having dishonest, immoral, inappropriate, hateful, indecent social media engagements. Why then is the opposite tolerated when foreigners are trying to seek an immigration relief? This is common sense, it's not "racist" or a product of "bigotry"
USCIS-2025-0003-0041	Anonymous	What specific recommendations are made about how the collection of social media information violates Executive Orders?
USCIS-2025-0003-0042	Anonymous	The collection of social media handles by USCIS is a waste of money, time, and resources. Ultimately, it will not provide DHS with any valuable information. Immigration agencies already experience an enormous backlog of applications needed to be reviewed by USCIS officers. Investing more time and resources into vetting social media will not speed up the process, it will only add to the backlog. Additionally, vetting social media is not required by any INA statute. Using a non-citizens social media as a tool to make decisions on whether someone meets admissibility requirements into the U.S. as a immigrant or non-immigrant is clearly erroneous. Imposing this is also a clear violation of the first amendment. There are numerous factors that could lead to multiple lawsuits for the U.S. if this is implemented.
USCIS-2025-0003-0043	Anonymous	Though I respect the need to "vet" prospective citizens and immigrants, I simply cannot believe that a country that prides itself on free speech feels the need to investigate a person's entire social media history. True, one should always be wary of what activities they choose to participate in on the internet. However, given the state of the current presidency, and the numerous concerns brought up by the administration regarding ideology and the like, I cannot stress enough the level of damage this will do to Americans's reputation on the global stage. I'm a born Canadian currently awaiting a review of my own immigration papers. To be told that my entire social media history may have to be examined is a deep concern, particularly because of the potential for impropriety. As an example to explain, prospective migrants to the Canadian province of Quebec must now take an "ideology exam" in order to assure that migrants's mindsets aligns wholly with that of the government. Words cannot describe how antithetical it is to the prospect of free speech when some random immigration employee can justify ruining a person's entire life, just because they are a republican who sneers at DEI supporters, or, for the sake of being bipartisan, a democrat that disapproves of Russian oligarchs. Of course, this is all to say nothing of the fact that… well, we's all made one REALLY bad post we should have deleted ages ago but forgot about, and we all know enough horror stories about people's tweets being found out of context and having their life ruined for it. Put simply: please, PLEASE, do not implement this policy. All you will do is draw further ire from the international community, at a time when the USA is already looking like a clown.
USCIS-2025-0003-0044	Joshua Cassedy	This seems like a convenient way to deport or otherwise exclude immigrants who dissent from present, past, or future administrations in a style that may have little to nothing to do with national security. This is particularly obvious given the present administration's heavy-handed approach to immigration, lumping nearly all immigrants into the category of horrible criminals, which is manifestly untrue. America has grown because we generally welcome immigrants who bring their unique culture to our shores and enmesh themselves in our culture, enriching both us and them. For these and other reasons, I strongly oppose this proposal.
USCIS-2025-0003-0045	Law Offices of Mariela Caravetta	Social Media use is equal to private conversations. Any individual presently in the US has the right to privacy to private conversations. Use of social media is a legitimate exercise of freedom of speech. There is not a legal and fundamental right of the government that deserves infringing in the rights of individuals to express their views and opinions in social media.

USCIS-2025-0003-0046	Mexico	Hlep me
USCIS-2025-0003-0047	Antonia Reyes	<p>Stated Purpose of the Regulation:
This collection of information is necessary to comply with section 2 of the Executive order (E.O.) entitled "Protecting the United States from Foreign Terrorists and Other National Security and Public Safety Threats", which directs implementation of uniform vetting standards and requires the collection of all information necessary for a rigorous vetting and screening of all grounds of inadmissibility or bases for the denial of immigration-related benefits. In a review of information collected for admission and benefit decisions, U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services (USCIS) identified the need to collect social media identifiers ("handles") and associated social media platform names from applicants to enable and help inform identity verification, national security and public safety screening, and vetting, and related inspections.</p> <p>The proposed regulation regarding the N-400 applications should not be approved. Applicants for the N-400 have typically been lawful permanent residents of the United States for a minimum of 3 to 5 years, if not longer. As lawful permanent residents (LPRs), these individuals have the right to live and work permanently in the United States, as well as the right to be protected by all U.S. laws.</p> <p>Requiring social media identifiers infringes upon the right to privacy of LPRs, violates their Fourth Amendment rights, and undermines their Fifth Amendment rights regarding self-incrimination and due process. This demand for social media information constitutes an unreasonable invasion of privacy and is unnecessary for making decisions regarding benefit requests.</p> <p>The current information collected on benefit applications--including date of birth, name, parents'; names, country of origin, criminal history, immigration history, and biometrics--sufficiently fulfills the goal of rigorous vetting. This existing data is specifically designed to meet the objective of vetting and verifying the identity of applicants without compromising their constitutional protections. Thus, social media identifiers should not be mandated for N-400 applications.</p>
USCIS-2025-0003-0048	Josh McCullough	I am writing against this proposed change that will simply weaponize surveillance against poor immigrants while anyone who pays Trump's bribery fee for 'gold card'; status goes unchecked. I also see no efforts to monitor domestic terrorists' social media accounts for similar concerns.
USCIS-2025-0003-0049	Anonymous	This is absurd, quite a good chunk of people applying for services are adults that do not own or really use social media, it's a violation of privacy, and simply absurd. You should not be required to produce a social media handle in order to get immigration services, and it has the potential to be abused in order to deny people based on how they are interacting with people online in a way that is completely seperately from the government. This will foster nothing productive, will cradle unjust denials, and has absolutely no place on federal documents. If this is meant to fight foreign powers, how about we register AIPAC as a foreign agency and stop sucking up to Russian oligarchs then.
USCIS-2025-0003-0050	Anonymous	I support this process.
USCIS-2025-0003-0051	Anonymous	ocial media functions as a modern form of private conversation, and all individuals in the U.S. have a right to privacy in their communications. Engaging in speech on social media is a protected exercise of free expression, and there is no legal or legitimate basis for the government to infringe upon an individual's right to share their views and opinions online.
USCIS-2025-0003-0052	Anonymous	I do not support this proposal. I also can not support this proposal with such little information on what exactly is going to be looked at and collected and what and how it is going to be used especially for "vetting" purposes. Social media information is extremely unreliable and fake accounts can be easily made that the information can not be trusted. This is a waste of man hours and will only extend application processes and benefits being received. The statement that this will also not cost anything, I find to be a lie. How is over 220,000 hours of social media scrolling not going to cost more money. Present real facts and information please so the public truly knows what you're trying to do before asking for public comment. I say no on this proposal.
USCIS-2025-0003-0053	Anonymous	I do not support this proposal to screen social media. This proposal will only create more work and longer wait times for applications and benefits. There is no information on the exact information the government is looking to obtain and social media information is extremely unreliable. This will only add more issues and not amount to anything useful. No actual terrorist or threat to national security is going to openly post on social media that is looking for immigration benefits. This is a waste of man hours that could be better spent else where. Also, with no actual information on what is exactly going to be collected and looked at and a full description of how it would be used, I can not support this!
USCIS-2025-0003-0054	Anonymous	Collection and processing through social media handles of each application will create unnecessary hurdles and lengthen the immigration vetting time. Furthermore, social media is a part of free speech and should not be a consideration during immigration proceedings. Social media identifiers thus should not be collected on immigration forms.
USCIS-2025-0003-0055	Wladimir Labeikovsky	Fuck this Nazi shit
USCIS-2025-0003-0056	Anonymous	<p>This proposed change is out of the USCIS scope and introduces an unnecessary intrusion into social media profiles which will increase administrative burdens and costs to the agency. This will also introduce more subjectivity into the approval process and limit the efficiency of the process of approving immigration requests.</p> <p>To address the cited problem this approach also seems insufficient and misdirected as seeking out social media handles would not include other personal documents like journals which could indicate bad intent. Just as soliciting journals or other opinion postings is clearly beyond the scope of the agency's purpose this proposed measure is also not within the purview of the department. These actions would conceivably be independently taken by the national security apparatus in the case of suspected terrorists etc and those suspected to be national security threats would already be labeled as such. If such a cooperation is not already in place that is a better modification to make to the current system than this blunt invasion of privacy which will not accomplish its intended goal.</p>

USCIS-2025-0003-0057	Kathryn Murphy	<p>This is necessary to verification and vetting for our national security. It is no different than what American Citizens must do to obtain employment in a corporation. In fact, we must also sign an agreement to allow them to access our social media accounts, holding them harmless if they find something to which they object, and results intermination. It is only fair to institute this for those seeking to enter the United States (for any reason). This should have been instituted from the very beginning. Should any immigration reform ever be made, this should be incorporated into it as part of the mandatory vetting process, along with the name, address, and telephone number of whichever attorney represents them or assists in their entry.</p>
USCIS-2025-0003-0058	Hamet Ndiaye	<p>Interesting program</p>
USCIS-2025-0003-0059	Vicky Rodgers	<p>I support this proposal, as it will harmonize the social media disclosure requirements between spousal applicants via a US consular post abroad and a spousal applicant via an adjustment of status. For far too long, spousal applicants via an adjustment of status were prioritized by USCIS and had fewer requirements to meet than their consular counterparts.</p> <p>The only problem with the requirement is that most spousal adjustment of status applications include an application for an Employment Authorization Document (EAD) and an Advanced Parole Document. This would make the information repetitive.</p> <p>Moreover, consular fiance visa applicants already provided this information to the US State Department when applying for their fiance visa on form DS-160. The social media check should be from the date of the DS-160 until adjustment of status case adjudication.</p> <p>Nothing these two caveats, a social media investigation for spousal adjustment of status applications should have been implemented a decade ago, at the same time as the rule was implemented for consular fiance and spousal applicants.</p>
USCIS-2025-0003-0060	Anonymous	<p>I know you wanted me to stay But I can't ignore the crazy visions of me in LA And I heard that there's a special place Where boys and girls can all be queens every single day I'm having wicked dreams of leaving Tennessee Hear Santa Monica, I swear it's calling me Won't make my mama proud, it's gonna cause a scene She sees her baby girl, I know she's gonna scream God, what have you done? You're a pink pony girl And you dance at the club Oh mama, I'm just having fun On the stage in my heels It's where I belong down at the Pink Pony Club I'm gonna keep on dancing at the Pink Pony Club I'm gonna keep on dancing down in West Hollywood I'm gonna keep on dancing at the Pink Pony Club, Pink Pony Club I'm up and jaws are on the floor Lovers in the bathroom and a line outside the door Blacklights and a mirrored disco ball Every night's another reason why I left it all I thank my wicked dreams a year from Tennessee Oh, Santa Monica, you've been too good to me Won't make my mama proud, it's gonna cause a scene</p>

USCIS-2025-0003-0061	Emma Bourne	<p>Hello,</p> <p>Thank you so much for taking the time to read this comment! I appreciate you opening this channel for public discussion, and allowing for this comment to be heard.</p> <p>I just wanted to clarify the purpose of this message board, so I can correctly and accurately provide information that will be helpful to our government. Can you please let me know which social media platforms are being sought out, and which I should name for future reference? Also, which users are being targeted and information requested for? I would just like to know which part of "Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion" I should be against. Repeating for clarification's sake, that is to say this form and our government are against "Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion"? Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion.</p> <p>I would truly love to hear the logic behind this reasoning and form, so I can do my very best to help.</p> <p>Thank you so much.</p>
USCIS-2025-0003-0062	Moctar Ba	Not at all
USCIS-2025-0003-0063	Anonymous	<p>The proposed changes to Forms I-751 and N-400 constitute a gross invasion of privacy and pose obvious risks to the First, Fourth, and Fifth Amendment rights of Conditional and Lawful Permanent Residents being respected. By definition, Conditional and Lawful Permanent Residents have already been subjected to rigorous screening for evidence of any crimes, activities, or associations which would make them ineligible to have obtained CPR or LPR status in the first place.</p> <p>Furthermore, requiring disclosure of the social media identifiers of a CPR's or LPR's parents, spouse or stepparent, and their children presents two clear problems: (1) a CPR or LPR is not responsible for the online activities of their parents, their spouse or stepparent, or their children; and, (2) it would be impossible for a CPR or LPR to know for certain whether their parents, their spouse or stepparent, or their children may have inadvertently or deliberately failed to disclose any social media identifiers they may have used in the past five years. Because of these two fundamental problems, it would be entirely improper for any decision with respect to an application to remove conditions on permanent resident status or to naturalize to be rendered based on any of these disclosure requirements.</p> <p>Finally, the proposed changes to Forms I-751, N-400 and others would result in greatly increased administrative burden for USCIS and associated costs to American taxpayers and would exacerbate existing processing backlogs.</p>
USCIS-2025-0003-0064	Anonymous	<p>requiring social media handles has several functional issues which cannot be overcome.</p> <p>"Social media" is excessively broad.</p> <p>There does not appear to be clarity for social media accounts which the user has forgotten about, lost access to, deleted, or platforms which have been shuttered.</p> <p>Social media expression is a core aspect of free speech, a protected right and core American value. Such requirements are extra-legal attempts to limit approval based on free speech.</p> <p>What is being sought through this solicitation of information lacks any clarity. There is no standard for what would be looked for. It comes down to USCIS employee discretion as to whether social media conduct is problematic.</p> <p>Final, this rule is clearly outside of agency authority to promulgate as this has no basis in the INA from which this could be seen as a logical outgrowth.</p> <p>This proposed rule change should be withdrawn in full.</p>
USCIS-2025-0003-0065	Anonymous	<p>All submissions received must include the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) Control Number 1615-NEW in the body of the letter, the agency name, and Docket ID USCIS-2025-0003. Submit comments via the Federal eRulemaking Portal website at https://www.regulations.gov under e-Docket ID number USCIS-2025-0003.</p> <p>I am submitting the biggest comment. Huge. No one else has ever submitted a comment this great before. I guarantee it. We should open up our borders and let as many people in as possible, because what an embarrassment we are and stain on humanity. I would ask god to help us but with the way we have treated others and</p>
USCIS-2025-0003-0066	Anonymous	USCIS is already highly inefficient as it is to add an extra hurdle of verifying social media. Not only is this a privacy issue, many social media accounts associated with an individual could be hacked or lost or express opinions that no longer represent the individual. This seems like a fear tactic as well to keep opinions suppressed about the current state of affairs in the American government; continue focusing on what actually matters which is taxes and real forms of identification

USCIS-2025-0003-0067	Anonymous	<p>Malevolent individuals walking the path of legal immigration are probably not going to be posting about their evil plans to destroy the nation on social media. If they are terrorists, criminals, or foreign actors committing espionage, they are probably keeping that information private. I say "probably", because there are always foolish people out there who publicly post such things and are (rightfully & thankfully) caught by law enforcement. Moreover, law enforcement already has the capabilities to conduct digital surveillance on unscrupulous malicious actors.</p> <p>For the vast majority of civilians trying to legally immigrate, this program is nothing more than overt government surveillance targeting ordinary people. Those which are familiar with social media know that the majority of content posted and circulating on such services are trite, and of no interest to investigators.</p> <p>This is not even a sure-fire way to detect an individual's opinions on certain matters. Anybody can be impersonated on social media, anybody can have their account hacked on social media, and of course, anybody can simply choose not to mention their most volatile & sensitive opinions on social media. Will investigators be able to confirm that suspicious or alarming content they discover online in relation to their investigations were actually posted by the subject in question?</p> <p>For example, on Elon Musk's 'X.com', the handle (public account name) which identifies any given user can be recycled and given to other users. The user associated with, for example, the handle "@johndoe" in 2025 could be a completely separate human being than was associated with that handle in 2015. To determine such a difference, investigators would have to spend time looking at the account's post history, which could be hundreds or thousands of posts, possibly over several years of historical data, to determine what person was operating the account handle at which times. They might need to use third-party tools provided by private companies to aid them in the investigation.</p> <p>Supposedly it will take about 286,000 work-hours annually to engage in such investigations, yet the given cost for this program is zero dollars. I imagine this means that USCIS's budget in other programs will be slashed to accommodate this one. That is a lot of resources being spent investigating accounts which are likely just posting family photos and memes, because most malicious actors will not be publicly plotting their evil schemes, and if they are, they can be caught without the existence of this program.</p>
USCIS-2025-0003-0068	Mark Sidwell	<p>RE: OMB Control Number 1615-New</p> <p>The new proposed rules are clearly a violation of the 4th amendment which protects everyone subject to the laws of the United States against search and seizure without a warrant or probable cause. Allowing the government to search prospective citizens social media without a warrant and without probable cause violates the very idea of freedom that this country was founded on.</p>
USCIS-2025-0003-0069	Anonymous	<p>Hello. Please don't add the collection of social media to the process. It would add so much time to an already long process and is not necessary given all the other evidence required about applicants.</p> <p>Thank you for your consideration.</p>
USCIS-2025-0003-0070	Anonymous	<p>This will add significant burdon on USCIS and DHS to process applications. There no estimate provided for that. Most aliens seeking legal immigration are not terrorists and this provision will only delay processing worsening already broken system. It is essential to avoid duplicating screening efforts at USCIS and DHS to save labor implement any new provisions.</p>
USCIS-2025-0003-0071	Abraham Palmer	<p>I think this policy is too extreme into intrusive. I think that when there is reason to suspect a problem, this could be a additional measure that was taken, perhaps that's already the system. However, to screen everybody's social media intrudes on the freedom of future citizens and permanent residence and is inconsistent with American values.</p>
USCIS-2025-0003-0072	Kajsa Johnson	<p>This notice is an egregious overstep in the privacy of law-abiding humans. It is contributing to a culture of fear among folks who, by and large, abide by our laws at a much higher rate than citizens and add to our country's prosperity. This goes against the core values of our country, and harkens back to the oppressive actions committed by the state (under British rule) that sparked the creation of our country. A right to privacy is a fundamental right, period. Citizen, or not.</p>
USCIS-2025-0003-0073	Anonymous	<p>(2) Evaluate the accuracy of the agency's estimate of the burden of the proposed collection of information, including the validity of the methodology and assumptions used;</p> <p>The purported estimate of the burden is obviously incorrect and flawed. There is no explanation whatsoever of the methodology, and it is obviously incorrect because it purportedly estimated "0.08 hours" for every single form, despite the changes being different in each form. For example, I-751 would collect social media data from the conditional permanent resident, the spouse/parent/stepparent, and children. This level of burden is clearly greater than, for example, Form I-730, which collects from only one person.</p>
USCIS-2025-0003-0074	Anonymous	<p>The right to free speech aside this does nothing to vet people even if it passes. People can scrub their social media entirely or provide a false handle. This is an unnecessary step that will do very little. What if someone gives a fake account? What if they delete all of their posts? What if they delete their account entirely and once approved just create a new one? Who in USCIS will spend the time to research all of one persons account or ensure they are not faking it? Its not only unnecessary but also useless. There's many ways to get around this regulation if passed.</p>
USCIS-2025-0003-0075	Manuel Hernández	<p>I consider that this measure is against the Right and Freedom... It violates the privacy of users... no one except friends and family have the right to know personal publications.The ideas expressed are part of the free thought that is guaranteed by the Constitution. It is up to the directors of the social network to control what is published. That's all. Thank you very much.</p>

USCIS-2025-0003-0076	Anonymous	<p>The proposed regulation regarding the N-400 applications should not be implemented. Applicants for the N-400 have typically been lawful permanent residents of the United States for a minimum of 3 to 5 years, if not longer. As lawful permanent residents (LPRs), these individuals have the right to live and work permanently in the United States, as well as the right to be protected by all U.S. laws.</p> <p>Requiring social media identifiers infringes upon the right to privacy of LPRs, violates their Fourth Amendment rights, and undermines their Fifth Amendment rights regarding self-incrimination and due process. The request for social media identifiers constitutes an unreasonable invasion of privacy and is unnecessary for making decisions regarding N-400 benefit requests.</p> <p>The current information collected on the N-400 benefit applications—including date of birth, name, parents' names, country of origin, criminal history, immigration history, and biometrics—sufficiently fulfills the goal of rigorous vetting. This existing data is specifically designed to meet the objective of vetting and verifying the identity of applicants without compromising their constitutional protections. Thus, social media identifiers should not be mandated for N-400</p>
USCIS-2025-0003-0077	Anonymous	<p>You should not implement this regulation. Requiring the search of people's personal social media handles and channels incentivizes abusive enforcement. DHS has a history of targeted Black and brown people. Specifically, DHS mistakenly under the first Trump Administration used benign cultural attitudes/styles against applicants. For example, finding that people wearing a Chicago Bulls hat or Air Force One sneakers were automatically gang members. This type of abuse is authoritarian. And considering the dictator-like tendencies and policies this Administration has established the past 40+ days, I do not trust it to operate lawfully if</p>
USCIS-2025-0003-0078	Anonymous	<p>The proposed changes to Forms I-751 and N-400 constitute a gross invasion of privacy and pose obvious risks to the First, Fourth, and Fifth Amendment rights of Conditional and Lawful Permanent Residents being respected. By definition, Conditional and Lawful Permanent Residents have already been subjected to rigorous screening for evidence of any crimes, activities, or associations which would make them ineligible to have obtained CPR or LPR status in the first place. Furthermore, requiring disclosure of the social media identifiers of a CPR's or LPR's parents, spouse or stepparent, and their children presents two clear problems: (1) a CPR or LPR is not responsible for the online activities of their parents, their spouse or stepparent, or their children; and, (2) it would be impossible for a CPR or LPR to know for certain whether their parents, their spouse or stepparent, or their children may have inadvertently or deliberately failed to disclose any social media identifiers they may have used in the past five years. Because of these two fundamental problems, it would be entirely improper for any decision with respect to an application to remove conditions on permanent resident status or to naturalize to be rendered based on any of these disclosure requirements. Finally, the proposed changes to Forms I-751, N-400 and others would result in greatly increased administrative burden for USCIS and associated costs to American taxpayers and would exacerbate existing processing backlogs. (I am copying this comment from another commenter because I believe it sums up the burden that will be incurred on all parties involved, leading to more failures to appropriately admit qualified individuals into their legal processing of status in the United States)</p>
USCIS-2025-0003-0079	REBECCA MUSARRA	<p>This is not time well spent. The resources of the federal government in general and USCIS in particular would be better spent on deporting people who commit violent crimes. That evidence will not be in social media. This is a nonsensical approach to USCIS's task. It is an invasion of personal privacy, it is an invitation to misconduct by USCIS officials (what if they start not just viewing but "liking," "DMing", or otherwise interacting with applicants on social media?), it is a waste of your time and money better spent on the core responsibilities of your agency. Do not pass such a ridiculous reg.</p>
USCIS-2025-0003-0080	Nick Roberts	<p>I believe permanent resident immigrants who are married with children born in the united states who are permanent residents completing their process by applying for citizenship should be excluded from the social media requirement, or should be allowed to sign a request to not have their social media scanned due to privacy concerns for their children. The children, as united states citizens, have a right to privacy from government searches, and the government has no need to view their pictures, videos, and activities as shared by their parents to their parents' circle of friends (most parents dont make pictures of their kids available to the general public). As a united states citizen who is married to a permanent resident who will be seeking her citizenship, with whom i share one child, i object to the government viewing pictures of my children without my permission. Further, my wife's social media contains pictures of us with my daughter (her step-daughter) who is also a united states citizen. Both of my kids are united states citizens who have a right to privacy in their photos and videos. As a united states citizen myself, i object to the government scanning my wife's social media as it is an invasion of my personal privacy as well. The government's desire to root out evidence of potential subversion in immigrants cannot happen at the expense of the privacy of united states citizens (children) who cannot consent to having their privacy violated, and it cannot come at the expense of the privacy of united states citizens who can consent but would choose not to consent. As a united states citizen i do not consent to the government having access to any information about myself or my children that i have not explicitly granted to the government.</p>
USCIS-2025-0003-0081	Anonymous	<p>Comment on USCIS-2025-0003-0001. Subject: ANONYMOUSLY OPPOSING TYRANNY: Reject USCIS Social Media Dragnet – It's a General Warrant for Your Thoughts Comment: Good joke, USCIS: you invite anonymous comments on a proposal designed to obliterate anonymity online. This isn't vetting; it's a digital general warrant to rummage through our lives, and it's especially dangerous for American citizens. This data grab is guilt by association in digital form. Connect with someone seeking legal immigration? Suddenly your social media, your First Amendment rights, become USCIS's business. Refuse to comply, to hand over your private data? USCIS sophisticated agents, armed with this new weaponized information – information even the President's immigrant wife might have online – will "inform" decisions. Translation: denial risk skyrockets. This coercive data collection chills free speech, violates the Fourth Amendment, and treats citizens like suspects. Withdraw this tyrannical proposal now, before liberty becomes another casualty of bureaucratic overreach.</p>

USCIS-2025-0003-0082	Anonymous	<p>I strongly oppose USCIS's proposed collection of social media identifiers from immigration applicants. This policy is nothing short of government overreach, a blatant attack on free speech, and a chilling escalation of state surveillance. This proposal is fascist in nature, rooted in authoritarianism rather than democratic principles. The U.S. government has no business policing speech or monitoring lawful online activity, particularly when it comes to immigrants—who already undergo extensive vetting. The First Amendment guarantees freedom of speech and association, not just for U.S. citizens, but for all individuals within U.S. jurisdiction. By forcing applicants to surrender their social media history, USCIS is essentially compelling self-censorship under the threat of immigration consequences. This is not about security—it is about control. It creates an environment where people, especially immigrants and their families, must police their thoughts, their interactions, and their personal beliefs for fear of being penalized by an arbitrary, opaque system. It opens the door for ideological discrimination, with USCIS empowered to deny applications based on political opinions, criticisms of government, or even jokes taken out of context. Furthermore, this measure disproportionately harms marginalized communities. It targets immigrants for a level of scrutiny that citizens would never tolerate, reinforcing a system of second-class status. It also raises serious privacy concerns—where does this collected data go? Who has access to it? What safeguards exist to prevent its abuse? History has shown that once a government claims the power to monitor speech, it rarely relinquishes it voluntarily. This policy is a dangerous step toward authoritarianism, directly conflicting with the fundamental values of a free society. The public does not accept mass surveillance as a condition of entry or existence in the U.S. If implemented, this would be another stain on the country's already fraught immigration system—one that echoes the worst tendencies of oppressive regimes rather than the democratic ideals the U.S. claims to uphold. I urge USCIS to immediately withdraw this unconstitutional, repressive proposal before it does irreparable harm to civil liberties.</p>
USCIS-2025-0003-0083	Anonymous	<p>Compelled Speech & Coercive Data Collection: Unconstitutional Echoes of Second Amendment Overreach - Withdraw USCIS-2025-0003 Comment: This USCIS proposal demands data under duress, compelling speech and employing coercive tactics chillingly reminiscent of unconstitutional overreach in other realms of American liberty. Imagine for a moment if this same "Generic Clearance" targeted Second Amendment rights. The outrage would be deafening – and rightfully so, because this proposal is equally repugnant to the First Amendment, employing the very tactics recently deemed unconstitutional when applied to the Second Amendment. This agency is engaging in compelled speech, plain and simple. Forcing individuals to disclose their social media identifiers is not merely requesting information; it is mandating speech as a condition for engaging in immigration processes and, critically, for U.S. citizens to maintain their relationships with loved ones seeking to navigate those processes. The First Amendment prohibits the government from forcing individuals to speak, to disclose their private affiliations and online expressions, especially when such compelled speech is designed to enable government surveillance and potential chilling of protected activities. This is not about voluntary information sharing; it is about coerced transparency, a hallmark of authoritarian regimes, not constitutional governance. Furthermore, the data collection itself is inherently coercive, particularly for U.S. citizens. While cloaked in the language of "voluntary submission," the implicit threat is undeniable: withhold your social media data, and you risk jeopardizing the immigration prospects of your family member, your friend, your community member. This is not genuine voluntarism; it is government-sponsored extortion, leveraging the immense power of the immigration system to extract private information from American citizens. This coercive tactic weaponizes the very system designed to be fair and just, turning it into an instrument of intimidation and data extraction. This is not a hypothetical threat. Consider the recent parallels to Second Amendment rights. When New York proposed collecting social media data from individuals applying for concealed carry licenses, the courts swiftly struck it down as unconstitutional. The judiciary recognized the inherent danger of such compelled disclosure and its chilling effect on the exercise of a fundamental right. The logic is identical here. Just as compelling disclosure of social media chills Second Amendment rights, it equally chills First Amendment rights of speech and association, especially when wielded coercively through the immigration system. The danger of compelled speech and coercive data collection is profound and far-reaching. It establishes a precedent for government access to vast troves of personal data as a condition for engaging with the government or exercising fundamental rights. It creates a slippery slope where more and more rights become conditional upon surrendering private information. It empowers the government to monitor, analyze, and potentially punish individuals based on their lawful online expression and associations, creating a climate of fear and self-censorship that is antithetical to a free society. USCIS must not be allowed to replicate the unconstitutional overreach attempted in the Second Amendment context within the realm of immigration and First Amendment rights. This agency must immediately recognize the inherent unconstitutionality of compelled speech and coercive data collection and withdraw USCIS-2025-0003 without delay. Anything less is a dangerous escalation towards a society where fundamental rights are not inherent, but conditional and subject to government data demands. Protect American liberty – reject compelled speech and coercive data collection.</p>

<p>USCIS-2025-0003-0084</p>	<p>Anonymous</p>	<p>GUILT BY ASSOCIATION: USCIS Proposal Weaponizes Immigration Against American Citizens Comment: USCIS proposes to punish American citizens for who they know. Let that sink in. This "Generic Clearance" is a declaration of guilt by association, a tyrannical doctrine repugnant to every principle of American justice and the Constitution. This agency dares to suggest that the associations of U.S. citizens – their families, their friends, their communities – can be mined and weaponized against them, creating a system of de facto punishment without due process and in direct violation of fundamental rights. This proposal is not about vetting immigrants; it is about intimidating American citizens. It's a clear and present danger to the First Amendment right of association, turning every U.S. citizen with ties to foreign nationals into a potential suspect. Your association with an immigrant becomes a liability, your social media a surveillance target, and your silence – your refusal to comply with this demand for your private data – a potential trigger for immigration denial for those you care about. Let's be clear: the notion of "voluntary" data collection from U.S. citizens is a bald-faced lie. USCIS knows exactly what it's doing. By insinuating that non-compliance from a U.S. citizen could “help inform identity verification, national security and public safety screening, and vetting” for an immigrant they are connected to, they are creating a system of unconscionable coercion. Refuse to hand over your social media? Risk jeopardizing your loved one’s immigration case. This is not a request; it’s blackmail, plain and simple. This agency is holding immigration processes hostage to extract private data from American citizens who have committed no crime, are under no suspicion, and are simply exercising their constitutional right to associate freely. This is not just overreach; it’s a deliberate and malicious attack on the very fabric of American society. It undermines trust, fosters fear, and turns citizens into informants in their own communities. The message is chillingly clear: associate with immigrants, and you too become a target for government scrutiny. Exercise your First Amendment rights to build bridges across borders, and you risk triggering suspicion and negative immigration consequences. This proposal is a direct assault on American citizens' liberty, leveraging the immigration system as a weapon to chill fundamental rights through guilt by association and coercive data demands. USCIS must understand: American citizens will not be bullied into surrendering their constitutional rights through veiled threats and guilt-by-association tactics. This proposal is not just flawed; it is morally repugnant and constitutionally invalid. Withdraw this tyrannical proposal NOW. There is no compromise on freedom. Guilt by association is not, and will never be, American justice.</p>
<p>USCIS-2025-0003-0085</p>	<p>Anonymous</p>	<p>Response to (USCIS-2025-0003): The USCIS proposal mandating the collection of social media identifiers constitutes an unequivocal and flagrant violation of the United States Constitution. This initiative, rooted in governmental overreach, represents an egregious infringement of fundamental American liberties protected under the Constitution and must be immediately withdrawn. This policy is an unconstitutional measure, explicitly contravening the Bill of Rights and undermining core constitutional principles of individual freedom and privacy. I. Violation of the First Amendment: Unlawful Restriction on Free Speech and Association The proposed requirement to collect “social media identifiers” is an absolute and clear violation of the First Amendment. This mandate constitutes compelled disclosure that directly suppresses freedom of speech and association. The chilling effect caused by governmental surveillance, inherent in this proposal, will result in widespread self-censorship, infringing upon the constitutional rights of American citizens who freely associate with individuals subject to immigration oversight. The vagueness of the term "social media identifier" provides unchecked discretion to USCIS, enabling intrusive investigations into private digital spheres. This expansive overreach is unconstitutional and designed to intimidate, monitor, and control individuals unlawfully, amounting to authoritarianism rather than legitimate governance. Furthermore, compelled disclosure violates constitutional protections on anonymity, essential for freedom of expression. Such coercive transparency dismantles fundamental freedoms, creating an environment of fear and oppression inconsistent with constitutional principles. II. Violation of the Fourth Amendment: Illegal Search and Seizure The proposed data collection constitutes an illegal search, flagrantly violating the Fourth Amendment. It authorizes USCIS to intrude into deeply personal spaces without probable cause, individualized suspicion, or judicial oversight. Social media data, rich with private information, must remain protected from indiscriminate governmental access, as the Fourth Amendment explicitly forbids generalized searches without constitutional safeguards. The policy presumes guilt by subjecting individuals, particularly American citizens through association, to unwarranted surveillance. This inversion of the presumption of innocence violates due process and represents unconstitutional preemptive punishment. II. Administrative Procedure Act and Paperwork Reduction Act Violations This policy unjustifiably burdens individuals, asserting necessity without credible evidence. USCIS’s claim of national security benefits is unsupported by substantial justification, thus violating the Administrative Procedure Act's requirement for reasoned decision-making. Additionally, the burden imposed clearly exceeds any plausible security benefits, violating the Paperwork Reduction Act, which exists precisely to guard against such oppressive government encroachments. IV. Constitutional Prohibition of Guilt by Association Critically, this policy threatens American citizens through unconstitutional guilt by association. The mere act of associating with individuals under USCIS scrutiny subjects citizens to government surveillance, an unequivocal breach of constitutional protections of free association. Such invasive oversight is expressly prohibited, violating fundamental constitutional guarantees. Moreover, the coercive labeling of social media disclosure as "voluntary," under threat of adverse immigration outcomes for loved ones, constitutes coercion, violating constitutional protections against compelled speech and coerced waiver of rights. III. Dangerous Precedent Threatening All Constitutional Freedoms Allowing USCIS to leverage vague national security rationales to infringe upon constitutionally protected freedoms sets a dangerous precedent. If social media data collection is permitted to compromise First and Fourth Amendment rights, all constitutional freedoms stand vulnerable to erosion under similar pretexts. USCIS must immediately withdraw this constitutionally violative proposal, reaffirming its commitment to</p>
<p>USCIS-2025-0003-0086</p>	<p>Anonymous</p>	<p>I'm very much against this, because this would create an overall online environment where individuals are further disincentivized to voice their opinions or show themselves authentically in the public sphere. Along with societal pressures, individuals will be further pressured by the US government to self-censor and silence their public opinion, such that our public online networks will further accelerate to being a non-representative caricature of the sentiment of the people. Furthermore, there will be additional mental burden on individuals to now be hyper aware of their social media presence and be prepared to contextualize any posting upon questioning. As a matter of practicality, even if the collection burden on individuals will be trivial from a time spent point of view, the processing burden of immigration applications on USCIS increases significantly. I do not believe the benefits, if any, of collecting individuals' social media identifiers are worth the cost to both applicants and USCIS staff members.</p>

USCIS-2025-0003-0087	Elizabeth Magill	This proposal is a violation of free speech. It also is wasteful of the time of immigration officials.
USCIS-2025-0003-0088	Anonymous	I am against this proposed activity when the government has no evidence that a person's social media accounts may have probative material that would impact a decision on where or not to grant them citizenship. This is a slippery slope; prying into this will lead to a more generalized surveillance state. Get a warrant. And if you can't, then step away. BUT this is wrong on so many levels. If an immigrant is questionable, there are far more legal ways to make the final determination. And keep your hands off their phones!
USCIS-2025-0003-0089	Ibrahima sy	Moi Ibrahim s'y
USCIS-2025-0003-0090	Kris Shiftlet	This is an overreach of power, and just another pointless step in an already long, expensive, and strict immigration process. Years of research have shown that immigrants are less likely to commit crimes than citizens (See NPR, Stanford Institute for Economic Policy Research, American Immigration Council, Politifact, Scientific American, etc.). Despite the fact that the proposal states that the added time to the process will be minimal per person, the cumulative time for all millions of immigrants will be profound and will cost taxpayer money. It will take a long time for individuals already with the recent layoffs in the federal government. Again, this proposal is ridiculous and it will waste time and money. Also, this proposal is a violation of privacy and free speech. As a born and raised American, I am of the firm belief that we are made stronger by our mix of people from all over the world. New ideas, new businesses, and economic growth come with population growth and immigration. I, on behalf of my family and friends, urge that this proposal be rejected.
USCIS-2025-0003-0091	Anonymous Coward	In all languages, especially those that can be associated with enemy states and where potential terrorists, drug smugglers can be reasonably believed can come from as well as in the languages of countries believed to have very high crime rate, such as Caribbean countries, Brazil, South Africa etc. Failing to provide a social media account can be viewed as an avoidance of disclosure too.
USCIS-2025-0003-0092	Twazunda Munsaka	Hi, my name is Twazunda T Munsaka. I am a 4th year F-1 student at Wilmington University. I was just wondering if someone who will be 4 years + months as a US resident can apply for citizenship (green card) benefits, provided the person started a non-profit initiative to mentor and guide prospective US-university applicants from other countries in their journey to applying for admission. The person provides daily posts on a whatsApp group chat updating the prospective applicants with application deadlines, universities hosting webinars, certificate-providers for career development and personal advice on questions asked by members? The person, along with her high school friends, compiled a pdf application guide for prospective applicants based on her former on-campus jobs. (pdf attached below).
USCIS-2025-0003-0093	Lauren Lanzon	This is just another attempt to expand the federal government's persistent and unnecessary surveillance into vulnerable minority groups. The government will use this to identify and harass other noncitizens, and other members of the immigrant community, whether or not they have immigration status. The United States keeps an ungodly number of people under Alternatives to Detention— keeping track of their locations, requiring them to check in regularly, and now, using their social media for tracking who they are associated with. Immigrants and noncitizens who do not have status are not criminals as a rule. The vast majority of them are not criminals at all. This is insulting and a violation of their rights. Do not institute this rule.
USCIS-2025-0003-0094	Ron N/A	I am in favor of this regulation so long as the information collected is used specifically for the vetting of individuals requesting access to the United States of America and her territories. I strongly believe we must protect our borders from all enemies and this regulation appears to help in doing that.
USCIS-2025-0003-0095	Anonymous	There are too many "what if's", too many questions, and too much room for bias... What if an applicant is a different person that they were when they posted a particular comment? What if an applicant posted an opinion 20 years ago that they no longer feel the same about today? What if an applicant doesn't have a social media handle? What if an applicant does not use social media publicly and only uses it privately with friends and family? Will the USCIS subpoena the social media company to gain that applicant's data as a law enforcement agency would with a suspect of a crime? What if an applicant's content is misunderstood? What if an applicant's name and likeness are used by another as in cases of "catfishing"? What if the applicant's right to freedom of speech is take away because they say something a US Government leader dislikes or disagrees with? What privacy rights will be taken away from an applicant? How will other internet ethics play a part? Such as an applicant's "right to delete"? Will an applicant's social media data be forever stored by the federal government even while the applicant wished to delete all of their online presence? Perhaps for valid reasons such as stalkers or other bad actors. What if an applicant is a comedian and they literally post nothing but jokes that one who is trying to learn about the applicant should really ignore? What if an applicant's social media account is a fictional character they created in order to become a social media influencer or content creator? What if they exercise their free speech rights by expressing their opinions? How will USCIS reviewers navigate the wide range of uses of social media? How will the USCIS gain social media data? How will the USCIS ensure an applicant's data and privacy rights are upheld? I can understand the need to address the executive order but what how does this proposal ensure that applicants' social media profiles are being looked at in a fair and unbiased way? It's clear that this rule will lead to applicant's desire not to express opinions of any kind publicly on any social media platform out of fear that their content may be lead to the rejection of an application because they expressed something that someone else didn't like or something that was taken out of context or misunderstood. And heaven forbid an applicant posts a word like diversity or inclusion! What if an applicant posts a picture of a cheeseburger on their social media profile with the caption saying, "With the inclusion of American cheese to this burger, I dub thee a cheeseburger!" Along with the other executive orders, a USCIS employee reviewing the applicant who posted the picture of a cheeseburger could very well reject that person's application due to the fact that they used the word, "inclusion" in a social media post even though it was about a cheeseburger and not about anything else.
USCIS-2025-0003-0096	Anonymous	I disagree with this and do not support it. People have several social media handles, some old that folks might not even remember they even had. People can be penalized for failing to disclose social media handles they have forgotten about.

USCIS-2025-0003-0097	Mindy Francisco	I do not want this to be approved. As a concerned citizen of this country, we believe in privacy and free speech. What someone posts, comments or likes on social media has nothing to do with their criminal or financial history. I would hate for someone to be denied a green card because they liked a post 10 years ago about something instead of who they are today and the amazing recommendations they are given. The application process is already daunting and expensive, why put people through the fear of having a ghost from their teen years show up? I hope this does not go into affect, the application process is fine as it currently is. Thank you
USCIS-2025-0003-0098	Jack Wayne Parr	While the intention is great, fraudsters and terrorists will always be 2 steps ahead of such generic operations. Even now they will keep their own social media account clean while using another for their deviant purposes. To put too much trust in social media pages even to confirm that the individual is not of danger to United States is a waste of time and even futile due to the deception mentioned earlier. Instead of relying on the individual to declare their social account, the government should set up a technology taskforce that can use bots to search social media for risky posts of the individual. That would be more appropriate and will catch them off guard.
USCIS-2025-0003-0099	Scott Gifford	We should not collect social media handles from all immigrants to the United States. A person's social media accounts are where they share their personal interests and views with their friends and associates, and the first amendment guarantees us freedom on our viewpoints, speech, and association. Collecting social media handles en masse creates a risk of bias by evaluators against viewpoints or associations which are protected by the first amendment, an intrusive burden of knowing the government will be inspecting a personal space, and a chilling effect on free speech on social media as immigrants worry what the impact could be on current or future immigration cases. Existing mechanisms are less intrusive and already effective for screening.
USCIS-2025-0003-0100	Anonymous	The definition of social media is unclear. For instance, is "regulations.gov" itself also considered as social media since people could leave comments on policies?
USCIS-2025-0003-0101	Anonymous	I'm strongly against this idea as it would violate the right of speech. This is an overreach, and it is against our ideals. This is more likely to be used as a weapon against certain demographics.
USCIS-2025-0003-0102	Anonymous	Allowing Federal Agencies to scan thru applicants social media, without a clear indication as to what will cause the application to be denied is illegal and not justifiable. This action imposes and sanctions freedom of speech, as well as installs fear in the applicants. All of the sudden, people won't be able to express their true opinion about the government as this might disqualify them from a visa, this action does not allow for a fair asesment of the applicant. If applicant hands over their social, how will it be handle, what will be the criteria to look for?, will it be stored?, will it be used for other purposes?, Since most of these are already civil rights, I strongly oppose the proposed action from the USCIS.
USCIS-2025-0003-0103	Bocar Lo	I consider that this measure is against the Right and Freedom... It violates the privacy of users... no one except friends and family have the right to know personal publications. Thank you.
USCIS-2025-0003-0104	Anonymous	All documents and forms submitted, background checks and all other vetting should be sufficient in applications. Social media handles have no place on government applications.
USCIS-2025-0003-0105	Marjory Murat	I don't agree with the new rule or possibility for Uscis to collect information on individual's social media on any application.
USCIS-2025-0003-0106	Anonymous	Choosing to be intrusive further when someone already submits a great deal of information is absolutely insulting to citizens and their families. If someone is trying to enter, collect the information you feel is necessary to provide a visa. If a citizen petitions someone to be here, stop digging for social media and other items. Its harassment. It's not appropriate to search someone when there is no criminal crime. So no, you should not be diving into people's lives. If you want someone to state if they are having issues, then submit a process where a citizen can place a report with proof to do so. That can be properly investigated and due process provided for their foreign national spouse, fiancé or family member to be investigated and cleared or placed in front of a judge to answer for possible and verifiable issues. If someone is single, they can provide references to avoid the intrusion in the U.S. Thank you.
USCIS-2025-0003-0107	Jorge Alejandro	Hello, I am writing to express my strong opposition to the proposed generic clearance for the collection of social media identifiers on immigration forms. I believe this policy could have serious negative implications for privacy, fairness, and the protection of individual rights. First, requiring applicants to provide social media identifiers raises significant concerns about privacy. Social media platforms often contain personal, sensitive, and sometimes irrelevant information that should not be used to assess an individual's eligibility for immigration benefits. This practice could lead to unintended consequences, such as the misuse of private data and the violation of personal privacy. Second, this policy may disproportionately affect vulnerable communities, such as immigrants who may not have access to social media or who use social media under pseudonyms for safety reasons. Forcing applicants to disclose this information could lead to discrimination, stigmatization, or even harm to individuals based on their online activities or lack thereof. Lastly, the broad collection of social media identifiers risks creating a system where people are judged based on their online presence rather than their qualifications or merits as individuals. This is neither fair nor appropriate, as online behavior does not necessarily reflect a person's character, intent, or qualifications for immigration benefits. For these reasons, I strongly urge USCIS to reconsider this policy and instead focus on more transparent, fair, and privacy-respecting methods for evaluating immigration applications. Thank you for considering my views. Sincerely
USCIS-2025-0003-0108	Anonymous	I don't think it necessary to collect the social media handles of people applying for an immigration benefit because it violates the right to privacy of the applicant and it can make the whole process harder. So I don't support the collection of the social media handles at all.
USCIS-2025-0003-0109	John Mears	I write in opposition to the proposed rule due to its potential threats posed to the constitutional guarantees of privacy, free speech, and equal protection. Additionally, I see the program as having little actual potential for any real security benefit, while also posing a significant threat of abuse. My comments are thoroughly laid out in the attachment.

USCIS-2025-0003-0110	Anonymous	<p>I do not agree with this. It is an invasion of privacy. I only use social media to read real news(much of the mainstream news is biased anymore.)I follow travel, cooking, fashion and gardening groups. I do not post or follow many that I know.My spouse and I do not follow each other as there is no point as we talk on the phone and see each other daily. We do not post about our lives as that is private. My spouse is not interested in my groups or recipe groups.and I do not want to look at how football news. To use this as a way to determine if a marriage is legitimate is flawed. Many people use social media for educational type things and not to post about their life. I think that this rule would cause people that have legitimate marriages to be targeted . If I support one side of a narrative such as either Palestine or Israel , it would make people’s rights to free speech to be silenced and set a tone of fear. We would be afraid to say anything politically charged. This is wrong. The government is going too far. Perhaps they want to watch us have marital relations? Would that prove it or if we don’t do it enough does that mean it isn’t a real marriage. Government is overstepping, our president doesn’t even wear a wedding ring, does that mean his marriage is not bonafide? His wife doesn’t live with him. The government needs to stay out of married people’s underwear!</p>
USCIS-2025-0003-0111	Legal Resident	<p>This violates 1st Amendment Rights for us LPRs who are protected by the Us Constitution. Most LPRs have already been vetted. This also goes against executive order President Trump signed 1/20/2025 RESTORING FREEDOM OF SPEECH AND ENDING FEDERAL CENSORSHIP. Sec. 2. Policy. It is the policy of the United States to: (a) secure the right of the American people to engage in constitutionally protected speech; (b) ensure that no Federal Government officer, employee, or agent engages in or facilitates any conduct that would unconstitutionally abridge the free speech of any American citizen; (c) ensure that no taxpayer resources are used to engage in or facilitate any conduct that would unconstitutionally abridge the free speech of any American citizen; and (d) identify and take appropriate action to correct past misconduct by the Federal Government related to censorship of protected speech. Sec. 3. Ending Censorship of Protected Speech. (a) No Federal department, agency, entity, officer, employee, or agent may act or use any Federal resources in a manner contrary to section 2 of this order.</p>
USCIS-2025-0003-0112	Anonymous	<p>Social media handles are in no way relevant to immigration or citizenship concerns, and are not regular identifiers necessary identifiers for the government to consider in either of these processes or beyond. I would like to implore the agency to reconsider implementing this change.</p>
USCIS-2025-0003-0113	Anonymous	<p>The proposed changes to Forms I-751 and N-400 constitute a gross invasion of privacy and pose obvious risks to the First, Fourth, and Fifth Amendment rights of Conditional and Lawful Permanent Residents being respected. By definition, Conditional and Lawful Permanent Residents have already been subjected to rigorous screening for evidence of any crimes, activities, or associations which would make them ineligible to have obtained CPR or LPR status in the first place. Furthermore, requiring disclosure of the social media identifiers of a CPR's or LPR's parents, spouse or stepparent, and their children presents two clear problems: (1) a CPR or LPR is not responsible for the online activities of their parents, their spouse or stepparent, or their children; and, (2) it would be impossible for a CPR or LPR to know for certain whether their parents, their spouse or stepparent, or their children my have inadvertently or deliberately failed to disclose any social media identifiers they may have used in the past five years. Because of these two fundamental problems, it would be entirely improper for any decision with respect to an application to remove conditions on permanent resident status or to naturalize to be rendered based on any of these disclosure requirements. Finally, the proposed changes to Forms I-751, N-400 and others would result in greatly increased administrative burden for USCIS and associated costs to American taxpayers and would exacerbate existing</p>
USCIS-2025-0003-0114	Anonymous	<p>I find it a bit offensive. So people can’t have any kind of privacy anymore ? Isn’t that against the constitution? I understand that USCIS wants to get the “lies” or “bad people” but this isn’t the way. A fake account can be made easily. Also now you have to be up to date with your statuses (if they go true with it)according USCIS or you could get in trouble... (maybe the user doesn’t want people to know where he lives exactly-maybe he/she wants to keep his/her relationship private - lies about his job out of shame) I’m against putting a form out asking about social media because it’s not based on a reliable information. No one wants to justify what they post on social media.</p>
USCIS-2025-0003-0115	Anonymous	<p>This is another useless and racist process to affect immigrants. If I was an immigrant looking applying for any immigration relief, I would just close my all my social media accounts one week before applying.</p>
USCIS-2025-0003-0116	Vanessa Reynaga	<p>Requiring applicants to provide social media accounts is a gross violation of the 1st amendment. Are we monitoring people's politics and ideologies? This country that prides itself in freedom of speech is veering dangerously close to a fascist state. Will the government crush any political and intellectual opposition ? Again, you are requiring people already residing in the United States to submit themselves to further monitoring under the thumb of the U.S. government. The government is rapidly chipping away at freedoms that the U.S. loves to boast about on the world stage. Does the government not know that so many applicants of these processes are Americans who have resided here most of their lives? This tactic is being used by the government to further instill fear in its population.</p>

USCIS-2025-0003-0117	William M	I worry that this rule will significantly increase the burden, both on USCIS officers and on individuals seeking immigration benefits, for little benefit. For social media handles to be useful information to collect, the reviewing officer will need to devote time to searching for and reviewing the respondent's social media profiles, which will meaningfully increase the complexity of steps that must be taken in the vetting process. Then, on top of that, I'm skeptical that that additional vetting will lead to the uncovering of much useful information. The proposed rule states that social media handles will be used to assist in "identity verification, national security and public safety screening, and vetting." Identity verification can be done much more effectively through documents like passports, which are already widely submitted alongside immigration petitions or applications. Meanwhile, conduct that suggests security risks or inadmissibility is unlikely to be disclosed on social media platforms. Most major social media platforms allow users to have "private" profiles that cannot be viewed in detail except by approved friends or followers of the account holder – which effectively means that the USCIS officer may be unable to view more than a bare minimum amount of information from a given profile in the first place. Passing this rule would also force USCIS to make complex determinations about which social media handles would need to be disclosed. Will accounts on chat services like Discord need to be disclosed? What about accounts on non-English-language platforms like WeChat or VK? What about accounts not tied to a person's real-world identity, such as the "Depths of Wikipedia" account on X? What about older platforms that are little used today, such as Myspace? Given that the social media landscape can change rapidly, how frequently will USCIS revisit its list of what platforms' handles must be disclosed? Resolving these questions will add significant complexity to USCIS' internal policymaking, but this burden can be avoided entirely if USCIS simply chooses not to collect social media handles in the first
USCIS-2025-0003-0118	Anonymous	I would question if this would not be a part of the second amendment right...
USCIS-2025-0003-0119	Malik Awan	Changing is not good for poor people They will suffer for future God bless America America is the best country ever. Please President stop those changes.
USCIS-2025-0003-0120	Lawrence Sweeney	This makes no sense. A student from a foreign country on a visa graduating college may want to become a citizen and contribute to the US but some person going over their Facebook page might be offended by something and block their application.
USCIS-2025-0003-0121	Evi Ontiveros	Do not want government using social media in immigration or other cases. Only crime cases.
USCIS-2025-0003-0122	Syed Ali	While I recognize the importance of national security and thorough vetting procedures, this measure raises significant concerns regarding privacy, free expression, and the effectiveness of such screenings. Privacy Concerns – Mandating the disclosure of social media accounts intrudes on personal privacy, compelling individuals to share details of their online presence beyond what is necessary for immigration processing. This could have a chilling effect on lawful speech, as applicants may self-censor out of fear that their content may be misinterpreted. Chilling Effect on Free Speech – Such a requirement could discourage immigrants from engaging in open discussions online, fearing that their opinions, even if lawful, might be misinterpreted or used against them. This is especially problematic for individuals from authoritarian regimes where online activity is already closely monitored. Questionable Effectiveness – Studies have shown that monitoring social media accounts is not a reliable way to detect security threats. Bad actors can easily circumvent scrutiny by using private accounts, pseudonyms, or encrypted platforms, rendering this requirement ineffective while disproportionately affecting law-abiding applicants. Administrative Burden and Potential for Misinterpretation – The vast volume of social media content makes it difficult to analyze in context. Immigration officers may misinterpret sarcasm, cultural expressions, or political discussions, leading to unjust denials or delays. Additionally, processing this information would require substantial government resources, leading to inefficiencies in an already overburdened system. Discrimination and Selective Enforcement Risks – The collection and analysis of social media data raise concerns about potential bias in enforcement. History has shown that policies of this nature often disproportionately affect applicants from specific countries, religions, or ethnic backgrounds, potentially leading to discrimination. Given these concerns, I strongly urge USCIS to reconsider this proposed change and focus on vetting methods that are both effective and respectful of individuals' rights. Enhancing security should not come at the cost of privacy, free expression, and fairness. Thank you for your time and
USCIS-2025-0003-0123	Anonymous	The requirement to disclose "all social media handles" is overly broad and ambiguous, making it likely that most applicants, if not all, would unintentionally fail to disclose certain social media handles. For instance, if an applicant encounters an issue while filing taxes through TurboTax and posts a question in the TurboTax support forum, should this forum be considered a social media platform? Opinions on this may vary. There are many similar situations where applicants may be unsure whether a platform qualifies as social media, which creates a high risk of non-compliance. If this policy moves forward, it could allow USCIS to accuse applicants of fraud or misrepresentation simply because they were unable to identify all relevant social media platforms, due to the unclear definition of "social media." To avoid such problems, USCIS should explicitly list which social media websites are subject to disclosure, similar to the approach taken by the Department
USCIS-2025-0003-0124	Anonymous	I am vehemently against this change, as I fear it will be weaponized against vulnerable demographics and used against them while anyone who can or is willing to shill out to enrich Trump or Musk will be allowed to skirt this. Additionally, domestic terrorists are not monitored or tracked to the same degree and pose a far greater risk.
USCIS-2025-0003-0125	Oumar Birane Ba	It's good idea
USCIS-2025-0003-0126	Anonymous	I do not support this.
USCIS-2025-0003-0127	Jesse Tucker	A great way to identify Anti-American immigrants before issuing US Citizenship. J.Tucker United States Marine Corps Veteran

USCIS-2025-0003-0128	Anonymous	<p>The addition of social media handle screening is unlikely to be an effective way to screen candidates looking to immigrate into the US. While it is possible to draw insights from some channels, there is no guarantee that the image a person portrays on social media accurately portrays them. If someone wanted, they could tailor their social media such that it portrays information that would be optimal in supporting their immigration application. Additionally, using social media may introduce more bias in the process as those evaluating may have implicit biases that may unintentionally influence their evaluation of an applicant's social media. Additionally, confirmation bias may be an issue if evaluators go in looking for information that would reinforce their pre-existing beliefs and attitudes about a person. For instance, if an evaluator has a negative bias against a specific group of people and has personal beliefs that they should not be considered valid candidates for immigration, they may look for information on their social media that supports this belief. It may not be easy to overcome the challenge of confirmation bias in this case as there would not be an opportunity for an applicant to share information that would introduce different viewpoints. While involving multiple reviewers could be a strategy to reduce bias, this would increase the burden (eg. effort, time, resources) for each application review and increase the amount of time to a decision. Moreover, it may be difficult to create a standardized evaluation criteria. Given that there is no standard requirements for what should be shared on social media/how it is used, it would be difficult to create objective evaluation criteria for evaluators to minimize bias. For instance, if a person has social media handles but does not share posts, it would be difficult to evaluate for validity. Additionally, the nature of content varies by user, so there is no guarantee that the type of information they share could be evaluated in a consistent manner. Moreover, there would need to be a process to verify that the social media platforms reported belong to the applicant. For instance, if a user were to share an account of someone with the same name and similar characteristics to them, an evaluator would need to be able to verify ownership, which also has the potential to introduce bias. Moreover, if an applicant does not have social media, it is unclear as to whether or not they will be adversely affected. Given this, it is unclear whether this could give priority to those who have social media and could be considered "more verifiable". Additionally, vetting social media for each applicant will increase the burden (eg. time, effort, resources) associated with the application evaluation process, potentially to a significant degree. About 63.9% of the global population uses social media, and on average, people use about 6.8 social media platforms per month. Evaluating 6-7 social media accounts for each applicant, which could be the majority of them, would likely add significant burden and lead to longer application timelines. Additionally, this would require sufficient staffing, which may not be feasible given DOGE's current initiatives to cut costs and improve efficiency in the federal workforce.</p>
USCIS-2025-0003-0129	Anonymous	<p>As A Victim of Human Trafficking and trying to Adjust my Status. We have cooperated with the Law Enforcement, submitted documents, evidences, proofs and suffered a lot. Another Fear like this added to our already damage Mentality does not help in this time and situation. I hope this tool wouldn't be used to Profile People. We've been hurt and suffered a lot already. We are doing it all legally.</p>
USCIS-2025-0003-0130	Anonymous	<p>Requiring social media handles on USCIS forms raises major concerns involving privacy, freedom of expression, and administrative burden. Knowing that immigration authorities can and will scrutinize social media activity has a chilling effect on free speech. It will especially affect asylum seekers and refugees fleeing persecution in their home country. There is also a huge risk of social media posts being misinterpreted. Memes could be viewed as satire by one person could be viewed as serious by another. Social media monitoring and collection would disproportionately impact individuals based on nationality, religion, and political beliefs. AI and human reviewers alike may introduce bias leading to discriminatory treatment. There is also little evidence that collecting social media handles is actually an effective tool for identifying security threats to the U.S. Lastly, monitoring social media accounts and collecting this information in forms would require significant resources on USCIS's side, which diverts USCIS resources from more effective immigration measures, such as processing visas and petitions. Requiring social media account information on USCIS forms presents serious privacy and ethical concerns, and should not be required.</p>

<p>USCIS-2025-0003-0131</p>	<p>Yamil Guevara</p>	<p>1. Violation of Privacy and Due Process Rights The collection of social media identifiers intrudes on personal privacy without clear legal justification. Fourth Amendment Concerns: The Fourth Amendment of the U.S. Constitution protects individuals from "unreasonable searches and seizures." Courts have recognized that digital privacy is protected under the Fourth Amendment. In <i>Carpenter v. United States</i> (2018), the Supreme Court ruled that individuals have a reasonable expectation of privacy in digital data, including cell phone records. Social media activity—especially that conducted in private settings or direct messages—deserves similar protection. Unreasonable Scope: This policy lacks clear limitations on what aspects of an immigrant’s social media will be reviewed and how that information will be used. Without narrow tailoring, it amounts to an overly broad surveillance measure. 2. Chilling Effect on Free Speech (First Amendment Violation) This policy risks chilling free speech by discouraging immigrants from engaging in online discussions due to fear of government scrutiny. First Amendment Protections Apply to Non-Citizens: While the U.S. Constitution primarily protects citizens, non-citizens physically present in the U.S. also enjoy First Amendment rights. In <i>Bridges v. Wixon</i> (1945), the Supreme Court held that non-citizens are entitled to free expression protections. Self-Censorship: Knowing that the government is monitoring social media, immigrants may avoid political speech, activism, or religious expression for fear of it being misinterpreted against them. This undermines the marketplace of ideas, which is essential for a democratic society. Targeting Certain Groups: There is a significant risk that this policy could be applied disproportionately against immigrants from specific regions or religions, leading to de facto discrimination in violation of the Equal Protection Clause (Fifth Amendment Due Process Clause). 3. No Empirical Evidence That Social Media Screening Improves National Security USCIS claims that social media surveillance will enhance national security, but there is no empirical evidence that such measures effectively identify threats. Government Reports Show No Proven Benefit: A 2019 report from the Brennan Center for Justice found that social media vetting programs failed to demonstrate that such surveillance meaningfully improves national security outcomes. The study noted that even in cases of terrorist activity, digital footprints were rarely predictive of intent. False Positives and Misinterpretation: Algorithmic and manual screening can misinterpret sarcasm, jokes, or cultural expressions as indicators of security threats. Example: In 2012, a British tourist was detained and denied entry to the U.S. after joking on Twitter about "destroying America" (a slang term for partying). This demonstrates how lack of context can lead to wrongful denials. High Cost with No Clear Benefit: A 2019 DHS Inspector General Report found that vetting social media required immense resources but yielded few actionable leads. Screening millions of posts manually or using flawed AI systems increases false positives while consuming time and taxpayer money. 4. Disproportionate Impact and Discriminatory Potential There is a high risk of bias in how social media vetting will be conducted. Past Precedents Show Selective Targeting of Certain Nationalities: The 2017 "Muslim Ban" (<i>Trump v. Hawaii</i>, 2018) disproportionately affected immigrants from Muslim-majority countries, even though national security justifications were weak. Social media collection could become a pretext for targeting people from politically disfavored or marginalized backgrounds. Selective Enforcement Concerns: U.S. citizens are not required to provide their social media handles for travel, raising Equal Protection concerns. Certain political beliefs or religious expressions could be flagged more frequently, leading to arbitrary denials. 5. Cybersecurity Risks and Data Misuse The collection and storage of social media handles pose serious cybersecurity risks. Data Security Failures in Government Agencies: The 2015 Office of Personnel Management (OPM) data breach exposed over 22 million personnel records, including those of individuals seeking U.S. visas. If social media data is similarly compromised, immigrants could become targets of identity theft or political retaliation. Risk of Data Misuse by Future Administrations: Once collected, there is little oversight over how social media data is stored, shared, or used. Future</p>
<p>USCIS-2025-0003-0132</p>	<p>Anonymous</p>	<p><u>I have to strongly voice my opposition to this proposition. On a legal level, as I'm sure you know, everyone in the United States including visitors and immigrants (documented and undocumented) have the general protection of the constitution, including the first amendment (1). This proposition is written in such a way that it can be used to target anyone for any reason at any time, without any clearly documented constraints or even aims, above and beyond the vacuous and vague text included in the Policy and Purpose section of the originating Executive Order. Specific attention should be drawn to the terms "hateful ideology" and "malevolent purposes", neither of which are defined and could likely be used to target anyone the Executive Branch disagrees with, regardless of the targets true intent and beliefs. On a practical level, it is clearly impossible to manually mass-vet all social media content generated by the individuals interacting with USCIS, so presumably this will be done programmatically with Generative AI or similar technology. Again as I'm sure you're aware, GenAI is in no way accurate or reliable enough to make decisions that affect a persons entire life (2) so cannot be used in this case without defining A: some specific manual verification step before acting upon any decisions, and B: an acceptable false positive rate that indicates how many incorrect decisions USCIS are willing to accept before the entire process is considered to be invalid. This is all ignoring that the proposition doesn't state what constitutes social media, and as such would likely cause people to immediately be in violation of the proposition when the implementers use a different definition of social media to what is the general understood meaning. (1) - United States v. Wong Kim Ark, 169 U.S. 649 (1898) et al (2) - https://cybernews.com/tech/google-ai-overview-hallucinates/</u></p>

USCIS-2025-0003-0133	Anonymous	<p>This proposed measure by DHS and USCIS raises serious concerns regarding freedom of speech and the right to privacy, both of which are protected under the First and Fourth Amendments of the U.S. Constitution. First, requiring applicants to disclose their social media identifiers directly chills free speech. Individuals may feel pressured to self-censor their online activity out of fear that their political opinions, religious beliefs, or personal associations could be misinterpreted or used against them in immigration proceedings. Such a policy could disproportionately impact those engaging in lawful political discourse or expressing dissenting views, which is a fundamental right under the First Amendment. Second, this measure constitutes an overreach into individuals' private lives, violating the Fourth Amendment's protection against unreasonable searches. Collecting social media data en masse without clear limitations on how it will be used, stored, or shared poses a significant risk of government overreach and potential abuse. The lack of transparency regarding how this information will be assessed and the potential for misinterpretation of online interactions further exacerbates these concerns. Additionally, social media platforms are not official or reliable sources of information. They are privately owned, profit-driven entities with inconsistent policies, flawed moderation systems, and susceptibility to misinformation. Basing immigration decisions on data from these platforms—where accounts can be hacked, impersonated, or falsely reported—introduces significant risks of error and unfair treatment. Since these companies are neither government agencies nor trusted, neutral players in the immigration process, their data should not be used as a basis for evaluating applicants. In a democratic society that values individual freedoms, policies that infringe upon fundamental rights should be subject to the highest level of scrutiny. This proposed data collection creates a dangerous precedent for government surveillance, undermining both privacy rights and the free exchange of ideas. It should be reconsidered to ensure that security measures do not come at the expense of constitutional protections.</p>
USCIS-2025-0003-0134	Anonymous	<p>This is unnecessary step in the immigration process which delays adjudication of cases and waste of taxpayers' money to pay for the agency who does the collection and review of social media handle of immigration benefit applicant.</p>
USCIS-2025-0003-0135	Dax Kaplan	<p>Collecting information related to someone's social media presence in relation to immigration would constitute a Fourth Amendment violation unless there is suspicion from other screenings that there is some violation of U.S. Law. The resulting administrative burden would also bog down an already slow process of obtaining citizenship. Thank you for the opportunity to comment.</p>
USCIS-2025-0003-0136	Anonymous	<p>I have received substantiated reporting that @elonmusk used falsified information to unlawfully obtain US citizenship after his student visa expired.</p>
USCIS-2025-0003-0137	Bree Dalager	<p>There is no reason to build a spy list for immigrants. Stop capitulating to the racist dictator. We already have enough trouble getting people to move to the U.S.</p>
USCIS-2025-0003-0138	Anonymous	<p>Mandatory social media screening for people coming to the USA should NOT be allowed. Are we not the land of the free?</p>
USCIS-2025-0003-0139	Anonymous	<p>I do not approve of this proposal. Adding more criteria for completion without guidelines as to what type of social media posts or comments on social media would trigger an adverse consequences will make things more complicated and confusing for immigrants, their legal support, and the USCIS workers. There needs to be more information on what the guidelines are and what adverse consequences would occur. There is also the fact that social media is extremely unreliable and irrelevant to immigration applications. The reviewing of social media is unreliable because so much on social media can be fake, people also Mature in life and what they believed or did 10-20 years ago is not who and what they believe now, also if you're collecting family, people can not control their family and what they believe and do especially what they post on social media. It is irrelevant to immigration because there is many other ways to Do extreme vetting without using unreliable social media accounts. Anyone who is a serious threat isn't going to post on their personal social media. All this is going to do is have unreliable and inconsistent information that is going to have a bunch of adverse consequences based on someone's interpretation of a picture or a post. There is also no way that almost 300,000 hours of work is going to cost no money, unless they will be relying on AI to go throw social media accounts which would make the information even more unreliable! And even then if it was to flag a picture or a post it would need to be reviewed and that is going to take actual people doing it which is just going to add even more to the wait times for applications and appointments causing even more backlog. This is a horrible idea on how to vet people when you the government have way better tools and resources to vet people than social media. Lastly, this is an extreme violation of privacy and it's running very close to an infringement on peoples 1st amendment rights to freedom of speech. Using someone's social media posts against them is in violation of their first amendment right to freedom of speech. Just because someone may not agree with what one person says doesn't mean they should have such severe consequences of not getting their immigration benefits approved. This is just not right and I can not support this proposal. Especially not right now with such little information on actual guidelines.</p>

USCIS-2025-0003-0140	Anonymous	<p>I am writing to express my strong opposition to the proposed rule requiring immigration applicants in the United States to provide their social media identifiers. This policy represents a serious infringement on First Amendment rights, including freedom of speech, association, and expression. The broad scope and discretionary power granted by this rule create significant constitutional concerns, including a chilling effect on speech, government overreach, and the risk of viewpoint discrimination.</p> <p>I. Chilling Effect on Free Speech The requirement to disclose social media identifiers will deter individuals from exercising their right to free expression. In <i>Lamont v. Postmaster General</i>, 381 U.S. 301 (1965), the Supreme Court recognized that government policies discouraging the free exchange of ideas are unconstitutional. Applicants may self-censor for fear that their lawful speech could be misinterpreted or used against them, effectively suppressing their ability to engage in open discourse.</p> <p>II. Violation of the Right to Anonymous Speech The Supreme Court has upheld the right to anonymous speech, recognizing it as essential for political and social discourse. In <i>McIntyre v. Ohio Elections Commission</i>, 514 U.S. 334 (1995), the Court invalidated restrictions on anonymous political leaflets, emphasizing that anonymity protects individuals from persecution and government retaliation. By requiring social media disclosure, USCIS forces individuals to reveal identities tied to online speech, violating this constitutional protection.</p> <p>III. Government Surveillance of Political and Religious Associations This rule enables unwarranted monitoring of political and religious affiliations, discouraging participation in protected activities. In <i>NAACP v. Alabama</i>, 357 U.S. 449 (1958), the Court ruled that forcing an organization to disclose its membership list violated associational rights, as it subjected members to harassment. Similarly, USCIS's policy could discourage immigrants from engaging in lawful activism, fearing it might jeopardize their applications.</p> <p>IV. Granting USCIS Excessive Discretion Violates the First Amendment The broad discretionary power given to USCIS officials raises serious constitutional concerns regarding arbitrary enforcement and viewpoint discrimination.</p> <p>A. Arbitrary and Discriminatory Enforcement Overly broad discretion allows government officials to apply the rule inconsistently, leading to discrimination against applicants based on speech or beliefs. In <i>City of Lakewood v. Plain Dealer Publishing Co.</i>, 486 U.S. 750 (1988), the Court struck down a law granting unchecked discretion over speech-related permits, warning that such power invites censorship. Similarly, USCIS officials could subjectively interpret social media content, penalizing applicants for political opinions or criticism of government policies.</p> <p>B. Overbreadth and Vagueness The rule lacks clear standards for evaluating social media activity, creating uncertainty that compels self-censorship. In <i>Reno v. ACLU</i>, 521 U.S. 844 (1997), the Court struck down vague regulations on internet speech, emphasizing that ambiguous laws chill lawful expression. Without precise guidelines, applicants will be forced to limit their online activity to avoid potential misinterpretation by USCIS.</p> <p>C. Viewpoint Discrimination The First Amendment prohibits viewpoint-based restrictions on speech. In <i>Rosenberger v. Rector and Visitors of the University of Virginia</i>, 515 U.S. 819 (1995), the Court ruled that government entities cannot favor or penalize individuals based on their viewpoints. The USCIS rule risks denying benefits based on applicants' political, religious, or ideological views, violating this principle.</p> <p>V. Lack of a Compelling Government Interest and Less Restrictive Alternatives Even if USCIS argues that the rule serves national security, it fails the strict scrutiny test, which requires that speech restrictions be narrowly tailored to serve a compelling interest. In <i>United States v. Alvarez</i>, 567 U.S. 709 (2012), the Court held that government restrictions on speech must be precise and justified. The USCIS rule, however, indiscriminately applies to all applicants without demonstrating that such scrutiny is necessary. Less restrictive alternatives, such as targeted investigations based on reasonable suspicion, could achieve the same goal without infringing on constitutional rights.</p> <p>VI. Conclusion The proposed rule is an unconstitutional overreach that infringes on free speech, anonymity, and association while granting excessive discretion to</p>
USCIS-2025-0003-0141	Anonymous	Sends the message Big brother is watching you
USCIS-2025-0003-0142	Cody Williams	<p>This is completely unacceptable and misguided at best. This spreads paranoia, misinformation and just unnecessary suffering. This opens door to subjective interpretation and biases to have outsized impact. This increases work load without much objective benefit, making already long process even longer. It's pure censorship. It will be used as a weapons against people with different political views. It's against what we stand for. It will never result in matching catching anyone, it will only affect lazy online trolls who are never going to do anything. It hinders diversity of mind in our nation. It is ambiguous and leads to violation of constitutional rights, it doesn't also determine any time limits, sharing vs liking. For sure it will be reversed after next election. So any efforts on it are waste of tax payers money. This should never be implemented, this is not 1947 Germany</p>
USCIS-2025-0003-0143	Anqi Zhang	<p>I oppose the collection of social media identifiers. This policy infringes on privacy, free speech, and violates constitutional rights. It risks profiling and discrimination. Please reconsider.</p>

USCIS-2025-0003-0144	Melodie Pimentel	<p>I am writing to express significant concerns about the U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services (USCIS) proposal to collect social media handles from applicants seeking immigration benefits. While I understand the stated goals of enhancing national security and identity verification, this regulation raises serious issues regarding data processing after collection, free speech implications, and broader risks of ineffectiveness and misuse. I urge USCIS to reconsider this policy for the following reasons: 1. Unclear Data Processing and Long-Term Privacy Risks The proposal does not adequately address how social media data will be processed, stored, or protected after it is collected. Social media handles can unlock a wealth of personal information — political views, religious beliefs, and social connections — that extends far beyond what is necessary for adjudicating an application for an immigration benefit. Once collected, what prevents this data from being retained indefinitely or shared with other government agencies or private corporations? The lack of transparency about post-collection safeguards increases the risk of data breaches or misuse, threatening applicants' privacy long after their cases are adjudicated. Without strict limits on retention and access, this policy could create a permanent digital profile of immigrants, ripe for exploitation. 2. Chilling Effect on Free Speech Collecting social media handles poses a direct threat to applicants' right to speech. Immigrant applicants, aware that their online activity could be scrutinized, may feel pressured to self-censor their opinions or associations to avoid misinterpretation by USCIS officials. Social media is a critical platform for expression, particularly for immigrants who may use it to connect with communities or voice perspectives on issues affecting their lives. The fear that a post could jeopardize their immigration status could suppress lawful expression, undermining First Amendment principles and creating an atmosphere of distrust. 3. Potential Exploitation by Third-Party Contractors Like Palantir The social media data collected under this rule could be fed into advanced analytics platforms operated by third-party contractors, such as Palantir. Palantir's software, designed to integrate and analyze vast datasets — including social media posts, financial records, and personal connections — could transform applicants' social media handles into detailed profiles of their lives, associations, and beliefs. This data could be used not only to assess applications but also to flag individuals for broader surveillance or enforcement actions, even absent evidence of wrongdoing. This policy risks enabling a level of profiling that exceeds USCIS's stated purpose, amplifying privacy violations and potential abuses without clear oversight or applicant consent. The proposed rule to collect social media handles from immigrant applicants is flawed in its approach to data processing, its impact on free speech, and its questionable utility. Rather than improving security, it risks creating a surveillance-like framework that erodes privacy and expression while straining agency resources. I strongly recommend that USCIS abandon this broad policy or, at minimum, limit its scope to cases with specific security concerns, accompanied by clear data protection rules and oversight to prevent misuse after collection.</p>
USCIS-2025-0003-0145	Temis Laguna	<p>Dear USCIS, The United States has long stood as a beacon of freedom, privacy, and individual rights. However, the proposal to collect social media handles in immigration applications is a blatant overreach that mirrors the same mass surveillance tactics used in authoritarian regimes like China and Russia. It is deeply concerning that a country that champions democracy and human rights is now adopting the same oppressive strategies it condemns abroad. If national security is the concern, the U.S. government should follow due process and require legitimate evidence before conducting investigations—NOT treat every applicant as a suspect from the start. This proposal directly violates:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The right to privacy – There is no justification for mass surveillance of individuals who are following legal immigration procedures. • Freedom of expression – This measure will force applicants to self-censor out of fear that their social media activity could be misinterpreted or unfairly used against them. • America's core democratic values – Implementing a broad surveillance system contradicts the nation's commitment to liberty and justice. The U.S. cannot denounce authoritarian governments while using the same invasive tactics. If someone poses a legitimate risk, the government must conduct individual investigations based on evidence, not impose a blanket surveillance system on millions of people. <p>I urge you to reject this proposal entirely. It is not only unjust and invasive but also sets a dangerous precedent toward a permanent surveillance state. Sincerely</p>
USCIS-2025-0003-0146	Anonymous	<p>Social media is where people share personal and private things and some things are satire that the older generation will not understand. Social media is where you can be goofy and dumb and should not be taken seriously.</p>
USCIS-2025-0003-0147	Anonymous	<p>Grossly unconstitutional</p>
USCIS-2025-0003-0148	Barry Butler	<p>I am writing here to object to the collection of social media handles/information on immigration forms. This has the potential to be broadly used to deny entry to people for reasons that have nothing to do with security and purely for political reasons. I do not believe that disagreeing with US policies is a reason to reject a visa. This is also likely to result in other countries collecting this data on US citizens when traveling abroad.</p>
USCIS-2025-0003-0149	Anonymous	<p>I do not consent this propousal, this is against the democracy and freedom wich this Country stands for.</p>
USCIS-2025-0003-0150	Anonymous	<p>I oppose this. Collection of social media identifiers is unnecessary and an invasion of privacy.</p>
USCIS-2025-0003-0151	Gen O	<p>The process of becoming a legal immigrant in the United States is already extremely slow, expensive, and painful to all involved. Families who are trying to enter legally are suffering from years apart as they wait for the government to take years to process these applications. I am a US citizen and I applied for a fiance visa for my partner to come to the US. At one point in the process, we waited more than 3 months for a piece of mail to be sent from one government agency to another. This process doesn't need to be slowed down any further. Police records and background checks are already conducted as part of the application. If any changes are going to be made, we should find ways to speed up an embarrassing slow government procedure. Thank you for the opportunity to comment.</p>
USCIS-2025-0003-0152	Elva Torres	<p>The government should NOT indiscriminately surveil those following the legal immigration process. Privacy is a fundamental right and cannot be sacrificed under the guise of security without clear justification. If someone poses a threat, they should be investigated on a case-by-case basis, not through a massive surveillance</p>

USCIS-2025-0003-0153	Comment Submitted by Jiacheng Zhang	<p>Subject: Strong Objection to Proposed Social Media Information Collection Regulations I am writing to express my strong disagreement with the proposed regulations that would expand the collection of social media information by U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services (USCIS). I believe this policy is deeply flawed and poses significant risks. Here are my primary concerns:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> * Severe Privacy Violations: This policy represents an unacceptable intrusion into the private lives of individuals. Social media platforms often contain highly personal information, including private conversations, photos, and expressions of personal beliefs. Broadly collecting this data creates a chilling effect on personal expression and violates fundamental privacy rights. * Chilling Effect on Free Speech: The fear of government scrutiny of online expression will undoubtedly stifle free speech. Individuals may self-censor their online activity, limiting their ability to engage in open discourse and exercise their First Amendment rights. This is particularly concerning for individuals from countries with different political climates, who may fear the misinterpretation of their online activity. * Potential for Bias and Misinterpretation: Social media posts are often taken out of context, and algorithms used to analyze this data can perpetuate biases and lead to misinterpretations. This can result in unfair or discriminatory decisions based on incomplete or inaccurate information. * Administrative Burden and USCIS Backlog: USCIS is already facing a massive backlog of cases. Implementing this resource-intensive policy will further strain the agency's resources, exacerbating existing delays and hindering its ability to process applications efficiently. This diverts resources from crucial functions like processing applications in a timely manner. * Lack of Clear Necessity and Scope: The proposed regulations lack a clear justification for the broad collection of social media data. The policy fails to demonstrate a compelling need for this level of surveillance and lacks sufficient safeguards to prevent abuse. The scope of information collected is overly broad and lacks clear limitations. * Security Risks: Centralizing vast amounts of personal data, including social media information, creates a significant security risk. This data could be vulnerable to breaches, potentially exposing sensitive information to malicious actors. * Damage to International Reputation: This policy undermines the United States' commitment to privacy and free speech, damaging its international reputation as a defender of these fundamental rights. This policy makes the United States more like authoritarian regimes. * Impact on diverse communities: This policy will disproportionately affect diverse communities, and those who are critical of the government. This will create a system of fear. I urge USCIS to reconsider these proposed regulations and prioritize policies that protect privacy, uphold free speech, and ensure efficient and fair immigration processing.
USCIS-2025-0003-0154	Comment Submitted by Michelle Z	Disagree with this notice. Violation of privacy.
USCIS-2025-0003-0155	Comment Submitted by Anonymous	So the US is heading for authoritarian now. Anything that the current administration doesn't like means bad. Pure ideology means total destruction. This is a violation to the first amendment.
USCIS-2025-0003-0156	Comment Submitted by Michael Vogel	As a US citizen with a spouse who is soon to apply for naturalization, I firmly oppose this overreach, which leaves applicants vulnerable to unconstitutional targeting on an ideological basis.
USCIS-2025-0003-0157	Comment Submitted by Cyrus Jalen	I strongly oppose the proposed collection of social media identifiers on immigration forms. This practice raises serious privacy concerns, risking exposure of personal information unrelated to immigration status. It may also lead to discrimination, profiling, and unfair decisions based on assumptions drawn from social media content. Additionally, collecting such data poses security risks and may discourage free expression as individuals alter their online presence to avoid scrutiny. I urge the government to reconsider this invasive measure and seek alternative approaches that respect privacy and civil liberties. Thank you for your consideration.
USCIS-2025-0003-0158	Comment Submitted by NA NA	<p>1. The Proposed Collection is Unnecessary and Lacks Practical Utility The requirement to collect social media handles from applicants does not serve a legitimate function in the adjudication of immigration benefits. USCIS already conducts rigorous background checks through various government databases, and there is no clear evidence that social media screening enhances national security in a meaningful way. Furthermore, the lack of clear guidelines on how this information will be used raises concerns about potential bias, misinterpretation, and arbitrary decision-making.</p> <p>2. The Estimated Burden is Grossly Understated The collection of social media identifiers imposes an excessive burden on applicants, requiring them to compile potentially years' worth of social media history across multiple platforms. Many applicants may not even recall past social media handles or may use different platforms in different languages, making compliance unnecessarily difficult. Additionally, the fear of misinterpretation or penalization for past speech will lead to a chilling effect on lawful expression.</p> <p>3. Privacy and Constitutional Concerns This proposal raises serious privacy and First Amendment concerns. Requiring individuals to disclose social media identifiers could lead to unwarranted government surveillance of lawful speech and online activity. The lack of safeguards regarding how this data will be stored, analyzed, and shared exacerbates the risk of misuse, data breaches, and wrongful denials based on subjective interpretations of online content.</p> <p>4. Disproportionate Impact on Vulnerable Populations This policy will disproportionately impact asylum seekers, refugees, and other vulnerable applicants who may have used social media in ways that do not conform to U.S. cultural or linguistic norms. Misinterpretations of foreign languages, humor, satire, or political speech could unfairly result in denials of benefits. This would contradict U.S. commitments to due process and equal treatment under the law.</p> <p>Conclusion For these reasons, I strongly urge USCIS to reconsider this proposed requirement and withdraw the collection of social media identifiers from the application process. The existing security and vetting measures are sufficient, and this additional burden serves only to infringe on privacy rights while creating unnecessary obstacles for law-abiding applicants.</p>
USCIS-2025-0003-0159	Comment Submitted by Anonymous	I am a US-born citizen married to a green card holder seeking citizenship. The proposed law requiring citizenship seekers to provide their social media handles is an unnecessary and unconstitutional invasion of his, my and our children's privacy. What happened to our constitutional rights such as the 1st amendment "freedom of speech", 4th amendment "protection from unreasonable search", and 14th amendment "citizenship rights for both born and naturalized citizens"? USCIS already has our marriage certificates, birth certificates (our children included), and a curated collection of photos of our marriage and life, they don't need to have access to our everyday family life and personal musings.

USCIS-2025-0003-0160	Comment Submitted by D Johnson	As a taxpayer, I do not support the use of federal resources and funding for the screening of applicants' social media accounts. I do not think this is likely to identify serious bad actors, who are very unlikely to be posting their actions on social media. USCIS backlogs are very long. The proposed change is a high-cost, low-benefit action which I, as a taxpayer, believe to be inefficient and do not support. In addition, I strongly oppose any requirement that applicants for a government service provide their social media handles. In my opinion, this is a serious threat to the freedom of speech. It opens the door to arbitrary government decisions based on unlawful discrimination on the basis of speech, opinion, or identity (as presented on social media platforms). Criminal acts occurring or viewable on social media, once identified by law enforcement, will already appear on individuals' background checks. It is highly inappropriate to direct a benefit-providing bureaucracy to view or read individual applicants' social media posts without cause. Thank you for considering my comment.
USCIS-2025-0003-0161	Comment Submitted by EMILY BELLE	Docket ID USCIS-2025-0003. Expanding surveillance on international applicants does nothing to improve national security when domestic terrorism remains a far greater threat. There isn't even enough funding for personnel to properly review these social media accounts, making it clear that the real goal is to slow down an already unreasonably long immigration process. I don't want my tax dollars wasted on spying on people who are following the legal process while those who enter illegally bypass this scrutiny. If surveillance is necessary, it should be focused where the real risks are, not on those complying with the law." Review attachment: https://downloads.regulations.gov/USCIS-2025-0003-0161/attachment_1.png
USCIS-2025-0003-0162	Comment Submitted by Anonymous	I strongly oppose the proposed rule to expand the collection of social media account information beyond visa applications for foreign nationals. This policy undermines the fundamental values that make America a beacon of freedom, including free speech, privacy, and human rights. The United States has long distinguished itself from authoritarian states by upholding civil liberties and protecting individuals from government overreach. Expanding surveillance in this manner creates a chilling effect on speech and discourages open discourse—values that are core to American democracy. Furthermore, this policy raises serious privacy concerns. Social media is often used for personal expression, political engagement, and private communication. Subjecting individuals to broad scrutiny based on their online activity not only violates their rights but also sets a dangerous precedent that could erode the freedoms we cherish. America is great because of its commitment to liberty and human dignity. This rule contradicts those principles and moves us in the wrong direction. I urge USCIS to reconsider and reject this
USCIS-2025-0003-0163	Comment Submitted by Anonymous	E.O. 14161 “directs implementation of uniform vetting standards,” but the Executive Office of the President nor Department of Homeland Security have sufficiently explained how the collection of social media identifier(s) will be uniformly applied to all applicants. As evidenced by recent actions taken against student activists and the rhetoric of the current U.S. Administration, there is substantial cause for concern that the collection of this data will be used to target specific groups of people based on religious or political beliefs. There are significant questions as to whether this would equally apply to a foreign national with white supremacist beliefs as it would to a foreign national who has political beliefs that are in opposition to the current regime’s foreign policy. At minimum, this rule change necessitates complete transparency of definitions and processes to ensure that no individual is having their constitutionally protected rights violated. The U.S. Constitution provides protection for free speech, regardless if any person or agency agrees with the content of the speech. The Fourth Amendment protects individuals from unreasonable search and seizure of private property. There are arguments that can and will be made by legal scholars that in most cases this will lead to a violation of constitutionally protected rights. There is reasonable certainty that there will be lawsuits filed against the federal government for these real or alleged violations, resulting in the spending of taxpayer dollars. The current U.S. Administration has stated that they will prioritize the reduction of inefficiency in government, whereas this will result in increased spending from lawsuits, reprinting of documents, updating, additional staffing to process requests (during a time of staffing cuts), etc. Such an initiative will also cause undue harm to the many foreign nationals filing for benefits and create additional challenges for USCIS. The processing time for USCIS adjudicated benefits can also take months or years in some cases. This additional step will cause additional delays without additional staffing. Due to the staffing cuts across many federal agencies, including USCIS, there is reason to believe that all benefit processing will be slowed by this process. There is also the question of efficacy and redundancy with this approach. Since 2019, the US Department of State has requested and vetted visa applicants’ social media identifier(s). In that time, the US DOS has not published any review of the initiative and its efficacy in preventing harmful actors from entering the United States. Similarly, Customs and Border Protection (CBP) reserves the right to search electronic devices and social media accounts. The American public has not received any evidence that this has been fruitful in protecting our country. By virtue of this already being reviewed by US DOS and CBP having the right to search electronic devices, adding this to USCIS would provide another level of redundancy on an agency that is not yet trained, equipped, or staffed to handle the demands. The United States also has additional agencies or divisions (including within the Department of Homeland Security), the Federal Bureau of Investigation (FBI), the Central Intelligence Agency (CIA), and others dedicated to law enforcement and investigation that are most suited to this work. The collection of this data by USCIS does not seem to add to the aim of protecting the United States from harmful actors. Finally, the collection of social media identifier(s) can only lead to the persecution of foreign nationals who respond honestly to USCIS and are therefore least likely to actually be threats to the United States. If the purpose is to protect the United States, it is hard to understand how this will accomplish that task. Individuals who truly seek to harm the United States are unlikely to promote those actions in such a public manner, so it is questionable what USCIS would be searching for. Again, the most likely information that USCIS could find is the promotion of political beliefs that are not in alignment with the U.S. Administration which is itself not a crime or grounds for denial of benefits. Furthermore, as USCIS is not a law enforcement or investigative arm, there are additional concerns about training, consistency, and the associated costs with ensuring this new data collection is appropriately used in accordance
USCIS-2025-0003-0164	Comment Submitted by Anonymous	Please stop spending tax money on hurtful things like this. Legal immigrants help with economy, and aggressive information collection diverts them away. This is very bad. Do better Trump.
USCIS-2025-0003-0165	Comment Submitted by Karen Kloske	Are we really going to start determining whether people can enter or stay in the US based on what they say? The constitution applies to everyone in the USA, not just citizens. If we make it a crime for certain groups of people to say certain things, how long until it's a crime for everyone? Don't be Big Brother, reject this policy.

USCIS-2025-0003-0166	Comment Submitted by Anonymous	I oppose the proposed collection of social media identifiers by USCIS: 1. Unjustified Economic Burden: The initiative imposes significant administrative costs on USCIS hiring staff, upgrading systems, and managing data from over 3.5 million applicants without evidence of proportional security benefits. These funds could better address immigration backlogs, boosting economic efficiency. 2. Deterrence of Talent: Requiring social media handles risks deterring skilled immigrants, who drive innovation and contribute billions to GDP. Privacy fears, especially from skilled European immigrants who are used to GDPR, could redirect talent elsewhere, harming U.S. competitiveness. 3. Inefficiency and Risk: The 286,000-hour burden and potential for misinterpreting social media posts could delay processing and exclude productive individuals, straining labor markets and reducing tax revenue while imposing cost on the American taxpayer. 4. Legal and Practical Doubts: This policy, tied to an executive order, faces likely many court challenges and a flat out reversal by 2028, rendering it a wasteful distraction from needed reforms. I urge USCIS to abandon this proposal, as its economic downsides outweigh speculative gains, and focus on streamlining legal immigration instead.
USCIS-2025-0003-0167	Comment Submitted by Anonymous	I am against this type of unnecessary surveillance as it is an invasion of privacy. Treat them like people with dignity this is not the 1900s. What's next Jim Crow laws being reintroduced?
USCIS-2025-0003-0168	Comment Submitted by Anonymous	This is fascistic and unnecessary for security. The agency should focus resources on processing forms quicker rather than needlessly complicating forms and processing times in the name of security. This is against the public interest.
USCIS-2025-0003-0169	Comment Submitted by Anonymous	this is incredibly awful! Not everyone uses social media as a way to "Brag" about the relationship they are in and 99% of the time anything people post on social media is presenting their lives in the best light possible anyway. It's not real. I think this is awful.
USCIS-2025-0003-0170	Comment Submitted by Andrew Myers	I oppose the proposed collection of social media identifiers by USCIS for the following reasons: 1. Unjustified Economic Burden: The initiative imposes significant administrative costs on USCIS hiring staff, upgrading systems, and managing data from over 3.5 million applicants without evidence of proportional security benefits. These funds could better address immigration backlogs, boosting economic efficiency. 2. Deterrence of Talent: Requiring social media handles risks deterring skilled immigrants, who drive innovation and contribute billions to GDP. Privacy fears, especially from skilled European immigrants who are used to GDPR, could redirect talent elsewhere, harming U.S. competitiveness. 3. Inefficiency and Risk: The 286,000-hour burden and potential for misinterpreting social media posts could delay processing and exclude productive individuals, straining labor markets and reducing tax revenue while imposing cost on the American taxpayer. 4. Legal and Practical Doubts: This policy, tied to an executive order, faces likely many court challenges and a flat out reversal by 2028, rendering it a wasteful distraction from needed reforms. I urge USCIS to abandon this proposal, as its economic downsides outweigh speculative gains, and focus on streamlining legal immigration instead.
USCIS-2025-0003-0171	Comment Submitted by Anonymous	Uscis officers have more than enough work as it is. Having uscis officers digging through social media is just a waste of time and resources that can be used to make impactful changes.
USCIS-2025-0003-0172	Comment Submitted by Anonymous	Invasive.
USCIS-2025-0003-0173	Comment Submitted by Anonymous	Highly approve of collection of any and all communications of prospective immigrants or visitors to our nation regardless of medium used.
USCIS-2025-0003-0174	Comment Submitted by Anonymous	I oppose the collection of social media identifiers due to significant security vulnerabilities that could potentially disrupt USCIS operations. A critical weakness in this policy lies in its susceptibility to malicious exploitation. Bad actors could create fraudulent social media platforms specifically targeting potential immigrants. Once users register on these platforms, automated systems could generate millions of associated handles or identifiers per user. These individuals would then be legally obligated to disclose all these handles in their USCIS applications. This creates a dangerous scenario where coordinated efforts could flood USCIS systems with an overwhelming volume of social media identifiers to process. Even a relatively small number of applicants caught in such a scheme could generate billions of handles, potentially paralyzing USCIS's processing capabilities and severely impacting legitimate applications. If a substantial number of applicants fall into this deceptive trap, they could collectively submit an astronomical number of identifiers ranging in trillions or even quadrillions. This vulnerability could effectively create a denial-of-service condition within USCIS's operational infrastructure.
USCIS-2025-0003-0175	Comment Submitted by Anonymous	I think this should only be used on a case by case basis. I personally don't use social media anymore, and wouldn't want a lack of evidence to be used against me or my green card/naturalization application. This violates the imagined privacy that is expected (albeit not inherent) when using social media platforms on "private" security settings. Going after criminals is one thing; going after wrongthink is something else entirely. I fear the abuse powers would be unchecked, and future administrations could discriminate more than they do now.
USCIS-2025-0003-0176	Comment Submitted by Elizabeth Diniakos	This proposed policy can cause errors which might impact targetting the wrong person. In some cases, it is an invasion of privacy of a U.S. Citizen or Lawful Permanent Resident. Data collection by other than enforcement agencies, can result in errors when the data is not standardized, or has entry errors which can result in duplicative data. This can result in longer processing times by all agencies involved and errors in enforcement. The policy to collect telephone numbers seems destined to fail. Many will not be able recall or locate this information. They may not be the owner of the data and this might result in targetting the wrong person (who might be a U.S. citizen or Lawful Permanent Resident). Asking for family members names and phone numbers is an invasion of privacy for those with legal status who do not wish to share their personal information.

USCIS-2025-0003-0177	Comment Submitted by Anonymous	<p>I am writing in opposition to the proposed collection of social media handles or identifiers of applicants for naturalization, permanent residency, asylum, and all other applications listed in the proposed document. I have several concerns related to the collection, analysis, and storage of social media information, as well as the resulting adjudication of a given application. First, I am concerned about the collection of social media information. The proposed policy states the data will be collected from “certain populations of individuals... as necessary.” The lack of specification over which “certain populations” will be subject to the collection of social media information creates confusion and an opportunity for bias based on race, religion, and other identity factors. New collection of information cannot and should not disproportionately target specific groups. Additionally, I am concerned about the right to privacy and free speech for applicants and their families. Social media is often used among small circles and is a private space to share updates and ideas. Forcing applicants to disclose personal and sensitive information about themselves and their network raises ethical and legal concerns, especially regarding the first amendment. Next, it is unclear how, specifically, the social media identifiers will be used to “validate an applicant’s identity.” Often, social media handles are made with fake or joke usernames or avatars. How will USCIS use this information to help them ascertain an individual’s identity? Presumably, USCIS will use social media handles to scour through posts that indicate a legitimate threat to US security, i.e. a threat of violence. However, posts made in jest, cultural idioms, or sarcastic remarks could be misconstrued as threatening without context. Similarly, liking or following certain posts or accounts does not signify endorsement, yet may unjustly flag an applicant. What if a user “liked” a concerning post several years ago, but never themselves posted anything concerning? Is this considered concerning for USCIS? The accuracy and validity of USCIS’ analysis is extremely weak given the lack of context for any given social media interaction. I am additionally concerned about the increase in administrative burden for USCIS as well as the wait time for immigration and asylum applications, which are already extremely long. Adding social media analysis would exacerbate delays, harming applicants with urgent needs. Additionally, I am concerned about the government’s use of social media posts and information to use unpopular speech, i.e. support for Palestine or opposition to abortion rights, as justification for the denial of a given application. The current administration has already taken several enforcement actions related to detention and deportation based not on an individual’s legal status, but rather their personal and political views. The lack of clear definition of what speech on social media is considered a “security or public-safety threat to the United States” means that USCIS can unilaterally decide what is and is not concerning. An applicant has no idea what speech of theirs may or may not raise concerns for USCIS and imperil their application. It is entirely at the discretion of USCIS, leaving approval or denial of an application open to bias based not only on race, religion, and nationality, but also political opinion and personal belief. The current process to identify legitimately threatening or concerning social media speech is sufficient to screen out bad actors; existing methods, such as notifications from intelligence agencies during background checks, are sufficient. Expanding USCIS’s role in scrutinizing online speech goes beyond its purpose and is unnecessary for the agency’s proper performance and functions. I am further concerned about the storage of information. Under this rule, USCIS is collecting the handles and identifiers of social media accounts. Will they use this information to download and store personal photos, videos, and other information that an applicant had posted to their social media? Will applicants be forced to make private accounts public? How will personal information be secured to prevent USCIS employees from accessing personal details of an applicant’s social media that has been stored within USCIS? In the event of a data breach, sensitive social media information could be exposed, leading to identity theft or harassment of applicants and their families. Urge USCIS to withdraw this proposed rule. The risks to privacy, free speech, due process, and efficiency far</p>
USCIS-2025-0003-0178	Comment Submitted by David Willcuts	<p>I am writing to express my strong opposition to the proposed generic clearance for the collection of social media identifiers on immigration forms. I believe this policy could have serious negative implications for privacy, fairness, and the protection of individual rights as well as the functioning of the USCIS. First, requiring applicants to provide social media identifiers raises significant concerns about privacy. Social media platforms often contain personal, sensitive, and sometimes irrelevant information that should not be used to assess an individual’s eligibility for immigration benefits. This practice could lead to unintended consequences, such as the misuse of private data and the violation of personal privacy for reasons that may be irrelevant to or even distracting from USCIS’s mission. Second, this policy risks detrimental effects for a vulnerable community, as immigrants who may not have access to social media or who use social media under pseudonyms for safety reasons. Forcing applicants to disclose this information could lead to discrimination, stigmatization, or even harm to individuals based on their online activities or lack thereof. Lastly, the broad collection of social media identifiers risks creating a surveillance system where people are judged based on their online presence rather than their qualifications or merits as individuals. This is neither fair nor appropriate, as online behavior does not necessarily reflect a person’s character, intent, or qualifications for immigration benefits. Moreover, the nature of the content being proposed for surveillance opens up various avenues for abuse that are inherent to unnecessary government expansions into individuals’ privacy. For these reasons, I strongly urge USCIS to reconsider this policy and instead focus on more transparent, fair, and privacy-respecting methods for evaluating immigration applications. Thank you for considering my views.</p>
USCIS-2025-0003-0179	Comment Submitted by Anonymous	This is not acceptable and its against free speech
USCIS-2025-0003-0180	Comment Submitted by Anonymous	This is a violation of constitutional rights to free speech. This will additionally slow down and already slow and dysfunctional immigration service with unnecessary reviews and added paperwork. This can be abused by government employees and should not be a thing
USCIS-2025-0003-0181	Comment Submitted by Christopher Hall	This is NOT how America works! This is unconstitutional and a direct assault on everything Americans hold dear. This President is an abysmal failure and doesn't understand the fundamentals of government. Has anyone even told him that's not the original Declaration of Independence hanging in the oval office? It's time to tell him clearly that enough is enough. He's a national embarrassment.
USCIS-2025-0003-0182	Comment Submitted by Anonymous	If they've already got their green card it means they've been vetted way more than people born here have ever been. You're infringing on basic privacy rights and freedom of speech.
USCIS-2025-0003-0183	Comment Submitted by Anonymous	This empowers the federal government in all the wrong ways.

USCIS-2025-0003-0184	Comment Submitted by Anonymous	How does that line in the National Anthem go? Something about the land of the free? You're going to need to take that out. Oh yeah, and delete the first amendment. The US is rapidly becoming the world's clown car.
USCIS-2025-0003-0185	Comment Submitted by Anonymous	This would effectively prevent people from acting on a core American value of freedom of speech.
USCIS-2025-0003-0186	Comment Submitted by Mercedes Lackey	The US government has no inherent right to sift through an individual's social media accounts on fishing expeditions. On the contrary, individuals have an expectation of privacy, especially where posts are shared by few or one.
USCIS-2025-0003-0187	Comment Submitted by Coleman Knabe	I can't believe I have to waste my time explaining to our government that this proposal is a painfully obvious infringement on free speech and is wildly authoritarian in nature.
USCIS-2025-0003-0188	Comment Submitted by Anonymous	This is a blatant affront to free speech. Immigrants are entitled to opinions; they are applying to become residents of the United States, not subjects of Kong Trump.
USCIS-2025-0003-0189	Comment Submitted by No Thanks	This is a dictator level overreach and a clear impedance on the first amendment. The only purpose of reviewing someone's social media is to find out if they say something that this administration doesn't agree with. Tread lightly with this maneuver.
USCIS-2025-0003-0190	Comment Submitted by Joel Watters	As is tradition with Republicans/Trump: it is unconstitutional by removing free speech. If a president puts out an unlawful order, is he upholding his oath to the constitution?
USCIS-2025-0003-0191	Comment Submitted by Brittany Cali	This is a violation of the first amendment. It also contradicts the EO Restoring Freedom of Speech and Ending Federal Censorship which states "(b) ensure that no Federal Government officer, employee, or agent engages in or facilitates any conduct that would unconstitutionally abridge the free speech of any American citizen; (c) ensure that no taxpayer resources are used to engage in or facilitate any conduct that would unconstitutionally abridge the free speech of any American citizen; and (d) identify and take appropriate action to correct past misconduct by the Federal Government related to censorship of protected speech. Sec. 3. Ending Censorship of Protected Speech. (a) No Federal department, agency, entity, officer, employee, or agent may act or use any Federal resources in a manner contrary to
USCIS-2025-0003-0192	Unrelated Comment Submitted by Anonymous	Trump is a hypocrite
USCIS-2025-0003-0193	Comment Submitted by Constitution Reader	This is a direct attack on free speech, a cherished right under the First Amendment. Every one has the right to express an opinion, whether or not I agree with it. I agree with the greatest thing Patrick Henry never said" I may not agree with what you say but I will defend to the death your right to say it."
USCIS-2025-0003-0194	Comment Submitted by Anonymous Anonymous	For a group of people who claim to love this country, your actions say differently. Your hap hazard policies and the way you are going about this is reckless and doing far more harm than good. The people you have put in place are, in most cases, unqualified and unwilling to learn about current state or current process and yet they feel it's a good thing to bully and make massive unproductive and costly changes. Just because you don't like something or heaven forbid someone expresses an unflattering opinion, doesn't mean it's wrong or can't be said, that's free speech; you protect the good and the bad, and protecting the words you don't like is even more important. There are a lot of people who died to protect the constitution, that you appear to be tossing in shredder. You should be ashamed of how you are
USCIS-2025-0003-0195	Comment Submitted by Anonymous	This proposed collection of social media-related information will delay adjudications of applications and petitions for immigration benefits, is not likely to yield any relevant information due to the inherent unreliability of social media, and inappropriately requests personal information. DHS should not proceed with this unnecessary collection of social media-related information.
USCIS-2025-0003-0196	Comment Submitted by David Arnett	Whereas I understand the issue at hand, social media is not more fact than fiction. I have been tagged in posts I genuinely do not support or represent, only to find out much later by some family member who just cruised by my profile. Until we are confident that every post and every like is a genuine representation of the person judging someone by it isn't fair to anyone.
USCIS-2025-0003-0197	Comment Submitted by Anonymous	This is clearly a violation of free speech.
USCIS-2025-0003-0198	Comment Submitted by Anonymous	I do not support this infringement on privacy. Increasingly, our country has demonstrated a trend towards dystopian over regulation and punitive measures against free speech. No to collecting social media handles and no to the government infringement on personal rights and values.
USCIS-2025-0003-0199	Comment Submitted by Anonymous	The protection of free speech and prohibition against warrantless searches apply to everyone in the US regardless of citizenship. Simply criticizing the policies of the president could be used as the justification for deportation.
USCIS-2025-0003-0200	Comment Submitted by Anonymous	This proposal is a violation of the first amendment. I am strongly opposed.
USCIS-2025-0003-0201	Comment Submitted by ML Rose	I'm perfectly happy with this rule. US employers have been censoring social media of their employees for years now. It's not uncommon for one to lose their job for postings that run afoul of the company's ethos. Online expressions often depict one's personal beliefs. Immigrant applicants should be vetted in every conceivable manner as we seek to avoid permitting a potential criminal into our country.
USCIS-2025-0003-0202	Comment Submitted by Anonymous	I am strongly against this proposed action. Not only is it a violation of first amendment protections, it will also result in a waste of federal resources. Either individual federal workers will need to search through, potentially, thousands of posts by an individual or an exorbitant contract will need to be procured for a third party to do so. Even if an efficient option were available, it does not reduce the chilling effect on free speech this would have.
USCIS-2025-0003-0203	Comment Submitted by Anonymous	Free Speech is a cornerstone of our legal history. Any act to curtail constitutionality protected free speech is an act that speaks to a sharp change in American values. It shows a turn away from basic Constitutional principles and towards the authoritarianism our founding fathers sought to leave. We are not a monarchy. We are not a dictatorship. We are for the people by the people. Individualism, including diverse ideas- bad and good- if we need be so basic for the current administration is a founding principle of this country. Shame on you for seeking to annihilate a basic freedom.

USCIS-2025-0003-0204	Comment Submitted by Mike F	No. Not only is this a violation of Free Speech, this will not make a shred of difference. Those who want to evade detection will. Those who are careless make mistakes. Those who are not well showcase it. It's not going to stop bad actors or nefarious thugs from doing anything. Even citizens of the US are subject to acting as domestic terrorists, or crazies. Just because those who enter our country seeking a better life should not be subjected to freedom suspensions. Illegal activities? Illegal immigrants? Sure. Resident aliens and immigrants who are legal are and should be protected by the rights we afford them, without them being stripped away.
USCIS-2025-0003-0205	Comment Submitted by Anonymous	This is a shocking breach of right to free speech and is deeply anti-American in every sense. A legislation like this will further strike fear into the hearts of every single person considering even going to America. The idea that our country would make receiving "immigration-related benefits" determinant upon whether or not the applicant had committed some arbitrary form of wrong-speak is antithetical to the very reasons upon which America was founded. Not only is collecting this information not necessary for national security, the broadness of the wording leaves the door wide open for a host of human rights abuses. Human rights abuses are abuses when they happen to anyone - not just American citizens.
USCIS-2025-0003-0206	Comment Submitted by Anonymous	This is a horrific abuse of power and incredibly infringes on privacy. It also implies the lack of freedom speech. Since when do we push away people who come here legally?!
USCIS-2025-0003-0207	Comment Submitted by Anonymous	Criteria for what counts as a social media account that will need to be reported needs to be clearly specified. Depending on how that is done, the burden on the applicant could be wildly underestimated. Many people have have hundreds of accounts that they have used within the last five years that might be considered a social media account beyond the obvious ones, and ensuring every last one of them is reported could be a grueling task taking well beyond 0.08 hours. Honest omissions could be abused as cover to deny potential immigrants benefits based on illegal criteria, such as their political views. Further, this is not necessary since the US already runs a vast intelligence network that can link applicants to social media accounts without the need for applicants to manually list them all on a form.
USCIS-2025-0003-0208	Comment Submitted by Anonymous	It sounds like a death knell for the basic tenet of Free Speech that should underpin any functioning Democracy and something you would expect in Russia rather than the USA
USCIS-2025-0003-0209	Comment Submitted by Anonymous	Asking a person to disclose social media identifiers on immigration forms seems to be fraught with abuse, especially depending upon who is currently in power in the White House when a person immigrated to our country. When the current administration appears to have animus towards particular religious groups or people who express certain beliefs how could there be any guarantees this information wouldn't be used against people. It doesn't appear this request is in good faith. When we the people don't feel as though we can trust the government to have our best interests at heart or that the usage of this information in future endeavors will also be in the best interests it's a sad day indeed. But when it feels as though you're deliberately trying to find ways to harm people living within your borders based on what may have been an off the cuff or spur of the moment scenario then I'm afraid we must view you & your request with skepticism or downright hostility, just as you seem to view us in the same manner. If you refuse to trust your citizens why would we give you the same courtesy? This administration has shown the government is downright hostile towards its citizens and why would we not trust them to turn on us or others in the future.
USCIS-2025-0003-0210	Comment Submitted by Anonymous	Another gross overreach by this administration's effort to scaremonger citizens and immigrants to stomp down their own rights and freedoms. This chips away yet another small piece of our freedom of speech - of what actually makes America great.
USCIS-2025-0003-0211	Comment Submitted by Anonymous	The United States has always been distinguished by being the sole nation in the history of mankind where people live free to speak their minds. This is in sharp contrast to the so-called free nations of Europe and Britain where people live in fear of a bureaucratic state that will punish them for saying the wrong thing, as determined by the bureaucrats. The current proposal is insidious in its intent to eliminate this freedom. It starts by targeting residents of the United States who are not citizens. It puts bureaucrats of the state in control of what the non-citizens are allowed to say in public. Giving this power to bureaucrats will destroy the uniquely free nature of the United States as a whole, forever. The nature of the bureaucratic apparatus anywhere, any time, is that it will not confine itself to exercise its power over the people in a narrow and judicious manner; it will inevitably expand its policing of free speech to all, citizens and non-citizens alike. From immigration and naturalization applicants, the policing will extend to naturalized citizens who will come under threat of having their naturalization reversed for something they may have said which doesn't meet the approval of the bureaucrats. Punitive actions for disapproved speech can extend therefrom to loss of jobs or imprisonment, just for having said something that doesn't meet bureaucratic approval. The legal distinction between naturalized citizens and natural-born citizens is negligible, hence it is certain that everyone in the territory of the United States will, sooner than later become subject to the tyranny of a faceless and malignantly stupid bureaucracy. This proposal opens the door to nothing short of slavery for everyone in the United States, which has hitherto been the only free nation in human history. In no time at all we will have a tightly monitored "social credit" system that runs the lives of people in Communist China. The very fact that this administration had the reckless audacity to put forward this proposal compels me to post this comment anonymously, in recognition of the underlying malignant intent to enslave a free people.
USCIS-2025-0003-0212	Comment Submitted by Richard Johnston	Aside from being unwarranted search under the 4th Amendment it will take a lot of additional staff to evaluate every green-card holder's online activity. The USCIS is spinning its wheels.
USCIS-2025-0003-0213	Comment Submitted by Mouhamadou Seydi	The First Amendment to the U.S. Constitution protects fundamental freedoms, including religion, speech, press, assembly, and the right to petition the government. This is the foundation of this great country and this policy undermines and violates it.
USCIS-2025-0003-0214	Comment Submitted by Michelle Horn	What happened to free speech? The first amendment? No to this regulation.
USCIS-2025-0003-0215	Comment Submitted by Anonymous	If past is prologue, this suppression of free speech will be the precursor to the famously named "bloody tenant of persecution for cause of conscience."

USCIS-2025-0003-0216	Comment Submitted by Anonymous	This is a blatant violation of free speach. In no way, should an individual's social media identifiers (“handles”) and associated social media platform names from applicants to inform identity verification, national security and public safety screening, and vetting, and related inspections. As it is, this rogue administration has many officials, at the highest level, that shouldn't have the security clearances they have. They have not been vetted.
USCIS-2025-0003-0217	Comment Submitted by Anonymous	Typically, this is another hypocritical and cynical attack on democracy and free speech by the trump administration, and infringement of all persons' constitutional rights and right to privacy and free speech. The trump administration is bent on usurping the constitution and grabbing as much power as they (and their billionaire handlers) are allowed.
USCIS-2025-0003-0218	Comment Submitted by Anonymous	While the intent of this proposalis to enhance security, it raises significant concerns regarding free speech, imposes undue burdens on applicants, and is unconstitutional. Unconstitutional Violation of First Amendment Rights The proposal infringes upon First Amendment protections by compelling applicants to disclose their social media activity. The requirement to reveal online identifiers can have a chilling effect on free speech, as individuals may self-censor their posts and online interactions out of fear that their words will be misinterpreted or unfairly scrutinized. The Supreme Court has consistently held that governmental actions that discourage lawful speech violate the Constitution. By creating a system that deters individuals from freely expressing themselves online, this proposal directly contradicts these established legal principles. Free Speech Concerns Requiring applicants to disclose their social media identifiers can have a chilling effect on free speech. Applicants might self-censor their online activities, fearing that their posts could be misinterpreted or used against them in their immigration proceedings. This self-censorship undermines the fundamental democratic principle of free expression. Moreover, the potential for misinterpretation of online content, especially when considering cultural differences and context, could lead to unjust outcomes. Undue Burden on Applicants The proposal also places an undue burden on applicants: Privacy Invasion: Applicants are compelled to reveal personal online identifiers, exposing not only their own information but also that of their connections, who have not consented to such scrutiny. Ambiguity and Compliance Challenges: The term "social media identifier" lacks a clear definition, leading to confusion about what information is required. This ambiguity can result in unintentional non-compliance, potentially jeopardizing applications. Increased Processing Times: Analyzing social media data is resource-intensive and may lead to longer processing times, exacerbating existing backlogs and causing delays for applicants. In light of these concerns, the USCIS should reconsider this proposal to avoid infringing on constitutional rights, chilling free speech, and imposing unnecessary burdens on applicants.
USCIS-2025-0003-0219	Comment Submitted by Anonymous	Apparently free speech is no longer a thing in Trump's United States. This would set a horrible precedent. To me, it is yet another example of this administration's authoritarian tendencies.
USCIS-2025-0003-0220	Comment Submitted by Anonymous	I agree with every word of the following posted by anonymous : "This policy is nothing short of government overreach, a blatant attack on free speech, and a chilling... The U.S. government has no business policing speech or monitoring lawful online activity, particularly... The First Amendment guarantees freedom of speech and association, not just for U.S. citizens, but for... History has shown that once a government claims the power to monitor speech, it rarely relinquishes it... is a dangerous step toward authoritarianism, directly conflicting with the fundamental values of a free country"
USCIS-2025-0003-0221	Comment Submitted by Anonymous	This is chilling and it's against free speech. This WOULD BE UN-AMERICAN TO SAY THE LEAST.
USCIS-2025-0003-0222	Comment Submitted by Wade Schlueter	Free speech is a protected right and infringes on one's privacy. It has no purpose for immigration related concerns. We should not violate constitutional rights of people coming to America looking to become citizens.
USCIS-2025-0003-0223	Comment Submitted by Anonymous	I am US citizen and do not support this. Infringes on free speech
USCIS-2025-0003-0224	Comment Submitted by Ryan Williams	The idea that any potential post on social media could be used to determine green card status is a scary thought. With a country built on freedom of speech, and social media being a common outlet for frustrations, this feels like a dangerous path towards either censorship, or people being too afraid to speak their minds.
USCIS-2025-0003-0225	Comment Submitted by Kristen Salas	This does nothing to protect anyone and is a MASSIVE waste of government time, resources and money.
USCIS-2025-0003-0226	Comment Submitted by Anonymous	100% UNNECESSARY for already legal green card holders, the govt already HAS their social media handles from when they applied for the green card, right? regardless, I'm 100% against this stupid xenophobic rule. Would you let Melania in if she had her old 'job' and was posting nudes on her social media accounts? And the HUMP is the biggest threat to our country now, not some random immigrants ALREADY HERE LEGALLY AND VETTED ALREADY. What a waste of officials time, and who pays for that? WE do. And whose CUTTING ALL THE GOVT JOBS SO THERE'S NOT ENOUGH PEOPLE TO VET THIS 'NEW' INFO? THE HUMP. STOP THIS CRAP! I'm a multi-generational born-here white guy too. DOWN WITH THE HUMP'S FASCISM AND HIS CABINET MEMBERS.
USCIS-2025-0003-0227	Comment Submitted by Anonymous	Wrongheaded, chilling, authoritarian. If you start down this path, just give up the pretense of supporting free speech. There is no justification for such intrusion.
USCIS-2025-0003-0228	Comment Submitted by Deirdre Kelly	I deeply oppose this proposed regulation for obvious breaches in Constitutional Free Speech violations. How we define a terrorist is deeply related to who's in power. The patriots who rebuked English colonization, the Sin Fein in Ireland 1970's, the African National Vingress in South Africa were all freedom fighters that we are proud of yet were each understood as “terrorists”. This also makes me wonder if in creating this critique, will I be watched and monitored as less patriotic. Stronger no to this

USCIS-2025-0003-0229	Comment Submitted by Anonymous	I oppose the proposal to vet social media profiles of green card applicants. Freedom of speech stated in the First Amendment is a cornerstone of American democracy. It protects the freedom to express opinion. When the US government requires access to one's social media accounts, it is an assault on the person's right of free speech. Everybody is entitled to privacy, including the privacy of communication in social media. It is protected by the Fourth Amendment, which prohibits the government from conducting unreasonable searches and seizures. To search an individual's private correspondence (i.e., papers) the government must obtain a valid warrant or establish an exception to the warrant requirement, such as the consent of the person being searched. If an applicant is suspicious, the FBI can (and usually does) investigate them before the application is approved. Based on the information found by the FBI, the applicant can be denied. However, requiring EVERY applicant to submit their social media accounts is unreasonable and is against the Fourth Amendment. The intimidation of free speech is a violation of the First Amendment. For these reasons I oppose this proposal. USA is not a police state. Many people come here to escape police state in their own country. Do not shut down the beacon of light that the US is to the world. Review attachment: https://downloads.regulations.gov/USCIS-2025-0003-0229/attachment_1.pdf
USCIS-2025-0003-0230	Comment Submitted by Christina L	This is a violation of free speech and should not be condoned. Not allowing people to become citizens or removing them entirely because they have different opinions is frightening and illegal.
USCIS-2025-0003-0231	Comment Submitted by Anonymous	I think it is wrong to make a person who is legally in this country give up their right to free speech to become a citizen. Did the people who paid for citizenship also have to give up their free speech?
USCIS-2025-0003-0232	Comment Submitted by Anonymous	This proposal would contradict the first amendment of the constitution by tying immigration of legal temporary residents to their protected speech. Individuals cannot be illegally denied status based on their public free speech.
USCIS-2025-0003-0233	Comment Submitted by Anonymous	This is a blatant and egregious violation of our constitutional right to free speech. It is clear that this will be used to discriminate against anyone who disagrees with the president and his administration. This has nothing to do with safety. If you cared about national security you wouldn't be letting a foreign billionaire access our treasury and social security and private data of millions of Americans.
USCIS-2025-0003-0234	Comment Submitted by Anonymous	<p>We need a full moratorium on immigration. The people are drowning in high costs and low wages. Why is it legal for skill labor such as electricians to be competing in wages with minimum wage?</p> <p>Why is it legal for over illegal and legal immigrants to replace Americans who can do skilled labor?</p> <p>We are told there's coding, or construction but then wind up training our immigrant slave replacements.</p> <p>This is a total sell out of the people in the southern border states and is now spreading across the nation.</p> <p>We need to pull the cork and deport these INVADERS. 40+ million!</p> <p>This will provide the relief that our strained system needs, Nation wide. We don't need a constant supply of new homes if we don't constantly replace our founding stock Americans. We can build as we need.</p> <p>Americans are drowning in Usury, low wages, poisoned food supplies, and we have been cut out of the free market by corporations.</p> <p>We need to change our ways before white people go extinct, and Americans are all put back into shackles.</p> <p>China is for Chinese, Japan for the Japanese, And America was built for Americans, Not for the world. Lets get back to our roots, we then wouldn't need to worry about breaking the bounds of one's privacy.</p> <p>We also wouldn't have the threat of Texas or other states allowing the construction of cities such as "sepic city" owned by known American hating terrorist. Who wish to segregate on our soil and inviting foreigners to live in their compound.</p> <p>We also need to re-evaluate these billionaires petition to create "smart cities" or accelerationist cities that operate outside the bounds and guidelines of the government.</p> <p>Which includes companies like Palantir that use AI to mark children as terrorist before drone striking them! How does a computer determine a terrorist?</p> <p>How does a company create "pre-crime technologies" without being a total invasion of personal privacy?</p> <p>How does a Palantir determine what "pre-crimes" are?</p> <p>How is this not crimes against humanity?</p> <p>How are vaccine companies given permission by the supreme court, that changing a patient DNA with patented technology, give ownership over that human to said company?</p> <p>While eliminating all human rights for unsuspecting victims.</p> <p>Get these traffickers, pedophiles, and corrupt officials out of our government, those who planned depopulation efforts and replacement migration.</p> <p>Break up these Megaopolys.</p> <p>Get rid of lobbying, Get rid of strong foreign ties and aid.</p> <p>Eliminate political parties and Eliminate the lengthy campaign cycle, reduce to three months and cut all funding to politicians. They should be federally covered and easily accessible for public's eye. We should have our politicians values, goals and aspirations. Then the people or their constituents can decide who best fits their interests.</p> <p>Lets focus on deportations and Making America's great again by preventing those listed above overreaches of power, corruption, treason, etc. Get those Rico cases going. Round</p>
USCIS-2025-0003-0235	Comment Submitted by Anonymous	This proposal is a horrendous infringement on both free speech/expression and the right to privacy. Additionally, this would easily give way to continued racial bias against immigrants, especially against Muslims and those from the Arab countries. This is not what America was meant to be.
USCIS-2025-0003-0236	Comment Submitted by Terry Jones	We absolutely should be closely scrutinizing every Green card holder in our country. Too many terrorists and terrorists leaning psychopaths have made it into our country and put all of us in danger. It's time that we put extremely strict requirements on any foreigner trying to come to our country! The globalists want to destroy us. They are using our own laws against us to infiltrate our country to destroy us or to make us look like them - third world status!

USCIS-2025-0003-0237	Comment Submitted by Anonymous	This is a blatant violation of free speech and goes against the values this country was founded on.
USCIS-2025-0003-0238	Comment Submitted by Anonymous	This proposal is nothing but another excuse to keep potential immigrants out of the US. Anything remotely unflattering to the current president will be deemed a security threat; first amendment be damned.
USCIS-2025-0003-0239	Comment Submitted by Anonymous	This appears to be a potential first amendment violation.
USCIS-2025-0003-0240	Comment Submitted by Anonymous	This very clearly threatens the freedom of speech!
USCIS-2025-0003-0241	Comment Submitted by Anonymous	Since when does an executive order override the constitution? This is absolutely against the concept of a free society that values liberty and freedom of speech. The government has no right to collect and monitor social media information from law abiding citizens without just cause.
USCIS-2025-0003-0242	Comment Submitted by Anonymous	Ever heard of free speech? What's wrong with this wannabe authoritarian , enough!
USCIS-2025-0003-0243	Comment Submitted by Anonymous	This is a reprehensible act intended to do nothing but chill speech critical of Donald Trump. It is completely antithetical to the value of free speech this country prides itself on.
USCIS-2025-0003-0244	Comment Submitted by Kurt Kriese	This request to collect information from social media is a violation of the First Amendment protection of the Freedom of Speech. Social media is the simple embodiment of free speech in the public forum. The government has no valid interest to collect information unless the posts have been reported to them as being violent threats to the general public or specific personal threats.
USCIS-2025-0003-0245	Comment Submitted by Anonymous	There are already rigorous screening in place for evidence of crimes. The unreliability and lack of security of social media platforms also runs the risk of collecting incorrect information. It is possible for accounts to be hacked or other people to gain access and post under an individual's username. This further constitutes an invasion of privacy if the usernames are used to look into private conversations. Individuals also have no way of guaranteeing that their relatives provide all social media identifiers, and they do not have any control of what those people post online. This also means that activity the individual disagrees with can be used against them. The security issue mentioned above is further compounded as we increase the number of accounts involved. The feasibility of parsing all the information on these social media platforms is also an issue. This would greatly increase the administrative workload for USCIS, costs to taxpayers, and processing times. Even if some sort of machine learning algorithm is used to assist in parsing, this raises questions of how to ensure its accuracy. This does not address the actual issue of preventing malicious actors. If there are individuals who actually intend harm, they would not be openly volunteering information about the platforms that they are
USCIS-2025-0003-0246	Comment Submitted by Anonymous	This comment is in re: Office of Management and Budget (OMB) Control Number 1615-NEW, Docket ID USCIS-2025-0003, under the auspices of the Department of Homeland Security. I firmly object to the proposed plan mandating the collection of social media identifiers for Green Card applicants. My first objection - because I have not seen it elsewhere - is that many don't use social media at all. A good friend of mine, a Green Card holder, is not on any social media at all. How will disclosure work for those who do not use social media sites or apps? It would be wrong for this to delay Green Card approvals for such candidates. My second objection is to do with how vague the language of this bill is. What constitutes a "social media identifier?" This language would seem to allow USCIS to speculatively search private digital data, looking for anything from a gamer ID to a reddit handle, from a Weibo account to a Washington Post subscriber ID (which also allows one to comment online). A Green Card applicant could easily make a good-faith testament saying she has no social media identifiers, only to be rejected for having once subscribed to the New York Times 12 years ago (thus giving her a name under which to make public comments), having a defunct Facebook account that has long since been disabled, or having signed up for a food delivery service that includes public-facing restaurant reviews. Without a clear delineation of included sites, virtually everybody who has ever used the internet may or may not have "social media identifiers" in a way that is unclear to the candidate and to USCIS alike. This opens the door to discretionary enforcement and ultimately to unconstitutional overreach against applicants' rights to privacy. There is also a First Amendment Constitutional concern. Citizens and non-citizens in America alike are protected by the first amendment right to freedom of speech. Finally, there does not appear to be any data to suggest that this act makes us safer, nor are there numbers to suggest how MUCH safer it would make America. In the absence of data to this effect, it is worth pointing out the immense burden this new rule would impose on all Green Card applicants and on USCIS. The burden of enforcement is thus greater than any substantiated national security benefits, and would cost taxpayers for no proven benefit, while violating Constitutional protections.
USCIS-2025-0003-0247	Comment Submitted by GINA MOSCA	Yeah absolutely not, you gestapo goons. Stop taking people's rights away. I mourn for our country every day.
USCIS-2025-0003-0248	Comment Submitted by Hugo Bezat	Never in my worst nightmares would have I ever imagined that our government would be acting like a two-bit dictatorship, scrutinizing people's free speech. History will not be kind to trump and his enablers.
USCIS-2025-0003-0249	Comment Submitted by Anonymous	I agree with it all, except checking and searching naturalized citizens social media accounts. I also would encourage monitoring their financial details while applying for citizenship or residency
USCIS-2025-0003-0250	Comment Submitted by Anonymous	Clear violation of the First Amendment. They have in fact learned from history and they are eager to repeat it... from the wrong side.
USCIS-2025-0003-0251	Comment Submitted by Veerandra Koyyalamudi	Unconstitutional, we are not a dictatorship. This goes against free speech.

USCIS-2025-0003-0252	Comment Submitted by Anonymous	This policy infringes on our rights to privacy and free speech rights. These rights, among many others, are enshrined in our Constitution. The authoritarianism taking root in our country is endangering everyone's rights and lives. We do not bow to dictators, despots, technocrats or kings. God Bless America.
USCIS-2025-0003-0253	Comment Submitted by Anonymous	Collection of social media data is a clear violation of free speech. Being appalled at the human rights abuses by the US and Isreal and commenting on it is not a crime. The crimes are the human rights abuses.
USCIS-2025-0003-0254	Comment Submitted by Scott Stradfley	America isn't related to Russia, North Korea, or China. Yet. Even though Donnie wants to be. Free speech is a right for everyone, even non-citizens.
USCIS-2025-0003-0255	Comment Submitted by Anonymous	I fully oppose this proposal requiring social media handles for immigration is clear government overreach. As social media has grown and is a place for new ideas and discussions as well as personal information/conversations and venting, this will undoubtedly stifle free speech which this country has in its constiution is a founding fundamental right of all people. It leaves the information far too open to misinterpretation and out of context usage that can leave it far too open as a weapon for bad faith actors with bias. Any criticism can be deemed objectionable at the whims of the administration. Social media can also be easily hacked and manipulated which makes it a shaky information to use as any evidence for any argument or against. This would introduce far too many problems without further guidelines for how/what information is being collected and used and what standards are being set to determine the data's importance to immigration status/acceptance/rejection. It is far too open to interpretation and introduces a very subjective, unclear requirement to an already flawed immigration system.
USCIS-2025-0003-0256	Comment Submitted by Anonymous	Goes against everything the country stands for and is more closely aligned with 1930s Germany. You're literally encouraging the first steps towards full blown fascism and all you who work for immigration don't seem to care. Remember that in fascist governments they may come for others, but eventually they come you also.
USCIS-2025-0003-0257	Comment Submitted by Leslie Goldblatt	I am against this! This is an affront to free speech.
USCIS-2025-0003-0258	Comment Submitted by Elijah Logsdon	This proposed rule is an appalling violation of freedom of speech.
USCIS-2025-0003-0259	Comment Submitted by Anonymous	With the information provided it is totally unclear why this is necessary and appears to be a potential violation of first amendment rights. Immigrants who are undergoing the immigration process or have been granted legal status already go through a rigorous and lengthy vetting process by USCIS that would uncover any connection to terrorist organizations. This proposed rule gives no guidelines as to what would be considered a link to terrorism and leaves open the possibility that an individuals personal political beliefs could be used to target their legal immigration status. I also find the assumption of the amount of time applicants are expected to spend on submitting this paperwork to be grossly underestimated. All government paperwork tends to be difficult to comprehend and hard to submit. This is an unnecessary burden on people who are already spending a great deal of time and resources competing their immigration documents. With the information provided I does not seem plausible that this will not cost the American taxpayer. Who will comb through this mountain of data? What are they looking for how long will that take. USCIS is already grossly understaffed and this will require either a huge amount of staff or opening applicants data to a yet untested AI screening. This is a vast overreach by the government against people who are trying to or have already been legally admitted to this country. Do not punish people who are entering this country legally by subjecting them to arbitrary judgement based on their political beliefs. This country was founded on the ideals of freedom of expression and we
USCIS-2025-0003-0260	Comment Submitted by A US Citizen	This is a clear violation of free speech.
USCIS-2025-0003-0261	Comment Submitted by Anonymous	As a natural born citizen of the United States I am wholly against this proposal. Our country was created by founders that opposed authoritarian rule. Founders that believed in the free exchange of ideas and a country that was accepting of people from all walks of life. I understand the need to vet individuals crossing the border. But, with this you go to far. You cross the line into an oppressive regime that destroys the very heart of American values. You challenge our core idealogy. The idea of freedom. We, the people, have the right to express our selves. We, the people, have the right to the freedom of ideas. We, the people, have the right to protest. These are global rights. Fundamental to humanity. What right do you have to deny your fellow man the entitlement of thought and opinion.
USCIS-2025-0003-0262	Comment Submitted by William O'Malley	This is just another move by this fascist regime to remake America in the image of the racist, bigotry of the right-wing trumpers. Stop your efforts to steal the constitutional rights of all Americans. Might I suggest Trump waste his time playing golf and leave our America and the world in peace. Isn't Trump still friends with Stormy? Screw around with her and leave the rest of us alone!!

USCIS-2025-0003-0263	Comment Submitted by Anonymous	In Reference to Control Number 1615-NEW, DHS, USCIS Docket ID USCIS-2025-0003 As a concerned citizen, I am strictly against the proposal due to its potential implications for American freedoms and values. Implementing this proposal raises several significant issues: A. Resource Burden and Unwise Spending Acquiring social media data will likely yield unreliable information, as individuals can create false online identities to mislead the government. Additionally, the cultural context of foreign applicants' social media may lead to misinterpretations, overwhelming USCIS with irrelevant data. B. Distracted Screening Process The indiscriminate monitoring of applicants diverts attention from genuine threats. Screening should focus solely on reasonable suspicion of criminal activity rather than treating each applicant as a suspect, which wastes resources on trivial posts. C. Privacy Violations This proposal risks infringing upon the First and Fourth Amendments by extending social media scrutiny to citizens related to applicants, thereby compromising their privacy and free speech rights. D. Censorship and Authoritarianism The proposal could lead to undemocratic censorship, as individuals' political views may be unfairly judged. Criminal conduct should be the only basis for denial, not opinions expressed online. E. Data Vulnerability Centralizing data collection poses risks of misuse by third parties, raising concerns about data security and potential future discrimination between naturalized and native citizens. F. Environment of Mistrust Fear of surveillance can stifle open communication and inhibit the exchange of ideas, undermining the spirit of immigration that has historically attracted people to the U.S. G. Presumption of Innocence Treating applicants based on their social media presence risks unequal treatment regarding one's lifestyle, background, and beliefs. This overreach by DHS infringes on the dignity of individuals seeking citizenship. H. Vagueness of Criteria The lack of clear standards for social media scrutiny complicates enforcement and can create a two-tier system, leaving those without social media vulnerable to disadvantage. I. Fear of the Unknown With increased scrutiny, law-abiding citizens may worry for their families' futures based on potentially misunderstood online activities, leading to arbitrary profiling. I am a US citizen and my children are US-born citizens as well. It is likely that in the future they might marry someone they meet overseas and want to come and live here in the US. In the past, I would have had no fear about that – they will marry decent, law-abiding people for whom getting a US green card would be absolutely a non-issue. Now I am concerned already. What if the potential foreign spouse was a student activist in their country? What if they made posts that the current US administration might not like? I feel like being a law-abiding, good citizen/person with no criminal history and with an upright character is no longer good enough to be able to reside here. It would not be enough to be that and to go through the appropriate immigration procedures in this new world; you need to be “liked and approved for who you are or who you seem to be” through your online presence; an impossible criterion: so vague and subjective. What will my future in-laws be expected to have said or not said in a tweet? Where my children might be able to establish their lives and whether they might be able to live in their country, the USA, will now be based on not how decent the person they marry is, but on a couple of tweets they might have liked or responded to? What kind of arbitrary profiling and control over citizens' lives is this? Recommendations: Clarify the actual goals of this proposal and address the potential constitutional issues it raises. Limit social media checks to cases with red flags of actual criminal behavior rather than generalized surveillance of all applicants. Conclusion: This proposal presents significant operational burdens and threatens civil liberties. The diversion of resources away from genuine threats, coupled with the erosion of American values like free speech and privacy, makes this initiative un-American and potentially harmful to societal cohesion. For operational burden, the return on it is dubious and potentially a negative return since it puts our limited resources in the wrong place, diverting them from where they should be used. The actual cost when it comes to its impact on the American society is the worse. How we interact with each other on a democratic platform on an
USCIS-2025-0003-0264	Comment Submitted by Danielle Sauder	With regards to Docket ID USCIS-2025-0003, if there are legitimate and credible reasons for viewing someone's social media account, then the government and its agencies can prove that in a court of law and receive specific and duly limited access to an individual's social media. This broad application is a gross assumption of power too open to abuse. "A government that governs least, governs best." - Thomas Paine
USCIS-2025-0003-0265	Comment Submitted by Anonymous	This is a violation of 1st Amendment rights and needs to be adjudicated.
USCIS-2025-0003-0266	Comment Submitted by Anonymous	This is a poorly thought out policy that infringes upon free speech and will have no positive impact whatsoever. It can only be used for discriminatory purposes.
USCIS-2025-0003-0267	Comment Submitted by Rebecca Matte	This policy would be an absurd infringement on freedom of speech. If people are here legally and otherwise fit the requirements for a green card, their opinions on the president or anything else are really not all that relevant. As someone Jewish, I especially do not want this to be used as a "purity test" on Gaza -- many citizens (and Jewish citizens) vehemently oppose the war and support the people of Gaza, and so we do not approve of any "filtering" occurring for applicants seeking green cards. Not in my name. First amendment protections are a foundation of this country and just because this administration has a thin skin does not mean that they can infringe such rights willy nilly. Leave things as they are.
USCIS-2025-0003-0268	Comment Submitted by Ahmed Temani	I strongly oppose this initiative to collect social media identifiers from green card holders and immigration applicants. Regardless of citizenship status, all individuals are entitled to First and Fourth Amendment protections. This policy subjects non-citizens to undue government scrutiny, and risks establishing a dangerous precedent for intrusive surveillance and unconstitutional profiling. I urge USCIS to withdraw this proposal.
USCIS-2025-0003-0269	Comment Submitted by Anonymous	This policy is antithetical to the principles of free speech under the First Amendment of the Constitution. This information should not be collected from legal residents, or individuals seeking legal residence, of the United States of America.
USCIS-2025-0003-0270	Comment Submitted by Anonymous	This is a terrible idea. The United States is a bastion of freedom and liberty, and is a shining beacon of light on the hill. Forcing applicants to surrender social media profile information imposes a chilling effect and achieves nothing. The U.S. is sufficiently large and robust to survive disagreements among its citizens. There is nothing to be gained by arbitrary rejection of applicants for their words. This is not the United States we want or need.
USCIS-2025-0003-0271	Comment Submitted by Anonymous	Oppose, clear violation of free speech.
USCIS-2025-0003-0272	Comment Submitted by Anonymous	This is a violation of free speech. The Trump administration will use this to reject applicants who criticize the President, like it already has. This will help turn the US into a dictatorship

USCIS-2025-0003-0273	Comment Submitted by Anonymous	This rule is an overreach and will have a chilling effect on not only free speech but the underpinnings of our democracy. This rule should be rejected wholeheartedly and shouldn't even be proposed as it is so blatantly unconstitutional.
USCIS-2025-0003-0274	Comment Submitted by Anon For safety	This is an absolute disgusting overreach by the government. Does free speech not mean anything anymore? Legally immigrating to the U.S. is already incredibly invasive, and now the government wants to base immigration on whether the immigrants openly supports the president. We all know that the unspoken basis of changing these regulations is to deny immigration to those who criticize Trump.
USCIS-2025-0003-0275	Comment Submitted by Haroon Iftikhar	For a nation built by immigrants, this proposed “disgraced” policy overwhelmingly targets foreign nationals, which implicitly reinforces the xenophobic notion that immigrants are potential threats unless proven innocent— hence the upside-down morality. None of the personal information on social media is vetting criteria for immigration. When the U.S. mirrors the surveillance behavior of illiberal regimes, it trades moral high ground for fear-based governance.
USCIS-2025-0003-0276	Comment Submitted by Anonymous	This would be an infringement on free speech, privacy and is truly chilling this is even a possibility. This is only based on direct political attacks on outspoken green card holders.
USCIS-2025-0003-0277	Comment Submitted by Anonymous	Greetings, In general I am supportive of the option to collect social media identifiers for immigration purposes. With that said, I think that a caveat is appropriate. First a little basis / background to add perspective... my girlfriend is a chinese national that holds a greencard. She is an exceptional person (who by the way isn't even aware of this proposed rule/law, and I haven't discussed it with her, this being MY generic thoughts) who is proud to be here, supports the U.S. and the opportunities it gives her, and thinks Donald Trump is "so cute" LOL I think that having such an exceptional person in my life that this would affect has caused me to consider this, and make me want to add my perspective. So here is the caveat.... I think there needs to be a trigger event to implement the Social Media Collection. I think it unfairly, and unwisely, potentially alienates the majority of persons targeted (legal immigrants that will by vast majority eventually become awesome new citizens, keeping the melting pot that is America going for the next generations.). So I think that there needs to be something, such as a violation of law, evidence of suspicious behavior, etc that triggers the collection event. That's all. I trust the Trump administration greatly. My concern is that the former idiot and his supporting clowns so unbalanced this country, that I sometimes fear that the return to normalcy will result in the pendulum swinging too far the other way. We need to right the ship... but we must always remember that the end goal is balance. That's all. keep up the good work! Peace, - citizen david :)
USCIS-2025-0003-0278	Comment Submitted by Amy Nasir	A rational mind does not work under compulsion; it does not subordinate its grasp of reality to anyone’s orders, directives, or controls; it does not sacrifice its knowledge, its view of the truth, to anyone’s opinions, threats, wishes, plans, or “welfare.” Such a mind may be hampered by others, it may be silenced, proscribed, imprisoned, or destroyed; it cannot be forced; a gun is not an argument. - Ayn Rand Your guns are not an argument. Donald Trump is an authoritarian thug. And he is ordering those in law enforcement to become criminals themselves. Green card holders have every right to exist, live and work in the US - and so should new immigrants. To punish these hard-working people because of their political views is heinous. Please stop this tyranny now.
USCIS-2025-0003-0279	Comment Submitted by Anonymous	Intrusion of Privacy: Reviewing someone’s social media raises significant privacy concerns, especially if it involves personal details not relevant to the immigration process, such as family matters or political opinions. Potential for Misuse: There is the risk that immigration officers or agencies may overstep boundaries, using social media information to unfairly judge or discriminate against applicants based on personal beliefs or affiliations. Contextual Misinterpretation: Social media posts can be taken out of context, leading to misinterpretation of an applicant’s views or activities. A post made years ago may not reflect the person’s current stance or behavior. Fake or Edited Profiles: Some individuals may manipulate or falsify their social media presence to appear more favorable, which could defeat the purpose of vetting. Subjective Decision-Making: The use of social media for vetting could lead to biased or discriminatory practices, especially when subjective assessments (like personal views or political opinions) come into play. For example, an immigration officer may unintentionally penalize an applicant for political or religious beliefs that don’t relate to their eligibility. Overlooking Legitimate Applications: Social media scrutiny might unfairly target certain individuals, especially those from marginalized or politically charged backgrounds, making them more likely to be questioned or denied based on biased assumptions. Fear of Expression: Applicants may self-censor or avoid engaging in certain discussions, such as political activism, out of fear it could negatively affect their application, undermining their right to free speech. Impact on Immigrant Communities: Social media vetting could disproportionately affect specific groups, such as activists, journalists, or individuals with certain cultural practices, leading to a perception of unfair targeting. Legal Uncertainty: There may be legal challenges to the constitutionality of such practices, particularly around the First Amendment (freedom of speech) and Fourth Amendment (protection against unreasonable searches and seizures). Ambiguity in Guidelines: There is a lack of clear standards for how social media should be used in vetting, which could lead to inconsistency and potential legal ramifications if applicants believe they
USCIS-2025-0003-0280	Comment Submitted by Anonymous	I oppose. As a citizen of the United States I do not support this chilling effect on free speech and believe it to be un-American, and more representative of the behavior of regimes we have long fought against.

USCIS-2025-0003-0281	Comment Submitted by Anonymous	If someone is in this country they should be extended all the normal individual rights of freedom of expression, assembly, and conscience. These rights are American insomuch as they are enshrined in our founding documents and upheld by long experience and court precedent. But our founders did not see them as merely contingent rights peculiar to this country or time but rather rights suited for all - endowed by the creator. This includes, famously, the right to anonymous speech. Several of the framers of our constitution argued for its adoption by the states in the Federalist papers under pseudonymous pen-names. In the present era, much vibrant political speech online - such as on X - is under pseudonymous handles. This ability to communicate anonymously helps X live up to its owners desire for it to be a free speech platform. The very fact of requiring applicants to turn over social media handles - setting aside the potential for an arbitrary and capricious litmus test evaluating their speech - would eliminate the ability for anonymous speech that has been used and enjoyed by many in this country - including many of Mr. Trump's most vocal supports on various platforms. Indeed - this very regulatory comment platform acknowledges the value of anonymous speech in petitioning the government by allowing the submission of an anonymous comment.
USCIS-2025-0003-0282	Comment Submitted by Anonymous	This is a blatant violation of free speech, and it won't end with immigrants. Any political figure backing this is actively paving the way for a modern Fourth Reich. If you support this, you are aligning yourself with fascism plain and simple. History will remember you not just as a coward, but as a collaborator. And because the United States holds far more global power today than 1930s Germany ever did, your legacy could be even darker than that of the Nazis. If you have even a shred of integrity left if you care at all about how history will remember your name renounce this now, or be marked forever as an enemy of freedom.
USCIS-2025-0003-0283	Comment Submitted by Cognexus, LLC	This is fear mongering by saying that green card holders are possible terrorists and we therefor need to strip them of their privacy and free speech rights. It's a flimsy excuse and should be rejected out of hand. Our brain drain is going to speed up and we will keep any intelligent people from coming here for legitimate reasons. It's a big step forward in making us a pariah nation.
USCIS-2025-0003-0284	Comment Submitted by Anonymous	I disagree with this proposal and am concerned about its intrusion into a person's right to privacy and free speech
USCIS-2025-0003-0285	Comment Submitted by Anonymous	This infringes on free speech and should not be permitted. The lives that are being adversely affected by President Trump's policies are horrendous, and this one especially is unconstitutional, as green card holders' first amendment rights are protected. It should not be allowed to go through.
USCIS-2025-0003-0286	Comment Submitted by Harsh Driver	This is an attack on free speech and a waste of taxpayer money that is better spent elsewhere.
USCIS-2025-0003-0287	Comment Submitted by Anonymous Nice Try	After seeing the tattoos and numerous affidavits that allegedly led to the deportation of Venezuelans without legally-mandated removal proceedings to an El Salvadoran concentration camp, I don't believe ICE is sufficiently educated or qualified to determine whether a user's social media sufficiently violates national security or public safety. Due Process is a constitutional right, for everyone who steps foot in this country, regardless of status. How long until this policy is focused on citizens, instead? First they came for immigrants, and I said something because I've read the poem. In the words of First Lady Melania Trump, be better.
USCIS-2025-0003-0288	Comment Submitted by Michael Beskin	Absurd. Anti American attempt to cull political adversaries. This is authoritarian bs and counter to the ideals set forth in the constitution. If you want to limit free speech move to a third world dictatorship.
USCIS-2025-0003-0289	Inappropriate Comment Submitted by Anonymous	Don't tread on me, you fucking facist
USCIS-2025-0003-0290	Comment Submitted by Anonymous	Speech on public media of people who have not shown evidence of criminal behavior is permitted. In fact, in a democracy, is welcome. And legal. And is none of the government's business.
USCIS-2025-0003-0291	Comment Submitted by Anonymous	Everyone in office NOW and anyone running in future for president, cabinet positions, supreme court, senate or house, federal or state, governors, secretary of state, local, township, county, village, school boards, library boards etc should have all their social media accounts entire lifetime scanned for content and made public.
USCIS-2025-0003-0292	Comment Submitted by Anonymous	This is a flat out blatant attack of free speech!!! This is NOT ok I don't support this what so ever as a born citizen here. This is flat out disgustin , disgraceful,and disrespectful!
USCIS-2025-0003-0293	Comment Submitted by N. F.	This is such a violation of privacy, liberty and free speech that I implore those in charge to resist this iron fistted, dystopian idea. Please abandon this disgusting violation in respect of the free speech foundation laid out by the founding fathers in the constitution.
USCIS-2025-0003-0294	Comment Submitted by Anonymous	This rule would seem to violate our Constitution's First and Fourth Amendments. If adopted, I hope a case is brought against it in Federal Court.
USCIS-2025-0003-0295	Comment Submitted by Rachelle Roosevelt	I oppose the proposed policy as it is a violation of free speech, one of the primary tenants of the foundation of the USA.
USCIS-2025-0003-0296	Comment Submitted by Anonymous	No. We already got screwed enough on the collection of our information. You have no right to anything that isn't public so please kindly back off. Thanks.
USCIS-2025-0003-0297	Comment Submitted by Anonymous	You're not only creating a chilling effect on the free speech (and the potential desire to come to the US) of the population you're targeting, but also that of run-of-the-mill Americans (that don't have funny sounding names) who might want to comment here but think "Oh sure, I'm going to comment here. That will just send them after me!" Well played.
USCIS-2025-0003-0298	Comment Submitted by Anonymous	First it's for Green card applicants so they lose free speech. Then it's gonna be for naturized citizens and then the people born here won't have free speech. I remember something like this from mustache man in the 1930s. This administration is a disgrace and I'm sad to say I'm an American.

USCIS-2025-0003-0299	Inappropriate Comment Submitted by Darryl Ponder	You have got to be fucking kidding me. What are we, some third world "shit hole" country? This is a violation of everything the USA stands for. Free speech is the bedrock, the foundation of our society and some wanna be dictator can't take that away. The ability of all in this country to call Trump a piece of human excrement, an orange cheeto, a piss-poor example of a man, shall remain unabridged. I suggest this idiot administration, that loves the Constitution so much, go read the first amendment and see how this stupid, dumb-ass regulation stacks up.
USCIS-2025-0003-0300	Comment Submitted by Anonymous	Blatant and appalling violation of the first amendment. Might as well tear up the Constitution.
USCIS-2025-0003-0301	Comment Submitted by Anonymous	Do we not believe in freedom of speech in the United States of America anymore? What the hell is wrong with this administration? The freedom to speak one's mind is ingrained in our constitution and to deny green card holders this freedom and un-American.
USCIS-2025-0003-0302	Comment Submitted by M.L Pardew	They are not citizens yet we don't need another 9/11 absolutely request release of their social media that's where it is always hidden .agree with President Trump protecting America and Americans
USCIS-2025-0003-0303	Comment Submitted by Anonymous	First, this is a terrible rule. Second, which department of the federal government will have enough staff to comb through the profiles once DOGE finishes their work. Terrible rule.
USCIS-2025-0003-0304	Comment Submitted by Anonymous	NO! NO! NO! This would be completely against the FREEDOM OF SPEECH we have in our country's constitution!!!!
USCIS-2025-0003-0305	Comment Submitted by Anonymous	This proposal violates freedom of speech and is unconstitutional.
USCIS-2025-0003-0306	Comment Submitted by Anonymous	It is unbelievable how this administration violates the Constitution on a daily basis. Americans should strongly condemn this policy.
USCIS-2025-0003-0307	Comment Submitted by Deanna Kauffman	This is nothing more than an attempt to stifle free speech based on one narrow viewpoint. Completely antithetical to the First Amendment. Has any one in this administration actually read the constitution which they took an oath to uphold?
USCIS-2025-0003-0308	Comment Submitted by Anonymous	Please don't do this, it's a violation of free speech, please protect the rights granted by the constitution
USCIS-2025-0003-0309	Comment Submitted by Concerned Citizen Taxpayer	No, no, no, no. There is absolutely zero reason to violate the Fourth Amendment of our Constitution. These are inalienable rights. They aren't negotiable. I did not serve my country and swear an oath to protect and defend The United States Constitution only to have some political figure come in and undo what this country is based on. This isn't Nazi Germany. This isn't the Soviet Union. This isn't China or North Korea. This is the United States of America and this is the hill I die on. People in this country legally should have the same government protections as every single one of us citizens. I don't see any of this vetting happening for the DOGE kids that you will yanked straight out of a discord server and gave access to our most sensitive data. And I don't see how you would give that kind of access to Elon Musk, who isn't a citizen, cannot pass a background check, and is committing crimes every single day by manipulating stock through insider trading as well as his fraud to hijack existing contracts with the US government and my tax dollars so that they could be funneled into his crappy company. Don't even think about it. This is not a slope you get to start on. Not a single inch. Not a single millimeter. None. Zero.
USCIS-2025-0003-0310	Comment Submitted by Ric Artache	Long over due, This is not a free speech issue, I agree the government has a right to review all social media postings for green card applicants and holders of green cards. These people are guests in our country. How would you feel if you invite someone into your home and they started talking crap about you and started posting you should die and invite people to protest outside your house and set up tents and vandalize you property
USCIS-2025-0003-0311	Comment Submitted by Anonymous	Collecting social media handles to insure that green card holders adequately inflate the president's ego goes against everything that the first amendment is about. This administration is simply looking to deport more and more immigrants that contribute to our country's culture and economy, simply for espousing views they don't agree with. Whatever they do to immigrants, don't think for a second they won't later turn it on citizens.
USCIS-2025-0003-0312	Inappropriate Comment Submitted by Anonymous	Requiring legal residents to fork over their social media accounts is solely for the purpose of monitoring without warrant and without cause ethnic groups and minorities Elon Musk and his whore Donald don't like and want to have murdered in El Salvador or an Immigration Customs Enforcement labor center. Go fuck yourselves you Nazi diarrhea sippers.
USCIS-2025-0003-0313	Comment Submitted by Rachel Humphrey	The 1st Amendment applies to all people in the USA, not just citizens. Social media accounts are considered speech, which last time I checked, was free. This is a slippery slope that ends with a loss of free speech for all Americans. Don't go down this path.
USCIS-2025-0003-0314	Comment Submitted by Anonymous	Unconstitutional and unethical. This is a disgrace.
USCIS-2025-0003-0315	Comment Submitted by Anonymous	A total intrusion of personal privacy by the Federal Government and violation of 1st Amendment.

USCIS-2025-0003-0316	MM1 Comment Submitted by Anonymous	The proposed changes to Forms I-751 and N-400 constitute a gross invasion of privacy and pose obvious risks to the First, Fourth, and Fifth Amendment rights of Conditional and Lawful Permanent Residents being respected. By definition, Conditional and Lawful Permanent Residents have already been subjected to rigorous screening for evidence of any crimes, activities, or associations which would make them ineligible to have obtained CPR or LPR status in the first place. Furthermore, requiring disclosure of the social media identifiers of a CPR's or LPR's parents, spouse or stepparent, and their children presents two clear problems: (1) a CPR or LPR is not responsible for the online activities of their parents, their spouse or stepparent, or their children; and, (2) it would be impossible for a CPR or LPR to know for certain whether their parents, their spouse or stepparent, or their children may have inadvertently or deliberately failed to disclose any social media identifiers they may have used in the past five years. Because of these two fundamental problems, it would be entirely improper for any decision with respect to an application to remove conditions on permanent resident status or to naturalize to be rendered based on any of these disclosure requirements. Finally, the proposed changes to Forms I-751, N-400 and others would result in greatly increased administrative burden for USCIS and associated costs to American taxpayers and would exacerbate existing
USCIS-2025-0003-0317	Comment Submitted by Shawn Singleton	As an American citizen by birth, this is a blatant attack on free speech. ANYONE in the United States or its territories is afforded the protection of free speech as outlined in the Constitution. What is or is not acceptable is not up to the political winds of our elected politicians or their appointees. Mr Trump and his henchmen such as Pam Biondi, Marco Rubio, Elon Musk etc have already proven they will target people expressing free speech because the speech is critical of Trump, his proposed policies or EOs. That is not how free speech protections were envisioned by our founders. Will these oppressive politicians then decide to attack this right of citizens because we have the audacity to criticize the government or the leaders? We MUST stand up and oppose this tyranny NOW!!
USCIS-2025-0003-0318	Comment Submitted by Anonymous	This proposal violates free speech. Free speech is essential in a democracy.
USCIS-2025-0003-0319	Comment Submitted by Anonymous	I believe the government has a responsibility to keep U.S. citizens safe from foreign terrorists and other national security and public safety threats. However, these terms need to be well-defined and the definitions accepted by the American people. The E.O. is written in a way that is too ambiguous, and therefore will only waste tax payer money by the resources needed to detain and question applicants, as well as by the lawsuits it will provoke. Different administrations could have different opinions about which groups are terrorist and public safety threats. It would produce a great hardship to change the rules of the game every four years. Additionally, what is defined as a national security threat can change overnight. How will this affect non-violent people living in the U.S. who have supported a country or group that is all of a sudden defined as a national security threat? If a president can decide on and name these threats as he wishes and at any time, then non-violent people who have different views should be safe from persecution. America is great when we are all free to non-violently express differing opinions and viewpoints openly without fear of retribution. Listening and learning has always been how people and societies improve themselves. Politics is complex and can incite the gamut of normal human emotions, and it is common practice to find community online. This does not make a person a terrorist or a threat. It is possible to be for some policies and against some policies of the same country or group. Does this make someone a terrorist or a threat? I do not think A.I. will accurately determine if a person is a real threat or just a person voicing an opinion. Where is the line going to be drawn? It is also too easy for a person to delete social media accounts in order to enter a country. Will there be an inconspicuous option to bribe the USCIS with \$5,000,000? Does the USCIS have evidence that this sort of screening does help prevent dangerous terrorists and threats from entering the country? Will the information collected be used against a non-violent person who simply has a different opinion or viewpoint than the current administration? Will this lead to a similar policy being enacted on all U.S. citizens? Is the information gathered going to be stored, where, and for how long? How will the USCIS ensure that this database is never hacked or compromised? In my lifetime, terrorists flew planes into buildings, therefore I don't trust that this policy will stop terrorists. As the E.O. is currently written, it is not detailed and transparent enough, which has the potential to do much more harm than
USCIS-2025-0003-0320	Comment Submitted by Jeff Carbine	No, do not do this. Why are we harassing immigrants? This is such blatant hate, these are people going about immigration "the right way" so why the invasion of their privacy? Jfc this administration has such a chip on their shoulder against immigrants.
USCIS-2025-0003-0321	Comment Submitted by Anonymous	Free speech doesn't mean to hurt anyone in any way, which also includes national security. It is good that Trump admin is proposing to vet the green card holders. People who want to live in this country need to abide by all the rules and not to be a security threat. For too long this has been taken for granted. Kudos to Trump for trying to make America Great Again. Good bless Trump & America.
USCIS-2025-0003-0322	Comment Submitted by doris hampton	I can't help but see this as another step towards having a police state. That is not who we are.
USCIS-2025-0003-0323	Comment Submitted by Erin R	This is a violation of First Amendment Rights. The Constitution applies whether you are somebody who is a citizen or somebody who is a green card holder who is here in the United States. The president's administration should be protecting and expanding rights, not chipping away at them. We are a nation of democracy, not totalitarianism and how we treat the least fortunate speaks volumes about who we are as a people. I support freedom and democracy. I don't support attacks on Constitutional Rights like this is.
USCIS-2025-0003-0324	Comment Submitted by B Schroeter	I am opposed to this. How cruel!
USCIS-2025-0003-0325	Comment Submitted by Anonymous	This violates the 1st amendment of the Constitution of the United States. Stop this.
USCIS-2025-0003-0326	Comment Submitted by Deborah DeLage	This violates free speech and privacy laws.
USCIS-2025-0003-0327	Comment Submitted by anonymous anonymous	As so many have indicated, this is a chilling attempt to intimidate -- and a violation of First Amendment rights

USCIS-2025-0003-0328	Comment Submitted by Gregory Newton	This is a very bad idea, and opens the door to censor free speech of everyone, and allow the government to take action against anyone for online comments of anyone they disagree with. to implement this would open for 1st admendment censorship no matter what.
USCIS-2025-0003-0329	Comment Submitted by Noway Ugetmyname	My family came to America on the Mayflower and I am an old man now. Never in my life have I ever seen a bigger threat to democracy than DJT, and in particular, the minions doing his bidding. The attacks on the rule of law spin my head, and his idiotic words about commandeering Canada(!), Greenland, and the Panama Canal, strike me as EXTREMELY un-American. Eisenhower and Reagan must be rolling over in their graves. I had no idea any American in a leadership role could be so cowardly as to support him. If he attempts to push his way into the FED, it will mean absolute disaster, sooner or later.
USCIS-2025-0003-0330	Comment Submitted by Anonymous	You say you are trying to protect the country from terrorism or bad people, but this is a slippery slope down to not allowing people who do not agree with you into the country. This is a country that needs varying opinions on everything, that is what we stand for. Quit trying the mask your strategy of barring entry to people who don't agree with the current administration. That is wrong and corrupt.
USCIS-2025-0003-0331	Comment Submitted by Nate Schnitker	I'm opposed to this rule. If comrade trump receives negative comments on social media he will kick you out of the country. Comrade trump ia such an insecure pussy he can't take any criticism. While you're at it kick out the immigrant Elon.
USCIS-2025-0003-0332	Comment Submitted by Anonymous	This is free speech for those in power if they agree with President Trump. This is unconstitutional.
USCIS-2025-0003-0333	Comment Submitted by Andrew Gagne	This will have a chilling effect on free speech. America should welcome all ideas, and social media posts should not be used to prevent candidates from entry or citizenship.
USCIS-2025-0003-0334	Comment Submitted by Susan Carlson	This is a violation of free speech.
USCIS-2025-0003-0335	Comment Submitted by Anonymous	Green Card holders followed all laws and were thoroughly vetted by USCIS. As such, they enjoy the full protection of the Constitution. This includes the 1st amendment. This is a clear violation of Free Speech.
USCIS-2025-0003-0336	Comment Submitted by Anonymous	Sec 2,\$b(ii) is specifically targeting those people who have entered the U.S. only during President Biden's presidency. That is not for national security. That is pettiness. Trump is going after anyone who came into the U.S. and has either committed a crime so he can hold them up to the camera and say, "look, another criminal, another rapist, another thief, etc. who Biden allowed to come in!" Or who has spoken out against Trump, who will then go on to find any way to deport them to the camps in El Salvador while calling them corrupt gang members. Or who had a religion which offends him, such as Muslims (not fanatics, not extremists, not terrorists) who are fleeing ISIS or otherwise being persecuted, maybe even Judaism since he certainly shows antisemitic tendencies. He'll also be targeting Mexicans and soon Canadians if his tariffs are any indications. This is a personal agenda, not national security. This is a multi-pronged information gathering process that if approved would be spying on U.S. residents. It would also allow the U.S. to spy on those who have already been vetted and allowed to enter through legal channels. Those within our borders who have been allowed in legally have the same protections under the Bill of Rights. They have 1st Amendment free speech. They have protections against unwarranted search and seizures under the 4th Amendment. Those include searching and seizing information (not made public) of various digital accounts. If it's online, even in private mode, they will consider it social media. If websites, like YouTube is considered "Social Media" then your watch history is available to the U.S. government under this E.O. for National Security. Under the normal rules of the U.S. Constitution, the government would need probable cause, then a warrant issued by a judge in order to get your viewing history. With this E.O. they violate your personal rights guaranteed by the Constitution. It is not okay. This EO is just violence against the U.S. population. Any federal judge worth his or her salt would shut this down.
USCIS-2025-0003-0337	Comment Submitted by Anonymous	This violates the first amendment
USCIS-2025-0003-0338	Comment Submitted by Anonymous	It is unacceptable to require access to social media. This is a violation of the first amendment.
USCIS-2025-0003-0339	Comment Submitted by Anonymous	It's absolutely ridiculous that in 2025 as an American citizen, I have to use a VPN because I cannot trust that Trump and Elon will not use my comment to charge me as a terrorist, This is absolutely disgraceful what you're doing and it's only a matter of time before you come after US citizens, since you're already coming after anyone who is a first generation citizen in violation of the Constitution. You and your sycophants are destroying the country and making the entire world hate and boycott us.
USCIS-2025-0003-0340	Comment Submitted by Nicolas Kassis	I'm voicing my strong disagreement with this proposal. There is no need for it and the justifications are dubious at best. The applicants already provide plenty of information that has been adequate to vet their identity without this addition for decades since the introduction of social media. The negative chilling impact on free speech far outweigh any perceived benefits. This is unlikely to survive the courts as well thus clearly a waste of time.
USCIS-2025-0003-0341	Comment Submitted by Anonymous	This is terrible. It is a violation of free speech, constitutional rights and common decency. It's a gross abuse of power - one among many by this administration. It's one thing to vet newcomers. This crosses a line. These people are here legally. The hypocrisy on display is mind-blowing.
USCIS-2025-0003-0342	Comment Submitted by Anonymous	I am writing against this proposal. This would have a chilling effect on free speech and would be unconstitutional, as the First Amendment gives a wide latitude for free speech, even for immigrants. The envisioned benefit does not justify the negative effects.
USCIS-2025-0003-0343	Comment Submitted by Anonymous	It is absolutely asinine to ask for social media access as well a gross violation of the freedoms America has. If politicians are this thin-skinned, they can't be trusted in leadership positions
USCIS-2025-0003-0344	Comment Submitted by Richard Tyler	I campaigned for President Trump in the last election and I fully support getting illegal immigration back on a more rational footing but this initiative violates the First Amendment rights of people who did everything required to become legal residents. It's not just a bad look, it's a bad idea.

USCIS-2025-0003-0345	Comment Submitted by Anonymous	I think this rule needs to be reconsidered as it could discriminate against anyone who doesn't support the policies of this administration! This would be a violation of multiple constitutional provisions and I doubt it would stand up to legal scrutiny!
USCIS-2025-0003-0346	Comment Submitted by Anonymous	First green card holders and then all citizens....Where does it stop? This is an invasion of privacy and a violation of free speech. I DO NOT want to live under an authoritarian government!
USCIS-2025-0003-0347	Comment Submitted by Anonymous	I feel this is a violation to free speech & should never be implemented. This is not what America stands for . This violates so many of our rights. I urge USCIS to withdraw this proposed rule. The risks to privacy, free speech, due process, and efficiency far outweigh any purported benefits. The use of social media to verify an applicant's identity and to assess public safety threats is unnecessary for the function of USCIS, may yield inaccurate data and thus invalid analysis and adjudication, and creates administrative burden for the agency and longer wait times.
USCIS-2025-0003-0348	Comment Submitted by Anonymous	The proposed policy in USCIS-2025-0003 directly infringes on the rights granted by the First Amendment of the Constitution. Everyone in the US, regardless of citizenship status, is supposed to be granted freedom of speech without retaliation by the government. Not only this, but the use of AI and datamining through social media companies is a direct violation of privacy for both non-citizens and citizens, as this opens up a new method of illicit surveillance. This policy will harm everyone in the US, regardless of citizenship status, considering it infringes on freedom of speech as well as privacy.
USCIS-2025-0003-0349	Comment Submitted by Anonymous	I am writing to reject this proposal. It has become increasingly concerning how deep into the lives of anyone in the Us, immigrant or not. For a party that claimed they didn't want the government to be so heavily involved in the lives of the public. This looks like cracking down on anyone who disagrees with them or anything they choose. This is a terrible step in the direction of destroying a 250 year old experiment. Our democracy is on the line and I think you really need to sit with that and realize just how far down this dark road you're going. And this shift would mean anyone, and I do mean anyone, could be silenced and watched. No. Reject it and reread the Constitution while you're at it. Remember what this country is actually about that isn't the money in your pockets.
USCIS-2025-0003-0350	Comment Submitted by Laurie Lo	This is a horrible idea. Violates the right to Free Speech.
USCIS-2025-0003-0351	Comment Submitted by Anonymous	This change is not "generic" as the title misleadingly suggests. It is a violation of the freedom of speech and an intimidation tactic. I strongly oppose its implementation.
USCIS-2025-0003-0352	Comment Submitted by Jennifer Clayton	While I recognize the importance of analyzing social media to identify true security threats to the United States of America, this is not the administration that should be creating or enforcing this policy. The American people will not trust Donald Trump or his appointees to use this ability to screen out only those who are truly a danger to the United States rather than good potential citizens who simply do not like him or disagree with his policies. His reputation as a petty and vengeful man on his own social media undermines any arguments that this policy improves national security and I am strongly opposed to creating and/or enforcing this regulation at this time.
USCIS-2025-0003-0353	Comment Submitted by Ignacio Feged	I oppose the collection of social media identifiers. It is a dangerous infringement on free speech and could lead to abuse and authoritarian action by the federal government. I urge the administration to uphold the right to free speech and reconsider this policy.
USCIS-2025-0003-0354	Comment Submitted by Barbara Tierney	This should be seen as a clear violation of privacy, violation of the first amendment, and also a precursor to doing the same to citizens. It is illegal!
USCIS-2025-0003-0355	Comment Submitted by Linda Kay Baker	Trump's order titled "Protecting the United States from Foreign Terrorists and Other National Security and Public Safety Threats" worries me because this is not limited to any group of people and if we do not stand up against it Trump can monitor everyone and take away free speech, because if you are not praising him he wants you to be silenced. The fear of government scrutiny of online expression will undoubtedly stifle free speech. So, the US is moving toward authoritarianism, with anything Trump dislikes being deemed bad. This ideological stance threatens the First Amendment.
USCIS-2025-0003-0356	Comment Submitted by S N	It seems to me this is more a "Protect Donald Trump any Foreign or US-born Citizen from Criticizing Him" document. I am a 72-year-old woman born in this country, and I have never seen anything like this. Terrorism of any kind should not be allowed; free speech should. It seems to me he is trying to wipe out any disagreement/dissent to his actions. For the first time in my life, I am embarrassed to be an American. ;;
USCIS-2025-0003-0357	Comment Submitted by Eric Smith	And what if you are "anti-social media" and do not have any form of social media? What about those people?
USCIS-2025-0003-0358	Comment Submitted by Anonymous	This is a violation of privacy. Also, who is determine what does or doesn't qualify for removal of permanent residents?
USCIS-2025-0003-0359	Comment Submitted by Marcus Shelton	Not just no but hell no. This fascist garbage is not welcome in this country
USCIS-2025-0003-0360	Inappropriate Comment Submitted by No Kings	Fuck you. The government doesn't get to control and censor speech you fucking shitbags.
USCIS-2025-0003-0361	Comment Submitted by Charles Borre	Criminals or terrorists will simply not provide this or provide fake information. This can only serve to stifle or punish protected speech.

USCIS-2025-0003-0362	Comment Submitted by Anonymous	Absolutely not. Green card holders have already been screened and vetted. Freedom of speech, religion and assembly is one of the few rights that separates the US from any other country. It is one of the many reasons I am proud to be an American. I welcome those seeking political asylum, fleeing tyranny, fleeing countries that do not respect any freedoms particularly freedom of speech, and who don't respect or want change. President Trump is using negative opinions about himself and his policies as a way to demonstrate that public safety is at risk. No, public safety is not at risk because of protestors and those who disagree with US policy and who have an opinion about the USA, whether it is favorable or unfavorable. Trump himself has said horrible things about my country, which happens to also be his country, and no one has asked him to turn over his communications and no has made attempts to deport him. He should turn over his communications with Vladimir Putin, right wing anti-government groups, and other groups and persons that wish to do our country harm. Targeting immigrants who have an opinion is not in the name of national security or public safety, it is being done to boost his ego and eliminate dissent because he and his opinions and policies are unpopular.
USCIS-2025-0003-0363	Comment Submitted by Michael Stahlke	There is zero doubt in my mind that the current administration will use this data to bar entry or citizenship to any individual who has ever personally criticized Donald Trump. Frankly, I believe that criticism of the president is in keeping with the highest traditions of the American public.
USCIS-2025-0003-0364	Comment Submitted by Anonymous	You're monsters. This is unbelievable. This is not my America and this is not my government.
USCIS-2025-0003-0365	Comment Submitted by robert lannon	Bad idea, First Amendment ? This is all for show, Fifth Amendment next to be 'exorcised by 'executive ? Can not believe how low we have devolved !
USCIS-2025-0003-0366	Comment Submitted by Anonymous	AGAINST. Hard against. You are subjecting people who have already been vetted to an additional and unnecessary layer of scrutiny, with the option to revoke their status. The only logical conclusion is that, rather than deport criminals and real threats, you would rather go after people who have already been determined to not be a threat. And based on what? Saying something you don't like, which falls under free speech? I should not have to remind you that guaranteed Constitutional protections apply to ALL PERSONS on US soil. Once you've run out of refugees and green cards, what then? Start deporting citizens? For what, an ugly sweater pic on Facebook? This proposed regulation is yet another small rollback of the Constitution. I am therefore entirely, wholeheartedly against it.
USCIS-2025-0003-0367	Comment Submitted by Carrie Montoya	This proposal would be a significant violation of the 1st Amendment of the US Constitution, which covers all individuals within the United States regardless of their citizenship.
USCIS-2025-0003-0368	Inappropriate Comment Submitted by Not ACHANCE	What will Fuhrer Trump do if the American People say NO???!?! Go Full Fascist, declare a National Emergency, nullify the Constitution, abolish Congress, replace "unreliable" Judges, carry out mass arrests and executions of "Enemies of the State", THEN get down to business... The Trump "Reich" will get the Green Card holders Social Media "Identifier" in order to monitor (ie: spy) them. What next? Require American Citizens to do the same? Have children report on their parents? Set up a Trump Youth Program and a Trump Young Woman's Child Rearing Program? Make Slavery legal again so Trump's rich friends can own people African Americans legally?. Build Concentration Camps and Slaughter a Hundred million or two Undesirables (Fuhrer Trump DOES have to be the best after all)? Oh, and lets not forget: Build a massive military and go on on a World Conquering Binge? Killing several Hundred million, destroying entire regions and numerous cities, dropping nuclear bombs on cities when they won't surrender or when they insult Fuhrer Trump. Devastating America as the world unites against us...just like Fascist Leader with Dreams of Godhood always do! NO, I DO NOT THINK THIS IS RIGHT, MORAL, OR CONSTITUTIONAL!!!! IT WON'T MATTER HOW FUHRER TRUMP & THE REST OF HIS TOADIES SPIN THIS, THEY WILL BE VIOLATING THE RIGHTS OF HUMAN BEINGS. AS FOR THE SUPREME COURT, THEY HELPED TO CAUSE THIS FASCIST MESS AND THEY NEED TO MOVE FAST TO STOP IT BEFORE IT IS TOO LATE. UNLESS, OF COURSE, IT IS ALREADY TOO LATE FOR THE JUDICIARY TO STOP THIS FASCIST REGIME.
USCIS-2025-0003-0369	Comment Submitted by Denise Guenther	As an older citizen of the United States, I am outraged by this new twist by the Trump Administration to violate democratic freedoms and the right to free speech. Many of the immigrants who have attained green card status have come to our country to become legal residents through hardships endured already in their home country and this is an unnecessary requirement to require them to divulge this personal information. Immigration forms should not be scrutinized to determine if the person is in agreement with current White House policies; again, this in violation of our own Bill of Rights which guarantees freedoms of speech, freedom to choose a religion to practice, among other written rights.
USCIS-2025-0003-0370	Comment Submitted by Anonymous	Free speech is not hindered by President Trump. If you are a true American citizen or wannabe there should be no problem with this very important new tool to prove that these green card immigrants are showing allegiance to the USA and not here for the freebies. Time for them all to assimilate or go back to there country of birth. Speak English, work honestly, love your neighbor and remember you are here to be an American not a political pawn.
USCIS-2025-0003-0371	Comment Submitted by Anonymous	This is an outrageous policy, directly opposed to at least two of the principles on which our country is founded: freedom of speech, and the banning of unreasonable search and seizure or any search or seizure without a warrant. It absolutely should not become law.
USCIS-2025-0003-0372	Comment Submitted by Anonymous	Requiring people who are legally recognized by the government to provide their social media accounts is tantamount to restricting their rights to free speech.
USCIS-2025-0003-0373	Comment Submitted by Vikki Stefans	This is an egregious violation of personal privacy and clearly allows for targeting dissent or unfavorable opinions of this administration. The chances of outing any real terrorists or criminals with it are vanishingly slim
USCIS-2025-0003-0374	Comment Submitted by Anonymous	This proposal is a violation of free speech.
USCIS-2025-0003-0375	Comment Submitted by Anonymous	I am not sure of the right political descriptor for this idea. However, the word "evil" and "unconstitutional" will have to do for now. The "identity verification" excuse does not hold up to scrutiny either.

USCIS-2025-0003-0376	Comment Submitted by Anonymous	This is a violation of the First Amendment. The First Amendment is so important that SCOTUS has, historically, protected it. The “freedom of speech” was so important to our founding fathers that they made it the “First Amendment”, not the second, third, etc. Whether you’re American citizen or a person seeking citizenship freedom of speech is the most valuable of our amended rights.
USCIS-2025-0003-0377	Comment Submitted by Anonymous	the government does not have the right inhibit or deny the right of free speech. It does not matter what rationale is provided (e.g., safety).
USCIS-2025-0003-0378	Comment Submitted by Anonymous	This is a total violation of free speech. Who will decide what disqualifies a person from having a green card? The process will be arbitrary and subject to the whims of those in power who want to stifle any criticism of themselves or their policies.
USCIS-2025-0003-0379	Comment Submitted by Anonymous	So Obama Never needed to have access to Private Social Media accounts, and Trump First Term didn't need it, and Biden didn't need it, BUT ALL of a SUDDEN Stephen Miller "thinks" this is needed so he can keep "PERCEIVED Enemies" out of the Country! Maybe the TRUTH is that this Administration is RACIST! RACIST
USCIS-2025-0003-0380	Comment Submitted by Anonymous	I disagree with this proposal. It violates the right to privacy and could lead to abuse by refusing to issue green cards to people critical of the administration.
USCIS-2025-0003-0381	Comment Submitted by Edward Johnson	I am the natural born citizen that sponsors my spouse as a Green Card holder. My wife and I share similar ideas and leanings. We are also on each other's social media accounts. I have a wide variety of interests, and influencers that I follow, and sometimes I will comment on things that might not fall in line with "what is thought to be in the interest of National Security and Public Safety." I served my country, and I can honestly say that there are things that are happening in this country that make me glad that I am not serving anymore. With that being said, there is insufficient information on how having access to someone's social media will make the country safe There is insufficient information on how those accounts will be vetted. Social media should not be a determination of someone's worthiness or trustfulness. There are plenty of people that have a "professional" account and a "personal account" for social media. Additionally, the standard that these accounts will be measured against, is unknown. Applying to USA Jobs, there are standards in the application process that tell you what you will be measured against. What criteria need to be in your application? For something that actually impacts families, shouldn't the need for that information be all the more necessary? In summary, I am against collection Social Media Handles for current and future green card applications. Such an act is the epitome of restricting the basic tenants of the Bill of Rights. There can be no Liberty or Pursuit of Happiness, if someone can't be free to express their mind.
USCIS-2025-0003-0382	Comment Submitted by Anonymous	This is a gross violation of the first amendment and cannot be passed
USCIS-2025-0003-0383	Comment Submitted by Anonymous	This is a violation of free speech and should be considered illegal and against the constitution.
USCIS-2025-0003-0384	Comment Submitted by Debra Adamczyk	I completely oppose this proposal. We live in the United States of America and we have a Constitution that guarantees free speech. There are legal ways to get this information if someone is suspected of a crime or as part of a credible investigation. This proposal is just another measure designed to make individuals afraid to speak. This is a very slippery slope and I hope people stop and remember what country they are defending. We are not the United States of America without the First
USCIS-2025-0003-0385	Comment Submitted by Anonymous	This proposal to screen the social media activity of green card applicants is a blatant violation of free speech. It directly targets individuals for their personal opinions, beliefs, and expressions, punishing them for exercising their right to speak freely. Social media is a space for open dialogue, and this policy will undoubtedly create a chilling effect, forcing people to self-censor out of fear of being denied residency. It’s a discriminatory and authoritarian approach that undermines the very principles of free expression the U.S. claims to protect. This isn’t about security—it’s about controlling and policing thought. It needs to be stopped immediately.
USCIS-2025-0003-0386	Comment Submitted by Anonymous	Free speech is fundamental to who we are as a nation and one of our most cherished rights. This proposal is a violation of that and it’s frightening this is even a consideration.
USCIS-2025-0003-0387	Comment Submitted by Anonymous	I very much regret voting for this president, who if you disagree with him, you are subject to any vengeful action he deems appropriate. This is clearly a violation of the first amendment, yet he doesn't care about violating the constitution or court orders when they disagree with him. He has forgotten he was elected president, not king, by 77 million (not more than 80 million as he claimed).
USCIS-2025-0003-0388	Comment Submitted by Anonymous	This is in violation of privacy and free speech rights.
USCIS-2025-0003-0389	Comment Submitted by Cynthia Kristensen	The collection of social media identifiers is a violation of privacy and free speech. Users have a right to their opinions, and to voice their opinions as long as they are threatening or committing violence. Criticism or opposition to any institution, idea or person is not the same as violence or a threat.
USCIS-2025-0003-0390	Comment Submitted by Angie B	First we throw immigrants out of the US even though we invited them here hundreds of years ago. Don't believe me, look at the Statue of Liberty "Give me your tired, your poor, your huddled masses yearning to breathe free, the wretched refuse of your teeming shore. Send these, the homeless, tempest-tossed to me, I lift my lamp beside the golden door!". Now we are wanting to stomp on their 1st amendment rights... I'm ashamed to be an American, for the first time in my life with the destruction Trump and Musk have caused. Despicable!
USCIS-2025-0003-0391	Comment Submitted by Kathy Tabora	This step would threaten the very freedoms and liberties upon which this great nation was founded. I would actively be against such a process. There are other ways to vet and limit the entry of those that would work against our country and our constitution. Period. Full stop. Focus on addressing the issues that plague our nation and stop these efforts at undermining our constitution.
USCIS-2025-0003-0392	Unrelated Comment Submitted by Joe Meadors	I am a survivor of the June 8, 1967 Israeli attack on the USS Liberty. For decades my USS Liberty shipmates and I have condemned the US government’s de facto policy of allowing the Israeli Defense Force to attack a US Navy ship, committing War Crimes in the process, with impunity and without remorse. Will the policy under consideration lead to outlawing our effort to ensure the US government investigates the attack on our ship? Joe Meadors USS Liberty Survivor Historian, USS Liberty Veterans Association Email: joe@ussliberty.com

USCIS-2025-0003-0393	Comment Submitted by Anonymous	As a recent recipient of a U.S.A. passport after years of being a Green Card holder I was extremely proud to become American. I think a large prop[ortion of those on Green Cards also share my feeling. To be treated suspiciously in this way without due process or grounds, and having our free speech removed, is reprehensible. Free speech is one of the main reasons why I was proud to become an American, To quote Mark Twain "Patriotism is supporting your country all of the time, and your government when it deserves it". I am very opposed to this measure.
USCIS-2025-0003-0394	Comment Submitted by Anonymous	Green card holders are supposed to have all the rights of citizens minus the right to vote or hold office. This is dystopian
USCIS-2025-0003-0395	Comment Submitted by Anonymous	this proposed regulation is clearly unconstitutional. it is a violation of our right to free speech and privacy. if this is passed, what's next? Will it then apply to American citizens? There is a huge difference in posting on social media criticism of politicians or government policies and someone actually being a terrorist or criminal. In fact, its the terrorists and criminals who will smart enough to go around these type of regulations.
USCIS-2025-0003-0396	Comment Submitted by Anonymous	The government has no business getting anyone's social media identifiers. This is a fundamental invasion of privacy that is wholly unnecessary, not to mention goes against our country's core value of freedom of speech. There is no reason for this overreaching move other than to further move against our democratic principles and inch closer to an autocratic society. I fervently oppose this proposed action for green card applicants.
USCIS-2025-0003-0397	Comment Submitted by Anonymous	Do not do this. This would be a violation of first amendment rights.
USCIS-2025-0003-0398	Comment Submitted by Anonymous	I am writing against this proposed change. Anyone who pays Trump's bribery fee for 'gold card' status goes unchecked. I also see no efforts to closely monitor domestic terrorists' social media accounts for similar concerns. And that's hypocrisy. This proposed change is preposterous and NOT EFFICIENT....since Trump and Musk are so "worried" about govt. inefficiency.
USCIS-2025-0003-0399	Comment Submitted by Marty Johnson	On first impression, xollecting social media identifiers is acceptable; however, the intended types of reviews are too open to interpretation. "Statements of support or opposition to policies/ideologies contrary to U.S. principles" is too broad and open to interpretation especially in our current political climate. I can not support this collection without more specificity around the acceptable use of data collected from social media sites.
USCIS-2025-0003-0400	Comment Submitted by Anonymous	This is a speech chiller for anyone who speaks in support of things the administration does not support. We won't become any safer by doing this. And I'm checking anonymous because if this does go through, then I can't trust that my government won't broaden their efforts to citizens next somehow. I hate this.
USCIS-2025-0003-0401	Comment Submitted by Maureen Brown	No, the US government should not demand that people hand over their social media accounts as part of the vetting process. We have already seen how the United States Immigration Authority has abused the right to privacy and the right to free speech of people who are already in the country legally. Granting this would enable further expansion of powers to the government that would amount to a witch hunt. This week we have already seen a French researcher refused entry into the United States because he had unfavorable views of Trump's shutting down NIH, NOAA, and other scientific institutions. No violence was expressed in his opinions, but still it was used as a pretext to refuse him entry. Dissent and free speech are both highly prized American values. We should not allow seizure of social media accounts without just cause just as we do not allow the search of homes in the United States without just cause. Not agreeing with an administrative policy is not a reason to bar a person from entry. We need to draw the line here and now before the overreach continues into the ability of citizens to express their opinions freely and non-violently and the media's ability to hold the government into account.
USCIS-2025-0003-0402	Comment Submitted by Anonymous	The worry is that social media will be misused to unfairly discriminate against decent people applying for visas. Hearing the way regular international tourists have been treated recently, many people feel scared to simply visit the U.S. now, which is sad as well as economically harmful. It's not pragmatic or healthy for the U.S. to start isolating itself from visitors and immigrants who can positively contribute to society. Do these people still have free speech? Can we tolerate safe people who might have differing opinions on current affairs? We did in the past. Hope we can continue the long tradition.
USCIS-2025-0003-0403	Comment Submitted by Sophie Peterson	The coward who proposed this needs to stop trembling at the notion that anyone ever disagrees with him. This is a direct assault on the constitution which protects all people in our country whether they are citizens yet or not
USCIS-2025-0003-0404	Comment Submitted by Anonymous	Collecting information related to someone's social media presence in relation to immigration would constitute a Fourth Amendment violation unless there is suspicion from other screenings that there is some violation of U.S. Law. The resulting administrative burden would also bog down an already slow process of obtaining citizenship. Thank you for the opportunity to comment.
USCIS-2025-0003-0405	Comment Submitted by Philip Hart	This legislation is both pointless and abusive, part of the general campaign of your administration against immigrants and citizens alike who dare speak out against the actions of this administration. Given that ICE and DHS are already wrongfully imprisoning and turning away people from the United States for criticizing the government or for doing scientific research which the administration opposes for purely ideological reasons, such as climate scientists and geneticists, this policy will only be used to further repress and persecute legal residents in violation of the First Amendment rights that protect *all* people in the US, not merely citizens. This policy will make our country less free by punishing people who exercise their fundamental right to freedom of speech, and it will make our country less safe, as DHS agents will waste their time chasing after thought criminals who said bad things about Trump or have pronouns in their bio instead of tracking down terrorists, who rarely admit to being terrorists in their social media handle. It is a shameful policy that if you have any love of the law, country, or humanity you will not put into effect.
USCIS-2025-0003-0406	Comment Submitted by Anonymous	This is a blatant disregard for the first amendment and freedom of speech. What's to stop you from gathering this information from "real" citizens? This is a travesty and if enacted, this country will lose a lot of the blue collar workers. We'll leave for other countries that will accept us for who we are.

USCIS-2025-0003-0407	Comment Submitted by Anonymous	This proposal raises serious constitutional and civil rights concerns. It violates the First Amendment by infringing on free speech and will lead applicants to feel pressured to self-censor out of fear of government scrutiny. It also raises Fourth Amendment issues, as broad social media surveillance without a warrant constitutes an unreasonable search. Furthermore, it undermines due process and equal protection under the Fifth and Fourteenth Amendments, subjecting certain individuals to intrusive scrutiny based on their immigration status. Such a policy creates a dangerous precedent for government overreach, eroding fundamental rights and principles of fairness in the naturalization process.
USCIS-2025-0003-0408	Comment Submitted by Anonymous	For years I've noticed things that we grew up with such as prayer in our classroom every morning before school starts and our pledge of allegiance to god and our country amongst other things has slowly gone away and the reason for this is immigrants coming here either legally or illegally and trying to change our traditions and culture and our way of life. We give them our freedoms and they use it against us to change our way of life and that's not right! United States citizens don't go to their countries and try to change their way of life and their beliefs "why"? Well for one because we respect their beliefs and values, if that's how they want to live then that's their choice, let them live how they want to live don't come here and change how we live and second Because we would end up floating in a river somewhere if we tried . Just look at how china is and the rest of the world. America has always stood for something, immigrants used to come here for freedom and to be apart of a great country, now they just come here to change us. To be honest at first I was against what president trump was doing because I didn't understand why he was doing it but now I see. President Trump reminds me a lot of my own dad. We as Americans need to make some big changes in our government or tear it down and start over either way I think that's what President Trump is trying to do and I support him .
USCIS-2025-0003-0409	Comment Submitted by Anonymous	No. Just no.
USCIS-2025-0003-0410	Comment Submitted by James Ferrero	The first amendment to the Constitutions applies to everyone in the country. The proposal does not define how such collected information would be used. But any action that restricts the freedom of a person in the country would violate the first amendment.
USCIS-2025-0003-0411	Comment Submitted by Anonymous	1. Social media accounts can be fake, so there's no telling whether a social media handle given is a real representation of the individual or not 2. Most people have multiple accounts, so who's to say they handed over all accounts or at least the relevant ones 3. Many people abandon accounts and forget they ever existed which could lead to people getting denied for withholding information that was purely unintentional 4. They already ask for this information so how is this different from the current policy 5. Given the aforementioned points how can there be an expectation to reliably gather useful information about applicants when all this info is not official, it's social media and can be entirely fake 6. This seems like just another waste of government employees time. Some Facebook account spam over a decade of posts, I don't condone paying a government employee to sit there and read Facebook posts all day (although I imagine this is exactly what many of them currently do) 7. What guarantees are that the government would expunge this information after an applicant acquires citizenship or do they intend to continue spying on them after they are American citizens? I feel like I could keep commenting on how dumb of an idea this is but I'll end with this points. Hopefully DOGE kills this on on the
USCIS-2025-0003-0412	Comment Submitted by Jyothi Marbin	I am writing to express my strong opposition to the proposed rule requiring the collection of social media identifiers on immigration forms. As a pediatrician and public health advocate, I am deeply concerned about the potential harm this policy could inflict on immigrant families, particularly children and adolescents. 1. Privacy and Psychological Harm to Children and Adolescents The proposed collection of social media information could have a disproportionate impact on young people. Adolescents use social media as a primary means of self-expression, exploration, and identity formation. Knowing that their online activity could be scrutinized by immigration officials may lead to heightened anxiety, self-censorship, and social isolation. Many immigrant children already experience significant stress due to family separation, immigration enforcement, and acculturative challenges. Adding government surveillance of their online activity exacerbates these stressors and could contribute to mental health issues such as depression and anxiety. 2. Chilling Effect on Free Speech and Advocacy Children of immigrant families often engage in social and political activism through digital platforms. Fear of government scrutiny may deter them from participating in discussions about immigration, human rights, and other important social issues. This undermines fundamental First Amendment rights and prevents young people from engaging in civic life. 3. Disproportionate Impact on Marginalized Communities Research indicates that communities of color and non-English speakers are often unfairly targeted for surveillance and enforcement actions. This policy could amplify existing inequities by increasing the likelihood of biased interpretation of social media posts, particularly those in languages other than English. For example, cultural expressions, jokes, or political discussions could be misconstrued, leading to unjust denials of immigration benefits. 4. Ineffectiveness in Ensuring National Security There is little evidence that social media screening effectively enhances national security. Immigration authorities already have access to various vetting tools, and expanding surveillance to include social media identifiers would likely lead to an overwhelming amount of data with minimal actionable intelligence. This could divert resources from more effective security measures. 5. Burden on Immigrant Families and Healthcare Access Fear of government surveillance may also deter immigrant families from seeking healthcare services. As a pediatrician, I see firsthand how fears related to immigration status impact healthcare decisions. Families who worry about government tracking may avoid seeking medical care, vaccinations, or mental health support for their children, leading to worse health outcomes and increased public health risks. For these reasons, I strongly urge USCIS to withdraw this proposed rule. Rather than imposing additional surveillance measures that infringe on privacy and civil liberties, I encourage policies that support the health, well-being, and
USCIS-2025-0003-0413	Comment Submitted by Tim Dombrosky	This policy is antithetical to the Frist Amendment protections on free speech. There cannot be caveats and exceptions to free speech.
USCIS-2025-0003-0414	Comment Submitted by Vilius dundzila	Thiss policy undermines the fundamental values that make the USA a beacon of freedom, including first amendment free speech, privacy, and human rights.

USCIS-2025-0003-0415	Comment Submitted by Joseph Mabel	Quite simply, this is appalling. It will prove absolutely chilling of the free speech rights of people in this country who wish to seek citizenship, leaving them in fear of speaking their minds lest the offend the government of the moment. It will allow any sitting government to limit new citizens to those it thinks will be in partisan agreement with it.
USCIS-2025-0003-0416	Comment Submitted by Anonymous	This is another attempt by the current regime to erode the rights of US inhabitants. It does nothing but foster the growing sense of authoritarianism and oppression of individual freedom, and is blatantly against true American values. Continuing down this path is a danger to the very fabric of free will in this country, and supporting it will cement your place on the wrong side of history. Someone needs to grow a spine and stand up for the rights of the People instead of bending over for corporate interests and billionaire tyrants.
USCIS-2025-0003-0417	Comment Submitted by Anonymous	No.... Plain and simple no.... Me a US born and raised citizen?
USCIS-2025-0003-0418	Comment Submitted by P Green	As a 17yr vet I am in total disagreement with this proposal, we don't have kings here in America who wants everyone to bow to his or her demands whatever happened to free-speech. The founding fathers would find this absolutely crazy that an American would request such a thing so I totally disagree with this request.
USCIS-2025-0003-0419	Comment Submitted by Anonymous	I'm extremely concerned about the right to free speech in this country - which is a right that applies to EVERYONE on US soil, not just citizens. The current administration is trying to chip away at the 1st amendment, and this proposed change is a huge step in that effort. This surveillance sets a dangerous precedent, that anyone who has said something online that the administration disagrees with could face consequences to their immigration status. This is far-reaching federal oversight, and this is fascism, make no mistake!
USCIS-2025-0003-0420	Comment Submitted by Anonymous	Essentially this policy tries to retroactively change the laws by which these individuals applied under, adding additional requirements to obtain their personal social media handles which is inherently unfair and should not apply. Who is to say if those individuals would have made the same choices to invest their lives and livelihoods in our country had they known the level of scrutiny or lack of privacy they would be subjected to by doing so. Then you must also take into account that one of the most American things you can do is add your voice to a cause either by championing it or by dissenting. This retroactive requirement would have a chilling effect on free speech, fundamentally protected under the first amendment which should be extended to all within our borders. It's disgraceful the blatant disregard of the constitution this administration has. Do not implement this policy. Additionally you must also consider, how does someone submit something they do not have? Not everyone uses social media. What resources would be needed to review the social media accounts that are being provided? What standards for review would be used? By whose judgement? Most social media platforms allow content to be held privately, would that content be treated differently than public content? Are you then setting the agency up for a class action suit for discrimination? Will the individual be denied access for a post they made going back how far? 1 year, 3 years, 5, 10? Do you hold someone responsible for a missive thought they wrote as a teenager when they are now an adult? This is clearly poorly thought through.
USCIS-2025-0003-0421	Comment Submitted by Anonymous	What's next? Ask for all the social media profiles of citizens in the greencard holder's "inner circle" like relatives by marriage? Threaten to deport them if their entire sphere of influence aren't supporters of the current administration too? How do you propose to identify correctly which social media accounts belong to them when even sites like FACEBOOK allow accounts that impersonate individuals and make it IMPOSSIBLE for people to get those false accounts removed? How will you ensure that the posts to those accounts are not made by others when the accounts are hacked?
USCIS-2025-0003-0422	Comment Submitted by Anonymous	This is not merely an erosion but an active attack on the principal of free speech. The great virtue of immigration is the vigor it brings to our marketplace of ideas. To create a system in which the government is empowered to exclude anyone it deems to have 'unwelcome' ideas is to betray the spirit of our Constitution and all those who worked, fought and died to defend it. No.
USCIS-2025-0003-0423	Comment Submitted by Anonymous	This is a violation of the constitution of the United States freedom of speech. I pray we can protect the constitution from the destructive behavior of our president and his friends.

USCIS-2025-0003-0424	Comment Submitted by Anonymous	This proposal reeks of authoritarianism - authoritarianism, in politics and government, the blind submission to authority and the repression of individual freedom of thought and action. That is not what we want, nor do we want that for people seeking to start new lives in this country. I think it violates the 1st and 4th amendments so in my mind it is high unconstitutional. Having a negative opinion of this President and his administration is covered by free speech and demanding access to their social media accounts impedes their access to free speech and results in a search of their "papers" which is NONE of the government's business. I'm already reading of people being removed simply because they had such opinions. This is NOT the country we want to live in. 1st Amendment: Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof; or abridging the freedom of speech, or of the press; or the right of the people peaceably to assemble, and to petition the government for a redress of grievances. 4th Amendment "The right of the people to be secure in their persons, houses, papers, and effects, against unreasonable searches and seizures, shall not be violated, and no warrants shall issue, but upon probable cause, supported by oath or affirmation, and particularly describing the place to be searched, and the persons or things to be searched, and the persons or things to be seized." I attached a copy of the constitution for your reference. Review attachment: https://downloads.regulations.gov/USCIS-2025-0003-0424
USCIS-2025-0003-0425	Comment Submitted by Anonymous	This will add additional time for screening in an already overburdened system. Wait times are out of control. This will also inhibit free speech and pressure people to stay silent.
USCIS-2025-0003-0426	Comment Submitted by Owen Shen	The proposed requirement for immigration applicants to disclose their social media profiles represents an unnecessary invasion of privacy that would have a chilling effect on free expression. This policy would disproportionately impact immigrants, forcing them to choose between their privacy and their immigration status. Many applicants would likely self-censor online, fearing that innocent expressions could be misinterpreted or used against them. Such excessive surveillance serves little legitimate security purpose while undermining fundamental rights to privacy and free speech that are cornerstones of American democracy. I strongly urge USCIS to abandon this invasive proposal and focus instead on methods that respect civil liberties while achieving legitimate security goals.
USCIS-2025-0003-0427	Comment Submitted by Kimberly Spillman	Vehemently opposed.
USCIS-2025-0003-0428	Comment Submitted by Anonymous	This is an egregious and disgusting violation of the First Amendment. The courts have affirmed that free speech applies to all, with additional protections when it is political speech. On its face this is nothing more than a despot with thin skin attempting to intimidate and silence those who *might* disagree with him. Very sad and pathetic.
USCIS-2025-0003-0429	Comment Submitted by Sean Mathewson	As a native-born American citizen, I absolutely reject this proposed rule to chill speech. This administration and President have already conflated “despising this fascist President” with terrorism. This is yet another way to chill freedom of expression and attempt to cement a cult of personality around an authoritarian leader by shutting off avenues of criticism. Absent aggressive, wide-ranging, and fulsome protections that take the adjudication of what is considered “terrorism” away from the despots in this executive branch—this proposed rule is yet another brick laid on the United States path to Dear Leader like levels of chilled speech. As an American, I support the first amendment and the freedom of expression and urge rejection of this proposed rule.
USCIS-2025-0003-0430	Comment Submitted by Anonymous	As a proud American, I fully believe in free speech, including for everyone I disagree with. I would strongly encourage the administration to be cautious with this regulation as it can lead to much greater problems the Founding Fathers warned us about.
USCIS-2025-0003-0431	Comment Submitted by Anonymous Anonymous	This is a blatant attempt to spark fear in anyone (non-citizens and citizens alike) wanting to express themselves freely. Anything that can be viewed as against policy and views of the administration could be deemed reasons for deportation. This is a direct assault on free speech and in direct conflict with the 1st amendment.
USCIS-2025-0003-0432	Comment Submitted by Jessamine Price	This policy would violate American traditions by excluding international workers and students from the basic right to communicate their thoughts with friends and family. It would also not make us any safer. The executive branch could use this information to target law-abiding American workers and students, simply because they support foreign aid or science research (things that are unpopular with the current administration). But while they are wasting man-hours and money on persecuting people for free speech, US officials lose time and money they could use defending us from actual threats. The green card application process is already very long and difficult--and expensive for USCIS to administer. USCIS collects a lot of information in this process and can make a determination if someone is a criminal, without collecting information on private conversations. I'm opposed to this policy because it violates the Constitution AND it's a waste of my taxpayer dollars to even spend time writing and proposing this. Very inefficient. The government should be fighting crime and terrorism, not mean tweets.
USCIS-2025-0003-0433	Comment Submitted by Anonymous	This is unacceptable and unconscionable. No one voted for their civil liberties to be violated.
USCIS-2025-0003-0434	Comment Submitted by E Rojas	Can you stop taking away our freedom of speech? This policy undermines the fundamental values that make America a beacon of freedom, including free speech, privacy, and human rights. IMPEACH TRUMP

USCIS-2025-0003-0435	Comment Submitted by Mike Fick	So we're not allowing people to criticize our government now? The US is supposed to be a pillar of free speech- the government punishing people for having opinions that it doesnt like is an affront to our identity as a nation.
USCIS-2025-0003-0436	Comment Submitted by William Thompson	I oppose this order. Permanent resident contribute to this country. They should be treated with respect not suspicion. Forcing people to hand over private information like this is a violation of the free speech principals that this country was founded on.
USCIS-2025-0003-0437	Comment Submitted by W Geoffrey Black	Collecting social media identifiers is not necessary for the proper performance of the legitimate functions of USCIS, and has little or no practical utility for evaluating anyone's eligibility under the law for citizenship or immigration benefits. It would, however, create a treasure trove of sensitive personally identifiable information that could potentially be accessed and abused by bad actors from within or outside the agency. I am concerned that this information could be used to conduct illegal mass surveillance, to harrass and intimidate lawful permanent residents for their political views, and to silence dissent. For these reasons, I strongly oppose this information collection.
USCIS-2025-0003-0438	Comment Submitted by Anonymous	This is a disingenuous move by the agency and the government. They claim they are making this change for security reasons. My spouse is a green card applicant. I can tell you from experience that their identity is verified six ways from Sunday. They do not need this information. It is only being done to curtail free speech. This administration has gone after vocal dissenters. They have used perfectly legitimate, peaceful statements that oppose the administration's policies as grounds for removal. That is what they want this information for: to comb through the lawful communications of people already lawfully admitted to look for statements they don't agree with to use as grounds for removal. It is un-American. I wholly do not support this. The agency should not implement such a rule. It will also needlessly, and fruitlessly, cost the federal government scores of millions of dollars in fighting law suits that will no doubt come out of this if passed. Combing through the social media postings of lawfully admitted persons is also something that takes scores of manpower and resources to do. For what return? Jingoism has no place here. Nor
USCIS-2025-0003-0439	Comment Submitted by Anonymous	This seems like an example of unconstitutional overreach which will not withstand judicial scrutiny.
USCIS-2025-0003-0440	Comment Submitted by Anon ymous	Not only is this proposal a blatant violation of constitutionally-protected first amendment rights but it would also be burdensome, time-consuming, and expensive to administer. The authoritarian creep in this proposal is obvious and frightening.
USCIS-2025-0003-0441	Comment Submitted by Anonymous	This shouldn't have to be explained in America in 2025, but this proposal is a violation of free speech, designed to protect the fragile egos of our current thin skinned "leaders" as they pull our country towards authoritarianism. I, a US citizen, am 100% against this.
USCIS-2025-0003-0442	Comment Submitted by Anonymous	I am writing to express strong concerns about the proposal of collecting social media handles as part of the green card application process. While national security and vetting processes are important, the collection of social media identifiers raises significant constitutional, ethical, and practical issues that undermine privacy, freedom of expression, and due process. Below are several compelling reasons to discontinue this practice: 1. Chilling Effect on Free Speech (First Amendment) The knowledge that the government is actively monitoring social media can cause individuals--especially immigrants and visa holders--to self-censor or refrain from lawful speech for fear it may be misinterpreted or used against them. This chilling effect on freedom of expression violates the spirit and intent of the First Amendment. 2. Violation of Privacy Rights (Fourth Amendment Concerns) Though non-citizens outside the U.S. have limited constitutional protections, green card applicants often live in the U.S. lawfully and contribute to society. Requiring them to disclose social media handles opens the door to broad, suspicionless surveillance that may constitute an unreasonable search under the Fourth Amendment. This practice effectively treats all applicants as suspects, without cause. 3. Vagueness and Risk of Misinterpretation Social media lacks context. Posts, likes, and comments can easily be taken out of context, especially in cross-cultural settings or where sarcasm, irony, or humor is misunderstood. Algorithms or overburdened adjudicators could misinterpret benign content, resulting in unjust delays, denials, or even deportation. 4. Discriminatory and Disproportionate Impact Studies have shown that monitoring social media disproportionately affects people from Muslim-majority countries or other marginalized communities. This raises concerns of discriminatory enforcement and profiling, which can violate equal protection principles. 5. Invasion of Third-Party Privacy By collecting user handles, the government may inadvertently gain access to the communications and identities of other individuals who have not consented to surveillance. This raises serious collateral privacy concerns for American citizens and residents engaging with green card applicants. 6. Lack of Evidence of Effectiveness There is little public evidence that collecting social media handles has materially improved national security or fraud detection. At the same time, the cost in terms of civil liberties and administrative burden is significant. Ineffective and overly broad security measures can reduce trust in the system and divert resources from more effective approaches. 7. Slippery Slope Toward Broader Surveillance Normalizing this kind of data collection for immigrants sets a dangerous precedent that could be extended to citizens, eroding privacy and civil liberties for all. 8. Due Process and Appeal Limitations If an applicant is denied based on social media activity, they may never be told the specific reason, leaving them unable to defend themselves or appeal effectively. This lack of transparency undermines fundamental principles of due process. * * * Conclusion Balancing security with liberty is a complex task. However, mandatory collection of social media handles risks turning green card applicants into perpetual suspects, undermines constitutional principles, and may ultimately do more harm than good. I respectfully urge the agency to veto this in favor of more targeted, evidence-based methods of vetting.
USCIS-2025-0003-0443	Comment Submitted by Anonymous	I think this is would be a gross violation of individual privacy and freedom of speech. Legal immigrants are vetted during the acceptance process and illegal immigrants would not volunteer their social media presence so this is targeting the wrong population to begin with.
USCIS-2025-0003-0444	Comment Submitted by Sylvia Franco	I believe this is a great start for illegals wanting to come into the United States. This freedom of speech is not affecting our US American citizen. This applies only to people who are applying for admission visa green cards. They need to follow and abide by our rules for those of you who don't think they should, but if they about a terrorist attack people that are already on in our our our grounds, this has happened before lighten up people smarten up is protect our country and be safe. Allow our
USCIS-2025-0003-0445	Comment Submitted by Anonymous	This is an appalling infringement on people's free speech. If you say it's to keep people safe, please show the proof of where having this information would have saved people from a terrorist? Please demonstrate why it's necessary to infringe on fundamental rights in this country for a vague reference to safety.

USCIS-2025-0003-0446	Comment Submitted by Rory Hertlein	America is quickly learning what it's like living under a fascist, authoritarian regime. This administration is so blatantly destroying our freedoms. In this case it's trampling on our freedom of speech. This is just another attempt from this administration to identify and deport people they don't agree with, or whom look and act differently than the "president" prefers. This will be a blatant miss use of tax payer money when this administration is trying feverishly to eliminate so called fraud, waste and abuse, which we, the people have not seen any serious evidence for.
USCIS-2025-0003-0447	Comment Submitted by Anonymous	This is a clear violation of free speech. The fact we are even talking about this in the United States is absurd.
USCIS-2025-0003-0448	Comment Submitted by Anonymous	Absolutely not. The peaceful criticism of elected officials in private or in public is an essential component of not just democracy but American democracy and essential for the functioning of a free society. Infringements into free speech is a direct attack on the first amendment of our constitution and should be discouraged and actively opposed. The weaponization of citizens' private communications unrelated to legitimate active investigations only serves to create mistrust and a less
USCIS-2025-0003-0449	Comment Submitted by Anonymous	totally opposed to this proposal. It infringes on free speech, it smells of oppression of people that may hold views that are not in line with the current government, it makes us no better then oppressive regimes like China and Russia
USCIS-2025-0003-0450	Comment Submitted by A US Citizen	This is a huge violation of free speech.
USCIS-2025-0003-0451	Comment Submitted by Anonymous	This is a violation of free speech. All people in America should be subject to all rights outlined in the Constitution regardless of citizenship status. There is no reason to provide social media credentials in the immigration process other than keeping people out whose ideals do not align with those of the administration in power. America should be a mixing pot of ideas allowing further development and growth and excluding people based on their Instagram posts or followings directly
USCIS-2025-0003-0452	Comment Submitted by William Bell	This is government overreach and is not needed. What IS needed is the Republican party returning to its central tenet of less government, not more, and Trump 2.0 resolving that administration's ongoing, and amassing, unforced errors, and unintended consequences of their rampant and not always thought-through Q1 2025
USCIS-2025-0003-0453	Comment Submitted by Anonymous	This is utterly antithetical to what America can, should, and for most of its history has represented, an opportunity to start a new life free from tyranny and fear. Because our would be dictator and the craven and cowardly party he ate cannot tolerate criticism. As Lynn Chaney said to the 99% of her fellow congressional Republicans who gone fully subservient, Trump will eventually die, but your dishonor and shame will live on.
USCIS-2025-0003-0454	Comment Submitted by Anonymous	Please uphold the right to free speech for all US citizens and non-citizens residing in the USA.
USCIS-2025-0003-0455	Comment Submitted by Anonymous	Already considering cancelling plans to see my relatives for the first time abroad because of this. I do not think that my wife and I would both make it back into the country. What a blatant violation of our rights. I guess this is the time to get better at my second language.
USCIS-2025-0003-0456	Comment Submitted by Anonymous	This is a blatant attack on freedom of speech, civil liberties and privacy of US persons.
USCIS-2025-0003-0457	Comment Submitted by Anonymous	As a public interest and human rights attorney, it is clear to me that this is a blatant attempt to quell free speech and punish individuals whose political ideologies diverge from the Federal administration. This pattern of targeting political dissidents is evident in the labeling of judges and lawyers who oppose the legality of the administration's actions as radical activists who should be impeached or lose their clearances. The fact that this policy would be ongoing once a permanent resident becomes naturalized indicates it is more about limiting free speech than protecting the country from terrorists.
USCIS-2025-0003-0458	Comment Submitted by Anonymous	This is absolutely a shameful attack on free speech. This violates the constitution and is nothing more than another bid toward totalitarianism. Very unAmerican.
USCIS-2025-0003-0459	Comment Submitted by Anonymous	This proposal upholds just how clueless, heartless and corrupt the current administration is. If they can require this for those wishing to gain entrance to the US, they can force all citizens to do same and we need to stand firm on NO!
USCIS-2025-0003-0460	Comment Submitted by Meredith Zolty	This seems like a loyalty test for Green Card holders, and a way for the government to limit the speech of people who want to stay in the country but may not agree with the current administration. That's a clear violation of free speech.
USCIS-2025-0003-0461	Comment Submitted by Anonymous	On top of violating the First Amendment rights of permanent residents, this is sheer stupidity and a misuse of time & money.
USCIS-2025-0003-0462	Comment Submitted by Anonymous	This is a very slippery slope. You guys are creating the framework to take away the free speech rights of all US citizens. We know it won't stop with immigrants who are legally here. You must all put an immediate end to this now and resign.
USCIS-2025-0003-0463	Comment Submitted by Anonymous	I oppose this on the basis that it is ripe for misuse and abuse — this is an unreasonable violation of privacy and could easily be used to police free speech. Visa and green card applicants already have to jump through an enormous amount of hoops and are well-vetted.
USCIS-2025-0003-0464	Comment Submitted by Anonymous	This a terrible idea and against the very idea of the 1st amendment. At the least it is a waste of government resources and an intimidation tactic. At the worst it's a slippery slope for all U.S. citizens.
USCIS-2025-0003-0465	Comment Submitted by Anonymous	This is in violation of the constitution.
USCIS-2025-0003-0466	Comment Submitted by Steve Burbrink	Simply - Stay out of people's lives who are here legally.

USCIS-2025-0003-0467	Comment Submitted by Anonymous	I am writing to express my strong opposition to the proposed collection of social media identifiers on immigration forms. This policy threatens fundamental freedoms, particularly free speech, and creates a dangerous precedent for discrimination based on personal beliefs and political opinions. Requiring individuals to disclose their social media handles will have a chilling effect on free speech. Many people, particularly immigrants and visa applicants, may feel compelled to self-censor their online expression out of fear that their views—especially if critical of government policies—could negatively impact their immigration status. This undermines the core democratic principle that individuals should be able to engage in open discourse without fear of government retaliation. Furthermore, such a policy is ripe for discrimination. People with unpopular opinions, dissenting views, or minority political beliefs may face unjust scrutiny simply because their ideas do not align with prevailing governmental perspectives. Immigration decisions should be based on lawful criteria, not subjective judgments about personal opinions expressed online. Additionally, the collection and use of social media data raise significant privacy concerns. Without clear limitations on how this data will be used, stored, and protected, there is a high risk of misuse, bias, and arbitrary denials. A person's online activity does not define their character or their eligibility to enter or remain in the United States. For these reasons, I strongly urge the agency to reject the implementation of this policy. It poses a serious threat to free expression, opens the door for discrimination, and undermines the very freedoms that make America a beacon of liberty.
USCIS-2025-0003-0468	Comment Submitted by JJ	This violates the first amendment and is a deplorable attempt to justify deporting immigrants who have done everything right in their path to citizenship.
USCIS-2025-0003-0469	Comment Submitted by Jacy Grannis	I'd like to be able to say this is unfathomable, but the current administration has consistently demonstrated hostility towards speech which displeases it, and which is otherwise legal, and so this isn't especially surprising. However, precisely because of that hostility towards protected speech, this policy proposal is wrong and un-American. Actual believers in free speech would not act this way or pursue this policy.
USCIS-2025-0003-0470	Comment Submitted by Debra George	Right now, the process to get a green card takes from months to years, and with the cuts in personnel, that period of time will probably be extended. If the USCIS adds trolling through online content of the applicants, it will not make the process more efficient or even safer, just longer. How long will it be until every department of the US government starts requiring the same information from its citizens? Do our 1st amendment rights mean nothing?
USCIS-2025-0003-0471	Comment Submitted by Anonymous	This is antithetical to the first amendment right to free speech and should not be passed.
USCIS-2025-0003-0472	Comment Submitted by Anonymous	I am strongly opposed to this practice as it violates freedom of speech and is against of what are our founding Fathers envisioned when they wrote the First Amendment. This is a blatant violation of human rights as we have them in the United States. Whether as citizens or legal immigrants or those aspiring to become citizens by legal means
USCIS-2025-0003-0473	Comment Submitted by Anonymous	This proposal represents a blatant disregard for American values and would be a further step down the slippery slope to chilling protected speech for citizens.
USCIS-2025-0003-0474	Comment Submitted by Andrew Syriala	It's imperative that we are a country that empowers people to speak out. If klan members and Nazis can say I share their opinion, then people with dissenting political opinions should be able to add well. This discourages that.
USCIS-2025-0003-0475	Comment Submitted by Anonymous	This disregards American's rights to free speech and is illegal.
USCIS-2025-0003-0476	Comment Submitted by Brian McCormack	As an American citizen who has lived aboard for many years, I am appalled at the idea that an applicant would need to give up their free speech rights. I lived in a country that was moving towards democracy and then elected a leader who became a dictator. This is exactly how it starts.
USCIS-2025-0003-0477	Comment Submitted by John Jacob	Fascism comes to America wrapped wrapped in the American flag. Trump is a Fascist. Historians including Robert Paxton have recognized this. Asking for social media accounts of greencard holders is not the end of this, it is meant to silence people and intimidate people into submission. It's a slippery slope and they'll continue their persecution of anyone that stands up and opposes them. Authoritarian governments want people to self-censor so that individuals will do the hard labor of suppression themselves thus saving the regime from having to persecute people directly. It will devolve and it's a matter of time until they start disappearing journalists and opposition leaders like Pinochet in Chile or Maduro in Venezuela.
USCIS-2025-0003-0478	Comment Submitted by Anonymous	How is this not a violation of privacy and free speech? We need to use, of all unreliable things, social media accounts to help “confirm identity?” And will you be “vetting” for political commentary? Will someone who disagrees with Trump’s policies be disallowed? Lots of gray area here around the protection of free speech. This needs to be clarified or thrown out altogether.
USCIS-2025-0003-0479	Comment Submitted by Anonymous	With the currently climate in Washington already viciously targeting immigrants and political opposition. I think it would be highly dangerous to allow something like this to pass. We are already seeing ICE work arounds to get access to IRS data which is normally protected. We are seeing war powers acts being utilized without intelligence agency confirmation of an actual war-like threat to the US, only to deport immigrants without due process. This administration has already shown that they will rush headfirst into anything to throw out immigrants regardless of whether they are here legally through a Biden era mechanism, or not. I can never support such a policy that would threaten our nations main standing point, that being to welcome all through immigration.
USCIS-2025-0003-0480	Comment Submitted by Anonymous	This is clearly an attempt to suppress free speech. It even extends into Orwellianism. This isn't the America I knew and loved. This isn't what I was taught as a kid in school. If you can get a warrant, you have no business collecting this data.
USCIS-2025-0003-0481	Comment Submitted by S Whitmarsh	Looking at applicants social media as a litmus test for immigration status would violate their right to free speech and expression.
USCIS-2025-0003-0482	Comment Submitted by james mcnelly	Whether one supports or opposes this measure, there is zero ambiguity about the goal: ideological monitoring and punishing those who don't align with the Trump administration in their personal private communications. You cannot tell Americans that this aligns with our freedoms or way of life. It categorically does not.

USCIS-2025-0003-0483	Comment Submitted by D Adams	This is a blatant violation of the First Amendment and has nothing to do with national security. If it did, then this administration would not be buddying up with Vladimir Putin - who has already interfered with our democratic processes. This proposal is nothing but another attempt to silence individuals who do not kiss King Trump's ring and intimidate honest, hardworking people who just want to live their lives in peace.
USCIS-2025-0003-0484	Comment Submitted by Anonymous	I am writing to express my opposition to the proposed collection of social media identifiers by U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services (USCIS). This measure raises significant concerns about privacy, practicality, and the burden on applicants. Privacy and Utility: Collecting social media information intrudes on personal lives and lacks clear evidence of enhancing national security or identity verification. Increased Burden: This requirement imposes unnecessary time and effort on applicants and diverts resources from USCIS's core mission. Risk of Misuse: There is a risk of misinterpretation or data breaches, potentially leading to unfair treatment.
USCIS-2025-0003-0485	Comment Submitted by Anonymous	Do not implement this proposal. The proposal to collect social media handles of green card applicants is ludicrous and ineffective in achieving stated goals. It is a gross invasion of privacy. This move would also decrease cybersecurity. There would exist an incentive applicant to fabricate information; it would be too easy to accidentally link to some other social media account of another person. Collecting social media handles also invites data theft and identity theft by malicious parties, which makes verifying information even more difficult. Do not implement this proposal.
USCIS-2025-0003-0486	Comment Submitted by Peter Gabancho	This is one of the most Un-American rules changes that I can imagine. The First Amendment of the constitution reads: Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof; or abridging the freedom of speech, or of the press; or the right of the people peaceably to assemble, and to petition the Government for a redress of grievances. Does it seem constitutional and just to demand people who are in the United States legally turn over their social media accounts? It is not. It is cowardly and men spirited. Does it seem just and constitutional to have he peaceful exercise of such a basic human right to lead to some ones deportation? It is not, it is a basic violation of peoples human rights. Do not allow this criminal policy change to move forward. If it should not be done to an American citizen then it should not be done to a legal resident.
USCIS-2025-0003-0487	Comment Submitted by Anonymous	Dear USCIS, I strongly object to the proposed collection of social media identifiers from immigration applicants. This policy raises serious concerns: Invasion of Privacy: Gathering social media data is an unwarranted intrusion into personal lives. Questionable Effectiveness: There's no clear evidence this measure will meaningfully improve security or vetting processes. Undue Burden: This requirement adds unnecessary stress and work for applicants and USCIS staff alike. Potential for Abuse: The collected information could be misinterpreted or misused, leading to unfair outcomes. Instead of this invasive approach, I urge USCIS to pursue more targeted and privacy-respecting methods to achieve its objectives.
USCIS-2025-0003-0488	Comment Submitted by Brian Gerrard	This violates free speech - one of the most important American values.
USCIS-2025-0003-0489	Comment Submitted by S J	This is a complete upheaval of the constitution, its amendments and everything that my family fought for in WWII. A terrible idea and waste of government money. How could a government propose something so against its own ideals???? I DO NOT support this as a life long voter.
USCIS-2025-0003-0490	Comment Submitted by Anonymous	This will obviously be used to deny people who have negative things to say about the current administration. Obviously. The White House may try to talk around it, but that's obviously what this is about. And that, obviously, flies directly in the face of the first amendment. President Trump, and the rest of your administration: stop being cowards and just say it out loud. Just say that you don't want the first amendment in effect anymore. Just say that you want to punish anyone who has anything negative to say about you. We all know it's the truth. So just say it.
USCIS-2025-0003-0491	Comment Submitted by Anon Anon	This is a clear violation of free speech and the first amendment, and an unnecessary administrative burden in an already burdensome process. It is clear this proposal is meant to instill fear in non-citizen populations and silence any individual who doesn't vehemently agree with the current administration.
USCIS-2025-0003-0492	Comment Submitted by Emily Chalmers	This proposal is absolutely terrible and should never become official policy. It smacks of KGB and Stasi tactics; it is spying on people's personal lives; and it is completely contradictory to the 1st amendment. This is not the USSR or East Germany. No one should have the right to peruse a person's personal life--and let's face it, many people now conduct their personal life on their phones. Further, many of the people the proposal targets have already become legal residents of the United States, opening the door to the possibility that anyone, US citizen or otherwise, could suddenly be required to submit their phones to the government in order to test their loyalty, That's a chilling thought. Terrible, terrible, terrible. Don't do it.
USCIS-2025-0003-0493	Comment Submitted by Kristen Tena	I am writing to oppose this change in legislation. Such a practice will have overreaching implications to unfairly constitute what is acceptable and not acceptable to say, a direct violation of first ammendment rights. America's strength comes from many voices with different perspective. There sh not be legislation that creates fear with communication.
USCIS-2025-0003-0494	Comment Submitted by Anonymous	When we start taking away free speech and the right to oppose something, we take away our rights as human beings. I oppose green card holders having to give social media accounts as a for if vetting. Not the America I want.
USCIS-2025-0003-0495	Comment Submitted by Anonymoous Anonymous	This would be a clear violation of the the First Amendment and would violate the core value of what it means to be American. Dissent or disagreement with one's government does not and should not preclude someone from living freely in this country. But as we have seen already, those who disagree with the president have been denied entry into this country. This policy is government overreach and a blatant violation of an individual's privacy.
USCIS-2025-0003-0496	Comment Submitted by Anonymous	One of the founding documents of the US is the first 10 amendments to the US Constitution, the Bill of Rights. This included Amendment 1 which states, "Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof; or abridging the freedom of speech, or of the press; or the right of the people peaceably to assemble, and to petition the government for a redress of grievances." As a naturally born US Citizen I find it abhorrent that the US government would run afoul of our founding principals in the disguise of 'security'. Only authoritarian dictatorships like in Russia, China, Turkey, Hungry, etc run by weak insecure men curb free speech. To move the US closer to the anthesis of our founding documents by adopting a unconstitutional rule like this would be leading the US further down a dark road. This rule is wrong and should not be adopted.

USCIS-2025-0003-0497	Comment Submitted by Anonymous	This is clearly a violation of Free Speech, afforded in the First Amendment to all people living in this Country.
USCIS-2025-0003-0498	Comment Submitted by Anonymous Anonymous	A policy meant to quell the discontent most people feel for Trump. This is a violation of free speech, plain and simple. Dress it up as you like; you are infringing on people's rights.
USCIS-2025-0003-0499	Comment Submitted by Anonymous	As a green card holder, with no malice nor interest in causing this great country harm, why are you interested in what I post on my Instagram in the first place? Do you really think that anyone who WAS looking to attack would be posting terrorist memes? This is purely another step towards the implementation of Trump's Reich and imposing his views and beliefs on anyone who doesn't agree with them, or finding ways to out them and no doubt retaliate. It is definitely NOT in the interest of free speech, nor of this country.
USCIS-2025-0003-0500	Comment Submitted by Anonymous	This is an obvious violation of free speech and represents a worrying pattern that has been emerging lately. No more of this.
USCIS-2025-0003-0501	Comment Submitted by Anonymous	This Republic is based on basic human rights and freedoms. We can not have a healthy nation while suppressing the freedom of speech and privacy rights of those living in this country.
USCIS-2025-0003-0502	Comment Submitted by Anonymous	This is a blatant violation of free speech.
USCIS-2025-0003-0503	Comment Submitted by Anonymous	I do not support the proposed collection of social media identifiers from immigration applicants. This policy raises serious concerns about privacy, as it constitutes an unwarranted intrusion into personal lives. Furthermore, there is no clear evidence that this measure will meaningfully improve security or vetting processes, making its necessity questionable. The requirement also imposes an undue burden on both applicants and USCIS staff, adding unnecessary stress and workload. Additionally, there is a risk that the collected information could be misinterpreted or misused, potentially leading to unfair outcomes.
USCIS-2025-0003-0504	Comment Submitted by Bernard Molyneux	This potentially opens the door to a future administration filtering immigrants by political stance, selectively inviting only those who are likely to vote a certain way when naturalized, and therefore skewing future elections.
USCIS-2025-0003-0505	Comment Submitted by Anonymous	This is a violation of the first amendment and free speech.
USCIS-2025-0003-0506	Comment Submitted by Anonymous	Aside from the free speech and privacy issues so many other comments have mentioned, the wording of the EO is too vague. Who decides what kind of content is evidence of a "threat"? Is disagreement with the current administration a threat? This is also idiotic because who is going to leave anything on their social media then? Everyone will just delete it. Or is there a minimum number of accounts or amount of activity, min period of time you have to be able to show? People will figure that out and fake it too. And if you're able to figure out that people are closing accounts and whatnot then you're just straight up spying on people. This is DUMB. The suspect applicants that this intends to "catch" are not bragging about their gang involvement on LinkedIn. (Unless you're just trying to deny/deport people that are critical of the current administration...if that's the case this isn't a democracy anymore!)
USCIS-2025-0003-0507	Comment Submitted by Anonymous	This crosses a line and is disturbing ,
USCIS-2025-0003-0508	Comment Submitted by Jacob Berger	This is a shotty policy and an invasion of privacy
USCIS-2025-0003-0509	Comment Submitted by Anonymous	dumb idea 1. you can have 2 or more accounts and only report the good 1. I don't have an account I like my privacy so i would not be able too give a account
USCIS-2025-0003-0510	Comment Submitted by Anonymous	I respectfully submit the following comments and concerns regarding the proposed collection of social media identifiers on immigration forms: 1. Necessity and Utility of the Collection (PRA Point 1): While national security and identity verification are critical objectives, the proposal lacks evidence demonstrating that collecting social media identifiers has materially contributed to more accurate or effective vetting in prior cases. The burden of proof should be on the agency to show this practice's utility in terms of measurable outcomes, especially given the potential for misuse or misinterpretation of online content. 2. Privacy, Scope Creep, and First Amendment Concerns: Social media content often includes personal views, political expression, religious speech, and interactions with friends and family. Collecting this information raises serious privacy concerns and chilling effects on free expression, especially among vulnerable immigrant populations. Clear, transparent boundaries are needed regarding: • Which platforms and types of identifiers will be collected, • How this data will be used, stored, and protected, • Who will have access to it and for how long. 3. Accuracy of Burden Estimate: The estimated burden of 4.8 minutes per respondent appears significantly underestimated. Identifying and listing past or current social media handles across multiple platforms could take substantially longer, particularly for less tech-savvy individuals or those with multiple profiles and languages. 4. Clarity and Guidance: The public should be provided with detailed instructions and examples of acceptable submissions. Will pseudonymous accounts, inactive handles, or accounts not tied to real names be required? How will USCIS distinguish between legitimate concerns and satire, sarcasm, or misinterpreted language? 5. Safeguards Against Misuse and Bias: The proposal should include explicit safeguards to ensure that social media data is not used discriminatorily or arbitrarily. There should also be oversight to prevent bias in how content is interpreted—especially content posted in foreign languages, cultural contexts, or under differing legal norms.
USCIS-2025-0003-0511	Comment Submitted by William Santer	This is a clear violation of first amendment rights. Doing this is a stepping stone to limiting the free speech of U.S. citizens.
USCIS-2025-0003-0512	Comment Submitted by Anonymous	This in violation of the first amendment which protects free speech for everyone, citizen or not, residing in the USA. This is government overreach and not small government.

USCIS-2025-0003-0513	Comment Submitted by Anonymous	Are you freaking kidding me?! Supposedly, the United States of America is a democracy. If that is the case, you don't invade someone's privacy who is here legally! You should be ashamed of yourselves!
USCIS-2025-0003-0514	Comment Submitted by Anonymous	I am against the department gathering social media handled from immigrants without reasonable cause, especially from green card holders who have already been through an extensive vetting process. While the costs of collecting this information may be minimal, it would require extensive government resources to review each and every immigrant's social media accounts. Furthermore, the information gained would be of questionable validity-it's easy to create social media accounts and create a false image for the public If is equally easy to clone an account t and create a negative impression. Furthermore, it is a violation of the fundamental right of
USCIS-2025-0003-0515	Comment Submitted by Anonymous	Complete and utter violation of the first amendment! Just, No!
USCIS-2025-0003-0516	Comment Submitted by LARA LYNN	This proposal directly contradicts the principles of our democracy, wherein lawful citizens can speak freely and criticize the government--which impacts their daily life in a multitude of ways--without fear of retaliation. Naturalized citizens must be afforded the same freedom. Without free speech, our nation will not stand.
USCIS-2025-0003-0517	Comment Submitted by Anonymous	Free speech is one of many reasons immigrants WANT to come to the United States. This proposal is simply antithetical to the foundation of free speech upon which our country is based. It's offensive to the American ideal, not to mention unconstitutional.
USCIS-2025-0003-0518	Comment Submitted by Anonymous	Dangerous, reckless, poorly thought out. What is this hoping for? Now any Green Card applicants should start running out and creating new, pro-Trump, pro-Conservative profiles. Until the next administration, then they can switch back to left leaning or create new pro-Democrat profiles. This is a massive infringement on free speech. It is anti-American. The founding fathers did not advocate for anything like this.
USCIS-2025-0003-0519	Comment Submitted by Jamie Richardson	To Whom it May Concern, As an American citizen, I have deep concern over the proposal to include social media accounts as part of the N-400 application for naturalization. It is a gross violation of privacy and First Amendment Rights, and will without a doubt be utilized for ill intent, likely to discriminate and deny opportunity. Green card holders deserve a chance to apply for naturalization in this country free of bias and discrimination based on their social media accounts. This is unprecedented surveillance of people that live in this country. We cannot stand for it. I am appalled that this is even being proposed. In my professional life, I have worked at clinics that help legal permanent residents get help with their N-400 application. Not only would this proposed requirement add unnecessary length to an already long application form, but it will undoubtedly cause confusion and harm to applicants and those who help them. The amount of undue bias that would be infused into the citizenship application, which is the LEGAL pathway that we as a nation support, is acutely against the values of this nation. I strongly oppose this proposed change to the N-400 form. Please do no proceed with this.
USCIS-2025-0003-0520	Comment Submitted by Peter Loomis	I believe this would be a gross violation of civil liberties including the first amendment. And possibly the fourth as well.
USCIS-2025-0003-0521	Comment Submitted by Anonymous	This will hurt American businesses, by discouraging the use of American owned media platforms worldwide.
USCIS-2025-0003-0522	Comment Submitted by Mark Travers	This absolutely violates free speech, not to mention how it can leak sensitive information about children.
USCIS-2025-0003-0523	Comment Submitted by Karen Delozier	I thought all of this was settled in the Bill of Rights. Why are we always having to fight for free speech? Are our politicians afraid of something? This is a violation of free speech and appears to be an attempt to collude with a foreign country to silence critics of deplorable crimes against humanity. This is unconstitutional and un-American and unacceptable.
USCIS-2025-0003-0524	Comment Submitted by James Becker	This proposal is a waste of government time and funding as well as a violation of privacy. Office of Management and Budget (OMB) Control Number 1615-NEW U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services Docket ID USCIS-2025-0003.
USCIS-2025-0003-0525	Comment Submitted by Safa egilmez	This is a blatant attack on free speech.... ANYONE in the United States or its territories is afforded the protection of free speech. Another step closer to a Fascist State. This should not be allowed. You already did vet those people who are Green Card holders when they applied for the Greencard. If this goes through, the next step will be forcing all US Citizens to hand over their electronic devices (As if currently, Government do not snoop and sift through Internet and Communication traffic using the secret rooms at the Telecom and Internet companies Data junctions)

USCIS-2025-0003-0526	Comment Submitted by Anonymous	<p>So the US is heading for authoritarian now,” an anonymous commenter said. “Anything that the current administration doesn’t like means bad. Pure ideology means total destruction. This is a violation to the First Amendment.” “Chilling Effect on Free Speech: The fear of government scrutiny of online expression will undoubtedly stifle free speech,” another comment read. “This is particularly concerning for individuals from countries with different political climates, who may fear the misinterpretation of their online activity.” Out of the 143 comments, 29 mentioned a violation of free speech. “This policy undermines the fundamental values that make America a beacon of freedom, including free speech, privacy, and human rights,” another person wrote. So the US is heading for authoritarian now,” an anonymous commenter said. “Anything that the current administration doesn’t like means bad. Pure ideology means total destruction. This is a violation to the First Amendment.” “Chilling Effect on Free Speech: The fear of government scrutiny of online expression will undoubtedly stifle free speech,” another comment read. “This is particularly concerning for individuals from countries with different political climates, who may fear the misinterpretation of their online activity.” Out of the 143 comments, 29 mentioned a violation of free speech. “This policy undermines the fundamental values that make America a beacon of freedom, including free speech, privacy, and human rights,” another person wrote. So the US is heading for authoritarian now,” an anonymous commenter said. “Anything that the current administration doesn’t like means bad. Pure ideology means total destruction. This is a violation to the First Amendment.” “Chilling Effect on Free Speech: The fear of government scrutiny of online expression will undoubtedly stifle free speech,” another comment read. “This is particularly concerning for individuals from countries with different political climates, who may fear the misinterpretation of their online activity.” Out of the 143 comments, 29 mentioned a violation of free speech. “This policy undermines the fundamental values that make America a beacon of freedom, including free speech, privacy, and human rights,” another person wrote. So the US is heading for authoritarian now,” an anonymous commenter said. “Anything that the current administration doesn’t like means bad. Pure ideology means total destruction. This is a violation to the First Amendment.” “Chilling Effect on Free Speech: The fear of government scrutiny of online expression will undoubtedly stifle free speech,” another comment read. “This is particularly concerning for individuals from countries with different political climates, who may fear the misinterpretation of their online activity.” Out of the 143 comments, 29 mentioned a violation of free speech. “This policy undermines the fundamental values that make America a beacon of freedom, including free speech, privacy, and human rights,” another person wrote. In short, whatever this Administration doesn't like is considered terrorism. The fear of government scrutiny of online expression will undoubtedly stifle free speech, and this is also concerning for individuals from countries with different political climates, who may fear the misinterpretation of their online activity. Seems to me that this policy proposal would disproportionately impact critics of Israel and the U.S. government’s handling of the conflict. Additionally, the concern is that activity would be continuously monitored on social media even if they became U.S. citizen. What is to stop this policy to extending to all Americans who voice their opinions and dissident. This is unconstitutional and violates Freedom of Speech. This administration calling for the Alien Enemies act already allows people to be detained without due process. This is very concerning and were the Democrats in office trying this the Republicans would be up in arms. This is not</p>
USCIS-2025-0003-0527	Comment Submitted by Thomas Welton	This, I'm sure will go from green card holders to the rest of us. A good way to stifle dissent. I know it would be difficult but I hope those who can dissent will do so. Definitely a suppression of free speech.
USCIS-2025-0003-0528	Comment Submitted by Sandra Kece	This is a violation of free speech. Green card holders were already vetted and should be immune to these types of intrusions, especially when it is designed to continue US complicity in Israel's genocide which is in direct violation of the ICJ order and US law.
USCIS-2025-0003-0529	Comment Submitted by Peter Simmon	is this really being considered? if you dont think like i want you to you cant be an american? did we not always celebrate different ideas? bad idea. dont do it.
USCIS-2025-0003-0530	Comment Submitted by Peter Simmon	is this really being considered? if you dont think like i want you to you cant be an american? did we not always celebrate different ideas? bad idea. dont do it.
USCIS-2025-0003-0531	Comment Submitted by Anonymous Anonymous	This proposal is antithetical to the First Amendment of the Constitution of the United States. It effectively ends free speech online for any green card holders currently in the U.S.A.
USCIS-2025-0003-0532	Comment Submitted by Anonymous	This violates free speech and inches our government closer to becoming a full authoritarian regime like Russia. Enacting this policy will also further erode trust in the government. In fact, fear of reprisal from Donald J Trump and his administration is why I'm choosing to identify as "anonymous".
USCIS-2025-0003-0533	Comment Submitted by Anonymous	This should not be a blanket policy, only a tool if a judicial process has been initiated against an individual. I think a blanket policy is a waste of tax payer dollars when we need to focus in re-employing people who have been laid-off, reducing food costs, protecting the financial well-being of older adults.
USCIS-2025-0003-0534	Comment Submitted by Anonymous	This is textbook Nazi Germany. First they come for the rights of the illegals, then they come for the rights of those who are legal. Then once those have been stripped, they strip the rights of women. They keep stripping it further and further until it's citizens are in concentration camps being murdered. What would your grandmother say about what you are trying to implement in our Democracy? They would be ashamed that you people who are enacting this are the Nazis. SHAME ON YOU!
USCIS-2025-0003-0535	Comment Submitted by Anonymous	Collecting social media information is not necessary for "enhanced identity verification, vetting and national security screening." First, an individual's social media information is not a good way to verify identity. Most social media accounts allow anonymous or pseudonymous screen names. Second, this proposed regulation threatens overreach, since it is targeting "certain populations of individuals on applications for immigration-related benefits." Which populations is not identified, and immigration-benefits includes a wide range of possible categories, from tourist to humanitarian to immigrant visas. There is a distinct possibility that these populations could be subject to scrutiny over speech, which is protected in the United States, regardless of one's citizenship status. This proposal provides no benefits and instead threatens distinct harms.
USCIS-2025-0003-0536	Comment Submitted by Anonymous	This is a proposal risks violation of freedom of speech and does not have my support.

USCIS-2025-0003-0537	Comment Submitted by Anita Tenley	This proposal is a dangerous infringement on free speech and could lead to abuse and authoritarian action by the federal government. I oppose the collection of social media identifiers. This administration must continue to uphold the right to free speech and eliminate this proposed regulation.
USCIS-2025-0003-0538	Comment Submitted by Anonymous	I'm a White U.S citizen and I'm here to say this proposal has no purpose other than to intimidate people and trample on First Amendment rights. Immigrants hold jobs, pay taxes, and help make our society as best as it can be. They deserve free speech rights and to feel safe from retaliation by authorities in the United States. I'm asking you to drop this proposal.
USCIS-2025-0003-0539	Comment Submitted by Anonymous	I am commenting against this proposed change. There should be no ideological test to determine immigration status of foreign nationals already in the country legally. Paying government employees to scourer social media profiles of law abiding green-card holders that have been in the United States for years without incident or cause for suspicion is not an appropriate way to spend tax payer dollars.
USCIS-2025-0003-0540	Comment Submitted by Anonymous	I'm writing against it. It is a waste of taxpayers money and a violation of free speach. It also creates extra workload which will likely delay the processing time of all applicaitons.
USCIS-2025-0003-0541	Comment Submitted by Anonymous	This is an attack on free speech, a blatant waste of taxpayer money, and clearly NOT what President Trump promised from his immigration platform.
USCIS-2025-0003-0542	Comment Submitted by Anonymous	This appears to be an obscene attempt to control the speech and opinions of anyone disapproving of Donald Trump and Republicans. Do you know what that is called? Fascism. Why not simply defecate on the US Constitution while you're at it? - Since that's precisely what this government and this proposal is attempting to do. And I notice that ALREADY many people that I believe would have proudly signed their name to these comments are AFRAID to express their own free speech publicly to their own government because of the Fascism ALREADY being demonstrated. It appears clear that Americans know that even American citizens will be targeted by their own government for expressing their CONSTITUTIONALLY-GUARANTEED right to free speech.
USCIS-2025-0003-0543	Comment Submitted by Anonymous	Are we now in China? This is a violation of free speech - they have already been granted by proper Authorities protections under U.S. law.
USCIS-2025-0003-0544	Comment Submitted by Anonymous	"This proposal is an unnecessary infringement upon the civil liberties and right to privacy that are the bedrock of American democracy and equal protection under the law. It creates an undue burden both on the targets of the proposal and on the government agencies tasked with the collection and processing of this data, for no useful purpose. In true cases of wrongdoing, criminality, or threat there already exist law enforcement mechanisms for monitoring and the collection of evidence, and this proposal contributes nothing to national security or public safety. This proposal is a step too far. It is government overreach, authoritarian and discriminatory in its intent, and unnecessary for the efficient practice of appropriate governance." Anyone can feel free to use this language as a template, if you think it's useful.
USCIS-2025-0003-0545	Comment Submitted by Frances Hilton	This proposal is a dangerous step into eliminating free speech by anyone who has a social media account. Millions of Americans have accounts, and millions are not immigrants. The danger lies in targeting innocent law abiding people who might have a name that triggers inspection. Do NOT pass this proposal and do not think that it won't be litigated. It is an affront to the Constitution and the 1st Amendment.
USCIS-2025-0003-0546	Comment Submitted by Leo Caddy	This is a blatant and unlawful violation of free speech rights of lawfully landed immigrants. People now will fear merely dissenting on social media from this government's policies lest they be denied citizenship. This is the kind of intimidation you would have on a form in China. This is so unamerican.
USCIS-2025-0003-0547	Comment Submitted by Saad M	This is completely antithetical to the values of the United States. The ultimate goal is to have a chilling effect on free speech, and clearly will be used to target pro-Palestinian voices among others that this administration finds objectionable. It is absolutely unbelievable that such a policy is being proposed.
USCIS-2025-0003-0548	Comment Submitted by Anonymous	I do not agree with this new policy. This will only be used as a weapon against immigrants. Where is the surveillance on domestic terrorist groups? It is nowhere to be found. Again this administration is attempting to address a problem that doesn't exist.
USCIS-2025-0003-0549	Comment Submitted by Matthew Donahue	Nope nope nope nope nope. What you're saying here is that rights of expression, assembly, press, and criticizing the government are earned rather than inalienably given. Mr President, actually read the document on your wall, and please end this foolishness. Cut the dictator crap.
USCIS-2025-0003-0550	Comment Submitted by Theodora Turnau	This sounds like this administration wants to police social media posts of green card holders AFTER trying to illegally deport a green card holder for protesting Israeli war crimes. First ammendment protections apply to green card holders as well as citizens.
USCIS-2025-0003-0551	Comment Submitted by Anonymous	This proposed new law goes against free speech, one of the foundational values of our country. I strongly oppose this proposal.
USCIS-2025-0003-0552	Comment Submitted by Anonymous	The gate to citizenship should not be unlocked with the loss of liberty.
USCIS-2025-0003-0553	Comment Submitted by Anonymous	This proposal is un-American, full stop.
USCIS-2025-0003-0554	Comment Submitted by Sandra Barton	I don't trust this administration's ability to correctly vet green card applicants' social media accounts. My friend is applying for a green card soon. He is from Iraq and helped the US coalition in Baghdad after the invasion for 9 years and is one of the good guys. How will you know this by looking at his Facebook? I'm afraid you will be xenophobic and not give him his green card because of your misreading of his social media which is in Arabic.
USCIS-2025-0003-0555	Comment Submitted by Anonymous	This is ideological screening. This is a violation of freedom of speech and expression. This is tyrannical and corrupt. Shameful in what it is.
USCIS-2025-0003-0556	Comment Submitted by Anonymous	• Due Process and Procedural Fairness: • The Fifth and Fourteenth Amendments guarantee due process, which includes the right to fair procedures. Vague or overly broad data collection practices could violate due process rights. There is no mechanism in this regulation for assessing the data the government has collected by the individual nor a process for disputing any adverse actions the government takes as a result. What opportunities will be granted to individuals in these circumstances?

<p>USCIS-2025-0003-0557</p>	<p>Comment Submitted by Anonymous</p>	<p>Assessment of legality: • The Fourth Amendment protects individuals from unreasonable searches and seizures. The collection of data, especially without warrants or probable cause, raises significant Fourth Amendment concerns. • <i>Carpenter v. United States</i> (2018): This Supreme Court case established that obtaining cell-site location information constitutes a Fourth Amendment search, requiring a warrant. This precedent highlights the Court's recognition of the significant privacy implications of digital data collection. • <i>Katz v. United States</i> (1967): This case established that the Fourth Amendment protects "reasonable expectations of privacy," which is highly relevant in the context of digital data. • This is particularly true when resident aliens are obligated to demonstrate contact (either through family or through employment) with US citizens. How will the rights of privacy and due process of US Citizens be protected? • The First Amendment protects freedom of speech. Government monitoring of social media activity, especially without clear standards, could chill protected speech. • <i>NAACP v. Alabama</i> (1958): While not directly about digital speech, this case established that compelled disclosure of membership lists could chill associational rights, a principle that could be applied to concerns about government surveillance of online activity. • Freedom of Religion, Universal Declaration of Human Rights, and the Geneva Conventions: • The government's application of the "extreme vetting" assessments to date over the past few weeks have been targeted towards Pro-Palestinian demonstrators. Within that context, targeting social media results may led to punishment of Muslims, Christians or Jews for believing that genocide of the Palestinian people is against both the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and the Geneva Conventions. The pro-Palestinian movement has been conflated with the assumption that believing in the right to freedom means that you support terrorism by government agencies. That logic fails on many fronts. • The Universal Declaration of Human Rights (UDHR), Article 18, guarantees the right to freedom of thought, conscience, and religion. This includes the freedom to hold beliefs and express them. These rights are ratified by the United States in the Constitution. Similarly, it highlights the fundamental human rights, including the right to life and freedom from discrimination. • The Geneva Conventions are a set of international treaties that establish standards of international law for humanitarian treatment 1 in war. Genocide is clearly prohibited by international law and is considered a war crime, and a crime against humanity. • On November 5, 1988, the US ratified the UN Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of Genocide. The definition of genocide expressed in this document is the following: In the present Convention, genocide means any of the following acts committed with intent to destroy, in whole or in part, a national, ethnical, racial or religious group, as such: (a) Killing members of the group; (b) Causing serious bodily or mental harm to members of the group; (c) Deliberately inflicting on the group conditions of life calculated to bring about its physical destruction in whole or in part. It is a fair criticism of the US government that providing weapons and intelligence to Israel has the effect of denying access to food and water and leading to a constant bombardment of bombs to destroy houses in Gaza which has brought about the physical destruction. Creating conditions where residents or US citizens cannot make that criticism without fear of retribution is a direct violation of both International Law and the Constitution. • This conflation is a logical fallacy. Believing that genocide is wrong is not equivalent to supporting acts of violence or terrorism. • It is vital to distinguish between: • The right to hold and express beliefs. • The act of inciting or engaging in violence or terrorism. • Punishing someone for their beliefs rather than their actions is a violation of fundamental human rights. • Conflating political or religious beliefs with terrorism can lead to discriminatory practices and the erosion of fundamental freedoms. • It can also fuel prejudice and create a climate of fear and distrust. • This is only one example of many over history where governments have attempted to create a national security threat out of the actions of individuals for the purpose of denying them their rights. Another example is the Holocaust / "If the threat with which Jewry faces our people has given rise to undeniable hostility on</p>
<p>USCIS-2025-0003-0558</p>	<p>Comment Submitted by Mira Miller</p>	<p>This proposal is an unnecessary infringement upon the civil liberties and right to privacy that are the bedrock of American democracy and equal protection under the law. It creates an undue burden both on the targets of the proposal and on the government agencies tasked with the collection and processing of this data, for no useful purpose. In true cases of wrongdoing, criminality, or threat there already exist law enforcement mechanisms for monitoring and the collection of evidence, and this proposal contributes nothing further to national security or public safety. This proposal is a step too far. It is government overreach, authoritarian and discriminatory in its intent, and unnecessary for the efficient practice of appropriate governance.</p>

USCIS-2025-0003-0559	Comment Submitted by Anonymous	<p>This Federal Register notice and the underlying Executive Actions that support it present a serious challenge to the balance between national security and constitutional rights, but further still to the stated efficiency goals of the Trump Administration that are being perpetuated through DOGE. The comments are primarily directed to the first statement: Evaluate whether the proposed collection of information is necessary for the proper performance of the functions of the agency, including whether the information will have practical utility. The broad scope of data collection, combined with a lack of specific safeguards and transparency, raises significant concerns about potential violations of the Fourth Amendment's protection against unreasonable searches and seizures. The absence of clear metrics for assessing social media content, and the lack of clarity around how collected "identifiers" will be used, creates a chilling effect on First Amendment rights, as individuals may self-censor their speech to avoid government scrutiny. The government must provide greater clarity and establish robust safeguards, including specific limitations on data collection, clear standards for its use, and mechanisms for oversight and accountability, to protect fundamental constitutional rights and ensure that any intrusion on privacy is justified by a compelling government interest and is narrowly tailored. Further comments below in detail:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lack of Specificity and Transparency: The "generic clearance" approach lacks specificity about what data will be collected, how it will be used, and what safeguards will be in place. This lack of transparency increases the risk of abuse and mission creep. The use of "identifiers" without a clear definition is particularly concerning. In particular, over the past few months, it appears a very ineffective method has been used for assessing and implementing the Executive Order Ending Radical and Wasteful Government DEI Programs and Preferencing. The technical implementation of this has focused on a keyword-based algorithm that has resulted in the loss of key historical figures on DOD websites and programs such as the Tuskegee Airmen, the Navajo Code Talkers, Jackie Robinson, and more. If a similar type of faulty query were built to review Social Media outputs, the government would lose many high-quality residents in areas such as Education and Health Services, Professional and Business Services, particularly technology, Construction, Farming, and Manufacturing. There is also no definition of what constitutes a social media identifier nor how the government will differentiate between social media where the user can control access to limited groups vs. publicly available information. • Impact on Government Efficiency: The notice fails to adequately describe how this data collection will improve government efficiency, KPIs, or time to resolve issues. It does not outline the hiring needs to support the initiative and how that affects the reduction of force in progress. It does not provide a clear cost-benefit analysis to justify the potential infringements on the constitutional rights of residents and citizens alike. While the rule addresses the amount of estimated time a respondent would need to collect and share the information, it does nothing to address the true cost to the public of the initiative. How much time will USCIS reviewers at all levels of the approval process spend on reviewing the social media accounts of immigrants? What was learned from the implementation of this program in the visa process that will be used to improve it here? What is the cost to taxpayers of each of those hours? How much extension is expected in the processing timelines as a result of this collection? What are the infrastructure and query time costs of reviewing the sites, and evaluating whether there are potential threats as a result? How many legal hours are expected to be needed by administrative judges or DOJ to assess and/or defend the use of social media. Give a full ROI on the cost benefit of this initiative not just a limited view of the impact to the respondent. • Potential for Abuse: A "generic clearance" could allow agencies to collect a wide range of information without specific authorization or oversight, increasing the risk of misuse. What type of prioritized system will be used to ensure that this is not universally applied? How will the information be removed from government databases once the individual becomes a US citizen? What guarantees are there around monitoring limits?
USCIS-2025-0003-0560	Comment Submitted by Anonymous	it is a concern for people like me as i believe in free speech and it is not fair and everyone should at least have the opportunity. no matter what they believe in.
USCIS-2025-0003-0561	Inappropriate Comment Submitted by Anonymous	This freaking shit is similar to the Indian govt linking aadhar to everything from Bank account, passport, voter's id, property documents, etc. All fucking authoritarian regimes want to control the masses and rule out any form of dissent!!!!
USCIS-2025-0003-0562	Comment Submitted by Anonymous	They are trying to strip us slowly but surely of every right we have! If you think this won't hurt you then you are out of your mind. Stop them before they turn into a dictatorship and take all of our rights away
USCIS-2025-0003-0563	Comment Submitted by Anonymous	As a U.S. citizen, I oppose this proposed regulation. Vigilance for truly anti-American beliefs in immigration proceedings is necessary and good, but the wording of this regulation would open these proceedings to prejudice against anyone who has even the slightest criticism of U.S. government policy. It would violate our founding commitment to free speech and political dissent.
USCIS-2025-0003-0564	Comment Submitted by Anonymous	This is a violation of the first amendment and countless privacy laws.
USCIS-2025-0003-0565	Comment Submitted by Anonymous	Nothing about this makes sense! They are people who are here legally & have the right to behave within the law, which includes being free to speak on whatever topics impact them or are important to them. The party of "free speech" appears to fear criticism.
USCIS-2025-0003-0566	Comment Submitted by Elon Musk	There is no reason that a government agency would need access to the social media accounts of legal residents of the United States, unless the government is planning on violating the First Amendment rights of those residents. "For if Men are to be precluded from offering their Sentiments on a matter, which may involve the most serious and alarming consequences, that can invite the consideration of Mankind, reason is of no use to us; the freedom of Speech may be taken away, and, dumb and silent we may be led, like sheep, to the Slaughter." --George Washington
USCIS-2025-0003-0567	Comment Submitted by Anonymous	I am against this policy. Social media should not have an impact on someone's visa process. Many people do not have social media either so scanning profiles of a select group of people is unfair.
USCIS-2025-0003-0568	Comment Submitted by Anonymous	As an American citizen, I find the very notion of this to be an a front to our way of life. Freedom is at the cornerstone of American Democracy, and that right to speech should be extended to all individuals seeking to be a part of our nation. Other avenues can and should be used to when making these determinations. Social media posts should not be considered.
USCIS-2025-0003-0569	Comment Submitted by Anonymous	In the land of freedom, where the revered first ammendment enshrines freedom of speech, this is unthinkable. It woukd stifle free speech and enable retribution and punishment for mere ideas. Not even dictatorial banana republics stoop that low

USCIS-2025-0003-0570	Comment Submitted by Justin Arroyo	I oppose this, as it's a clear overreach. This is the exact opposite of reduced government; it's weaponized government directed at people whose lives are different than your own, and after all the time-related and financial hurdles that those people have cleared just to come to the States "the right way"... Very sad just how suspicious and jingoist the country has become, primarily from disinterest, ignorance, and crippling disillusionment...
USCIS-2025-0003-0571	Comment Submitted by Anonymous	This is another attempt to rid America of non-white people and an attempt to muzzle free speech.\ All submissions received must include the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) Control Number 1615-NEW in the body of the letter, the agency name, and Docket ID USCIS-2025-0003. Submit comments via the Federal eRulemaking Portal website at https://www.regulations.gov under e-Docket ID number USCIS-2025-0003.
USCIS-2025-0003-0572	Comment Submitted by Anonymous	The public burden of 0.08 hour per application form is grossly underestimated. The information requested is broad and ambiguous. There is no clear definition of what are social media platforms. Tons of apps claims to have some social features while many users do not necessarily use those features. But the proposed rule is not clear on whether those apps and accts are reportable. I estimate each applicant could spend dozens of hours collecting and analyzing the hundreds of app on their phone and deciding whether they are reportable. Also the proposed rule does not specify a time limit for inactive accts. It is not feasible for a person to remember inactive acct used and abandoned years ago.
USCIS-2025-0003-0573	Comment Submitted by Anonymous	You say that this will help to vet applicants, but haven't you already done that? This will quickly lead down a slippery slope, one that ends in the loss of free speech.
USCIS-2025-0003-0574	Comment Submitted by Anonymous	The First Amendment is not a suggestion, it is the bedrock founding principle of this country. This suggestion violates that principle and disgraces our country. I wholeheartedly disagree and reject this assault on free speech and urge that it be swiftly rejected.
USCIS-2025-0003-0575	Comment Submitted by Joseph Mohrmann	This is an attack on freedom in America. It is unacceptable.
USCIS-2025-0003-0576	Comment Submitted by Anonymous	This is a violation of the first amendment. An attack on free speech. All legal is resident have 1st amendment rights.
USCIS-2025-0003-0577	Comment Submitted by Anonymous	It's a horrible idea and an attack on Free Speech. One party can choose to deny someone the right to become a citizen simply because of thier politics and beliefs. Where does the line end? If someone is a real credible threat, then that's what the CIA, FBI and NSA are for. Expressing one's opinions on politics and policies without fear of reprisal is what makes America a powerful country. It's ideas and concepts and communication that allow us to make decisions. Censorship and punishment at people solely for thier voices and beliefs is in violation of the Constitution.
USCIS-2025-0003-0578	Comment Submitted by Anonymous	Clearly against free speech!
USCIS-2025-0003-0579	Comment Submitted by Jay Shuck	A proposal like this flies in the face of everything the Constitution stands for. What an ugly and embarrassing mockery of basic American free speech and privacy rights. What country—and century—did such a garbage idea come from? I'm 100% against it.
USCIS-2025-0003-0580	Comment Submitted by Faith Fleming	First and foremost the idea that you must turn over your social media as part of a citizenship application appears to violate First Amendment rights. Second, the criteria for determining what sort of content indicates "hostility" is incredibly vague, leaving room for this authority to be wielded disproportionately against those who may have criticisms of certain government policies (again, violating First Amendment rights). Third, there is no indication that user data would be deleted following approval of one's citizenship application, which would effectively mean that the US government can continue to spy on new citizens. Such conduct is in direct contravention to American values and our constitutional rights.
USCIS-2025-0003-0581	Comment Submitted by Anonymous	This is an unconstitutional violation of privacy and free speech.
USCIS-2025-0003-0582	Comment Submitted by Anonymous	This newest assault on the US Constitution by the Trump Administration is yet just another part of a coordinated campaign to create an atmosphere of fear, purposefully feeding off the ignorance and intolerance which abounds in our nation. This executive action demanding fealty to a particular point of view politically, and in violation of long standing US and International law, is disgraceful and indicates a president on a personal vendetta of retribution and vengeance, and not any legitimate public policy. Our First Amendment rights are now imperiled in this fascistic coup and personality cult which has supplanted the rule of law. The disgusting "Citizens United" decision of the Supreme Court of the United States has allowed our electoral system to be completely purchased by corporate special interests, and individuals such as Elon Musk. Individual US citizens, and immigrants living here legally, by any reasonable interpretation of the First Amendment should not be persecuted and singled out for their beliefs. Most especially if they differ from those in governmental power. For this sham administration to move to violate the First Amendment rights of immigrants, and discriminate against them in this manner, is clearly illegal, unethical and immoral. Review Attachment: https://downloads.regulations.gov/USCIS-2025-0003-0582/attachment_1.pdf
USCIS-2025-0003-0583	Comment Submitted by Anonymous	The document doesn't make it clear what is considered 'social media'. Is a whatsapp account considered 'social media'? An email address? An old fashioned forum account? BBS, FidoNet, Usenet, AIM, ICQ? Early pre-Internet projects? A random anonymous comment on a Government website, is it social media too? What if the account existed previously but was deleted by user or a social media platform terminated the account for any reason? What if the social media platform is now defunct and does not have any user accessible interface or any data anymore? How much time should have passed after the account deletion or the time last used to make it mandatory? What if the user does not remember having an account with some particular social media account? What if the user does not use any social media at all? What if the user never had any social media accounts? What if the user kept a private household self-hosted social media platform for close family members or for purely testing or research purposes? Deleted backups of those systems, with rotating IDs? Shall all such instances be disclosed as well? How ownership is going to be established? There needs to be more clarity over what should be disclosed and what should not.

USCIS-2025-0003-0584	Comment Submitted by Anonymous	This is destroying our freedom of speech. Of course those in the current administration would be able to keep saying anything they wished I am sure but "We the people " would continue what has already started, being deported or jail time for sharing our opinion if not the opinion of the trump administration.
USCIS-2025-0003-0585	Comment Submitted by Anonymous	I do NOT support this proposal. It will not make anyone safer, since green card holders and other immigrants with conditional legal status have already been vetted, and the likelihood of finding anything in people's social media accounts that is reliable evidence of terrorism is virtually nil. I am also very concerned about First Amendment rights being suppressed for everyone by having the government digging into people's personal accounts without any specific cause or suspicion of a crime. Merely being critical of a government official or policy is not "hostility" that rises to the level of a national security concern. This is just a pretext to go fishing around to find anything that might possibly give this administration a reason to claim that immigrants are terrorists, since they don't want anyone in the US to disagree with their point of view. It has great potential to be abused, and is a further waste of time and resources. We should focus on real evidence, not people talking trash on
USCIS-2025-0003-0586	Comment Submitted by J W Gary	This administration wants the freedoms to say or type ANYTHING they want, but want to suppress other voices. The social media info will be used to track every word expressed & will result in people being punished for their thoughts, while "our government" gets away with criticizing anything they choose. The 1st Amendment applies to all people.
USCIS-2025-0003-0587	Comment Submitted by J W Gary	This administration wants the freedoms to say or type ANYTHING they want, but want to suppress other voices. The social media info will be used to track every word expressed & will result in people being punished for their thoughts, while "our government" gets away with criticizing anything they choose. The 1st Amendment applies to all people.
USCIS-2025-0003-0588	Comment Submitted by Anonymous	Free speech is an essential part of an intact democracy. This proposal threatens free speech.
USCIS-2025-0003-0589	Comment Submitted by Anonymous	This is an utter violation of the First Amendment.
USCIS-2025-0003-0590	Comment Submitted by Anonymous	This is a huge red flag to stop freedom of speech. First Amendment: Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof; or abridging the freedom of speech, or of the press; or the right of the people peaceably to assemble, and to petition the Government for a redress of
USCIS-2025-0003-0591	Comment Submitted by Christopher Earnhart	The only thing this can be used for is determining if someone has an opinion that is unpalatable to the current administration. Actual terrorists wouldn't be posting about it on Facebook. It violates fundamental first amendment rights that should be granted to all US citizens and anyone that we welcome into this country. Anyone who lives within our borders for any reason is a human, deserving the benefit of the principles we say we hold dear as a country and as a people. Freedom of speech is foundational and fundamental in our laws, our constitution, our national myths, and our morals. I know many immigrants, and it is already exceptionally difficult for them to stay in the country or work towards citizenship. There isn't any need to make that more difficult for the many good people wanting to come to our country on the off chance that you will catch someone foolish enough to use social media to plan a terrorist attack. In the meantime, it will instead be weaponized against people who merely express opinions that are and should be protected under the First Amendment to the Constitution.
USCIS-2025-0003-0592	Comment Submitted by Anonymous	This would be a clear violation of the the First Amendment and would violate the core value of what it means to be American. Dissent or disagreement with one's government does not and should not preclude someone from living freely in this country. This policy is government overreach and a blatant violation of an individual's privacy, with no meaningful positive impact on security, and would bog down the immigration system with needless data.
USCIS-2025-0003-0593	Comment Submitted by Anonymous	This is absolutely a violation of the free speech of those whom are here legally. It's yet another racist guy by the Trump administration under the false flag of safety.
USCIS-2025-0003-0594	Comment Submitted by Anonymous	A terrible invasion of sacrosanct privacy. I condemn this attack on our right of free speech. These kinds of positions by the Administration bring us always closer to an authoritarian regime.
USCIS-2025-0003-0595	Comment Submitted by Anonymous	This proposal in a fundamentally un-American attack on free speech. To support this would be antithetical to one of the core tenets of our country.
USCIS-2025-0003-0596	Comment Submitted by Anonymous Anonymous	Requiring green card holders to turn over their social media accounts is a blatant violation of first amendment rights and serves no purpose other than scaring people into not criticizing the current administration. There is no valid purpose or legitimate reason the government needs this information in order to verify identities, something that is already done in order to receive a green card. The extent to which this administration is using regulations to punish those who don't hold similar political views is abhorrent and undermines the very essence of democracy.
USCIS-2025-0003-0597	Comment Submitted by Jamie Kroll	A basic search of the First Amendment Rights details that this Amendment: "protects the right to express oneself, even if the expression is unpopular or controversial!" I am overwhelmingly opposed to the idea of myself, or ANY other individual, finding themselves in a position to determine whether someones expression of self determines their status in this country. What someone says or posts on social media should be a protected right as freedom of speech, under the 1st Amendment of the United States Constitution. I interpret this statement in the 1st Amendment to mean that our forefathers wanted us to be able to express ourselves, in whatever manner we so choose, without consequence by our own Government. This directly violates the 1st Amendment, and you should be ashamed for even bringing this to
USCIS-2025-0003-0598	Comment Submitted by Anonymous	This makes a chilling effect on free speech, one of the many freedoms that make America great. He's already threatened to jail journalists the first time he was in office. If this goes into effect, then we might as well be living under a dictatorship, as that's where we're heading. Like a frog unknowingly in a cooking pot with the water temperature slowly rising so he doesn't realize he's being boiled alive.
USCIS-2025-0003-0599	Comment Submitted by Patrick Boehner	This is a complete violation of first amendment rights of people within the country, and would have a chilling affect on the free speech of anyone entering the country.

USCIS-2025-0003-0600	Comment Submitted by Adam Millard	I support efforts to curb illegal immigration. I support efforts to make our country safer. This proposal does neither. In fact, it takes immigrations who have successfully integrated into US society and contributed financially and in other ways for years and paints them as outcasts and a danger. The danger is in fact an administration who is increasingly resistant to feedback contrary to its aims. Free speech is the bedrock of an increasingly at-risk democracy. The fact the current administration feels necessary to vet opinions of people who were already approved to be part of and contribute to US society is ridiculous. These people pay taxes, are our neighbors, our significant others. Why should their opinions be screened? And how are they different from viewpoints of US citizens? All this effort does is split families and neighborhoods. And in my specific case, turn someone whose only request of government for years "was to be left alone" to instead become politically active to fight for my neighbors and loved ones. So, people may have dissenting views. So what? And why does that somehow constitute a security risk for people who are already here and have been for many years. This policy is short sighted, authoritarian, and only serves to paint the government as paranoid of its own. It absolutely should not be done. The founders would be ashamed. I know I increasingly am.
USCIS-2025-0003-0601	Comment Submitted by T R	This seems like a real waste of time and money just to harass immigrants and brown people. Don't do this.
USCIS-2025-0003-0602	Comment Submitted by Anonymous	Guilty until proven innocent. Just like civil forfeiture. I'll probably leave the country.
USCIS-2025-0003-0603	Comment Submitted by Ziomara Medero-Vargas	This is a clear violations of the First Amendment and a total waste of time and money
USCIS-2025-0003-0604	Comment Submitted by Anonymous	Checking everybody's social media sounds like a waste of money, resources, and time. It is also an invasion of privacy.
USCIS-2025-0003-0605	Comment Submitted by Anonymous	Collection and processing through social media handles is a gross violation of free speech and should not be a consideration during immigration proceedings. Social media identifiers thus should not be collected on immigration forms. The definition of social media is not clear. This is terrible rule making.
USCIS-2025-0003-0606	Comment Submitted by Anonymous	There are plenty of people (myself included) who would very much prefer to keep their real/private life separate from their online life. I, for one, remain faceless online to people who I don't know and interact with in real life. About the most online information I'd want to provide on a real form--let alone a government one--would be an email address to contact me at and/or the very few online accounts that already bear my real name and/or face.
USCIS-2025-0003-0607	Comment Submitted by Barry O'Flanagan	This is a veiled effort to remove another chink from the armor of democracy. Not only does it violate our constitutional right to free speech, it will be used unethically, immorally and illegally to bully and intimidate good people aspiring to be American citizens! This effort should never be allowed. In fact it's ridiculous that this tyrannical administration is even allowed propose this. Hell no!
USCIS-2025-0003-0608	Comment Submitted by Anonymous	This is a blatant attack on free speech and unconstitutional.
USCIS-2025-0003-0609	Comment Submitted by Anonymous	This regulation seems like a total infringement of those American civil rights which these people are hoping to achieve by becoming citizens of our great country. Freedom of speech is guaranteed - or at least- used to be
USCIS-2025-0003-0610	Comment Submitted by Randy Juras	This sounds more like Germany in 1933. Trump has done nothing but create fear. He has attacked Freedom of speech. And now he wants to further attack green card people. Many a foreign scientist are now going to find another country to work in. Trump is out of his league now. And our Democracy is going to suffer.
USCIS-2025-0003-0611	Comment Submitted by Anonymous	I am strongly opposed to this. My husband is a naturalized citizen and looked to the U.S. as a country that valued independent, free speech. This act of policing people's free speech and expression as part of the immigration process is oppressive and stifles our vibrant democracy. Our forefathers would be aghast at the idea. I fail to see how such oversight will actually reduce risk of terrorism here or abroad. This feels like scapegoating of anyone seeking to emigrate here. Shame on this administration for even conceiving of this.
USCIS-2025-0003-0612	Comment Submitted by Anonymous	I am strongly opposed to this regulation. It is not clear how the collection of social media information is relevant to naturalization eligibility, and this regulation cannot move forward without justifying this regulation to the public. As it stands, this regulation is unfairly invasive to individuals seeking a legal path to citizenship in the United States, and I have serious concerns that the data that DHS collects would be used to affect applicants in a biased and prejudicial way. As others have noted, this regulation also appears to violate first amendment protections, affecting legal residents.
USCIS-2025-0003-0613	Comment Submitted by Anonymous	I don't see how it is a free speech issue. Reading their comments doesn't stop them from saying anything they want to. Public comments are just that, public.
USCIS-2025-0003-0614	Comment Submitted by SHARON DAVES	As a Mayflower Decendent of William and Susanna White, I am appalled at what the current administration is doing! At no time in our history has any administration done things to stifle the free speech that our ancestors fought so hard for. If any other administration had tried these things that President would have been promptly impeached and removed from office! House and Senate Republicans seem to have forgotten their oath of office which is to the people of this country not exclusively to the President and his current sycophants! I am ashamed of our elected officers for not upholding their duty to "We the People. " Shame on you! From the 11X Great Grand Daughter of William and Susanna White
USCIS-2025-0003-0615	Comment Submitted by Shawn Slaton	100% support this! If a supposed immigrant posts, likes, shares, supports those who scream "death to America" or death to any specific people group, they do not belong here. Put em out!
USCIS-2025-0003-0616	Comment Submitted by Anonymous	This proposal is an absolute violation of the right to free speech that this nation was founded upon. Requiring any person to give up their right to have an opinion that is in opposition to that of the acting administration which could result in their detention or expulsion from the country is antithetical to everyything that the Unites States has stood for over the past 250 years.

USCIS-2025-0003-0617	Comment Submitted by Jeffrey Raker	USCIS's social media data collection (E.O. 14161) faces key legal/policy issues. It's a massive privacy intrusion, chilling free speech (1st Amend.), like location tracking in Carpenter v. US. "National security" justification is too broad, risking 4th Amend. violations against unreasonable searches. Algorithmic analysis for decisions raises due process concerns, mirroring debates on automated justice. The high admin. burden vs. questionable security gains is inefficient. Lack of data use limits risks "scope creep" and outright discrimination.
USCIS-2025-0003-0618	Comment Submitted by James McCormick	I don't see that expansion of the current rules will in any way affect free speech. In fact it merely sees how the person participated in his/her free speech right. This is what I expect the governing authorities to do as part of their background checks.
USCIS-2025-0003-0619	Comment Submitted by Anonymous	Social media of green card holders should be made available to the US government. The US should know if this person is against the US and wants to do harm in the United States. US citizens must always be first. All these green card holders should be vetted very carefully.
USCIS-2025-0003-0620	Comment Submitted by Greg Pettit	This is a clear violation of the first amendment. I would have expected this from Iran, Russia, or China.
USCIS-2025-0003-0621	Comment Submitted by Anonymous	I am a US citizen, born and raised in this country. For many years it has been difficult to be proud to be an America. The current administration makes that even more difficult. Supposedly, they are proponents of free speech. However, in actuality, that is only true when the speech agrees with opinions already held by the administration. I believe in speaking truth to power. I believe in holding space for people who hold different viewpoints than my own. I do not believe we need to obtain people's social media handles on their immigration forms. People can hold views different from your own and never act upon them. It is not the holding of a controversial view that is problematic, it is acting in anger and violence upon those views. Such as when the administration cut off resources to Ukraine. I do not support the collection of social media identifiers of immigration forms.
USCIS-2025-0003-0622	Comment Submitted by Anonymous	This is another example of the current administration trying to get away with violating the constitution by violating the First Amendment. I had thought better of our lawmakers than this.
USCIS-2025-0003-0623	Comment Submitted by Anonymous	The idea that you can pay 5 million USD and not hand over social media profiles, yet must do so as a poor person is insanity. Not only is this a two tiered system in favor of the wealthy, but this is fundamentally against the US Constitution. Absolutely disgusting.
USCIS-2025-0003-0624	Comment Submitted by Holly Kay Benedict	To want smaller government means that there is less government interference in the lives of citizens and prospective citizens. Requiring social media handles from applicants applying for citizenship almost seems like the federal government will be watching their accounts for any opportunity to revoke green cards and applications for citizenship if there is any indication that the applicant disagrees with the current administration. The ability to disagree is a first amendment right that is granted to anyone under the jurisdiction of the United States. Please don't do this.
USCIS-2025-0003-0625	Comment Submitted by Angela Ferguson	People should be afforded the right to privacy and freedom of speech. This would be a blatant assault on the First Amendment. We are a Constitutional Republic. That's not something that could ever be compromised. Not even in the name of security. Otherwise, we become no different than a fascist authoritarian regime. We are a country founded on the tenets of life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. We must not compromise our most basic and valued identity. Do not trample the First
USCIS-2025-0003-0626	Comment Submitted by Jim Capizzo	Joe McCarthy would love this.
USCIS-2025-0003-0627	Comment Submitted by Anonymous	Thus proposal is a violation of free speech rights of both citizens and immigrants. It will not make our country safer, and could endanger the life and freedom of anyone associated with a potential immigrant.
USCIS-2025-0003-0628	Comment Submitted by David del Rio	This looks like a step toward party vetting of future voters and political influencers. One of the worst ideas for an administration full of terrible Ideas.
USCIS-2025-0003-0629	Comment Submitted by Anonymous	This is an unnecessary measure that has nothing to do with criteria that makes someone eligible to be in this country.
USCIS-2025-0003-0630	Comment Submitted by Elizabeth Klein	This is a blatant attack on free speech. U.S. legal residents - even guests and tourists - are not terrorists or enemies of the state, simply because they express disagreement with the Trump administration. I don't even recognize my country anymore. Proposals like these are shameful.
USCIS-2025-0003-0631	Comment Submitted by Anonymous	What happened to the First Amendment? Free speech is core to our democracy, and to require visa and green card holders to submit their social media accounts for inspection is a violation of that. I oppose this rule.
USCIS-2025-0003-0632	Comment Submitted by Anonymous	I, like most, do not believe that this administration will limit its search of social media accounts to "informing identity verification, national security and public safety screening, and vetting, and related inspections." Many legal residents are already being deported or are in deportation proceedings without having been convicted of any crime. It's solely based on their personal beliefs. This is, without a doubt, going to end poorly, and violate the rights of US-citizens and immigrants alike. I say no to
USCIS-2025-0003-0633	Comment Submitted by Anonymous	The collection of an individual's online communications will damage the culture and identity of America as a nation of freedom of speech. It flies in the face of the constitution. When one person is afraid to speak we must all be afraid. We are all in this boat together. If we wanted to live in an environment of oppression and fear there would be no need to come to America. The war of independence was not fought so that our freedoms could be trampled upon. As a citizen I do not fear those with different opinions. I fear those who would prevent us from having different opinions
USCIS-2025-0003-0634	Comment Submitted by Anonymous	The collection of social media handles is an egregious violation of protections against search and protection of free speech, fundamental freedoms our nation was founded on. This proposal has no place in American life. Do not collect this information.
USCIS-2025-0003-0635	Comment Submitted by Lia Sko	Yes do it. It is important. USCIS has all their information anyway. We only want people that uphold American culture and values. If you don't like that, choose a different country to immigrate to. I chose the USA because of the freedoms and opportunities. A lot of the world population is willing to immigrate and assimilate with the best country in the world and have nothing to hide on social media

USCIS-2025-0003-0636	Comment Submitted by Anonymous	The proposed changes are against the rights established by the First, Fourth, and Fifth Amendments. They are a gross overreach and an invasion of privacy. Green Card holders are already subjected to rigorous screening and long wait times. Pursuing their social media presence opens the door to them being judged by their opinions instead of by tangible metrics. These changes will increase the administrative burden for USCIS, making the process less efficient.
USCIS-2025-0003-0637	Comment Submitted by Anonymous	I oppose this proposal because it is an unnecessary infringement upon the civil liberties and right to privacy that are the bedrock of American democracy and equal protection under the law. It creates an undue burden both on the targets of the proposal and on the government agencies tasked with the collection and processing of this data, for no useful purpose. In true cases of wrongdoing, criminality, or threat there already exist law enforcement mechanisms for monitoring and the collection of evidence, and this proposal contributes nothing to national security or public safety. This proposal is a step too far. It is government overreach, authoritarian and discriminatory in its intent, and unnecessary for the efficient practice of appropriate governance.
USCIS-2025-0003-0638	Comment Submitted by Sarah Heile	Our own Constitution says - "Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof; or abridging the freedom of speech, or of the press; or the right of the people peaceably to assemble, and to petition the Government for a redress of grievances." This is a clear violation of that amendment.
USCIS-2025-0003-0639	Comment Submitted by Anonymous	To check the background of someone in the United States from another country to help obtain there intent, seems like good practice to me. I do not see this as a free speech violation at all.
USCIS-2025-0003-0640	Comment Submitted by Justin T	I think this is a great idea . Legal or illegal immigrants are not given the same protections under the United States constitution. We must make sure another 9-11 style attack is never able to happen again. If they really want asylum, they should do anything and everything possible to make sure it happens. At the end of the day we would be looking for illegal activities and links to terrorists organizations. I don't see what the big deal is, the federal government already does this anyways. if Donald Trump thought of it some people are against it regardless.
USCIS-2025-0003-0641	Comment Submitted by Steven Ramsey	Where does this lead? It is a complete infringement of the human rights. Our own constitution, which is the standard many other nations have built their laws to mimic, protect us from this autocratic over reach. We should not require permanent residence to open themselves to this violation. I can understand short term visas but if someone is applying for permanent resident they should have been vetted well before this point. This government overreach into silencing opposition.
USCIS-2025-0003-0642	Comment Submitted by Averroes Ghias	I am writing to express my opposition to USCIS proposed collection of social media identifiers as outlines in USCIS–2025–0003. The proposed rule is a step toward censorship of individuals that disagree with the actions of our government its allies. It serves to act as a measure one step away from active censorship of activists and political dissenters. It is especially problematic and relevant in the current political climate where the executive has adopted a campaign of retribution. Additionally, the rule does not adequately explain how the data collected will be assessed. This leaves the data ripe for abuse in contexts it was not initially intended. Without further insight into the procedure of assessment, this rule will lead to the abuse of data for political suppression. With regards, Averroes Ghias
USCIS-2025-0003-0643	Comment Submitted by Averroes Ghias	I am writing to express my opposition to USCIS proposed collection of social media identifiers as outlines in USCIS–2025–0003. The proposed rule is a step toward censorship of individuals that disagree with the actions of our government its allies. It serves to act as a measure one step away from active censorship of activists and political dissenters. It is especially problematic and relevant in the current political climate where the executive has adopted a campaign of retribution. Additionally, the rule does not adequately explain how the data collected will be assessed. This leaves the data ripe for abuse in contexts it was not initially intended. Without further insight into the procedure of assessment, this rule will lead to the abuse of data for political suppression. With regards, Averroes Ghias
USCIS-2025-0003-0644	Comment Submitted by Anonymous	As a U.S. citizen, I am deeply concerned about the proposed policy requiring visa and green card applicants to disclose their social media identifiers. This policy directly threatens the fundamental principles of freedom of speech and due process. My professional life has afforded me the opportunity to build relationships with numerous visa and green card holders. I am acutely aware of the potential for this policy to unjustly impact these individuals. The proposed data collection, which includes posts, likes, and associations, creates a scenario where my own constitutionally protected speech could be used to deny someone entry or lead to their deportation. The notion that my political views, expressed legally and rightfully, could be used to penalize an individual with whom I share a social media connection, even without any direct discussion of these views, is abhorrent. This policy creates a chilling effect on free expression and undermines the due process rights of applicants. Furthermore, the potential for misuse of this sensitive data is alarming. The lack of clear safeguards and oversight raises serious concerns about privacy and the potential for discriminatory application of this policy. Therefore, I strongly urge the government to reconsider this invasive and unjust policy. It is inappropriate and detrimental to require social media identifiers from visa and green card applicants. Finally, the proposed changes to Forms I-751, N-400, and others, which would accompany this data collection, would result in a greatly increased administrative burden for USCIS and associated costs to American taxpayers. This would exacerbate existing processing backlogs, further hindering the efficient operation of our immigration system. Submitted anonymously to protect the current and future visa and green card applicants I know whom the government could penalize because I submitted this public comment.
USCIS-2025-0003-0645	Comment Submitted by Abby Cheruiyot	Collection of this information is unnecessary to evaluate applicants and could limit freedom of speech.
USCIS-2025-0003-0646	Comment Submitted by No absolutelynot	McCarthyism, plain and simple. Maybe put your energy into following up on actual threats to public safety like pollution, traffic and gun violence.
USCIS-2025-0003-0647	Comment Submitted by Anonymous	Reading this, I can't help but be amazed at how hostile the current administration is to the American Constitution. The fact that this is even being considered strikes me as anti-American at best. Some people need to remember the oath they took. Disgusting.
USCIS-2025-0003-0648	Comment Submitted by Anonymous	It is absolutely necessary to maintain freedom of speech whether one is a citizen or a guest. The United States must have vigorous conversations that may explore views contradictory to political position in order to gain a clearer understanding of the issues. Collecting social media from anyone is an appalling intrusion on that freedom which is brought to us through the United States Constitution.

USCIS-2025-0003-0649	Comment Submitted by Anonymous	This idea is out of a dystopiannovel This This idea is out of a dystopian novel. This is not the America I grew up in. I am strongly opposed to this invasion of privacy and right to free speech.
USCIS-2025-0003-0650	Comment Submitted by Anonymous	Object to this. This proposal violates free speech. Free speech is essential in democracy.
USCIS-2025-0003-0651	Comment Submitted by Anonomous Anonymous	Big brother is watching. 1984, George, you had it right. Who needs to be scared of communists or dictators with nuclear weapons when American gangsters have taken over the government. I suggest you look at your own social media accounts (and your own hearts), but not those of others. IF...(a big IF) there is something that happens to create reasonable suspicion of intended violence, then go through the proper channels and get a judge to issue something for a particular person. But it's unreasonable and an attack on our freedoms to require this of all greencard holders and prying into their personal lives.
USCIS-2025-0003-0652	Comment Submitted by Anonymous	This is a blatant violation of our rights of free speech rights, and yet another example of our precipitous slide into fascistic autocracy.
USCIS-2025-0003-0653	Comment Submitted by Anonymous	What an assault on free speech. An inexcusable violation of privacy.
USCIS-2025-0003-0654	Comment Submitted by Anonymous	This is absolutely against the Freedom of speech and should not be implemented.
USCIS-2025-0003-0655	Comment Submitted by Anonymous	This is unconstitutional. Without free speech, we no longer have a democracy. Only tyrants seek to suppress the voice of the people. Doesn't it say something important when so many of the commentors here are choosing anonymity?
USCIS-2025-0003-0656	Comment Submitted by Anonymous	This suggested regulation screams of political bias and discrimination. It suggests that the 1st amendment is not for all people living in the US but only for current citizens. This is not what our founders envisioned, first and second tier rights. Disgusting.
USCIS-2025-0003-0657	Comment Submitted by Anonymous	The definition of social media is really broad: websites and applications that enable users to create and share content. By that definition, is this regulation.gov website also a social media? Apparent it allows users to create and share comments. There are so many similar websites the public burden cannot possibly be only 0.08 hour. Would be more like 8 days. Will USCIS provide a definitive list of reportable social media providers to remove the ambiguity and narrow down the scope?
USCIS-2025-0003-0658	Comment Submitted by Anonymous	This is ridiculous. This flooding the zone nonsense has to end; it's hurting our country to violate the rights of people in the country legally. Free speech is a right all people in the country have, not just citizens, and this is a huge overreach with no justification. This is the United States of America, not Oceania.
USCIS-2025-0003-0659	Comment Submitted by Anonymous	Hello. Please don't add the collection of social media to the process. because this is going to take a lot of time and energy and not everyone will remember the details. or remember on what they have posted and it is painful and stressful and very traumatic. and this is also a concern for those who are under the age of 21. and those who are older. and those who have a disabilities too. this is very concerning as this could affect their prospects on entering the US and it is very scary. so please reconsider and think of other people.
USCIS-2025-0003-0660	Comment Submitted by Anonymous	This rule violates free speech. Also, the immigrant may have other social media accounts, so what do you accomplish by tracking their whitewashed accounts only? They can still post whatever they like using their undisclosed accounts, so what's the point?
USCIS-2025-0003-0661	Comment Submitted by Anonymous	I DO NOT SUPPORT THIS for very good reason and that is the concern of them being like less than and that is not okay and we are very concerned on how will they be treated. This will hurt a lot of people and people will suffer as a result of this vile purposal.. we do not support this and this will have very serious consequences.
USCIS-2025-0003-0662	Comment Submitted by Anthony Lombardy	No government agency should be permitted or allowed to collect social media identifiers, posts, or information from those applying for or holding any U.S. immigration status.
USCIS-2025-0003-0663	Comment Submitted by Eric Schmidt	This violates free speech - totally against the !st amendment . DO NOT PASS
USCIS-2025-0003-0664	Comment Submitted by Patrick Vaughn	I believe that this proposed new policy on collection of social media of those with permanent residence status is a threat to liberty. Liberty is a foundational American value and the cornerstone of our Constitution. It is of utmost important that we protect first amendment rights and values for all people. When we do not do so as a country we begin to resemble an authoritarian repressive state where there is only one opinion allowed, one party or leader to support, and people's lives and wellbeing is threatened. Permanent Residents already undergo thorough vetting. This is an unnecessary new requirement that comes at too high of a cost to our
USCIS-2025-0003-0665	Comment Submitted by Alexander Manappallil	Anyone applying to be a citizen of the United States or get legal residency should be in compliance with the laws of the country. Free speech is encouraged and should be accepted except where such free speech is against the law or interests of the united states. If the USA has branded an organization as terrorist related, at that point this is no longer free speech. If you support actions that allow the law of the united states as passed by congress, then you are indicating you are against the will of the people of that country as represented by the congress, senate and the president. It is the right of this country to know if you stand for the principles of the nation or against it. I support these measure for the US government ensuring the person attempting to get citizenship is someone that has the best interest of the country of adoption than the country of birth or personnal belief and a valuable addition to the American societety
USCIS-2025-0003-0666	Comment Submitted by Anonymous	This can be grounds for unfair dismissal of genuine applicants based on innocent acts on social media. People should have a right to openly share on social media without any negative repercussions by government. This information collected on immigration forms suppresses free speech.
USCIS-2025-0003-0667	Comment Submitted by Anonymous	This is part and parcel of the authoritarian creep of this administration. What makes America great is our First Amendment and our free press. The president wants to take away our rights because he cannot handle criticism.
USCIS-2025-0003-0668	Comment Submitted by Anonymous	This is invasion of privacy and personal space by the federal government. This would mean my most private and personal conversations with my dear ones are subject to scrutiny by some Tom duck and Harry at USCIS. This is a terrible move.

USCIS-2025-0003-0669	Comment Submitted by Anonymous	Freedom of speech is one of many reasons immigrants WANT to come to the United States.... This proposal is simply antithetical to the foundation of free speech upon which our country is based
USCIS-2025-0003-0670	Comment Submitted by Anonymous	I am all for it. Protect America at all costs!!
USCIS-2025-0003-0671	Comment Submitted by Tim Evans	This would be an egregious violation of free speech -- especially imposed after the fact and arbitrarily.
USCIS-2025-0003-0672	Comment Submitted by Anonymous	This regulation is a violation of freedom of speech. Green card holders have already been vetted before they ever get their green card. Furthermore, it is possible that people will be labeled terrorists simply because of their political positions. We've seen some of that already. It would be a short step to require even citizens to hand over their social media information and to subsequently be labeled terrorists due to their political positions. This could be used to effectively make it illegal to oppose or champion particular political views, without there being such a law, simply because one's view's could be labeled as those of terrorists, infringing on everyone's free speech. Again, green card holders have already been vetted, so this can only be used to curb our right to free speech. I am opposed to this regulation.
USCIS-2025-0003-0673	Comment Submitted by Chase Latour	This policy is a troubling attempt to undermine lawful residents' rights by subjecting them to government scrutiny over their social media activity. It sets a dangerous precedent that could penalize individuals for expressing opinions that differ from the government's stance. Such a measure contradicts the fundamental principles of free speech and personal privacy that are central to American values.
USCIS-2025-0003-0674	Comment Submitted by David Rochon	This proposal is ridiculously intrusive and a waste of government resources. I oppose it wholeheartedly.
USCIS-2025-0003-0675	Comment Submitted by Anonymous	It is almost laughable how the executive order specifically calls out actions to be taken against foreign nationals who seek to undermine the people of the US by restricting their rights to free speech, freedom of religion, or seek to replace or overthrow the culture on which our Republic is based. So this proposal is supposed to enforce section 2 of the order yet is clearly in violation of section 3 (paraphrased in this comment). Many people holding green cards are permanent residents and so long as they commit no crimes, should be able to enjoy freedom of speech and freedom of religion. Though, increasingly, disagreeing with this administration is becoming a crime. It is unfortunate that this administration is choosing authoritarianism rather than seeking real, tangible solutions to problems. This is America and people should not have to fear punitive actions for disagreeing. Sure, if you condone or seek violence, then yes (apparently unless you seek violence for Trump, then it's ok), you should be punished and/or disqualified for citizenship/residency status. But merely dissenting is no crime. Our country was built on dissent.
USCIS-2025-0003-0676	Comment Submitted by Anonymous	I believe that this is unnecessary, and absurd. Especially considering the numerous legal citizens facing threats of captivity. This law could easily be abused and misconstrued, causing harm for millions of innocent individuals. This administration must be stopped immediately, or authoritarian will fall upon us before we know it. To anyone who is listening, this cannot be put into affect, Trump MUST be impeached, and Elon must be removed from the White House, immediately.
USCIS-2025-0003-0677	Comment Submitted by Anonymous	This stance is completely in violation of free speech protections.
USCIS-2025-0003-0678	Comment Submitted by Anonymous	The collection of social media information seems like a method of censorship that, if accepted as the norm in green card applicant phase for US residency then the next step will be randomly confiscating the cards of already accepted residents just because they have opinions that are unfavorable to the politics of the current administration. Social media can be manipulated and inaccurately interpreted.
USCIS-2025-0003-0679	Comment Submitted by Anonymous	This regulation is more in line with an authoritarian regime. What happened to life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness?
USCIS-2025-0003-0680	Comment Submitted by John Stringer	This proposed rule would mean that any green card applicant or naturalization applicant would not be able to express their free speech on social media out of fear that they will be deported for expressing an opinion that the government doesn't like. There are already stories in the press about foreign citizens being turned away at the border because they have social media posts or writing criticizing the current administration. The first amendment protects the right to freedom of expression without fear of punishment or retaliation, and this would have a chilling effect on the ability of immigrants to exercise that right.
USCIS-2025-0003-0681	Comment Submitted by Anonymous	This is a major violation of free speech which is ensured by first amendment of the US constitution, hence this is unconstitutional and illegal.
USCIS-2025-0003-0682	Comment Submitted by Anonymous	Violation of free speech and an attempt by a fascist authoritarian wannabe dictator to squash dissent.
USCIS-2025-0003-0683	Comment Submitted by Anonymous	This is an outrageous proposal that is meant to stifle political opposition to the current administration, not protect the nation from terrorism or threats! This is a violation of free speech, meant to intimidate and provide the government power to decline and revoke status of anyone they choose to harm. OPPOSE!
USCIS-2025-0003-0684	Comment Submitted by Anonymous	This proposal overtly violates free speech and engenders fear for expressing opinion. It is un-American.
USCIS-2025-0003-0685	Comment Submitted by Anonymous	There are employers who check social media of applicants. What's the difference?
USCIS-2025-0003-0686	Comment Submitted by Anonymous	A violation of free speech and privacy!
USCIS-2025-0003-0687	Comment Submitted by Anonymous	A violation of free speech and privacy!
USCIS-2025-0003-0688	Comment Submitted by Anonymous	This is another way to suppress free speech by this administration. This should not be allowed to happen. We are a country of immigrants. Vetting of people should be done before the people were allowed to enter with work visa's. Note I picked anonymous even though I was born here over 75 years ago because I no longer trust the gathering of government information.

USCIS-2025-0003-0689	Comment Submitted by Anonymous	This is NOT a free speech issue. This is a great way to determine a person's views on the US before granting them permanent residency with actual evidence. I would not want to grant permanent residency to someone who supports a terrorist organization. This is coming from a green card holder
USCIS-2025-0003-0690	Comment Submitted by Kyra Freestar	Adamantly opposing this "Generic Clearance for the Collection of Social Media Identifier(s) on Immigration Forms" First Amendment of the US Constitution: "CONGRESS SHALL MAKE NO LAW respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof; or ABRIDGING THE FREEDOM OF SPEECH, or of the press; or the right of the people peaceably to assemble, and to petition the Government for a redress of grievances." FREEDOM OF SPEECH is for everyone, of every age, every nationality, every immigration status.
USCIS-2025-0003-0691	Inappropriate Comment Submitted by ely mesrahi	If we don't stop Trump from weaponizing every aspect of the US, we will literally change to an autocracy. This is unbelievable, WHERE IS THE FREE OF SPEACH. ALL OF THIS SHIT SHOW IS JUST FOR THE SAKE OF ISRAEL. Trump should change his moto from America first to israel first. From make America great again to make israel great again.
USCIS-2025-0003-0692	Comment Submitted by Debbie Wynkoop	The government should NOT be able to access the social media accounts of green card holders. This is a violation of free speech and an attempt by Trump to deport innocent people who disagree with him and his policies. Trump is trying to destroy our democracy so he can have complete power.
USCIS-2025-0003-0693	Comment Submitted by Anonymous	This is a reprehensible act intended to do nothing but stop speech critical of Donald Trump.... It is completely antithetical to the value of free speech this country prides itself on. It is clear from the use of social media in the recent deportations of so-called gang members, that this powered will be abused to circumnavigate due
USCIS-2025-0003-0694	Comment Submitted by Anonymous	I strongly oppose the proposed regulation requiring U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services (USCIS) to collect social media identifiers and associated platform names from immigration applicants. This policy is fundamentally at odds with the principles of free speech and privacy that are cornerstones of American democracy. The collection of social media information for immigration purposes raises several significant concerns: 1. Chilling effect on free speech: This policy would likely discourage immigrants from expressing themselves freely online, fearing that their posts could be misinterpreted or used against them in the immigration process. This self-censorship undermines the very values of open discourse that the United States has long championed. 2. Privacy invasion: Requiring applicants to disclose their social media profiles represents an unwarranted intrusion into their personal lives and those of their friends and family members. This level of surveillance is disproportionate to the stated goals of identity verification and security screening. 3. Potential for misinterpretation: Social media posts can often be taken out of context, leading to unfair judgments about an individual's character or intentions. This is especially problematic given the informal nature of most social media communication and cultural differences that may affect interpretation. 4. Lack of evidence for effectiveness: There is little concrete evidence that social media screening is an effective tool for enhancing national security or public safety. The potential negative impacts on civil liberties outweigh the speculative benefits of this policy. 5. Discriminatory impact: This policy could disproportionately affect certain groups, particularly those from regions with politically sensitive issues, leading to unfair treatment in the immigration process. Instead of implementing this invasive and potentially counterproductive policy, USCIS should focus on more targeted and evidence-based approaches to identity verification and security screening. The agency should prioritize methods that respect individual privacy and uphold the principles of free expression that make America a beacon of freedom around the world. In conclusion, I urge USCIS to reconsider this proposed regulation and seek alternative methods that balance legitimate security concerns with the protection of civil liberties and democratic values.
USCIS-2025-0003-0695	Comment Submitted by Julio Rodriguez	This is unnecessary , an invasion of privacy, and is opening the door to bias in an applicant's petition for adjustment of status. The myriad backgrounds and documentation they submit as part of their application is more than sufficient, this is the step in the wrong direction and will open liability for USCIS.
USCIS-2025-0003-0696	Comment Submitted by D Elnakhal	I am against this, as it violates the Fourth Amendment.
USCIS-2025-0003-0697	Comment Submitted by Anonymous Anonymous	The rights afforded to me by the Constitution of the United States is the reason I have chosen to live in this country as a permanent resident for over 20 years. I have two children with a U.S citizen. I cherish the protections granted to me under the Constitution, particularly freedom of speech, and protection against unreasonable searches and seizures. This proposal threatens the intention of the Constitution of the United States in offering those protections to all that live in this beautiful country. It specifically threatens freedom of speech and is, by its very nature, an unreasonable search of a person's free speech. This proposal is anti-American - and must be stopped. I have already, as a green card applicant, sworn that I am not a member of the nazi party, or a terrorist organization. The nazi party notoriously suppressed free speech. So did the British when they ran this country as a colony. That is why the constitution has those protections. Free speech is central to a free society, something the founding fathers recognized and enshrined. Let's keep it that way.
USCIS-2025-0003-0698	Comment Submitted by John Lucier	On one hand I get the negative comments about free speech and an authoritarian state, conversely one could argue if we are championing free speech, then individuals should not be afraid of the world hearing what they have to say! It doesnt seem credible for anyone wanting to hide behind a wall of secrecy for their activities online. The worst forums I have encountered in my 30+ years online were the ones that allowed people to freely switch between multiple online identities and accounts, all under aliases. Stand up for who you are and what you say, if youre ashamed of what youve posted in the past theres usually something going on
USCIS-2025-0003-0699	Comment Submitted by Anonymous	Not only is this a massive invasion of privacy and threat to free speech, it's absolutely idiotic, because any halfway competent person can access social media with an alias and a VPN and bypass this effortlessly. Not to mention you'd need tens of thousands of staff to review the information--unless you're planning on doing it via AI or some other INCREDIBLY suspect computer program. No one's security is improved by this. It's disgusting on every conceivable level.
USCIS-2025-0003-0700	Comment Submitted by Anonymous	Threat to the 1st and 4th amendment rights granted by the Constitution to ALL PEOPLE on American soil. Plus, doing this for applicants who are already legally in the US (i.e. Green Card Holders applying for Citizenship) is an example of government surveillance and not at all American. Slippery slope before this applies to all Citizens and we become another China or Russia. STRONGLY OPPOSED BY WE THE PEOPLE.
USCIS-2025-0003-0701	Comment Submitted by Anonymous	This is a slippery slope leading to a destruction of the rights of future Americans. This goes against our principles of free speech.

USCIS-2025-0003-0702	Comment Submitted by Anonymous	I'm writing to the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) about Control Number 1615-NEW, Docket ID USCIS-2025-0003. I do not think that DHS and USCIS should collect social media handles and platforms. This collection process will take time and I don't think it will help to find people who are actual terrorists -- it seems more a means to thought-police people and deprive them of their right to speak their mind. That used to be what was great about America -- let's keep it that way.
USCIS-2025-0003-0703	Comment Submitted by Ralph C	Contrary to what commenter's would have you believe this is online with standard vetting procedures. We allow companies to do this in their hiring process so why would this be a problem in the issuance of permanent residence status? This is not a 1st amendment violation. This is common sense.
USCIS-2025-0003-0704	Comment Submitted by Anonymous	This country is slowly drifting towards an authoritarian regime where FREE SPEECH is an abomination. The STATUE OF LIBERTY should be changed to The Statue Of Bondage!
USCIS-2025-0003-0705	Comment Submitted by Anonymous	I'm an immigrant, so I guess I don't have the same First Amendment freedoms the native-born US citizens have. It does seem ridiculous to me that I can be fined or jailed for speaking my mind, and I'm sure that's not just something immigrants have to deal with. It's obvious that the USCIS is violating the First Amendment to the US Constitution, which explicitly prevents such overreach by government.
USCIS-2025-0003-0706	Comment Submitted by Karen Gohdes	Asylees and refugees have already been rigorously vetted, so making social media screening part of the process to adjust their status to permanent resident is inefficient and unnecessary. I am assisting a family friend with his green card application. He says USCIS agents are welcome to look at the pix of his puppy on his Facebook page, and see what he says on Whatsapp to his elderly aunties in Africa, but it sure strikes me as a colossal waste of time and taxpayer dollars. USCIS already estimates a processing time of 15.5 months for my friend's case; adding needless screening will only make that preposterous wait time worse. The only thing USCIS should be doing with the already heavily screened asylees applying for adjustment of status is making sure they have stayed compliant with the law since they have arrived, and if so, issuing them their green cards in a timely manner. Furthermore, it seems to me that asking for social media handles will have the effect of chilling free speech, which is un-American, and making the immigration process even more onerous and unpleasant, which is both unkind and self-defeating for our
USCIS-2025-0003-0707	Comment Submitted by Anonymous	Clearly a violation of freedom of speech. MAGA and GOP love to talk about free speech, yet they want to silence those who are here legally / Americans. I am a U.S. Citizen, and this proposal is RIDICULOUS. If Musk allows derogatory/fascist/racist/pornographic content on his own company X and he utilizes free speech without limits and retaliation just as Trump does, why do they want to silence our right to free speech? The government should be worried about other things, but clearly, that's not a priority. This is all for show. The government doesn't want to help its own citizens with basic needs. They "promised to make America Great Again," but the reality is that America is far from being great. It is obscene what has been happening in this country. Instead of change, we are being set back. MLK fought hard for civil rights and the end to racism, but it is unfortunate that we as a country still have these disgusting, deeply rooted, hateful beliefs ingrained into our society. Society needs to wake up. People need to be educated. There are far too many Americans who are ignorant and lack any form of education. This is why our country is not progressing!
USCIS-2025-0003-0708	Comment Submitted by Jasmine Shao	This is unnecessarily burdensome. USCIS already deals with enough paperwork. The immigration system will only become more bloated and delayed by additional review of social media. This waste of time is also unlikely to yield useful results. Most people have private accounts. I strongly oppose this proposal and hope that USCIS will not implement it.
USCIS-2025-0003-0709	Comment Submitted by Anonymous	I do not support this proposal. I do not believe this policy would have any effect on making the USA safer or prevent terrorism. I do not want to see the Trump administration adopt this policy for Green card holders living in the USA and urge against enacting this now or at any point in the future.
USCIS-2025-0003-0710	Comment Submitted by Anonymous	I agree 100% with this decision from the government. Many immigrants inside our country are posting videos and comments in social media against America, his people and culture. In special many Cuban YouTubers inside USA are posting negative comments because all of them are coming to abuse the system and from here they are supporting Cuban regime. I am encouraged the government to make sure they are doing their best investigation on this people. America First.
USCIS-2025-0003-0711	Comment Submitted by Anonymous	This infringes on our constitutional rights for free speech and erodes our liberties that our country is founded upon. I dissent and do not agree on behalf of all the legal immigrants who have resided within our country.
USCIS-2025-0003-0712	Comment Submitted by Thomas Hancock	This is absolutely an illegal infringement on the First Amendment (freedom of speech) and green card holders are protected under the U.S. Constitution. As a natural born citizen I am appalled this is even a consideration.
USCIS-2025-0003-0713	Comment Submitted by Anonymous	As a US citizen, I am completely opposed to this proposal. It is a direct attack on our first ammendment rights-freedom of speech, which applies to everyone in the US, regardless of immigration status. Do not strip us of our constitutional rights! I am not a Bot nor am I being paid to say this! I am a very concerned US citizen, trying to defend our constitutional rights!
USCIS-2025-0003-0714	Inappropriate Comment Submitted by U.S. Citizen	1st amendment, you stupid nazis.
USCIS-2025-0003-0715	Comment Submitted by Priya Dugad	This is a monumental waste of public resources and directly antithetical to the First Amendment.
USCIS-2025-0003-0716	Comment Submitted by Anonymous Anonymous	This proposal seeks to criminalize anyone who exercises their first amendment right. The proposal is highly authoritarian, wrongheaded, and anti-American. Submitting anonymously because I deeply fear that a government willing to deport or imprison dissenters would have no problem going after those who speak out against such actions.
USCIS-2025-0003-0717	Comment Submitted by Anonymous	There is no reason anyone hoping to become an American citizen or resident of the United States of America should have their social media presence assessed in the process. Anybody with a social media account of any kind knows that their online persona(s) can be tracked down and linked to their identity by anyone who wishes to find it, and there is no reason that social media should have anything to do with immigration. The idea that an individual's online presence would have anything to do with their right to live in the United States is an intrusion on the fundamental civil liberties that supposedly define this country, namely the right to free speech without judgment or repercussion, and it has severely negative
USCIS-2025-0003-0718	Comment Submitted by Julio Perez	This is actually unbelievable that an American Government would require such information. Has the Constitution and it's Bill of Rights been suspended? Stop this Totalitarian approach to apparently everything this administration does. STOP IT NOW!
USCIS-2025-0003-0719	Comment Submitted by Priya Sridhar	Hello, I am writing to protest this violation of free speech. Such a motion is unconstitutional and biased, while forcing talented people to share their skills with other countries. Do the right thing and do not enable this.

USCIS-2025-0003-0720	Comment Submitted by Anonymous	Transparently dangerous and a gross violation of essential rights.
USCIS-2025-0003-0721	Comment Submitted by Anonymous	I think this is a terrible idea. Social media posts can are not a reflection of who a person is. They can reflect how people feel on a day to day basis, but not be how they feel about issues at the time they are applying for visas or citizenship. They should also be considered free speech that shouldn't be used against them in any way.
USCIS-2025-0003-0722	Comment Submitted by Anonymous	This proposal is in direct violation of the first amendment of the US Constitution.
USCIS-2025-0003-0723	Comment Submitted by Anonymous	I think this is absolutely necessary. We do not need people in our country who wish to support those who wish harm to our country. Pro hamas individuals should have their green cards or even their citizenship revoked!
USCIS-2025-0003-0724	Comment Submitted by Jessica Adams	The proposal to require immigrants legally residing in the United States to submit social media profiles for government review is an obscene overreach of authority. This would trample on free speech rights as well as the privacy rights of these legal residents, and raises serious concerns of "slippery slope" issues - how long before the administration moves from reviewing the social media of legal immigrants for consideration of status revocation and deportation to requiring the same of natural born citizens? The administration has already proved it will deport people to countries other than their origin, why should we think this wouldn't also eventually lead to shipping off citizens to a country they've never been to? That this has even been proposed, and is under consideration is a shame on the history of our democratic institutions and an insult to every immigrant who has ever contributed to our society.
USCIS-2025-0003-0725	Comment Submitted by Anonymous	This is a terribad idea. How the freak does someone's social media have anything to do with immigration. And screw saying it helps verify their identity, I can make a social media account look like it matches anyone. This is like asking what other consumer products they have used in their life.
USCIS-2025-0003-0726	Comment Submitted by Anonymous	Collecting data on social media accounts from parents, stepparents, and spouses is nearly impossible. Social media accounts are deeply personal, and those individuals can simply refuse to provide the information or provide incomplete information, endangering the petitioners' application.
USCIS-2025-0003-0727	Comment Submitted by Anonymous	The USCIS states that it wants to collect social handles as follows: "This data will be collected from certain populations of individuals on applications for immigration-related benefits and is necessary for the enhanced identity verification, vetting and national security screening and, inspection conducted by USCIS and required under the E.O." Who are "certain individuals", the USCIS should clarify how it determines the groups whose social handles need to be collected. The UCSIS claims that social handles will improve identity verification. The agency already collects documents that verify identity, such as birth certificates, IDs, passport copies, and marriage certificates, among others, all far more credible than social media handles. The agency claims that social handles are needed to help with national security screening. The information posted on social media is not actionable plans to endanger US security; what the agency is expecting to examine are mostly criticisms of the current administration and political figures. It is obvious that the agency wants this information to target individuals who oppose the administration in power, criticize its actions, or support its opponents. It is a blatant attack on free speech and a shameful way to screen out immigration applicants based on their views. The USCIS must also consider that social accounts are frequently stolen and impersonated, often with no recourse to the original user to restore their account. The UCSIS does not explain how it intends to deal with social handles from anonymous social networks such as Reddit, the entire platform built on anonymity. Lastly, the USCIS expects the burden of information collection to be 0.08 hr or 5 minutes. This is a gross understatement. For people whose exposure to social media begins as young as their teenage years, there may be multiple social accounts, some active, some abandoned. The applicants, fearing misrepresenting information to UCSIS, would need to remember somehow and find all of their accounts. The author of this comment has two Facebook accounts, a Twitter account or two (deleted), a tiktok account (stolen and finally deleted), a LiveJournal account, an Instagram, Snapchat, multiple Reddit accounts, and several foreign accounts that are inaccessible now. The UCSIS also does not clarify if it intends to request content that was posted privately or for friends only. The agency does not explain how it would expect to collect information from deleted social media accounts, where past information is not
USCIS-2025-0003-0728	Comment Submitted by Anonymous	This is a blatant and obvious violation of the first amendment which guarantees freedom of speech and the fourth amendment which protects against unlawful searches. All searches with the exception of the threat of immediate danger must be approved by a judge based on evidence that justifies the necessity of a search. Any "evidence" obtained by an illegal search cannot be used against an individual.
USCIS-2025-0003-0729	Comment Submitted by Ariana Smith	This proposed collection of social media accounts is an invasion of privacy of unprecedented proportion, and no cause has been shown that would justify this - what link can DHS show between someone's TikTok account and their eligibility for immigration relief? The applications at hand ask intense, exhaustive vetting questions and applicants sign under penalty of perjury - not to mention, applicants are subject to biometrics which determine whether they have criminal history. This additional measure goes above and beyond what is appropriate and proportional to collecting the requisite information regarding whether applicants pose national security or other risks to the United States, and its extremely limited (if existent at all) utility does not outweigh the massive waste of time it imposes on agencies as well as the taxpayers funding them. For an administration focused on "efficiency," this proposed rulemaking is shocking and frankly inconsistent with the administration's stated goals (where is DOGE here?).
USCIS-2025-0003-0730	Comment Submitted by Anonymous	This goes against the constitution's direct protection of free speech, privacy and is absolutely not the sign of a democracy. This is an outrageous overreach of the government. What happened to small government and freedom of expression and liberty?
USCIS-2025-0003-0731	Comment Submitted by Finn M	This is gross overreach and does nothing but encourage harassment and penalization, and is in complete violation of the first amendment, and right to privacy. I am writing in strong opposition to this proposition.
USCIS-2025-0003-0732	Comment Submitted by Anonymous	I do not support the policy being considered here—every policy I do not support the policy being considered here. The first amendment protects even those applying for legal immigration status. Their activity on social media should not subject them to refusal and should not come under consideration in the process of evaluating applications. I strongly oppose this country having this be part of our official immigration application process.
USCIS-2025-0003-0733	Comment Submitted by Steven R	This proposal violates free speech. Free speech & privacy are essential in a democracy.
USCIS-2025-0003-0734	Comment Submitted by Anonymous	The Trump Administration has shown it can't be trusted with any personal or classified information (most recent demonstration: Pete Hegseth). When it comes to social media, Trump should agree to let his own, and his friend Musk's unhinged and unprofessional accounts be investigated, flagged, taken down, and so on. I am firmly against the collection of social media identifiers on immigration forms. It's clearly anti-immigrant because this administration won't even put the magnifying glass on its own wrongdoings. They'd rather focus on targeting a group of people trying to do what most folks are trying to do-make a better life for themselves.
USCIS-2025-0003-0735	Comment Submitted by Anonymous	What is the purpose of this? That government critics are kicked out of the country before they have an opportunity to become citizens? Awful idea that could be turned on conservatives next time that Republicans are not in power.
USCIS-2025-0003-0736	Comment Submitted by Anonymous	I firmly disagree with the policy being presented for people seeking a green card or other immigration benefits to being submitted to providing their social media accounts and identities. This policy is harmful, and can easily be used in unconstitutional ways.

USCIS-2025-0003-0737	Inappropriate Comment Submitted by Anonymous	You vile racist un-American tRumpig cunts.Do the country a solid and swallow a load.
USCIS-2025-0003-0738	Comment Submitted by Anonymous	Unnecessary and completely unreliable. Social media handles can be created multiple times for an individual and can be changed multiple times over. New ones can be created, old ones deleted This is a waste of resources, tax payer money and time. Not to mention, it's highly questionable from a privacy perspective.
USCIS-2025-0003-0739	Comment Submitted by Anonymous	This proposal is against free speech. What happened to a free country!
USCIS-2025-0003-0740	Comment Submitted by The Law Office of Driver Womack, PLC	While legally there is no expectation to privacy for what you hold out to the public, there is an expectation to being forced to provide information with just cause. This should remain as it is a balancing act for the federal government. The government searching and viewing what can be viewed by all the public constitutional rights are not being infringed upon. However, asking an individual to provide all social media handles and etc. can be likened to an unreasonable and unjustified search. Tapping the government asking for a benefit should bot expose you to unreasonable and unnecessary abuse and scrutiny. Again, the balance is being reasonable. The demand for handles is overreach. And please tell me, who hasn't forgotten his or her handle or email created?! If an immigrant happens to forgot one of their handles this then allows the government to easily state the immigrant is inadmissible.
USCIS-2025-0003-0741	Comment Submitted by Annie La Rue	This is a violation of the letter and the spirit of our guiding document, the constitution. The first amendment should not be abridged. This would have a chilling effect on free speech and that is not acceptable for any reason. As Americans, we should value our freedoms not only for ourselves, but for every human being. This requirement is a feeble attempt to use prior speech as a tool to exclude persons from this country. The very essence of this freedom is that we must allow speech we do not agree with to continue to exist freely, along with speech we do agree with. If this is changed, we will no longer be free, any of us, and the constitution will have no power to govern our nation. I strongly support the constitutional right to free speech and do not support this proposal today or at any future date. This would also chill efforts by the press to do their jobs. It is an unnecessary invasion of privacy, and an inappropriate and inefficient method to determine the likely level of safety of any individual wishing to enter our country. This is a terrible unAmerican idea, and should be rejected outright.
USCIS-2025-0003-0742	Comment Submitted by Anonymous	strongly oppose - a waste of tax payer money to encroach on free speech
USCIS-2025-0003-0743	Comment Submitted by Todd Kranock-Alagbar	I do not support monitoring individual social media handles. Free speech is one of the founding rights of this country. This possible practice would be a slippery slope. When would any such surveillance end? After they become citizens? Would this practice be applied to full citizens after being naturalized? I strongly oppose this proposal and so should every American. <u>The government should not even proposing this policy if it come from a position of protecting the constitution.</u>
USCIS-2025-0003-0744	Comment Submitted by Anonymous	Asking this information of people who are already here, working in the USA, violates their right to freedom of speech. Everyone has an expectation of privacy as well, and this should also be respected. Furthermore, there are many sides of social media posts that just are "fake". People show what others want to see, not necessarily who they are. I think this is just another attempt at the Government trying to control people in a democracy.
USCIS-2025-0003-0745	Comment Submitted by Manuel Ortiz	Anything threatening our first amendment rights is unacceptable.Our fourth amendment rights against unreasonable search and seizure must also be respected.
USCIS-2025-0003-0746	Comment Submitted by B R	Anyone residing in the US has a guarantee of free speech under the First Amendment, which ensures that the people can criticize the federal, state, and local governments without harm. To review the social media - or speech - of legal residents, asylees, or any visa holder or applicant - and to just people based on it is a violation both in fact and Spirit of the First Amendment. Just because someone is critical of the US or Israel or any other country or government does not make them a national security risk to the US.
USCIS-2025-0003-0747	Inappropriate Comment Submitted by fuck you	you are fucking nazis. fuck you
USCIS-2025-0003-0748	Comment Submitted by Concerned Patriot	This request is Absolutely Unpatriotic and spits in the face of our constitution and our right to freedom of speech and expression.
USCIS-2025-0003-0749	Comment Submitted by Christine Sublett	Any surveillance or collection of social media or other information on foreign nationals should also be directed and required of domestic terrorists and domestic people of interest.
USCIS-2025-0003-0750	Comment Submitted by Anonymous	This policy leaves the door wide open for violations of constitutional protections across the board, beginning with protected free speech that is essential for a democracy to survive. Abuses have already taken place in the last few weeks. This policy proposal is an attack on every citizens right to free speech, and an attack on people's right to peacefully protest.
USCIS-2025-0003-0751	Comment Submitted by Anonymous	In support of. You are free to speak however you are not free of any consequences for your speech.
USCIS-2025-0003-0752	Comment Submitted by Anonymous	Besides violating free speech, social media is not a reliable tool. It can still be hacked or stolen, which would affect someone's status. People also grow and views change. Another concern is whether someone uses social media. Not everyone has an account or uses their accounts.
USCIS-2025-0003-0753	Comment Submitted by Lillie Baugh	I agree they use social media to hide so turnabout is fair play

USCIS-2025-0003-0754	Comment Submitted by Emilie Harris	As an American citizen, I am concerned about broadening social media screening to grant visa or citizenship status. I believe that this will leave too much room for the personal bias of the officer doing the screening.
USCIS-2025-0003-0755	Comment Submitted by Heather Whitaker	The only reason this is being suggested is to identify people with opinions critical of the administration. This kind of thought policing is a violation of free speech and is utterly anti-American.
USCIS-2025-0003-0756	Comment Submitted by Amanda Andrews	This is absolutely governmental overreach. It suppresses free speech and free communication and discourages the essential debate of new ideas and innovation. I do not support the Collection of Social Media Identifier(s) on Immigration Forms.
USCIS-2025-0003-0757	Comment Submitted by Anonymous	I believe that anyone who is attempting to gain entrance into a new country should submit any and all information necessary to establish their eligibility to enter that country. If people do not wish to do this, then they risk possible denial of entrance. Please keep in mind, the monitoring of social media accounts to verify a person's statements or character, is done every day in the U.S. by employers and others seeking to validate information provided by persons they may wish to hire, admit to a technical school, apply for programs, etc. Americans submit to background checks, credit checks, drug testing, and a myriad of other verification processes. Persons requesting to enter the U.S. should also be prepared to show who they are. If they do not wish to do so, then they are free to apply to another country.
USCIS-2025-0003-0758	Comment Submitted by Anonymous	Requesting social media handle is a clear violation of free speech which is part of the United States Constitution.
USCIS-2025-0003-0759	Comment Submitted by Anonymous	Requiring citizenship and green card applicants to submit their social media handles raises serious concerns about privacy, free speech, and potential discrimination. This policy could discourage people from expressing themselves online out of fear that their posts may be misinterpreted or unfairly used against them. Additionally, it risks creating an environment where individuals are judged not on their legal qualifications but on subjective evaluations of their online activity. Instead of enhancing security, this measure may disproportionately impact certain groups and undermine fundamental rights.
USCIS-2025-0003-0760	Comment Submitted by IfUrSilentnXsofOppression UrTakngSideofTheOppressor	As a United States Citizen by birth I'm appalled by the audacious overreach by our government into the personal lives of it's citizens and non-citizens. If citizens were granted the same overreach into the private lives of our government officials, I guarantee things far worse than anything found on a non citizens social media would come to light. Perhaps we should look within our selves for our own righteousness before checking someone's Tik Tok to verify theirs.
USCIS-2025-0003-0761	Comment Submitted by Anonymous	Stay out of individuals' social media. If the administration is all about "free speech", then you certainly don't need to be prosecuting and deporting people for their "free speech" because it doesn't agree with the president. That's authoritarianism, NOT free speech. And BTW, send deport elon as an illegal immigrant.
USCIS-2025-0003-0762	Comment Submitted by Rosa Murphy	Don't do this! This is against everything that could make America align with its professed values!
USCIS-2025-0003-0763	Comment Submitted by Cathy Martin	This is DYSTOPIAN!!!! This is America!! The land of the free!! You can not pass legislation like this it is un-American. NO ONE WANTS THIS!!! This is Nazi-like!!!
USCIS-2025-0003-0764	Comment Submitted by Anonymous	This goes against the law of free speech established by lawmakers of our democracy. Thanks.
USCIS-2025-0003-0765	Comment Submitted by Anonymous	If you're asking for the opinions of Citizens of your proposed policy, well then as a voting citizen, I don't trust anything you say. I don't approve nor do I condone what you are thinking of doing on the grounds of the 4th Amendment protections. But we all know you don't care about pesky things like Laws or Constitutional rights so why are you even asking?
USCIS-2025-0003-0766	Comment Submitted by Anonymous	This is an invasion of privacy and free speech that meets the expectation of the Chinese CCP. People who already lived in the USA are already accustomed to the USA norms, and are trying to live the American dream. Why are roadblocks being presented?
USCIS-2025-0003-0767	Comment Submitted by Anonymous Anonymous	This proposal violates free speech, which, last I checked is a protected right per the first amendment. I'm ashamed to be an American in these times. This is not making anything great at all.
USCIS-2025-0003-0768	Comment Submitted by Dot Wellington	This is a blatant violation of the right to privacy under the 14th amendment. Regardless of political beliefs or stance on immigration, this is obvious government overreach.
USCIS-2025-0003-0769	Comment Submitted by Benjamin Chiszar	We are under invasion. We are at War! The most important thing we can do as a nation is to keep our enemies out. We should stop ALL migration to the US for 5 years. If not, then One of the best ways to identify those who don't share our Judeo-Christian Democratic Capitalist values is to dramatically increase the vetting process. We must check ALL available backgrounds including anything and everything related to the invaders viewpoints. Please check all social media and internet footprints. Please check all writings. Please check all associations and that of family/friends. We must do everything we can to intentionally exclude as many of the 7.7 Billion humans who want to destroy America by existing within her. The
USCIS-2025-0003-0770	Comment Submitted by T H	I can comment here anonymously and say whatever I want as protected by the First Amendment, yet you want to take away that right from those who come to the US? No. That is not okay. People have the right to not have the government invade their private spaces or anonymous identities. This is an unacceptable government overreach. Use the data attached to the government issued identification that a person already has to hand over when they enter the country. Their personal online profiles and handles are not yours to invade, judge, or use to prosecute or persecute. If you see something you don't like, will you ship them off to a prison in El Salvador or Gitmo? This administration should be denied access to personal information not pertinent to identity or legal standing. What someone likes, shares, writes, and the images they post are none of your business. Withdraw this ridiculous suggestion that
USCIS-2025-0003-0771	Comment Submitted by Anonymous	This is anti free speech and should not be implemented
USCIS-2025-0003-0772	Comment Submitted by Anonymous	Do NOT do this! It is an affront to American values and the Constitutional right of free speech. Besides, a social media profile can be faked for good and bad reasons. Nothing found in such a manner could or should be trusted to make proper decisions. I am a US Citizen born and raised, college educated, and a combat veteran, this is NOT what America should be focused on, it's wrong, and a stupid idea.
USCIS-2025-0003-0773	Comment Submitted by Anonymous	Yes please start this. Our country is not safe now, and this will definitely help
USCIS-2025-0003-0774	Comment Submitted by Elisa Krause	This does absolutely nothing! You know that people can change their social media IDs and do it all the time. Who is to say that "orangeape47" is the same person on Reddit, Facebook and Blue Sky? Stop smacking on free speech. I get that the dude looks to 1933 Germany as a blueprint for how to run a nation, but this is trampling on everyone's rights. Has nobody read 1984? "War is Peace. Freedom is Slavery. Ignorance is Strength." And I am ashamed of everyone who stands behind this fascist regime.

USCIS-2025-0003-0775	Comment Submitted by Anonymous	I strongly oppose the Department of Homeland Security's plan to collect social media handles from Americans and legal immigrants applying for immigration benefits. This is exactly the kind of government overreach that conservatives have been warning about for years. First, it was the Patriot Act. Then it was spying on American citizens. Now it's compiling lists of people's social media activity, which smells a lot like Big Brother tracking political speech. We all want our country to be safe. But this isn't safety, it's surveillance. This policy opens the door to weaponizing government tools against people who express the "wrong" opinions. Who decides what's a threat? Some unelected bureaucrat in Washington? We've already seen how vague "national security" claims have been used to target conservatives, veterans, parents at school board meetings, and others who simply dare to speak up. This is a slippery slope. Today it's immigrants, tomorrow it could be natural-born American citizens. You don't protect freedom by sacrificing the very rights that define America. I voted for a government that protects borders and stands for the Constitution, not one that spies on us like we live in China. This proposal is un-American, it sets a dangerous precedent, and it needs to be shut down. <u>Withdraw this policy. Get back to enforcing the law and protecting our rights, not invading our privacy.</u>
USCIS-2025-0003-0776	Comment Submitted by Anonymous	We DO NOT live in a big brother state and this is NOT a Communist country where the Government has a right to MY private conversations with others, or to use it as a tool to harass people seeking to better themselves. I cannot actually believe I live in a country that would ever think that this ok or allowable. This is the country of the free, not thailand where they have cameras on every corner and they use it to force compliance. Who is to say they won't be using it for others? Trans people? Gay people? People who say they don't agree with a rule or current administration? <u>This is an asset on my rights as an american citizen to privacy. I am making this comment anon because this is staring to become a Fascist country .</u>
USCIS-2025-0003-0777	Comment Submitted by Kathleen Graber	I am against this Generic Clearance for Collection of Social Media identifiers! Too often innocent citizens get entangled in nets such as this. This search would be unconstitutional and goes against our 1st Amendment rights which you should be familiar with being a government agency.
USCIS-2025-0003-0778	Comment Submitted by Anonymous	This proposal violates free speech. Free speech & privacy are essential in a democracy.
USCIS-2025-0003-0779	Comment Submitted by Anonymous	People are free to express their ideas and opinions without fear even if they contradict the party currently in power. Unless a person action is against others safety and peace; Law has nothing to do with his/her opinions
USCIS-2025-0003-0780	Comment Submitted by Lauren Daaboul	I am against monitoring social media of immigrants and green card applicants. I don't think the government should have access.
USCIS-2025-0003-0781	Comment Submitted by Anonymous	This proposal claims to "ensure that those seeking immigration benefits to live and work in the United States do not threaten public safety, undermine national security, or promote harmful anti-American ideologies," according to a statement by a USCIS spokesperson, and there is the likely possibility that AI is used to assist with it. Such regulations are dangerously vague and may be used to unlawfully suppress freedom of speech. There is no concrete definition of what constitutes "threats to public safety", "undermining national security", or "harmful anti-American ideologies." Such vagueness opens the door for abuse to remove those who simply hold perfectly reasonable and patriotic views that the current government in charge might disagree with. Second, using AI is extremely unreliable and dangerous. Not only will that involve submitting possibly hundreds of thousands of people's data to unnecessary and insecure intrusions, but it is very likely that the AI will not be able to consistently make judgements about what social media posts are relevant to the law and therefore
USCIS-2025-0003-0782	Comment Submitted by Kelly Reske-Espinali	Freedom of speech and expression are protected by the first amendment. Just because Trump and other MAGAs are snowflakes that can't handle the truth about them being terrible doesn't make somebody a terrorist or otherwise ineligible for immigration benefits. No other administration considered allowing g negative comments to impact immigration benefits.
USCIS-2025-0003-0783	Comment Submitted by Anonymous	This is a terrible idea. Immigrating to the USA should not force someone to give up their first amendment rights. There's nothing to protect immigrants from DHS using these days improperly.
USCIS-2025-0003-0784	Comment Submitted by Anonymous	It is not the responsibility of the US government to violate the privacy of those entering the United States beyond the absolute boundaries necessary. When customs already checked for criminality, why does it find it necessary to further violate privacy? If criminality is established (and not by declaring protected actions as criminal), further breaches of should and will not
USCIS-2025-0003-0785	Comment Submitted by Anonymous	Do not do this!! The US is wasting resources to send the message that current administration is not accepting of people from ethnicities and races other than whites. ICE is going above and beyond, emboldened and authorized by the current administration's hatred, to remove those who are here legally but who disagree with the current administration's view. That is anti-American and anti free speech. Culling more data from social media breeds more paranoia with a witch hunt that makes us NO SAFER. these efforts and resources need to be
USCIS-2025-0003-0786	Comment Submitted by Anonymous	I believe this to violate free speech and due process.
USCIS-2025-0003-0787	Comment Submitted by Anonymous Anonymous	Using social media for processing immigration is a bad idea for multiple reasons. First, our government has shown it cannot be trusted to be viewpoint-neutral. It *will* use the acceptability in its eyes of people's opinions to go after people. Second, it's an unreliable means of data collection. Impersonation and mistaken identification are common. How can you tell which Juan Valdez is associated with an account? Third, it will chill free speech, as people will rightly fear being targeted for their views.
USCIS-2025-0003-0788	Comment Submitted by Katherine Nelson	This proposal clearly violates, free speech. The Americans are tired of government overreach.
USCIS-2025-0003-0789	Comment Submitted by Anonymous	Absolutely not. Our government is too divided and politically motivated to their distinct parties instead of doing what is actually best for our nation. I don't trust anyone to make unbiased decisions about the contents of people's social media. We have free speech and people's politics if not harming others shouldn't determine whether they get approved for immigration
USCIS-2025-0003-0790	Comment Submitted by Philip Merrick	This is a terrible policy. It's designed to limit our freedom of speech and give the government more control over our lives. It's totalitarian and un-American.
USCIS-2025-0003-0791	Comment Submitted by Jamie Hulsey	I absolutely oppose this. There are already measures put in place since Obama was in office. Anymore of this is A COMPLETE GOVERNMENT OVERREACH by our horrible president. Enough is enough!
USCIS-2025-0003-0792	Comment Submitted by Anonymous	I do not support this regulation. There is no legal or legitimate basis for the government to infringe upon an individual's right to share their views and opinions online. Furthermore, it is a poor determination of a person's long-term views of the government once in the U.S. This regulation becomes the precedent for future use of social media to pry into the private lives of individuals; adoption, for example.
USCIS-2025-0003-0793	Comment Submitted by Anonymous	I am opposed to this proposal since I think it is discrimanatory overreach. While it is reasonable to vet those benefitting from immigration, social media is used in such a haphazard way, with people sometimes posting flippant comments that are not their true feelings, or liking something one day, but really not agreeing, not to mention that it can be hacked and abused by unknowns. None of this is exceptional, making the risk of drawing the wrong conclusion about a person's background and/or feelings relatively high. It is discrimanatory in that it seems to imply there is a bigger risk among foreign born/noncitizens than among citizens. Crime and even domestic terrorism remains higher among native born citizen population.

USCIS-2025-0003-0794	Comment Submitted by Anonymous	The Department of Homeland Security and the U.S. Citizen and Immigration Services should use every avenue available to vet prospective citizens, especially on social media. Many companies are asking for a prospective employee's social media history therefore, it should also apply to anyone requesting entry into the United States. The 1st Amendment should only apply to people once they become citizens. Prior to that, and during the vetting process, every post made on their social media accounts should be scrutinized for anti-American and
USCIS-2025-0003-0795	Comment Submitted by Anonymous	The American people truly want free speech, less surveillance, and to know were being heard. Stuff like this is not only limiting speech, but its also leading to cases of little to no due process and if that's happening what's next?
USCIS-2025-0003-0796	Comment Submitted by Anonymous	I am writing to oppose this policy, which represents an inappropriate infringement on privacy and freedom of speech for immigrants and would have a chilling effect on freedom of expression and debate.
USCIS-2025-0003-0797	Comment Submitted by Anonymous	I as a U.S. citizen am fully against and reject President Donald Trump's Executive order.
USCIS-2025-0003-0798	Comment Submitted by Anonymous	I am against this proposal due to the fact that social media handles are easily replicated and often falsely. Millions of people have been a victim of social media hacking, had their data stolen and published as a fake profile. This proposal can result in an immigrant being falsely denied or accused of things they have zero connection to. A simple search for Elon Musk for example will populate thousands, and I do mean thousands of profiles connected not only to him but also his businesses, many of which are likely not even him. Therefore, it is not a verifiable or reliable means of evaluating anyone.
USCIS-2025-0003-0799	Comment Submitted by Manoj Moorthy	This is really important since anti-national communists, palestine and hamas supporters, anti government social media movement makers all should be properly vetted before advancing any status of theirs since this will help make them grow from strength to strength further impacting the national security and internal threats. Thank you and God bless
USCIS-2025-0003-0800	Comment Submitted by Anonymous	One of the dumbest ideas yet. How do you create a "uniform" standard spanning all languages , slang and ages ? How do you interpret poetic license in a different language? For example "I could kill for a beer" , could be interpreted in a multitude of ways and then multiply that with the complexity of different languages. This is an example of a stupid tax waste to stroke the egos of the incompetent.
USCIS-2025-0003-0801	Comment Submitted by Anonymous	America is built on the backs of immigrants and slaves. Deport Trump back to Germany, then we can talk about enforcing immigration laws.
USCIS-2025-0003-0802	Comment Submitted by Anonymous	This is an infringement of one's right to free speech
USCIS-2025-0003-0803	Comment Submitted by Anonymous	I am absolutely against this. I already see my country detaining visa and green card holders in perpetuity without charges for holding opinions that differ from our current administration. I find that this plan, on its face, only makes that easier and more likely. No more abducting students for having wrong-think. I hate it. I think this plan exposes the worst and weakest tendencies of our country in a meaningless show of repression, asking me to surrender my freedoms and the freedoms of my community in the name of illusory security. You want to chill free speech? Because I cannot imagine this having any other end-goal excepting to make people too afraid to speak out against the erosions of democracy that I already see.
USCIS-2025-0003-0804	Inappropriate Comment Submitted by Dain Carlsson	I thought we lived in america, not fucking nazi germany. You should all be fucking ashamed of yourselves, fucking pathetic
USCIS-2025-0003-0805	Comment Submitted by Moira Ryan	To Whom It May Concern, I am writing to express my concerns regarding the proposed collection of social media identifiers by U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services (USCIS) as outlined in Docket ID USCIS-2025-0003. While I recognize the importance of national security and effective vetting processes, I urge the agency to reconsider this measure due to its potential implications for privacy, free expression, and administrative burden. Lack of Practical Utility This proposal lacks clear evidence that collecting social media identifiers meaningfully enhances national security. Research has shown that broad social media surveillance often leads to false positives, misinterpretation of context, and an overwhelming amount of data with minimal actionable intelligence. Without transparent criteria for how this information will be assessed, there is a risk of subjective or biased determinations that could unjustly impact applicants. Chilling Effect on Free Speech and Privacy Concerns The mandatory disclosure of social media handles raises serious First and Fourth Amendment concerns. Many individuals use social media to engage in political discourse, organize community efforts, or discuss personal experiences—including sensitive matters such as religion, gender identity, and trauma. Knowing that USCIS will scrutinize their online presence may deter applicants from exercising their right to free speech, even in lawful and non-threatening ways. Additionally, requiring social media identifiers creates an environment of mass surveillance, where individuals fear their past posts could be misinterpreted and used against them. Disproportionate Burden on Applicants The estimated time burden of 0.08 hours (approximately 5 minutes) per respondent is unrealistic and does not account for the complexity of social media usage. Many applicants have multiple accounts across various platforms, some spanning over a decade. It is unclear whether applicants will be expected to provide historical handles, private account information, or explanations for deleted content. This uncertainty places undue stress on individuals already navigating an often complex and lengthy immigration process. Potential for Discriminatory Impact There is a significant risk that this policy will disproportionately affect certain immigrant populations. Social media content is often informal, multilingual, and reliant on cultural context, making it prone to misinterpretation—especially by government officials unfamiliar with the nuances of different languages and online communities. Without clear guidelines and accountability measures, there is a heightened risk that racial, religious, or political biases could influence decision-making. Recommendation to Minimize Burden and Safeguard Rights If USCIS proceeds with this proposal, it must establish clear, publicly available guidelines detailing: How social media data will be used in decision-making What safeguards will be in place to prevent discrimination and ensure due process How applicants can appeal decisions influenced by social media findings Whether applicants will be required to disclose private or deleted content Additionally, a robust impact assessment should be conducted to evaluate whether this measure effectively improves security outcomes or merely increases bureaucratic hurdles. For these reasons, I urge USCIS to reconsider the necessity of this proposal or, at a minimum,
USCIS-2025-0003-0806	Comment Submitted by Ellen Despina	This violates our free speech.
USCIS-2025-0003-0807	Comment Submitted by Anonymous	This proposal is ridiculous. See the Constitution. the government may not restrict speech!
USCIS-2025-0003-0808	Inappropriate Comment Submitted by Dain Carlsson	Hey you fucking nazis
USCIS-2025-0003-0809	Comment Submitted by Craig Dobbins	This is a terrible idea. It reeks of Orwellian fascism, and has no place in a democracy. Even non-citizens are supposed to have their rights protected by the first amendment. This is completely unacceptable, un-democratic, un-republican, and a step towards an erosion of all of our rights.

USCIS-2025-0003-0810	Comment Submitted by Anonymous	The proposed regulation, which would require immigration applicants to disclose their social media identifiers, raises significant concerns about privacy and freedom of expression. Mandating the submission of personal social media information is akin to government surveillance of private lives, infringing upon individual liberties protected by the Constitution. This policy may deter applicants from freely expressing themselves online, fearing that their posts could be misinterpreted or used against them in the immigration process. Such a chilling effect on free speech is antithetical to the democratic values that the United States upholds. Furthermore, collecting and analyzing social media data is fraught with challenges, including the potential for misinterpretation and bias, which could lead to unjust outcomes. The Electronic Privacy Information Center (EPIC) has pointed out the susceptibility of social media information to misinterpretation and bias, casting doubt on its reliability in vetting processes. The implementation of this regulation not only invades personal privacy but also sets a concerning precedent for governmental overreach into the personal lives of individuals seeking to contribute to American society. However, it's essential to consider the more significant implications of this policy on civil liberties and seek alternative methods that respect individual rights while addressing national security concerns. There is hope in finding
USCIS-2025-0003-0811	Comment Submitted by Anonymous	This is a violation of free speech. It is not a means to "vet" immigrants. It will take unnecessary resources and cost taxpayers money and it is just a means to subjugate immigrants. Do not do this.
USCIS-2025-0003-0812	Comment Submitted by Anonymous	This should absolutely be mandatory. Seeking entry into our country is a privilege and not a right. What people post publicly is fair game for assessment and if the person seeking a visa, asylum, or other isn't willing to provide this information, then that is a huge red flag. If we can deny entry into those that wish us harm and it saves a single life it's worth it. If an individual seeking entry posts pro-hamas or anti-American extremism, I don't want them in our country.
USCIS-2025-0003-0813	Comment Submitted by Anonymous	The United States has long stood as a beacon of freedom, privacy, and individual rights. However, the proposal to collect social media handles in immigration applications is a blatant overreach that mirrors the same mass surveillance tactics used in authoritarian regimes like China and Russia. It is deeply concerning that a country that champions democracy and human rights is now adopting the same oppressive strategies it condemns abroad. If national security is the concern, the U.S. government should follow due process and require legitimate evidence before conducting investigations—NOT treat every applicant as a suspect from the start. This proposal directly violates: •The right to privacy – There is no justification for mass surveillance of individuals who are following legal immigration procedures. •Freedom of expression – This measure will force applicants to self-censor out of fear that their social media activity could be misinterpreted or unfairly used against them. •America's core democratic values – Implementing a broad surveillance system contradicts the nation's commitment to liberty and justice. The U.S. cannot denounce authoritarian governments while using the same invasive tactics. If someone poses a legitimate risk, the government must conduct individual investigations based on evidence, not impose a blanket surveillance system on millions of people. I urge you to reject this proposal entirely. It is not only unjust and invasive but also sets a dangerous precedent toward a permanent surveillance state. ChatGPT said: Here's your refined version with a strong, clear, and persuasive tone: The United States has long been a global symbol of freedom, privacy, and individual rights. Yet, the proposal to collect social media handles in immigration applications is a blatant overreach—one that mirrors the mass surveillance tactics used by authoritarian regimes like China and Russia. It is deeply troubling that a nation founded on democracy and human rights is now adopting the very same oppressive strategies it condemns abroad. If national security is the concern, the U.S. government should follow due process and require legitimate evidence before conducting investigations—not treat every applicant as a suspect from the outset. This proposal is a direct violation of: • The right to privacy – There is no justification for the mass surveillance of individuals who are following legal immigration procedures. • Freedom of expression – This measure will pressure applicants to self-censor, fearing their social media activity could be misinterpreted or unfairly used against them. • America's core democratic values – A broad surveillance system contradicts the nation's commitment to liberty and justice. The U.S. cannot credibly denounce authoritarian governments while employing the same invasive tactics. If someone poses a legitimate risk, the government must conduct targeted investigations based on evidence—not impose mass surveillance on millions of people. I urge you to reject this proposal entirely. It is not only unjust and invasive but also sets a
USCIS-2025-0003-0814	Comment Submitted by Kyle Waite	This is a clear and obvious attempt to penalize and suppress free speech
USCIS-2025-0003-0815	Comment Submitted by Julia Finder	This is an invasion of privacy, a violation of the first amendment, and a gross misuse of government resources. No one's social media should be a factor for any government aid or
USCIS-2025-0003-0816	Comment Submitted by Anonymous	What a waste of time and money. This is a blatant attempt to remove free speech. 8
USCIS-2025-0003-0817	Comment Submitted by Anonymous	Absolutely not. It is a fact that immigrants are less likely to commit crimes than those born in the United States. This is nothing more than another attempt to undermine privacy and stifle free speech in the name of so called security. This administration has proven that it will use any information found to be even remotely critical of the administration or their policies as an excuse to retaliate against our allies, private companies, universities, law firms and even our legal residents.
USCIS-2025-0003-0818	Comment Submitted by Anonymous	This is a direct violation of Free Speech. Collection of social media identifiers should never be used to personally ID and/or vet anyone, as these identifiers accounts are not even inherently secured against threats/subversion. Nor do most social media accounts require a user to submit proof of citizenship as a condition of use. To even BEGIN tracking these details by government would run afoul of various privacy laws that already exist to protect identities.
USCIS-2025-0003-0819	Comment Submitted by Anonymous	This proposal is unconstitutional. This proposal violates free speech. Free speech & privacy are essential for democracy.
USCIS-2025-0003-0820	Comment Submitted by Jessie N	This is an unconstitutional attack on free speech. It is unacceptable in these circumstances but, also, those of you who support this beware--if this is passed, some version of it will eventually be used on all Americans, not just the immigrants that you seek to deport, even though they are doing exactly what they're supposed to be doing.
USCIS-2025-0003-0821	Comment Submitted by Anonymous	Please preserve our deomcracy. Please preserve our free speech. First amendment must stay in tact.
USCIS-2025-0003-0822	Comment Submitted by Anonymous	This expanded search of social media posts that are anti-Trump violates everyone's rights to Freedom of Speech, INCLUDING Visa holders living and working in the US. It's totally unacceptable and needs to stop!
USCIS-2025-0003-0823	Comment Submitted by Anonymous	This is insane. Absolutely not OK with Big Brother coming in.
USCIS-2025-0003-0824	Comment Submitted by Ralph Warmack	I fully support the proposal to consider social media comments on applications for visas, green cards, asylum and any other authorization to reside in the USA.
USCIS-2025-0003-0825	Comment Submitted by Andrea H	This violates the constitution and free speech rights. I am strongly opposed.
USCIS-2025-0003-0826	Comment Submitted by John Blaze	This seems to just be more government overreach to strip away first amendment rights. Especially since so much more crime is done by natural born US citizens. What evidence is there that this would help at all?

USCIS-2025-0003-0827	Comment Submitted by Anonymous	As a US citizen who has for my entire lifetime, had to provide various documentation to verify personal identity for hundreds of purposes, including the intrusive employer/insurance E-Verify (which is shared among hundreds of other entities), while illegal aliens and non-citizens have benefitted from the same exact benefits and services without proper documentation nor eligibility, I fully support this proposal, as well as by any other means possible to ensure US citizens are not second-in-line to benefits afforded them.
USCIS-2025-0003-0828	Comment Submitted by Anonymous	I oppose the proposed DHS policy requiring immigration applicants to disclose social media handles. While national security is vital, this measure infringes on First Amendment protections of free speech and association. It risks creating a chilling effect, where individuals feel pressured to self-censor lawful expression, including political opinions, religious beliefs, or personal identity, because they fear that what they say online could be misinterpreted or used against them. This kind of self-censorship undermines the democratic principles the First Amendment is meant to protect. This also raises Fourth Amendment concerns. Compelled disclosure of online identities enables broad surveillance of individuals without individualized suspicion. Even if the content is publicly visible, requiring applicants to submit their handles facilitates profiling, data aggregation, and inference that goes well beyond what's appropriate for screening purposes. There is little empirical evidence that social media screening improves public safety or immigration outcomes. A 2017 DHS Inspector General report found pilot programs lacked performance metrics and could not demonstrate effectiveness. Furthermore, documents obtained by the Knight First Amendment Institute revealed that the National Counterterrorism Center assessed its use of social media identifiers in vetting as having "very little impact on improving the screening accuracy of relevant systems." As a graduate student studying public health and policy, I am deeply concerned about the precedent this sets. I urge DHS to withdraw this rule and pursue evidence-based practices that
USCIS-2025-0003-0829	Comment Submitted by Anonymous	This proposal is clearly an invasion of privacy and an unconstitutional overreach that thwarts our constitutional right to free speech. Our constitutional protections apply to citizens and non-citizens alike and it's illegal to deport people for expressing views that are contrary to the President's or anyone else's opinions. People speaking out are not terrorists just because they express a viewpoint contrary to US policy or the president's views. Please reject these changes and disallow this practice.
USCIS-2025-0003-0830	Comment Submitted by Janet Forney	I strongly oppose the proposed rule requiring visa beneficiaries already present in the United States to provide their social media account information. This policy is unnecessary, redundant, and infringes on privacy and free speech rights. Visa applicants already provide social media identifiers when initially applying for their visas via Form DS-160. Requiring them to submit this information again after they have been vetted and admitted to the U.S. serves no clear security purpose and imposes an unnecessary administrative burden. There is no demonstrated benefit to duplicating this data collection, which diverts resources from more effective security measures. Additionally, this policy raises significant First Amendment and privacy concerns. Collecting social media information can create a chilling effect on free speech, as individuals may self-censor for fear of misinterpretation. This is particularly concerning for non-citizens, who may feel especially vulnerable to government scrutiny. Analyzing social media activity for immigration decisions is unreliable and prone to errors due to the complexity of online expression. Moreover, the lack of clear guidelines on how this information will be used, stored, or protected creates a risk of misuse and discrimination. Automated tools and subjective interpretations of social media content could lead to unfair denials and delays in immigration benefits. Given these concerns, I urge DHS and USCIS to withdraw this proposed rule. It is an invasive and unnecessary expansion of government surveillance that does not enhance national security but instead threatens individual rights.
USCIS-2025-0003-0831	Comment Submitted by Anonymous	This policy would be hugely harmful to the rights of American residents, particularly their right to freedom of expression. The number of complaints submitted anonymously are an expression for the fear that even the suggestion of a policy like this brings people.
USCIS-2025-0003-0832	Comment Submitted by Anonymous	This is a horrible idea. an invasion of privacy
USCIS-2025-0003-0833	Comment Submitted by Anonymous	Absolutely not, though I highly doubt public opinion will sway the current administration. It seems hellbent on destroying what remains of our liberties.
USCIS-2025-0003-0834	Comment Submitted by Anonymous	I am against this idea. Green card holders have already been better and shouldn't have to provide this information. Everyone has a right to privacy and to free speech in the United States. This is a violation of both. It is too much over reach for the federal government.
USCIS-2025-0003-0835	Comment Submitted by Amy K	This is a violation of free speech with is guaranties by our constitution.
USCIS-2025-0003-0836	Comment Submitted by Nope Not Happening	Violation of the first amendment. Go back to south africa unelected president musk!
USCIS-2025-0003-0837	Comment Submitted by Anonymous	This is complete BS. The whole "smaller government" thing should demand LESS data collection rather than more. People's personal opinions and what they share should not determine how they are treated. Period.
USCIS-2025-0003-0838	Comment Submitted by Anonymous	I strongly oppose this idea to collect social media handles from those involved in the immigration process. It violates the essential American ideal of freedom of speech. If enacted, it will be used to punish political dissidents rather than discover true security risks. It also opens up the possibility of increased digital surveillance of US citizens both here and abroad.
USCIS-2025-0003-0839	Comment Submitted by MICHAEL ORR	This will not accomplish what the U.S immigration claims it will accomplish. It will only violate the constitutional rights. Social media has no connection to any sort of application that's based on approvals. Once again human nature is continously trying to control others.
USCIS-2025-0003-0840	Comment Submitted by John Brown	One concern I have is that the social media posts will be reviewed in a politically skewed view that is not well defined. My biggest concern is that access to social media posts/accounts will be used to scrape/mine contact information. If this secondary data is collected, it's use could be broad, undefined, and at the discretion of the collector. In the current political environment, it seems that social media companies like Meta and others would yield broad access to secondary data to avoid implied punishment. To view an individuals' posts is one thing; to then build a graph of connections to use for whatever reason would infringe on the secondary parties right to privacy.
USCIS-2025-0003-0841	Comment Submitted by Anonymous	This proposal should *not* be allowed to go into effect. It violates basic tenets of the United States' constitution, first and foremost the idea of free speech. Social Media platforms are a modern way for individuals to express and exchange ideas and opinions, and are not necessarily tied to real-world ideas. Furthermore, we have already recently seen government overreach, using social media accounts against both citizens and non-citizens, in an attempt to silence any disagreement with the current administration. A core principle of our democracy is the ability for individuals to express views that may differ from those of the current administration, and this policy would violate that principle in both fact and intent - using fear-based policies to silence dissent and free exchange of ideas before they even begin

USCIS-2025-0003-0842	Comment Submitted by Anonymous	<p>The proposal to give DHS broad clearance to scour the social media accounts of green card applicants for anti-American content is a red flag. The term "anti-American" is dangerously subjective. Would criticism of a sitting president count? Would expressing outrage over systemic injustice or protesting government actions be grounds for rejection? In a free society, dissent is not disloyalty—it's democracy in action.</p> <p>This kind of sweeping surveillance casts a chilling effect, suggesting that love for America must come without critique. But true patriotism doesn't mean silence—it means striving to make this country better, even when that means calling out its flaws.</p> <p>We should be vetting applicants for security risks, not for their willingness to conform to a sanitized, state-approved narrative. This is not national security, it's ideological policing.</p> <p>Moreover, the First Amendment protects freedom of speech, and while it's written to apply to "the people," courts have long interpreted it to extend to non-citizens as well, including green card holders, visa holders, and even undocumented immigrants while they're physically present in the U.S. Therefore anyone on U.S. soil has the right to free speech, even if they're not a citizen. That includes criticizing the government or expressing political opinions.</p> <p>We know this hasn't stopped this administration before. Somehow it will find a way around first amendment policy to exploit rights and the discretionary nature of immigration law. DHS doesn't need a conviction or criminal behavior to deny a green card—just a vague justification like "character concerns." That's the loophole. By branding certain views as "anti-American," the government could penalize people simply for exercising free speech. (Like somehow a loophole will be found for comments like mine. They will be deemed to not follow the exact "commenting rules" on this platform and be excluded).</p> <p>In summary, this is not about national security. It's ideological vetting disguised as patriotism. And it's dangerous. In a healthy democracy, dissent is not disloyalty. Criticism is not a threat. Silencing people who love this country enough to want it to improve? That's unequivocally un-American.</p>
USCIS-2025-0003-0843	Comment Submitted by Anonymous	<p>For non-US citizens, there are steps the government can take to revoke or not approve visas. However, with limited exceptions, these cannot be based on speech that is protected (by the First Amendment). The US government is currently revoking and denying visas based on constitutionally protected speech. Fairness, equity, inclusion, and advocacy for the value of human lives in certain locations has been deemed "un-American" by the current administration. This measure, if approved, will allow for violation of the constitution on a larger scale and for targeting speech the administration does not approve of. Moreover, requiring individuals to share social media handles compels speech that is itself constitutionally protected.</p>
USCIS-2025-0003-0844	Comment Submitted by Anonymous	<p>I support President Trump in making our country safer. So in turn, I support the collection of social media handles from immigrants applying for any type of permission to legally reside in the USA.</p>
USCIS-2025-0003-0845	Comment Submitted by Anonymous	<p>The DHS and State Department "policies" of scouring social media profiles of foreign International students here in the country with F-1 as a means to arrest and detain them based on speaking out or protesting against the genocide in Gaza is abhorrent. All people have the right to express their personal views on society, politics, the government. It's called freedom of speech, one of the tenets of our country. Speaking out about the atrocities in Gaza perpetrated by the Israeli government and being labeled a 'supporter of Hamas is a cop out. We are no better than China, Iran, and Turkey. International students today. Are American citizens next? We are no longer the beacon of light. I fear for my children, grandchildren and the future of</p>
USCIS-2025-0003-0846	Comment Submitted by Concerned Citizen	<p>The proposed collection of social media identifiers by U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services (USCIS) targets individuals applying for legal entry or immigration benefits. While these applicants do not yet enjoy the full constitutional protections afforded to citizens, the First Amendment's guarantees of free expression and association extend to all individuals within U.S. jurisdiction, including non-citizens. This raises concerns about whether the policy could disproportionately burden applicants' rights to free speech and expression. FREEDOM OF SPEECH IN IMMIGRATION CONTEXT Even for non-citizens, courts have recognized that constitutional protections apply in certain contexts. In <i>Bridges v. Wixon</i>, 326 U.S. 135 (1945), the Supreme Court emphasized that non-citizens have a right to free speech that cannot be arbitrarily restricted. Collecting social media identifiers may discourage lawful expression, especially if applicants fear their online activities could be misinterpreted or used against them during the vetting process. This chilling effect could deter applicants from engaging in public discourse, even on non-controversial topics. CHILLING EFFECT AND SELF-SENSORSHIP The requirement to disclose social media handles could lead to self-censorship, as individuals may avoid expressing opinions or engaging in discussions that might be perceived as contentious by immigration authorities. Although the government has a legitimate interest in national security, policies that broadly surveil online activity risk overreach. The chilling effect on lawful speech is particularly concerning for asylum seekers or refugees who may need to express dissenting views about oppressive regimes. POTENTIAL FOR OVERREACH The absence of clear guidelines on how USCIS will use social media data exacerbates concerns about overreach and viewpoint discrimination. In <i>Reno v. ACLU</i>, 521 U.S. 844 (1997), the Court struck down overly broad internet regulations, emphasizing the need for narrowly tailored measures when regulating speech online. Without precise criteria for assessing social media content, this policy risks arbitrary enforcement and could disproportionately impact individuals based on their political or religious beliefs. BALANCING NATIONAL SECURITY AND FREE EXPRESSION While national security is a compelling government interest, it must be balanced against individual rights. Courts have consistently held that measures infringing on constitutional rights must be narrowly tailored to achieve their objectives without unnecessary restrictions (<i>Holder v. Humanitarian Law Project</i>, 561 U.S. 1 (2010)). USCIS's proposed policy appears overly broad and lacks sufficient safeguards to ensure it does not infringe on protected speech. CONCLUSION Although non-citizens applying for legal entry are subject to rigorous vetting, policies like the collection of social media identifiers must be carefully scrutinized to avoid infringing upon fundamental rights. The potential chilling effect on free expression, coupled with the risk of arbitrary</p>
USCIS-2025-0003-0847	Comment Submitted by Cara Wood	<p>Free speech is an essential part of an intact democracy. This proposal threatens free speech.</p>
USCIS-2025-0003-0848	Comment Submitted by Anonymous	<p>The proposed collection of information is NOT necessary for the proper performance of the functions of the agency. This is a ridiculous proposal and whomever drafted it should be fired.</p>
USCIS-2025-0003-0849	Inappropriate Comment Submitted by Anonymous	<p>Very fascist administration we have here. Fuck no to this collection of social media identifiers on immigration forms. Fuck no 'till I have no more breath in my body.</p>

USCIS-2025-0003-0850	Comment Submitted by Trevor Evans	I'm against your proposal. By doing so you're saying that the vast information network currently possessed and abused by the administration is not enough to catch bad actors. Photos of people at birthday parties, living life, and connecting with others is not a viable path to discerning good candidates from bad. It's clear bias with the added problem of sweeping up even more legal residents information and involvement, simply by having closer than 6 degrees of connection. This is just another extension of red scare politics, putting more power and overwatch into the hands of an already morally and legally dubious agency. I wholeheartedly do not support this and am impressed by your willingness to go to such lengths to fail to justify your already occurring deportations. It only ceases to be amazing when viewed through the lens of time, and the reflection of your agency to implement such willfully racist policies while castigating naysayers to your power, as demonstrated most recently by your forced removal of the educated population who don't support genocide in Israel, or rather, are only able to support wanton violence to be viewed as American. Wholly unsupported, as has my trust in your legal responsibilities to do what's right by law and humanity.
USCIS-2025-0003-0851	Comment Submitted by Anonymous	This is a gross overreach by the federal government and a violation of the constitution. While this is unsurprising given the countries current direction, it doesn't make it the right choice. Stop ignoring the principles and rights of our country.
USCIS-2025-0003-0852	Comment Submitted by Ed Scheel	I do not want this to be approved. As a concerned citizen of this country, I believe in privacy and free speech. What someone posts, comments or likes on social media has nothing to do with their criminal or financial history. Who would be deciding what social media activity is acceptable? This will be expensive for homeland security to operationalize, ripe for advise of various forms, and unfair and inappropriate for a country where freedom of speak is a core right and value. Please reject this proposal.
USCIS-2025-0003-0853	Comment Submitted by Suzanne Francis	This proposal violates free speech. Free speech is essential in a democracy.
USCIS-2025-0003-0854	Comment Submitted by Joshua Lindquist	Don't do it. This is authoritarianism under the guise of national security. You're already detaining and deporting people who express opinions the administration doesn't like. I feel like I'm living in a third world dictatorship. This is not what America is supposed to stand for.
USCIS-2025-0003-0855	Comment Submitted by Anonymous	I don't know anyone who thinks this is a good idea. Keep your nose out of my business.
USCIS-2025-0003-0856	Comment Submitted by Theresa Novak	America is beginning to no longer be the "Land of Freedom of Speech, Religion, and Rights". When our government monitors our speech and our interests on social media and then punishes people for thinking and speaking differently than certain individuals, we no longer will stay a free nation. There is a difference between people who want to actively hurt United States citizens and people who think differently than the people who are currently in political power at this time. Our nation was built on immigrants and just because Congress hasn't fixed our immigration laws shouldn't excuse their lack of responsibility by looking for ways to kick out law abiding citizens who followed our laws to be a part of our society. I object to more government monitoring our right to freedom of speech.
USCIS-2025-0003-0857	Comment Submitted by Nicholas Durkin	No i do not want government, specifically dhs to have broader authority and access to social media information. The agency has already shown that they do not know how to implement such a broad authority equitably, and the people working at dhs make their own interpretations of law, rule, or regulation. This proposal, when used in contradiction to the proposed aims makes us all less safe and subject to the whims of automatons who do not know how to apply the law, rule, regulation except for how they are ordered to do so. This makes all vulnerable to abuses of authority, which the current administration is guilty of as demonstrated by all the judicial interventions. Bad actors such as the trump administration and the people he has placed in authority should not be given any additional authorities to help them discriminate and abuse their authority. Do not give dhs any additional power to unilaterally bypass constitutional protections. No on this law, rule, or regulation!
USCIS-2025-0003-0858	Comment Submitted by Anonymous	NO! Absolutely NOT! This absurd and yet another attempt at silencing the people and violating free speech. These authoritarian tactics have nothing to do with the safety of our country, and everything to do with extending the government's reach in controlling the masses. NO NO NO!
USCIS-2025-0003-0859	Comment Submitted by Anonymous	The government should only collect information that it is given voluntarily.
USCIS-2025-0003-0860	Inappropriate Comment Submitted by Anonymous	Just because trump can't handle people expressing their true feelings about him is no reason to deny freedom of speech, association, and thought. This new rule is a violation of the constitution and doesn't serve a legitimate purpose nor does it increase security nor vetting of anyone. It is simply a bullshit suppression tactic by an imbecile would be king. Fuck trump
USCIS-2025-0003-0861	Comment Submitted by Matt Clerkin	For years the government has not relied on social media as a vetting source for those seeking citizenship. There is no need for this information to be used today.
USCIS-2025-0003-0862	Comment Submitted by Matt Bernau	The monitoring of social media accounts is a violation of the Fourth Amendment, no government needs to spy on people for political reasons. This is a proposal by totalitarian dystopian Fascism practiced by dictators living in fear of public opinion. If you do continue to demand social media accounts, the simple solution is for everyone to delete their mag 7 social media accounts and use Signal like the Defense Secretary.
USCIS-2025-0003-0863	Comment Submitted by Anonymous	NO! Social media sources are generally private and thus not open to government intrusions!
USCIS-2025-0003-0864	Comment Submitted by Anonymous	This is absolutely an attempt to control free speech and thought. If the government can deny asylum of green card status based on an individual's perspective we have stopped being a democracy. The government should not be allowed or free to require social media handles and information.
USCIS-2025-0003-0865	Comment Submitted by Michael Conway	Sounds like a good, common sense and rational idea.

USCIS-2025-0003-0866	Comment Submitted by Anonymous	This is a blatant violation of the first amendment and a tremendous waste of resources. I do not want my taxpayer dollars paying for people to spend time on social media. What's stopping people from saying they don't have social media? If someone has already gone through the visa process they likely have already been vetted. Immigrants have are allowed to have "anti-American" opinions just as much as American citizens.
USCIS-2025-0003-0867	Inappropriate Comment Submitted by Melissa Griffith	This is definitely the ideal authoritarian bullshit people used to come here to avoid. Land of the free (as long as you agree), right? You say, "All immigrants are bad," while allowing one to rob our entire government?! This is stupid, and people here legally should have the right to free speech on social media or elsewhere. You can do the legal thing now, without a new rule, by getting a fucking warrant. Now, I know the puppy killer loves her internment camps and kidnapping young scholars off the street, but again, you could avoid all the bad press by simply following the law and get a fucking warrant. Therefore, this rule is pointless. Rehire the judges you shit canned, and get a fucking warrant.
USCIS-2025-0003-0868	Comment Submitted by Anonymous	Under no circumstances should you collect social media data on immigrants.
USCIS-2025-0003-0869	Comment Submitted by Anonymous	I stand with Mark Zuckerberg and Elon Musk in their opinions that free speech and expression on social media is quintessential to liberty and freedom in the 21st-century. I want to echo Justice Holmes's dissent in Abrams v. US and his interpretation of the first amendment in that we should be "eternally vigilant against attempts to check the expression of opinions that we loathe." Although the executive has made the argument that immigrants pose a strong and imminent danger to this country, it can not be enough to justify a plain invasion of individual liberty and the fundamental freedom of expression by the government. The means of collecting personal information from social media hardly fits the ends of protecting our borders and making immigration more strict. If the government does recognize these means as a close fit, the logical next step, of course, is passwords, data, direct and private messages, and personal photos. The government, in its ends of regulating immigration has should have no reason to look at our social media accounts.
USCIS-2025-0003-0870	Comment Submitted by Jacob Cheuvront	This is a waste of time and money. No one who is serious about entering the US would leave public posts on an existing account or supply accurate handles through a formal government process.
USCIS-2025-0003-0871	Comment Submitted by Kristen Green	This is a dangerous infringement on constitutional right to free speech. I implore the administration to uphold the right to free speech and reject this policy.
USCIS-2025-0003-0872	Comment Submitted by Anonymous	This is a huge infringement on basic privacy rights and people's right to free speech. Where does it end? At what point do we just decide to become an authoritarian nation where everything and everyone is monitored and censored? The trend is clearly heading in that direction and so I can not support this plan.
USCIS-2025-0003-0873	Comment Submitted by Mike Svihel	This is a Great topic and a complicated one. On one hand of course, no country in the world wants anyone coming into their land who is associated with a terrorist group. Everyone's definition of a terrorist may be different and may change over time and can be twisted by future governments. Just because a group or individual is unhappy with the current or future administrations does not warrants as being labeled as a terrorist. And I think most people would agree with that. But what happens if the current or future government decides they want full loyalty and all of a sudden just like China, ban / flag any comments that are negative towards the government and all of a sudden your unsupportive comments about the current governments are now in the pool of a terrorist definition. This is the fine line of a democracy freedom of speech versus China, Russia and North Korea and how the government has tight reigns over what is acceptable to talk about and no room for disagreeing with the government. It's a slippery slope. So yes I support blocking "terrorists" from entering the country. But what is that definition and to what extreme and extent are American citizens willing to get up their privacy for it? Americans trust that the government will protect them but not at the cost of freedom of speech, freedom of press and other freedoms spelled out in our constitution. No matter what the future policies are, they have to allow for citizens and non-citizens to be able to make fun of the current and future government whether it's in memes or jokes or or comments in social media. That is the nature of a democracy and that is human nature to talk about things that bother us that we see as needing improvement or laughing off situations that are difficult for an individual or group because that is the only reflex there is. At the end of the day we are all Americans and we all need to work together to support each other and the human family outside of the United States. We are all in this together. Our lives are over very
USCIS-2025-0003-0874	Comment Submitted by Anonymous Anonymous	Free speech is the cornerstone of democracy in the United States. Everyone in this country, whether a citizen or resident should be afforded this right no matter who is in office or what their political perspective, free speech in all of its forms is a fundamental right.
USCIS-2025-0003-0875	Comment Submitted by Anonymous	dumb law
USCIS-2025-0003-0876	Comment Submitted by Benjamin Cleek	No way! We don't have an immigrant issue and this is chilling to everyone's free speech and privacy rights. I also object to the verbiage of the bill, as it is incredibly vague and could be applied to anyone the current administration doesn't like.
USCIS-2025-0003-0877	Inappropriate Comment Submitted by Joe Stutler	This is more Nazi shit. Reminder: It never works out well for Nazis.
USCIS-2025-0003-0878	Inappropriate Comment Submitted by Ms. Nickles	I belive you are specifically "hunting" people on Trump's behalf, disguising this as a neccessary element of Trump's racist executive order! STOP your gaslighting and bullshit! I'm sure after you receive my comment, I will now be in the crosshairs of Trump's revenge....just like others who are having their free speech rights tramples upon. Seizing a persons phone or looking at social media is and should be illegal. It is a supressing and oppressive action meant to create fear!Something this administration uses and does well...until we understand what you are doing. Review Attachment: https://downloads.regulations.gov/USCIS-2025-0003-0878/attachment_1.docx
USCIS-2025-0003-0879	Inappropriate Comment Submitted by Margaret Liss	Free speech is our first amendment. Using someone's social media content as a way of blocking those with beliefs that differ from the current administration's far right wing beliefs goes against our first amendment. this policy should NOT be approved. this isn't for our safety or even for national safety, this is a way to prevent and deter those with more progressive views from coming into the USA. We will lose a lot of good immigrants if this is allowed to go forward. It will turn our country into more of an authoritarian far right wing shit hole. Being able to speak our minds without fear that the government is going to send us to a black site or prevent people from entering our country goes against what our founders intended. Do NOT let this
USCIS-2025-0003-0880	Comment Submitted by Anonymous	I oppose this update to the rules. I believe the existing social media review rules for visa and permanent residency applicants are sufficient. I fear these rules would be used to penalize views and opinions which, while unpopular, are protected under the First Amendment and do not pose material threats to U.S. national security. This could have chilling effects on the free expression rights of all living in the U.S., including citizens. While it may be views you dislike penalized today, it could be your own views penalized tomorrow.

USCIS-2025-0003-0881	Comment Submitted by Anonymous	Hard pass. This violates the constitutional right to free speech. Applicants are already vetted in a number of other more legal ways.
USCIS-2025-0003-0882	Comment Submitted by Anonymous	While not opposed to social media info being reviewed for NEW applicants, applying this retroactively is punitive as there was no pre warning to those people that they're continue to be monitored and they may have posted things that - ONLY in light of this new administration - be twisted to appear problematic. Also, how is anyone proving the correct info is given and what about those who change their info ahead of applications? It seems highly ineffective to get this info
USCIS-2025-0003-0883	Comment Submitted by Barbara Lacy	This is an invasion of privacy. Every individual should be able to express their opinions and solicit the opinions of others. It is only when they take aggressive action that they disrupt society. People should not suffer consequences from open discussions about current events.
USCIS-2025-0003-0884	Comment Submitted by Anonymous	It is not appropriate to require anyone to provide their social media contact information/name. It is invasive. Those who are involved in secret or nefarious behaviors will use snap chat or signal where there is no history.
USCIS-2025-0003-0885	Comment Submitted by Anonymous	The proposal does much more damage than good. It goes against fundamental idea of free speech, while can still be circumvented in numerous ways by real terrorists.
USCIS-2025-0003-0886	Comment Submitted by Anonymous	This is un-American!! Waste of money and stupid.
USCIS-2025-0003-0887	Comment Submitted by Anonymous	This proposal is a violation of free speech. If enacted, this will be a further step toward authoritarianism and must be halted. Everyone in the United States is protected by the First Amendment, regardless of citizenship status. My fear is that this will be a slippery slope to monitor everyone's posts to punish comments deemed as not in alignment with the administration.
USCIS-2025-0003-0888	Comment Submitted by Anonymous	Reeks of Orwellian Thoughtcrime. Please do you duty to refuse unlawful orders from tyrants. I am posting this anonymously because POTUS and his administration have an unhealthy obsession with retribution.
USCIS-2025-0003-0889	Comment Submitted by Anonymous	Reject this rulemaking proposal. Despite the intent, it is unlikely this can avoid incidentally infringing on First and Fourth amendment right of US citizens. The use of AI would additionally be problematic both in the implementation of known bias in a environment rife for such bias, as well as the environmental impact of operating the AI.
USCIS-2025-0003-0890	Comment Submitted by Anonymous	I agree with this: "I am writing against this proposed change that will simply weaponize surveillance against poor immigrants while anyone who pays Trump's bribery fee for 'gold card' status goes unchecked. I also see no efforts to monitor domestic terrorists' social media accounts for similar concerns." What happened to the America that was hyper opposed to a surveillance state? We are now just like socialist countries who snatch people exercising their freedom of speech from public streets by secret police wearing masks. Shame on even considering this.
USCIS-2025-0003-0891	Comment Submitted by Aleph Solais	This is an EXTREME violation of privacy, and will only interfere with the protection of free speech.
USCIS-2025-0003-0892	Comment Submitted by Anonymous	This would be wildly unconstitutional. The Constitution applies to all persons residing in the US, citizen or not. Everyone has the same constitutional protections.
USCIS-2025-0003-0893	Comment Submitted by Anonymous	This violates free speech. Office of Management and Budget (OMB) Control Number 1615-NEW in the body of the letter, the agency name, and Docket ID USCIS-2025-0003.
USCIS-2025-0003-0894	Comment Submitted by Anonymous	My response to this proposal is NO. It's a violation of privacy and makes the US a blatant terrorist of personal information. As a US citizen, I will support all lawsuits against this proposal.
USCIS-2025-0003-0895	Comment Submitted by Rebecca Keim	This is a terrible idea. Once the government is open to surveil immigrants, where does it stop? Do they start surveilling birthright citizens? Does the McCarthy era start all over again? I oppose this.
USCIS-2025-0003-0896	Comment Submitted by Anonymous	Unnecessary.
USCIS-2025-0003-0897	Comment Submitted by Anonymous	This proposal worries me about the free speech of others who use social media. If the government is allowed to associate individuals to their online personas, it has a chilling effect on the free movement and association of ideas necessary for a free society. Even if the government chooses not to do anything with the information, which many believe to be unlikely, the fact that they collect and associate this information in itself, is enough to suppress freedom of speech and would arguably violate the first amendment. It's easy to be pressured into self-censorship when the government knows who is criticising it.
USCIS-2025-0003-0898	Comment Submitted by Anonymous	This kind of overreaching surveillance is unnecessary and encroaches on free speech.
USCIS-2025-0003-0899	Comment Submitted by Brett Pittman	The U.S. government is really embracing their Orwellian nature at this point and you all disgust me and the majority of the American people. Take this proposal and shove it.
USCIS-2025-0003-0900	Comment Submitted by Phillip Luebke	Orwellian. I strongly oppose additional monitoring and infringement of personal freedoms.
USCIS-2025-0003-0901	Comment Submitted by Anonymous	I do not believe we need to crack down more heavily on immigrants. We already do plenty to limit and vet these immigrants. This proposal is a dangerous overstep into more and more invasions of privacy.
USCIS-2025-0003-0902	Comment Submitted by Anonymous	I strongly oppose the universal collection of potential and current immigrants' social media information by the US government. We have already seen that our current government is not willing to extend basic freedom of speech to immigrants. If we cannot guarantee this human right equally to citizens and noncitizens, social media information will be unfairly weaponized against legal immigrants, as it already has been.

USCIS-2025-0003-0903	Comment Submitted by Anonymous	I don't think the US Government should monitor the social media comments of citizens.
USCIS-2025-0003-0904	Comment Submitted by Nicole C	<p>To Whom It May Concern:</p> <p>I am writing to register my strong opposition to the proposal requiring individuals applying for immigration benefits including green cards and citizenship to submit their social media handles. This proposal raises serious concerns regarding the protection of free speech, privacy, and the potential for government overreach.</p> <p>Constitutional Guarantees and Free Speech: The United States has long upheld the principles enshrined in the First Amendment, which protects the right to free speech and expression. Mandating the collection of social media information from lawfully present individuals many of whom are seeking a better life in this country creates a chilling effect on free expression. Citizens and residents may feel compelled to censor their online activities, undermining the democratic values that have been a cornerstone of our nation.</p> <p>Historical Precedent and Privacy Concerns: While it is acknowledged that social media monitoring has been a practice in immigration enforcement for over a decade, expanding this practice to include those already vetted and legally residing in the United States is unprecedented. This proposal risks transforming a targeted security measure into a broad surveillance tool that infringes on personal privacy. Such actions could discourage the open exchange of ideas and contribute to a climate of self-censorship and fear.</p> <p>Impact on Vulnerable Communities: This measure disproportionately affects individuals who are already navigating a complex and often intimidating immigration process, such as asylum seekers and green card applicants. Requiring detailed personal data including social media handles places additional burdens on these communities and risks subjecting them to increased scrutiny without clear, demonstrable benefits to national security.</p> <p>Call for Reconsideration: I urge the agency to carefully reconsider this proposal in light of its potential to erode fundamental civil liberties. It is essential that efforts to enhance national security do not come at the expense of constitutional rights and the democratic principles that have long defined our country. Rather than broadening surveillance measures, alternative approaches that balance security with respect for individual freedoms should be pursued.</p> <p>Thank you for your consideration of my comments. I respectfully request that this proposal be withdrawn or substantially revised to protect the constitutional rights of those seeking to contribute to our society.</p>
USCIS-2025-0003-0905	Comment Submitted by Anonymous	As humans, we have a right to a certain amount of privacy. This includes immigrants and green card holders UNLESS there is due process. There should be a standard of data required to be able to search anyone's social media and phone. Data that goes through the legal process. I am 100% against an arbitrary search of social media and phones without due cause.
USCIS-2025-0003-0906	Comment Submitted by Anonymous	<p>Last I checked, the first amendment applies to ALL PEOPLE in US jurisdiction. It's abhorrent I even have to comment that.</p> <p>Not to mention this is also in direct violation of the fourth and fifth amendments. If Trump wants to get rid of free speech and due process, he should move to Russia where that's allowed. Our constitutional rights are more important than our god-kings wishes.</p>
USCIS-2025-0003-0907	Comment Submitted by Anonymous	Absolutely not ok. Not until due process and warrants are reinstated.
USCIS-2025-0003-0908	Comment Submitted by Anonymous	I think you've done enough. I don't support the additional weaponization of social media.
USCIS-2025-0003-0909	Comment Submitted by Anonymous	I am against this. In the US we have the freedom of speech. This should apply to everyone in the US.
USCIS-2025-0003-0910	Comment Submitted by Patricia Denny	Violates free speech. Harmful to democracy.
USCIS-2025-0003-0911	Comment Submitted by David Payne	Freedom of speech is a fundamental right anything less is unconstitutional. These petty personal vendettas going on under the tRump administration are an attack on the constitution and the rule of law.

USCIS-2025-0003-0912	Comment Submitted by Max Joslyn	<p>The vague language of this Executive Order would effectively limit Constitutionally protected rights to free speech; creating amongst social media users a fear of Federally adjudicated punitive measures taken against those whom our current administration deems a threat to our country's security. Given the unscientific, apathetic and basely bigoted agenda expressed and enacted by our current administration it is not without reason to imagine this EO will be wielded with impunity, under the directive of a Chief Executive who's proclivity for retributive-action-without-evidence creates a greater threat to the safety of US Citizens and Non-Citizens alike. Further, what will happen to those who refuse to share their social media accounts with federal agents? Will it be grounds for dismissal of citizenship applications? What if someone neglected to disclose a dormant account which they created when they were younger but have since abandoned or otherwise forgotten because they are seeking asylum from hostility faced in their country of origin?</p> <p>This EO does not safeguard our country or its citizens and will merely be used for wonton refusal of citizenship and will likely be expanded to target naturalized and immigrated citizens alike.</p>
USCIS-2025-0003-0913	Comment Submitted by Chris Born	<p>Having lived in Germany and seeing what the Nazis achieved by curtailing freedom of speech and having lived in Thailand and seeing how a monarchy can restrict it's citizens right to speak freely, giving the Department of Homeland Security any more authority or power scares the absolute hell out of me! My father fought all across Europe and North Africa during WWII to ensure that the United States would remain free. My mother immigrated from England as a war bride and left her country out of love and because true freedom of speech was possible in the United States. If a regulation like this is passed the United States loses the right to hold other countries accountable for the way it treats its citizens and immigrants. If the United States is able to institute a regulation like this it surely can muzzle anyone, including the current President. Maybe it is not such a bad piece of legislation!</p>
USCIS-2025-0003-0914	Comment Submitted by Anonymous	<p>The proposal borders on spying on people living in the US and potentially US citizens. It is reminiscent of McCarthy era tactics which have been roundly condemned. Those tactics led to the destruction of the lives of many Americans regardless of guilt or innocence. The innocent largely never recovered from the stains on their reputations. This proposal opens to the door to repeating mistakes of the past.</p>
USCIS-2025-0003-0915	Comment Submitted by Rachel Gatwood	<p>I object to the proposed practice of collecting social media handles on immigration forms. Social media can be an important outlet for people's opinions and emotions, and it would be all too easy for someone to misjudge a potential immigrant for subjective reasons—for example, because of a difference in opinion or a misinterpretation of a slang phrase. If artificial intelligence made the judgments, that would be even worse, as it could only base its conclusions on whatever training material it was provided. It could have a chilling effect on speech, especially if the criteria for judging the social media content were not explicit. The gathering and analysis of social media content could take a long time, as would the process of verifying that a social media account actually belongs to the person named—tying up resources that could be better used elsewhere. What's more, the information found on social media would not even be reliable. People would try to game the system by having multiple accounts, some secret, or by borrowing pseudonymous accounts from friends. They would delete or hide problematic posts, and any efforts to find deleted or hidden posts would likely have to rely on the social media platforms' disclosure. All this affects my life because I know and work with many wonderful immigrants and visa holders. If they felt chilled by worries over their speech, or if their applications were throttled by red tape or overburdened immigration officials, my life would be poorer for it. Moreover, I happen to know that immigrants commit less crime than non-immigrants, so the current vetting process can't be called especially risky. For these reasons I urge you to drop the entire idea of collecting social media information.</p>
USCIS-2025-0003-0916	Comment Submitted by Jimmy Golfball	<p>I think Kristi Noem is a buffoon.</p>
USCIS-2025-0003-0917	Comment Submitted by Anonymous	<p>Absolutely no. Do not collect anything that infringes upon the first amendment rights of free speech.</p>
USCIS-2025-0003-0918	Comment Submitted by Oreste Drapaca	<p>The proposal violates freedom of speech, violates the right to privacy, and does nothing to secure the United States. It is a form of domestic population control under the false pretext of providing security. It is too vague and designed to be applied capriciously against anyone who the administration deems a dissident.</p>
USCIS-2025-0003-0919	Comment Submitted by Anonymous	<p>This is a clear violation of free speech.</p>
USCIS-2025-0003-0920	Comment Submitted by Anonymous	<p>This is another hypocritical and cynical attack on democracy and free speech by the trump administration, and infringement of all persons' constitutional rights and right to privacy and free speech. The trump administration is bent on usurping the constitution and grabbing as much power as they (and their billionaire handlers) are allowed. Can you tell me exactly how this strengthens fraud detection or identity theft, or national security? Can you tell me exactly who will be tasked with monitoring the various social media sites day in and day out, especially since doge fired more than half of the government employees recently? Can you tell me what key words you will be using to search the social media sites? Can you tell me which social media sites you will target? Do you not have anything better to do with your time than harass people?</p>
USCIS-2025-0003-0921	Comment Submitted by Anonymous	<p>You have enough of my information. Immigration issue is not worth collecting more information from me. I will leave all social media if this passes. You should be focusing on companies sharing less of our data.</p>
USCIS-2025-0003-0922	Comment Submitted by Grant Larson	<p>I am in favor of collecting social media handles of those applying for immigration in the US and changes of status in compliance with the President's executive order. This is an important tool for national security.</p>
USCIS-2025-0003-0923	Comment Submitted by Anonymous	<p>This is an invasion of privacy. Please don't do this. It shows an inherent lack of trust. The very fact this is being considered should make us angry and ashamed to call our country, the land of the free.</p>
USCIS-2025-0003-0924	Comment Submitted by Anonymous	<p>You guys need to use Facebook to vet people? Come on! Just do your jobs!</p>

USCIS-2025-0003-0925	Comment Submitted by Anonymous	This proposal violates free speech. Free speech is essential in a democracy.
USCIS-2025-0003-0926	Comment Submitted by Anonymous	This is a blatant and unconstitutional attack on free speech and the privacy of citizens and those seeking to become citizens, legally.
USCIS-2025-0003-0927	Inappropriate Comment Submitted by Anonymous	Donald Trump and Elon Musk can fuck all the way off! Leave immigrants alone. They pay way more in taxes than they ever get from benefits. Deport Elon Musk!
USCIS-2025-0003-0928	Comment Submitted by Celina Casillas	There is no such thing as free speech if you aren't a US citizen. There's no such thing as entitled and privileged to US benefits and protections if you aren't a US citizen. I am a US citizen born here after my parents immigrated and became US citizens LEGALLY. My father became an engineer, served in the US navy, and worked every day he had in this country. My mom became a school teacher and taught both in English and Spanish in the public school system. My parents educated us and we earned bachelor's and master's and MD degrees. We are all US citizens and worked hard to serve this country. We don't expect hand outs and freebies just because we can breathe air in this country. Please DO monitor everyone in this country. People doing honest things in an honest way have nothing to fear by being monitored. YES PLEASE DO COLLECT SOCIAL MEDIA INFORMATION !
USCIS-2025-0003-0929	Comment Submitted by Anonymous	This shockingly terrible idea flies in the face of the First Amendment and gives undue power to the party in office. The views that they express on social media should not influence whether or not they become citizens. This is a terrible idea.
USCIS-2025-0003-0930	Comment Submitted by Anonymous	Doing this will actually make it harder to catch the criminals trying to get into this country. The only people that this will affect are the innocent and honest immigrants trying to come in. The really bad ones will hide any of their trails before coming here. Not to mention that we need immigrants and this just deters any good ones from coming.
USCIS-2025-0003-0931	Comment Submitted by Rebecca Giannini	I strongly believe in outlet first amendment right to freedom of speech. I also believe that vetting someone's social media is an infringement of their rights (even if they hold a visa or a green card). In addition to infringement of first amendment rights I believe this is a waste of funds and resources. Instead of wasting funds and resources vetting social media. We should spend creating a pathway to citizenship. Deportation should only be used for violent crime and not for protesting.
USCIS-2025-0003-0932	Comment Submitted by Anonymous	Hello I personally find this proposal, among many other proposals of this current administration to be a grave threat to freedom of speech and is a form of intimidation. We should not be a country of enforced conformity, nor a country unable to deal with criticism of our past or values. If they are so great they will stand up under scrutiny, and otherwise the criticism will grow and build until correction is made. That is goal of a more perfect union, to become more perfect, not to assert it is already there.
USCIS-2025-0003-0933	Comment Submitted by Anonymous	This proposal violates free speech. Free speech is essential in a democracy.
USCIS-2025-0003-0934	Comment Submitted by JOHN SEARLES	I am a US Citizen and my family goes back until the early 1800's when they immigrated from Europe. This proposal is very bad and very dangerous. The lower level individuals making these calls may flag someone because they do not like their political or religious views or background. It could be used by lower level employees to punish views that that employee considers to Conservative or Liberal. This is a very bad idea. Please do not do it.
USCIS-2025-0003-0935	Comment Submitted by Anonymous	This proposal violates free speech. Free speech is essential to a thriving democracy. Do not enact this proposal.
USCIS-2025-0003-0936	Comment Submitted by Veronica Gutierrez	I agree it should be done. We have countries that hate us and have intricate plans on how to infiltrate to cause disaster so we can never be too safe.
USCIS-2025-0003-0937	Comment Submitted by Anonymous	Back off people's right to privacy and free speech.
USCIS-2025-0003-0938	Comment Submitted by Melisaa DeGenova	This is another disgusting attempt at eliminating legal, hardworking immigrants on ideological grounds. What litmus test does a social media post have to pass before someone accuses it of being anti-Trump's agenda? This is a despicable tool for despotism and censorship.
USCIS-2025-0003-0939	Comment Submitted by Katy Gaffney	No
USCIS-2025-0003-0940	Comment Submitted by Anonymous	Instead of violating freedom of speech, recommend the agency review and implement due process.
USCIS-2025-0003-0941	Comment Submitted by Karen Bullock	I am opposed to the expansion of surveillance of social media on immigrants. Especially those living in the US already. They have already been vetted. This goes back on the promises to them made by the US. And it sets up a double standard where immigrants are never really good enough because they must be checked again and again. It goes against first amendment principles which apply to ALL people in the US regardless of immigration status. Plus adding an untested factor like AI that can't even interpret how to draw hands couldn't possibly determine the meaning of human communication patterns. Even humans can't do that a lot of the time on social media. Online interactions are hard to interpret generation to generation. Do you understand every meme or slang or cultural reference? Especially if it is from a culture not your own? Of course not. But we expect AI to. And we expect this to determine immigration processes for people? The failure rate will be immense. And I wonder if that's exactly why this proposal is being made. That way you can just blanket deny anyone or deport anyone based on faulty AI decisions and never have to truly feel responsible.

USCIS-2025-0003-0942	Comment Submitted by M L	This proposal is more about expanding fascist American policy than anything to do with "security". Attacking free speech is attacking America from within.
USCIS-2025-0003-0943	Comment Submitted by Lilly Kubit	<p>FREE SPEECH/ DUE PROCESS VIOLATION</p> <p>With all the other atrocities surrounding infringement on free speech, I have no doubt this will be used for the wrong reasons. Under the constitution, the First Ammendment protects free speech, which is inclusive of opinions surrounding the government. This change will mean more surveillance, and likely more wrongful detainments due to the current administration viewing any critique as a national security threat, or, even worse, terrorism. It is NOT terrorism to voice opinions about Trump or Biden or Hillary or anyone, negative or positive. It is NOT a threat or danger to their lives to say you disagree or even despise the things they are doing. Truly, this combined with all the student visa revokations screams that this will be used to silence anyone who speaks out against any atrocity done by this administration, namely the conflict in Gaza. This administration will no doubt use these methods to further their agenda, possibly sending even more innocent people, WITHOUT DUE PROCESS, to prisons outside our borders, making it impossible to fight for justice for them and others. We are barrelling toward facism, which defined by Miriam Webster dictionary, means: a populist political philosophy, movement, or regime (MAGA and all the other slogans) that exalts nation and often race above the individual (targeting all non-white dissenters and undocumented immigrants), that is associated with a centralized autocratic government headed by a dictatorial leader (Trump consolidating power and taking funding away from congress, trying to impeach judges that don't agree, and firing anyone who isn't a loyalist), and that is characterized by severe economic (being told the tariffs will fix the economy even though the stock market has been downturned, the majority of americans have already been living in a recession since the stimulus checks stopped, and eggs are the highest price they've been) and social (MAGA, trans bathroom debate, roe v. wade overturned, likely Oberfell coming soon,) regimentation and by forcible suppression of opposition (revoking student visas and deporting dissenters of the genocide of Gaza, sometimes going back months when Trump wasn't even in office). This will continue the repression of truth and free speech and the regression of American society, to the benefit of only a few, namely Trump, Elon and their bootlickin' loyalists.</p>
USCIS-2025-0003-0944	Comment Submitted by Anonymous	Not just no, but heck no! This not only goes against the principles of free speech but may also constitute unreasonable search and seizure. Supposing Birthright citizenship ends, there is NOTHING that would prevent this administration from also going after natural born citizens. Take the long view and always look at any potential legislation with an eye towards how it could possibly be used in the most abusive way.
USCIS-2025-0003-0945	Comment Submitted by Donald Noonan	<p>It is inappropriate to collect social media data for so many reasons. Freedom of speech, well short on inciting sedition or violence, should not be an issue. Social Media sites are easily hacked or hijacked which could harm an applicant if they are targeted by their enemies, or anyone with a grudge or an agenda.It could be a pissed off family member for something ridiculous. THeY certainly know your passwords.</p> <p>If a "radical" likes your "post" or you "like" a particular "post" of someone whose larger history is radically violent. It's impossible, unless you're the government with seemingly unlimited resources, to do a search on anyone you interact with momentarily online.</p>
USCIS-2025-0003-0946	Comment Submitted by Craig Murphy	I 100% support having people share their social media handles when applying for U.S. citizenship, green card, asylum and other immigration benefits. This is a good proposal.
USCIS-2025-0003-0947	Comment Submitted by Coleman ROSE	<p>No to this proposal.</p> <p>This is basing life and death decisions on rumors and assumptions. Our immigration policies should reflect our national values. Most of us still believe our Constitution, the Bill of Rights, and subsequent Amendments represent our national values. This will be used by the current administration to filter people based on their world views. That also means that our people filter could change considerably every four years, unless of course the proposing administration is planning to prevent such a change through realizing Project 2025.</p>
USCIS-2025-0003-0948	Comment Submitted by Elizabeth Kandror	This is an absolutely awful, dystopian, unconstitutional regulation amendment ever. This should be trashed and never, ever resurrected.
USCIS-2025-0003-0949	Comment Submitted by Anonymous	Collecting social media handles is an extensive invasion of privacy, a likely violation of several amendments, will cost an exorbitant amount of money from taxpayers for DHS/USCIS to actually follow up on, delay the already incredibly long backlogs for processing applications, and only serves to weaponize speech against even law abiding immigrants who may disagree with the administration (which is not, and should not be, illegal). This is a horrendous overreach and must not be implemented.
USCIS-2025-0003-0950	Comment Submitted by Jason Miller	Stop invading free speech and criticism in the name of "national security"
USCIS-2025-0003-0951	Comment Submitted by Anonymous	<p>It is incredibly cruel to try to deny someone the right to citizenship because you disagree with them.</p> <p>As an American-born citizen, this is an attack on free speech and it is an invasion of privacy for the sole purpose of lording power over people.</p>
USCIS-2025-0003-0952	Comment Submitted by George Washington	I'm all for the tracking of these ILLEGALS and ultimately exporting them back to whatever 3rd world country they came from. MAGA
USCIS-2025-0003-0953	Comment Submitted by Anonymous	I am against this proposal. This is government overreach and violates people's rights to free speech.

<p>USCIS-2025-0003-0954</p>	<p>Comment Submitted by Anonymous</p>	<p>I am writing as a proud U.S. citizen, a successful entrepreneur, a taxpayer, and someone who has contributed to this country through hard work, innovation, and community-building. I strongly oppose the Department of Homeland Security's proposed policy to require the collection of social media handles from applicants for U.S. citizenship, green cards, asylum, and other immigration benefits.</p> <p>This proposal is invasive, unnecessary, and deeply concerning for anyone who values freedom, privacy, and the foundational principles of this country. The United States has always been a nation built by immigrants — people who came here to pursue safety, opportunity, and liberty. Subjecting them to surveillance based on their online presence is a slippery slope that risks turning our democracy into a state of suspicion and profiling.</p> <p>As a business owner, I interact with immigrants every day — they are my colleagues, clients, employees, and friends. Many of them are among the hardest-working and most loyal people I know. The idea that we would treat them with such distrust by forcing them to hand over their social media information sets a dangerous precedent. Social media is an imperfect and context-lacking medium. A joke, a quote, or a comment taken out of context can be easily misinterpreted and weaponized.</p> <p>This policy will not enhance national security — it will only deepen fear, discrimination, and bureaucracy. It may even deter qualified, talented individuals from contributing to our economy and society because they don't want to be subjected to unfair digital scrutiny.</p> <p>I urge the Department to withdraw this proposal. Let us focus on real, data-backed solutions to enhance security — not intrusive measures that erode trust, freedom of expression, and the very values we claim to protect.</p>
<p>USCIS-2025-0003-0955</p>	<p>Comment Submitted by Penelope Roberts</p>	<p>This is a clear case of unjustified government overreach into people's privacy rights. People have a right to privacy under the 4th amendment. This is a ridiculous policy change that will infringe on people's basic rights.</p>
<p>USCIS-2025-0003-0956</p>	<p>Comment Submitted by Anonymous</p>	<p>I am against collecting of social media on Immigration forms</p>
<p>USCIS-2025-0003-0957</p>	<p>Comment Submitted by Julie Hasquet</p>	<p>No. Our Constitution and the amendments give us freedoms in this country that we have valued for well over 200 years. Free speech, freedom of expression, freedom to assemble; those are all freedoms we hold dear. There is no need to expand the processes already in place to monitor and screen. We are becoming a cruel and inhumane country. Please stop trying to turn us into WWII Germany and modern day Russia. Please stop trying to destroy the very foundations of what we were built on.</p>
<p>USCIS-2025-0003-0958</p>	<p>Comment Submitted by Karin Grayson</p>	<p>The proposed order violates the first amendment in full. Those who have entered the country through legal channels are protected under the same rights as us citizens and should not be treated as second class citizens. We are not living in a dictatorship. This country is founded on democracy and this act threatens to illegally strip away rights of people's who have fought tooth and nail the right way to earn their place in this country.</p> <p>There are legal cases upon cases that could be cited but I'll refer you simply to the first amendment of the US constitution.</p> <p>Simply out to monitor ones s9cial media activity is simply put an overreach of the president and unconstitutional.</p>
<p>USCIS-2025-0003-0959</p>	<p>Comment Submitted by Elissa Dresden</p>	<p>this is an idea contrary to the constitution. especially with the advent of AI it is too easy to fake and deep fake all social media identifiers and content. this goes against the privacy act and the first amendment.</p>
<p>USCIS-2025-0003-0960</p>	<p>Comment Submitted by Anonymous</p>	<p>This goes against the first amendment. People should have the freedom to speak their mind.</p>
<p>USCIS-2025-0003-0961</p>	<p>Comment Submitted by Anonymous</p>	<p>While I understand the need for National Security, I fail to understand why the Republican Party refused to endorse the Border Bill that Mr. Lankford (one of their own, I might add) presented. It was endorsed by Border Control and would have been the most comprehensive, conservative border control policy in decades. Why the sudden turn-around? Someone maybe wanting to demonize people with different skin color, language, accent or culture? Hmmm??? Was that it? This endeavor to further intrude into people's lives is simply another example of authoritarian overreach by an out- of- control administration. Still waiting for those checks and balances I've heard about my entire life.</p>

USCIS-2025-0003-0962	Comment Submitted by Anonymous	<p>The proposed revisions to Forms I-751 and N-400 raise serious concerns regarding the protection of First, Fourth, and Fifth Amendment rights for Conditional and Lawful Permanent Residents. These individuals have already undergone extensive background checks to establish their eligibility for CPR or LPR status, suggesting that further invasive scrutiny may be unwarranted.</p> <p>The requirement to disclose social media identifiers for parents, spouses/stepparents, and children presents significant challenges. Firstly, CPRs and LPRs should not be held responsible for the online activities of their family members. Secondly, it is practically impossible for applicants to guarantee the complete and accurate disclosure of all social media identifiers used by their relatives over the past five years. Consequently, adverse decisions based on these disclosure requirements would be fundamentally unjust.</p> <p>Moreover, these proposed changes would substantially increase administrative burdens and costs for USCIS, exacerbating existing processing delays and placing an undue burden on American taxpayers.</p> <p>In the interest of transparency and fairness, it is also proposed that elected government officials be required to disclose all sources of income, as well as any dual citizenships or foreign loyalties. This would ensure that those making decisions affecting the nation are held to the same standards of disclosure as those seeking to reside or naturalize within it.</p> <p>Furthermore, there are concerns that this proposed bill has a sole purpose to protect the Zionist regime, and that the American government has become a slave of Zionism. These concerns should be addressed, and all conflicts of interest should be made public.</p>
USCIS-2025-0003-0963	Comment Submitted by Anonymous	Regarding: USCIS-2025-0003. I fully support the use of social media being added to the immigration form. Government needs to be able to investigate potential immigrants at all levels of available information.
USCIS-2025-0003-0964	Comment Submitted by Anonymous	I DO NOT SUPPORT THIS!!! The government should not have access to this information.
USCIS-2025-0003-0965	Comment Submitted by Matthew Wilkinson	Social media is included in free speech. Taking action against Visa or Greencard holders for exercising free speech is unconstitutional.
USCIS-2025-0003-0966	Comment Submitted by Anonymous	<p>Collecting this information will further the delays to an already difficult process, which will result in an uptick in illegal immigration. It should be more streamlined to apply for and be considered for immigration through the legal avenues, yet instead this would propose incorporating further obstacles. Additionally, this violates an individual's right to an opinion and incorporates a bias to the consideration of anyone seeking citizenship, which will result in a less objective or uniform examination of qualification.</p> <p>My question to Homeland Security is how is it possible to manage this information without creating a large scale ethical dilemma resulting in denial of qualified individuals who have a different political opinion or perspective on controversial topics? This will only backfire as we continue to exacerbate an already contentious immigration procedure. Even with an outlined checklist of when, why, what and how to identify the use case for social media surveillance, you cannot ensure that bias is not introduced.</p> <p>Please consider alternative options.</p>
USCIS-2025-0003-0967	Comment Submitted by Anonymous	This straight out of the fascist playbook. The U.S. population does not support this. It is extremely anti-democratic, which supposedly our country was founded on those principles. So, which is it? We are a nation of immigrants, which wouldn't exist without immigration. This is completely anti-thetical to our founding and spits in the face of the founding fathers and the constitution. I am unequivocally opposed to this, let me be clear, and so is anybody else who believes in our democracy, and the principles of democracy.
USCIS-2025-0003-0968	Comment Submitted by M A	This is a violation of free speech. This opens the door for surveillance on not just visa applicants but all citizens. Meta is dangerous and using their platforms as a tool to screen sets a dangerous precedent to monitor all social media accounts for any political dissent.
USCIS-2025-0003-0969	Comment Submitted by Joan Wrxall	Collecting social media account data is a fascist intimidation tactic not worthy of consideration by our government. It's an exceptionally intrusive violation ranking right up there with stalking. I'm more concerned with the Nazis within our government than surveillance of citizens and visitors. What next? Neuralink installed in every person in the country? I appreciate your thuggish warning that I shouldn't identify myself on this form in the space you provide to do just that. For god's sake;
USCIS-2025-0003-0970	Comment Submitted by Brent Baker	<p>This is a huge overstep, it goes against the principles of free speech. The government should not be tracking the social media usernames of people simply because they want to become Americans.</p> <p>As a US citizen, I am saying this should not be a policy of the United States government, it stifles free speech and is antithetical to who we should be.</p>
USCIS-2025-0003-0971	Comment Submitted by Anonymous	No. Free speech is under attack and comments people make are misconstrued to corner them into a terrorist category, thereby justifying this administration to deport them without due process. Just because people think that Israel has overstepped in killing so many Palestinians, does not mean they support Hamas, or are antisemitic. It simply means they don't support actions taken. This administration has gone too far, and this proposed action of searching all social media is a threat to democracy and free speech.
USCIS-2025-0003-0972	Comment Submitted by Anonymous	This is a very bad idea, particularly with this authoritarian administration currently deconstructing our government. I'm a white male, born and raised in the US and denying or deporting someone who happens to share an opinion that they don't like is abhorrent. It's un-American; more like Nazi Germany or Stalinistic Russia. And this kind of Big Brother stuff is why I choose to submit this anonymously.

USCIS-2025-0003-0973	Comment Submitted by Belinda Johnson	This is just another way for Trump to hurt people who don't support his fascist dictatorship. He is actively shredding the US Constitution by taking away free speech and our right to assemble peacefully.
USCIS-2025-0003-0974	Comment Submitted by Robert Scofield	I address this criterion: "Evaluate whether the proposed collection of information is necessary for the proper performance of the functions of the agency, including whether the information will have practical utility;" Speaking both as a citizen and an attorney I am concerned that proposals such as this get expanded after they are adopted. For example, according to the Associated Press this proposal expands a policy adopted by President Obama. In my work I have seen laws passed for one purpose being used to achieve another. My concern is that if the government finds this plan useful, it will then expand it to include citizens. Therefore, I think it would be better not to take this step which could be expanded either by the present administration or one in the future.
USCIS-2025-0003-0975	Comment Submitted by Henry Stiepleman	I don't think we should do this.
USCIS-2025-0003-0976	Comment Submitted by Anonymous	Protect Free Speech! It's the hallmark of Democracy! There is no need to be afraid of a diversity of opinions. It fosters an open and inclusive society.
USCIS-2025-0003-0977	Comment Submitted by Kristen Stewart	Meta has turned off fact checkers on its platforms to ensure freedom of speech for its users as it claims fact checking is a form of censorship and is against the first amendment. We have set the precedent that social media is considered a platform for free speech. If we hold this idea to be true, then it is un-american to check anyone's (including people trying to legally enter the country) social media. In this country, we believe every person has a fundamental right to free speech. This speech can AND SHOULD be used to challenge the status quo, generate new ideas, and to challenge leadership. Is that not why I have the ability to write this message itself? As a person who truly believes the freedom of speech is the base of America, I also believe in the right, and the obligation, to critique America itself. How can we expect our country to continue to grow if we never let in the outside voices?
USCIS-2025-0003-0978	Comment Submitted by Daniel Pasto	No, collecting social media handles is a violation of free speech and chilling toward thoughts and ideas. It is more anti-American than what it claims to prevent. Immigrants are NOT criminals and there is no justification for treating them that way.
USCIS-2025-0003-0979	Comment Submitted by Anonymous	This administration is an embarrassment and should be ashamed of itself to play big brother and spy on people like this. America isn't great and won't be until we remove trump and co from office.
USCIS-2025-0003-0980	Comment Submitted by Anonymous	This is an affront to free speech. There is no information that should be relevant to whether someone is aloud to enter the country that can be found online. By deferring to online sources and social media the context of the rest of these peoples lives will be excluded. I thought that this country was all about a fair and just process?
USCIS-2025-0003-0981	Comment Submitted by Anonymous	Don't you think I ever expanding surveillance state impinges on our collective rights to life liberty in the pursuit of happiness? What do we draw the line on this every year? There's a new surveillance program the government tracks her phones or social media. It's particularly interested in immigrants and minorities that doesn't like. Where is the freedom? Where's the liberty here? Those things exist in name only in America. Shame on y'all shame on y'all shame where is this gonna stop? They won't stop with us sooner or later they'll be Monitoring every single person that works for the government. Someday, all the surveillance will be on you too and we'll all just live in 1984.
USCIS-2025-0003-0982	Comment Submitted by Irene Yates	The collection of social media information is unnecessary to accomplish the administration's goals of rigorous and uniform vetting. This information collection will only cause fear among applicants that their constitutionally protected speech will be a factor in determining USCIS' response to their form submission. There seems to be no mechanism to determine if an applicant has chosen to withhold their social media information or if they have no social media presence. Will a lawful permanent resident with no smartphone or computer need to prove that they don't have a Facebook account to apply for naturalization? On the other hand, would a Hamas member purposefully disclose an X account with evidence of their affiliation in their student visa application? It is unclear to me if there is any feasible policy solution to these problems other than discarding the idea. This collection appears to be a waste of USCIS officials' time and effort that only results in fear and anxiety among potential applicants and damages the credibility of the office.
USCIS-2025-0003-0983	Inappropriate Comment Submitted by Brandon Loi	This violates the 4th amendment. Fuck you!
USCIS-2025-0003-0984	Comment Submitted by Anonymous	This is a blatant and obvious setup to violate the first and fourth amendments.
USCIS-2025-0003-0985	Comment Submitted by Anonymous	If AI is used to entrap those wishing green cards or citizenship it can just as easily be used to entrap those who do not agree with the public policy of the president who are citizens. This dystopian future is one we should all strongly oppose. For instance. Palestinians are people. They are not terrorists. They live on ancestral lands coveted by an occupying country. The United Nations has condemned settlements which are illegal under International law. It isn't anti semitic to point out the violations of Israel against Palestinians and yet there are political alignments that have sought to do so, to make any criticism of Israel a deportable offense rather than a free speech right. I think there has to be real and probable cause for subjecting people to more intrusive automated screening, which is prone to error. It must not become a routine and politicized element of immigrant or refugees's assessments.
USCIS-2025-0003-0986	Comment Submitted by Kat O'Brien	This is an attack on free speech and the Constitution. Please read the Constitution and Bill of Rights before attempting to pass laws.

USCIS-2025-0003-0987	Comment Submitted by Anonymous	Yeah sorry, this is gonna be a no from me. Free speech means free speech, you don't get to pick and choose
USCIS-2025-0003-0988	Comment Submitted by Anonymous	Not only is this a clear violation of the first amendment, this order assumes the guilt of those seeking to immigrate to this country. Our court system operates on the premise that individuals are innocent until proven guilty. This program is a clear overreach of our government in an attempt to ensure that those allowed over the border align their beliefs with the executive branch of our government. We are a nation built on freedom, and the protection of that freedom. We are a nation that should be proud of those who are diverse, as we were a nation founded on immigrants seeking freedom from the oppression of foreign governments. We should value outside perspectives, instead of shunning them. We should be proud to protect those seeking asylum. You MUST not allow this to pass, and you MUST protect ALL of our first amendment rights. You breach it here, and you open the door for it to be breached elsewhere. We must protect the constitution that built this free nation.
USCIS-2025-0003-0989	Comment Submitted by Seth Friedman	<p>To Whom It May Concern,</p> <p>I respectfully submit this comment regarding USCIS's proposal to collect social media identifiers on immigration forms (Office of Management and Budget Control Number 1615-NEW, and Docket ID USCIS-2025-0003). While national security is unquestionably an important governmental objective, the methods described raise significant constitutional issues, particularly concerning the First and Fourth Amendments.</p> <p>Collecting social media identifiers may infringe upon individuals' First Amendment rights by creating a chilling effect on free speech and association. Such extensive monitoring risks deterring open and lawful expression due to fear of undue governmental scrutiny. Moreover, the breadth and vagueness of the proposed data collection implicates serious Fourth Amendment concerns, potentially permitting intrusive, suspicionless surveillance absent clear, individualized justification.</p> <p>In the absence of explicit and transparent safeguards, this expansive approach could unintentionally facilitate abuses of power or selective enforcement practices, particularly if wielded by actors hostile to democratic and constitutional principles. Therefore, I encourage those within USCIS dedicated to upholding democracy to implement robust oversight mechanisms, explicitly limiting the scope, retention, and permissible uses of collected social media data. Ensuring rigorous constitutional protections is essential to maintaining public trust and preventing unintended harm to foundational democratic rights and freedoms.</p> <p>Respectfully submitted, Seth Friedman 3/31/2025</p>
USCIS-2025-0003-0990	Comment Submitted by Anonymous	<p>This can set precedent for this crooked administration to use the collection of social media identifiers to target other populations. Who would be next?</p> <p>The free speech propaganda is yet another lie. This is against the first and fourth amendments (freedom of speech, and freedom against unreasonable search and seizure.</p> <p>Also, immigrants have built this country. Immigrants still build it. We should also defend the immigrants who are refugees.</p>
USCIS-2025-0003-0991	Comment Submitted by Anonymous	I don't see what good it does to collect social media handles. They're too easy to fake, or to have multiple accounts. And I keep having to report scammers who have duplicated my legitimate accounts. So there's very little useful data here. The resources going to investigating these things will be wasted. If we want to spend in this area, it would be better spent on actual boots-on-the-ground investigations. And I don't see what any of this has to do with applying for immigration benefits anyway.
USCIS-2025-0003-0992	Comment Submitted by Anonymous	This is a disgusting and disturbing violation of free speech. I whole-heartedly OPPOSE this proposal.
USCIS-2025-0003-0993	Comment Submitted by Anonymous	How far is the government overreach going to extend? Free speech is a pillar of democracy. How long until citizens will be monitored as well? Reject this proposal. We do not need or want an authoritarian government.
USCIS-2025-0003-0994	Comment Submitted by Anonymous	A person's social media account is not the government's business. No matter where they come from, inside or outside of the United States. Reject this proposal to collect social media identifiers.
USCIS-2025-0003-0995	Comment Submitted by Anonymous	Free speech is an essential element of US democracy even when you disagree with what another person says. To deport and exclude people because they do not proclaim loyalty to your political views is unpatriotic and undemocratic in the US.
USCIS-2025-0003-0996	Comment Submitted by Anonymous	This is pretty bad. It is a serious invasion of one's privacy -- as bad as reading a diary. I believe the purpose is to intimidate and threaten potential immigrants. They are humans and should have the same rights as the rest of us.
USCIS-2025-0003-0997	Comment Submitted by Anonymous	This proposal violates free speech. Free speech is essential in a democracy.
USCIS-2025-0003-0998	Comment Submitted by Anonymous	Making people give up their social media handle to vet their comments and determine their eligibility or ineligibility is a gross violation of free speech and privacy. This is actually an extremely scary time in the US as we teeter on the brink of becoming a fascist society. Everything this country was founded on is being challenged. You may as well pull down the Statue of Liberty at this point.

USCIS-2025-0003-0999	Comment Submitted by Anonymous	<p>This proposed collection of Social Media Identifiers is an egregious misunderstanding of the factors important to evaluating immigration paperwork and a gross overstep of the Department with regards to the freedoms that individuals in the United States enjoy. In evaluating the necessity of the information to be collected, and it's practicality, we can begin look at the type of information that is being gleamed from the proposed action. The disclosure of Social Media Identifiers provides the evaluating agency with only information that has been provided by the applicant in the virtual public sphere. Many people use Social Media to share personal details about their lives, such as where they have travelled, any significant life events they have endured, and their stances on political issues, as well as much more mundane details meant for meaningful relationships in their lives. It is clear that this information is not necessary to the evaluator. While I can imagine the department may envision finding suspicious activity or connections via Social Media, this must be considered in a practical sense. Social Media is easily manipulatable, and easily hidden. No person who considers applying for one of the immigration processes overseen by this Department would leave incriminating posts or details available on their Social Media, if those details were ever there to begin with. The practicality of this collection is revolting, as it leaves significant room for misuse and opinion-based decisions. In cases where an applicant has strong political opinions that have been left available on Social Media, the evaluator who has been made aware of this information has now been unintentionally primed to bias. The risk of the evaluator making a poor decision (whether to accept an unacceptable applicant or deny an acceptable applicant) is significantly raised by the practical implementation of this collection. Not only is there this risk of bias, but the inclusion of this information can very often muddle an application in the presence of contradictory posts or posts made in jest. Or even simply the type of posts made may be incongruent with a significant change that has occurred in the applicant's life that is not reflected by Social Media. There are endless opportunities for error. Additionally, the burden put on the employees of the department needing to perform this additional vetting is significant. Many people post on their Social Media often, leaving those burdened with evaluating this information overloaded with, frankly, useless information. The Department cannot in good faith consider implementing the proposed collection of data. There is nothing to be gained and everything, including the public trust, to be lost. Do not do this.</p>
USCIS-2025-0003-1000	Comment Submitted by Anonymous	<p>Reference: e-Docket ID number USCIS-2025-0003 Reference: Office of Management and Budget (OMB) Control Number 1615-NEW</p> <p>The proposed policy in USCIS-2025-0003 directly infringes on the rights granted by the First Amendment. More importantly, it will do further damage to the US economy by indiscriminately removing valued members of our community that contribute to its fundamental workings. Our nation is founded on the principles of open discussion without fear of retribution, and we are better for it.</p>
USCIS-2025-0003-1001	Comment Submitted by Anonymous	<p>No one is required to be on social media. Social media is a toy, Its socializing... and its absolutely of no business to any sort of govt scrutiny... our own POTUS says treasonous comments, then blows it off as "a joke"... and on social media as well.</p> <p>This is a person in a role model position whose comments are brushed off as humor when it backfires. Since social media is not a deposition or any form of legal binding statement, nothing can be considered legal to intrude upon, or assume a person would have one of these childish accounts. If you were to try to compel others to share this, any intelligent person would scrub or delete the account immediately afterwards, and just start another one.... You are not paid by our tax dollars to police the public's social life or opinions. People have all sorts of disturbing opinions. None of which are crimes to think or share, when not acted upon... they are expression, venting or simply discussion. Good luck mandating owning a social media account.. im sure you'll next choose which ones you think we should have to benefit your favorite cronies....</p>
USCIS-2025-0003-1002	Comment Submitted by nicole gangl	<p>I would ask that y'all let everyone in this country have the freedom of speech regardless of where they're from or who says they're supposed to be here.</p>
USCIS-2025-0003-1003	Comment Submitted by Anonymous	<p>This is completely unethical and unnecessary. Expanding surveillance on international applicants does nothing to improve national security and there isn't even enough funding for personnel to properly review these social media accounts, making it clear that the real goal is to slow down an already unreasonably long immigration process. Furthermore, what even defines a "social media identifier"? This language would seem to allow USCIS to speculatively search private digital data and to arbitrarily define what is a threat and what is not. This is an obvious attack on first amendment rights to free speech, which applies to both citizens and non-citizens in the US. There isn't even any definitive proof or data to support that this would even make us safer. If anything, this is merely another act that would take my tax dollars and use it to spy on people; I vehemently object to this plan.</p>
USCIS-2025-0003-1004	Comment Submitted by Anonymous	<p>I strongly urge you NOT to implement this rule. It is unnecessary and invasive, and there is no evidence to suggest it will have any positive impact on national security.</p>
USCIS-2025-0003-1005	Comment Submitted by Anonymous	<p>My wife and I are proud Americans. I was born a US citizen and she got her citizenship recently. The processes to obtain permanent residency and citizenship are already stressful enough. We filled out form after form, documenting our relationship with each other, proving that we've had an established relationship and will continue to do so. This is all stressful enough without having the added stress of anything said or done on social media being brought into question.</p> <p>The oath that one takes to become a citizen is not taken lightly and many are willing to give up the nationality of their home country so that they can be American. The oath that they take is an oath to uphold the meaning of the constitution, which includes the freedom of speech. This proposal would deny them that freedom and it would stain the constitution.</p>
USCIS-2025-0003-1006	Comment Submitted by Anonymous	<p>My wife and I are proud Americans. I was born a US citizen and she got her citizenship recently. The processes to obtain permanent residency and citizenship are already stressful enough. We filled out form after form, documenting our relationship with each other, proving that we've had an established relationship and will continue to do so. This is all stressful enough without having the added stress of anything said or done on social media being brought into question.</p> <p>The oath that one takes to become a citizen is not taken lightly and many are willing to give up the nationality of their home country so that they can be American. The oath that they take is an oath to uphold the meaning of the constitution, which includes the freedom of speech. This proposal would deny them that freedom and it would stain the constitution.</p>

USCIS-2025-0003-1007	Comment Submitted by Jennifer Brooks	Do not do this. Social Media is not reliable enough. It can be hacked, used by other family members with the password, or taken out of context.
USCIS-2025-0003-1008	Comment Submitted by Joshua Herbert	<p>To Whom It May Concern,</p> <p>I respectfully submit this comment regarding USCIS's proposal to collect social media identifiers on immigration forms (Office of Management and Budget Control Number 1615-NEW, and Docket ID USCIS-2025-0003). While national security is unquestionably an important governmental objective, the methods described raise significant constitutional issues, particularly concerning the First and Fourth Amendments.</p> <p>Collecting social media identifiers may infringe upon individuals' First Amendment rights by creating a chilling effect on free speech and association. Such extensive monitoring risks deterring open and lawful expression due to fear of undue governmental scrutiny. Moreover, the breadth and vagueness of the proposed data collection implicates serious Fourth Amendment concerns, potentially permitting intrusive, suspicionless surveillance absent clear, individualized justification.</p> <p>In the absence of explicit and transparent safeguards, this expansive approach could unintentionally facilitate abuses of power or selective enforcement practices, particularly if wielded by actors hostile to democratic and constitutional principles. Therefore, I encourage those within USCIS dedicated to upholding democracy to implement robust oversight mechanisms, explicitly limiting the scope, retention, and permissible uses of collected social media data. Ensuring rigorous constitutional protections is essential to maintaining public trust and preventing unintended harm to foundational democratic rights and freedoms.</p> <p>Respectfully submitted, Joshua Herbert 03/31/2025</p>
USCIS-2025-0003-1009	Comment Submitted by Laura Tabili	<p>The proposal to spy on people's social media accounts is antithetical to a free society.</p> <p>People are entitled to their First Amendment rights without fear of retaliation.</p> <p>This is a terrible proposal and you must reject it.</p>
USCIS-2025-0003-1010	Comment Submitted by Anonymous	<p>Dear Gestapo,</p> <p>No</p>
USCIS-2025-0003-1011	Comment Submitted by Anonymous	This is unconstitutional and violates free speech.
USCIS-2025-0003-1012	Comment Submitted by Je Whaley	This is an absurd proposal. We do not need America to increase surveillance of anyone. This is a dangerous precedent and a slippery slope toward less freedom for everyone. Stop it now.
USCIS-2025-0003-1013	Comment Submitted by Anonymous	I say, Yes we should collect as much data as possible, I work for non profit employer, I screen many immigrants, and I find that some use several multiple first and last names, if you were to dig a little deeper, I'm sure you find more either incriminating or other not, collection of this data is important
USCIS-2025-0003-1014	Comment Submitted by Nate LaHue	<p>I strongly oppose this. What makes America great is that we welcome a diverse array of people with diverse opinions from around this world. This what built us into a super power.</p> <p>The first amendment applies to everyone, regardless of citizenship. This simply a slap in the face of freedom. Ironic that a government that claims to love Freedom is pushing this.</p> <p>Defend our FREEDOM, and stop this madness.</p>
USCIS-2025-0003-1015	Comment Submitted by Kara W	These people have already been vetted and have been living here as legal immigrants. To suddenly require them to turn over the social media handles they have been able to have because they live in a country that allows them the freedom of speech? Are you trying to get immigration numbers down by turning the US into the same authoritarian hell hole that many of those people have fled from? If they are already here, they have constitutional rights, including free speech. Not only is it a violation of the freedom of speech, it is a waste of time and resources to search the social media accounts of people who have already been vetted. Pathetic.
USCIS-2025-0003-1016	Comment Submitted by Anonymous	Keep your hands out of our social media. Stop infringing on our rights to privacy. Smaller government means less government listening in on us.
USCIS-2025-0003-1017	Comment Submitted by Aram J	This makes immigrants slaves and if someone forgets to share their old accounts info and forget to mention their rarely used or forgotten accounts then that can be used against them at Port of entry. Immigrants are not slaves so please stop this.

USCIS-2025-0003-1018	Comment Submitted by Carolyn S	<p>I am writing to express significant concerns regarding the proposed information collection by U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services (USCIS) to gather social media identifiers and associated platform names from those who seek the shelter of our national's laws and liberties.</p> <p>I. An Unwarranted Invasion of Privacy The policy's broad scope for collecting social media information represents an invasion of privacy that extends beyond what is necessary for legitimate security concerns. Social media accounts are digital repositories of personal expression which contain extensive personal information about individuals' political views, religious beliefs, family relationships, and protected activities that go far beyond what is needed for security vetting.</p> <p>II. First Amendment Principles Ignored This collection stands counter to the Executive Order on Returning Free Speech to America, which rightfully proclaims: "The First Amendment to the United States Constitution, an amendment essential to the success of our Republic, enshrines the right of the American people to speak freely in the public square without Government interference." It must be acknowledged that in our present age, social media platforms constitute our modern public square—the digital commons where ideas are exchanged, just as our founding fathers gathered in actual public squares to debate the principles of liberty that would form our nation. The Administration itself recognizes this truth through its prolific use of these platforms for public address. Indeed, social media has become so integral to public discourse that even after inciting insurrection, a former President found it necessary to construct his own virtual public square to maintain communion with his followers.</p> <p>Let us be mindful that many immigrants choose our shores precisely because of our steadfast protection of free expression. Knowledge of government surveillance of social media could create a significant chilling effect on free speech for immigrants and their communities. Applicants may self-censor legitimate speech out of fear it could negatively impact their immigration status, thereby diminishing that liberty of expression that we proclaim to be essential to the success of our Republic.</p> <p>III. Potential for Discriminatory Application The proposed collection references "certain populations of individuals" without providing clear, objective criteria for determining which applicants will be subject to social media screening. This vagueness creates substantial risk of disproportionate impact on particular national, ethnic, or religious groups, potentially violating equal protection principles and anti-discrimination laws.</p> <p>IV. Due Process Concerns The policy raises grave questions about how social media content shall be interpreted, potentially divorced from cultural context, and whether petitioners shall be afforded meaningful opportunity to address adverse findings based on such content—rights which every person within our borders, by natural law, ought to enjoy.</p>
USCIS-2025-0003-1019	Comment Submitted by A. Gillespie	<p>If implemented, this policy will result in life-changing decisions being made on the basis of the most stupid thing a person has ever said.</p> <p>Think of the dumbest thing you've ever said, either in person or on social media. Now imagine you're applying for a job, and the hiring manager knows that about you. The proposed rule makes for the same basic situation, but worse. Because there's more jobs in the world, but only one United States of America.</p>
USCIS-2025-0003-1020	Comment Submitted by Michelle Martin	<p>The government does not need to collect more information from legal residents. Collecting social media information is useless since anyone with any bad intentions would of course change their social media accounts the minute they arrive. Also, it's more of an incursion into the government controlling speech. It isn't their job. The Bill of Rights was written to constrain the government's powers. So no more collection of data from Lawful Permanent Residents. It's a useless but invasive reach the government shouldn't expand. We should be upholding free speech for all.</p>
USCIS-2025-0003-1021	Comment Submitted by Marijah Sroczynski	<p>This policy will not fulfill its aims of protecting us from foreign terrorist threats but will instead chill free speech and stifle conversations necessary for an educated public in a free democracy. I hope you reconsider this ridiculous idea that you are perpetuating in my name as a citizen of this country.</p>
USCIS-2025-0003-1022	Comment Submitted by kathryn salman	<p>There are too many concerns with collecting this information without proper procedures limiting the use of social media and specifically which social media sites, what is done with information, and how long monitoring of such information is done. Civil rights groups have raised concerns that the policy proposal would disproportionately impact critics of Israel and the U.S. government's handling of the conflict. Others have noted that this policy would disparately impact Muslim and Arab applicants seeking U.S. citizenship that have voiced support for Palestinian human rights. And as written it is entirely possible that people's activity would be continuously monitored even if applicants became U.S. citizens.</p> <p>This regulation seems hastily written to comply with President Trump's executive order titled "Protecting the United States from Foreign Terrorists and Other National Security and Public Safety Threats." Soon after assuming office on January 20th. While there may be good reasons to monitor social media, this regulation as written does not do that and exposes the risk and arguably likelihood of unlawful use by the Homeland Security agency.</p>
USCIS-2025-0003-1023	Comment Submitted by Anonymous	<p>I am FIRMLY AGAINST this gestapo-style "collection of activities" and attack of immigrants who are working to be in this country. This administration is out of control and ignoring the constitution for which it stands.</p>

USCIS-2025-0003-1024	Comment Submitted by Joyce Antila Phipps	This has nothing to do with terrorism but is a blatant attempt to simply stifle any dissent. This violates everything our Nation was built on
USCIS-2025-0003-1025	Comment Submitted by Anonymous	This is unethical and a dangerous infringement on constitutional right to free speech. The fast and loose ethical policy the administration has adopted is concerning .
USCIS-2025-0003-1026	Comment Submitted by Anonymous	I oppose the collection of social media handles from people applying for immigration-related benefits by the Department of Homeland Security. Regarding the U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services Office of Management and Budget (OMB) Control Number 1615-NEW, Docket ID USCIS-2025-0003: This policy invades personal privacy and First Amendment Rights and the foundational principles of the Declaration of Independence of the United States of America. Social media information is low quality, unreliable, convoluted, and easy to wildly misinterpret, and therefore not a valid, useful or uniform source of information for vetting. Please do not implement this proposed new policy on collection of information.
USCIS-2025-0003-1027	Comment Submitted by Anonymous	This proposal violates free speech. Free speech is essential in a democracy.
USCIS-2025-0003-1028	Comment Submitted by Antonio Aguilar	I think this should only apply to people originally from higher risk countries. People originating from allied nations or lower risk nations shouldn't have to do this.
USCIS-2025-0003-1029	Comment Submitted by Andrea Hjorth	As an American citizen, I fully support this.
USCIS-2025-0003-1030	Comment Submitted by Anonymous	I agree with a previous comment and will copy the text here with my own additions: This proposal directly violates: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • "The right to privacy" There is no justification for mass surveillance of individuals who are following legal immigration procedures. • "Freedom of expression" This measure will force applicants to self-censor out of fear that their social media activity could be misinterpreted or unfairly used against them. • "America's core democratic values" Implementing a broad surveillance system contradicts the nation's commitment to liberty and justice. <p>The U.S. cannot denounce authoritarian governments while using the same invasive tactics. If someone poses a legitimate risk, the government must conduct individual investigations based on evidence, not impose a blanket surveillance system on millions of people.</p> <p>In addition, by requiring social media information there will be unnecessary process to review social media of potential US citizens, creating undue burden on staff and/or technology used by staff. This proposal appears to only serve as a means of identifying those who do not agree with the governing administration for the purpose of further persecution or denial of citizenship. As a country, we should not be barring diverse opinions but rather welcoming diversity of thought.</p>
USCIS-2025-0003-1031	Comment Submitted by Anonymous	This is an affront to Free Speech for those already legally residing in the US. It will chill protest and commentary on immigration-related topics for fear of retaliation. As a citizen of this country, I oppose this the collection of social media information for anyone residing in the United States.
USCIS-2025-0003-1032	Comment Submitted by Tina Curtis	This is overreach and should not be allowed. There is way too much opportunity for the government to use words as cause to deport those who oppose the current administration.
USCIS-2025-0003-1033	Comment Submitted by Anonymous	This is completely unacceptable and misguided at best. This spreads paranoia, misinformation and there is no unbiased way to draw conclusions from this. This can be easily manipulated by posting what could be perceived as favorable material. This opens the door to subjective interpretation and biases to have out sized impact. This increases work load without much objective benefit, making already long process even longer. It will be used as a weapons against people with different political views. Variety of expression and opinion has been the cornerstone of success for this country for a couple of hundred years. This should never be implemented, this is not Germany in the 1930s.
USCIS-2025-0003-1034	Comment Submitted by Anonymous	Social media is an essential form of free speech. This proposal can be intentionally or unintentionally expanded to infringe free speech, particularly expression of political view. It should NOT be adopted.
USCIS-2025-0003-1035	Comment Submitted by Anonymous	Collecting this data seems like a blatant attempt at targeting innocent individuals. It violates free speech and 4th amendment rights, letting the government do whatever they want without fair process. This won't protect anyone.
USCIS-2025-0003-1036	Comment Submitted by Anonymous	This proposal violates free speech. Free speech is essential in a democracy.
USCIS-2025-0003-1037	Comment Submitted by Rebecca Stancl	I oppose this rule as it is in direct opposition of FREE SPEECH. There are no clear rules or a fair process in this regulation as proposed. This kind of surveillance could silence legal immigrants or unfairly target communities based on identity or their views.
USCIS-2025-0003-1038	Comment Submitted by Kali Horn	This is completely unconstitutional and illegal and should not be implemented.
USCIS-2025-0003-1039	Comment Submitted by Anonymous	Expanding social media surveillance to people already vetted and in the U.S. legally is a step too far. It is an extra burden and cost to the taxpayer. It provides no value and will restrict free speech.

USCIS-2025-0003-1040	Comment Submitted by Laurence Gebhardt	<p>I oppose proposed Generic Clearance for the Collection of Social Media Identifier(s) on Immigration Forms.</p> <p>I oppose based on two points: 1) Evaluate whether the proposed collection of information is necessary for the proper performance of the functions of the agency, including whether the information will have practical utility; 4) Minimize the burden of the collection of information on those who are to respond, including through the use of appropriate automated, electronic, mechanical, or other technological collection techniques or other forms of information technology, e.g., permitting electronic submission of responses.</p> <p>Information on social media sites is not reliable. Social media is often hacked and modified to add misinformation, disinformation, deep-fake imagery, text, and voice data. Consider how much fake news from social media is used to defame, slander, and embarrass elected and political candidates.</p> <p>The proposed action is not necessary and would waste tax dollars. Current USCIS screening and vetting procedures for immigrants, refugees, asylum seekers, international students and tourists are functional and viable. Evidence is strong that artificial intelligence technology challenges the best government, media and corporate verification methods so proposed generic social media collection efforts would make too many mistakes.</p> <p>Laurence Gebhardt</p>
USCIS-2025-0003-1041	Comment Submitted by John Williams	This is a violation of the first amendment. It is wrong.
USCIS-2025-0003-1042	Comment Submitted by Anonymous	The vague language of this EO that would seemingly allow for artificial, capricious, or downright nefarious segmentation of individuals to single out and collect unnecessary information is alarming at the least, and given the behavior of the administration thus far, fairly easy to foreshadow how this power would be abused. Allowing USCIS to collect unneeded information from some, but not all, applicants for services for which they are able to be judged qualified or not qualified on the basis of other, legitimate, related information would be an unconscionable step toward further abuse of power, and would also be a giant leap away from the first amendment rights of free speech and assembly.
USCIS-2025-0003-1043	Comment Submitted by Anonymous	I am concerned this proposal violates free speech, which is an essential and basic right for a free society. It is unsettling to me that people need to censor themselves about their beliefs because they may differ from the current administration. For the record I am a member of the republican party.
USCIS-2025-0003-1044	Comment Submitted by Sofia Wright	I strongly oppose a requirement for a social media account to be included in immigration applications. I believe it is not necessary and not effective to evaluate an individual's identity or eligibility for citizenship. Additionally, I am very concerned that this threatens people's privacy and freedom of speech.
USCIS-2025-0003-1045	Duplicate Comment Submitted by Sofia Wright	I strongly oppose a requirement for a social media account to be included in immigration applications. I believe it is not necessary and not effective to evaluate an individual's identity or eligibility for citizenship. Additionally, I am very concerned that this threatens people's privacy and freedom of speech.
USCIS-2025-0003-1046	Duplicate Comment Submitted by Sofia Wright	I strongly oppose a requirement for a social media account to be included in immigration applications. I believe it is not necessary and not effective to evaluate an individual's identity or eligibility for citizenship. Additionally, I am very concerned that this threatens people's privacy and freedom of speech.
USCIS-2025-0003-1047	Comment Submitted by Sarah Masterman	<p>(1) Evaluate whether the proposed collection of information is necessary for the proper performance of the functions of the agency, including whether the information will have practical utility.</p> <p>Collecting information from the social media accounts of legal immigrants is not necessary for the proper performance of the functions of the department of Homeland Security. We have seen that this administration has expelled immigrants because they have protested against the actions of foreign governments that are allies of the United States. Legal immigrants should have the right to express their opinions and ejecting immigrants whose opinions differ from those of the administration does not make us, as citizens of the United States, safer.</p> <p>(3) Enhance the quality, utility, and clarity of the information to be collected;</p> <p>At a time when the administration has expressed a desire to cut our Federal Budget and reduce the number of Federal Employees, the idea that we have the time, energy and resources to meaningfully screen the social media accounts of millions of people seems unreasonable. I am aware that artificial intelligence and other screening tools might be used as a first pass on surveillance, but it is well known that these technologies are not reliable and would require humans to vet the information required through such screenings. It would be easy for people with truly evil intentions to hide those intentions from screening tools, so those who would be affected would be non-threatening immigrants who have opinions distasteful to the administration. Keep in mind that once these tools are in use, they would also be available to all future administrations and to others within the government.</p>
USCIS-2025-0003-1048	Comment Submitted by Laura Gettemy	<p>Collecting social media handles will not be particularly useful, because anyone who has truly damaging information on a social media profile will simply not report that one. (If a profile is easy to find by searching for someone's given name or other available information, then the officials can readily locate it themselves. If it is not, they are unlikely to find it.)</p> <p>Not everyone has public social media profiles, and many people have several, so it will not be easy to detect if anyone chooses to withhold information. I don't see any benefit that could be gained here that would outweigh the danger to free speech and the potential for arbitrary decision-making.</p>

USCIS-2025-0003-1049	Comment Submitted by Marina Marin	<p>please pay attention to a blogger living in the USA (a native of Ukraine) and her immediate entourage, as in live broadcasts and numerous appeals to Ukrainian migrants in the United States, Lena Mathies urges:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Boycott the decision of the current government regarding Ukraine and the actions and statements of President Donald Trump; 2. She broadcasts all broadcasts of the President of the United States on television live and criticizes the general public. 3. Discredits US President Donald Trump by pointing out in his posts that he has been convicted. I believe that these actions are aimed at discrediting the current President of the United States, Donald Trump, and at organizing riots against migrants from Ukraine. <p>Links to instagram:</p>
USCIS-2025-0003-1050	Comment Submitted by Anonymous	<p>To: Office of Management and Budget (OMB) Control Number 1615-NEW</p> <p>Docket ID USCIS-2025-0003</p> <p>I believe that USCIS should consider looking into the social media accounts of the individuals applying for green cards and US citizenship. There are individuals out there "cheating the system" and taking advantage of these green card based marriages for benefits. It is common for these marriages to happen among US military members and civilians. While the civilian is on the path to citizenship, the service member receives BAH benefits. In this one case, the service member claims to be single on social media but is actually "married" to a DACA recipient who currently holds a conditional green card. The recipient has also claimed to make a fake account so they can exchange fake conversations.</p> <p>From: Anonymous submission</p>
USCIS-2025-0003-1051	Comment Submitted by Anonymous	<p>USCIS should look into the social media accounts of the individuals who applied for green cards, US citizenship and who may already hold a conditional green card. Some of these individuals are more than likely to be committing marriage fraud to gain easier and faster access to US citizenship. There are videos on Tiktok influencing individuals on how to provide proper evidence to USCIS. Since it so common for these marriages to occur between service members and DACA recipients, it is most likely fraud and they claim to be single on their social media.</p>
USCIS-2025-0003-1052	Comment Submitted by Anonymous	<p>Yes!! US. Immigration should definitely consider looking into the social media accounts of applicants or people with conditional green cards. There are individuals committing green card based marriage fraud and are basically living double lives - "married on paper" but claiming they are single on their social media.</p>
USCIS-2025-0003-1053	Comment Submitted by Katherine Granger	<p>1615-NEW Self Docket ID USCIS-2025-0003</p> <p>I do not think requiring social media information from migrants is useful or necessary, and only serves as a measure to intimidate people from expressing their rights to free speech, as per the first amendment.</p> <p>Requiring someone's social media makes a lot of assumptions that a) the person applying has social media, b) they use their accounts regularly and c) openly share their personal life in instead of keeping that information private from the internet. If an applicant does not have any social media accounts, would they need to actively make a brand new account for the sole purpose of applying to migrate to the US? What use would that serve the department that was hoping to get information about the applicant when all they have to refer to is a brand new empty social media account? How would the department verify that this account was the only one the applicant has, and that they don't have multiple anonymous accounts under different emails? Would they start to need to invade people's privacy to verify every single account they have?</p> <p>The use of AI to analyze the data seems very flawed, especially considering the high stakes of the procedure. AI is still very much driven by specific search criteria and it's possible that the search criteria won't hit actionable content. While AI could be useful as an initial screening tool, we're nowhere close to where AI will be able to exercise the judgment of a trained fraud detection and national security officer. At most it seems like AI would be used as a way to pick out keywords related to political institutions or events, and using any negativity expressed as an excuse to deport/detain/reject immigrants. Just because someone is critical of the government doesn't mean that they are an active threat to the US; people expressing their right to free speech shouldn't cause folks to be deported, especially if they are already living in the US and otherwise contributing to society like any other citizen.</p> <p>This proposed system seems like it would be very easy for bad faith people to work around; just make a burner account with nothing inflammatory in it, and tada, they can get in. People acting in good faith, however, would be intimidated into silence, in fear that something they stated would be misinterpreted by a machine as a negative statement. This proposed policy is very concerning and feels more like a show of authority rather than an actual practical policy with actual use.</p>

USCIS-2025-0003-1054	Comment Submitted by Brendan Wright	<p>RE: OMB Control Number 1615-New</p> <p>The new proposed rules are clearly a violation of the 4th amendment which protects individuals not just citizens, subject to the laws of the United States against search and seizure without a warrant or probable cause. Access to electronic information is access to personal papers and private communications. This is not a border search there is no reasonable suspicion. Allowing the government to search prospective citizens social media without a warrant and without probable cause violates the very idea of freedom that this country was founded on.</p>
USCIS-2025-0003-1055	Comment Submitted by Anonymous	<p>This is a speech-chilling action by DHS that fundamentally undermines the values that this country was built upon and that we strive, every day, to promote and improve. By using social media posts as a criteria to approve or deny immigration status, we are affecting the livelihoods of people based on whether they agree or disagree with us. Immigrants to this country have been some of the greatest contributors to American society and this is essentially silencing them. Why would some of the most talented thinkers, creators, and engineers come here if they're always watching their back? We would be losing out on tremendous talent. Beyond that, it's simply psychological warfare on millions of people who would essentially could be punished for exercising their 1st amendment rights. Our constitution applies to all people in the United States, not only those of us fortunate enough to be citizens. Further, accessing the social media accounts of non-citizens is a blatant disregard for the fourth amendment; you simply cannot search and seize private information of a resident when they're here.</p> <p>I think this is a dark turn that opens the door to picking immigrants whether they support our politics or not. And I mean not just "our" as in American value politics but specifically partisan politics. This is hypocrisy coming from an administration that has been banging pots and pans saying that our broken immigration system is Democrats "buying voters". This is such a blatant mechanism for doing that exact same thing, but it's not the Democrats doing it.</p>
USCIS-2025-0003-1056	Comment Submitted by Anonymous	<p>This proposal violates the Bill of Rights, specifically the First and Fourth Amendments. It is un-American and a gross overreach into blatant authoritarianism. Protections that allow us to exercise free speech and protect us against unlawful search and seizure are foundational to our values and should never be eroded.</p>
USCIS-2025-0003-1057	Comment Submitted by MUHAMMAD KROMAH	<p>As an Immigrant Advocate enrolled in VIISTA (Villanova Interdisciplinary Immigration Study Training for Advocates) program, I feel compelled to comment on this proposal that raises significant concern regarding privacy, civil liberties, and the potential for discrimination.</p> <p>The U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services (USCIS) pending requirement to collect social media identifier(s) data on immigration forms and/or within information collection systems is a call for concern.</p> <p>The proposal disregards privacy by infringing on individuals' freedom of expression and suppressing social opinions. The proposal runs contrary to the core principles of the Bill of Rights, which uphold liberty, justice, and limited government. It also threatens to hinder diversity by unfairly targeting innocent, peaceful and law-abiding immigrants who are seeking a safer environment and better livelihood. There are already government agencies tasked with identifying individuals of concern. If an applicant is flagged on suspicion, USCIS can take appropriate measures against such an individual rather than subjecting the entire immigrant population to a sweeping privacy violation.</p> <p>Additionally, some immigrants may choose to keep their social media private or inactive to avoid unwanted attention, criticism, or harassment; some applicants and or family members may even be unable to recall or navigate their accounts due to limited literacy or digital skills. This uncertainty could potentially lead to misjudgment or bias against these applicants. Moreover, the idea of government scrutiny of self-expression and personal interaction on social media could lead to unintended consequences. Applicants may feel compelled to reluctantly censor themselves, due to concern about the accuracy, context and misinterpretation of their social media posts.</p> <p>This proposal is an ineffective way to combat fraud or extremism. There are more reliable and appropriate tools, such as Biometric Screening, Fraud Detection and National Security (FDNS) Directorate, Consular and Security Screening, Counterterrorism and Security Vetting (CTS), etc. which are specifically designed for verifying claims and addressing potential security risks. These methods are more effective and less invasive than general social media monitoring.</p> <p>Should this proposal move forward, it would hinder privacy, diversity, and freedom of expression, as well as promote unjust discrimination against immigrants. It would contradict major principles of the Bill of Rights. Applicants could censor themselves due to fear of misinterpretation. Many immigrants would be victims of biased decisions due to misunderstanding of their social media activities. Government agencies are already equipped to identify individuals of concern, making mass scrutiny unnecessary. There are more effective and less invasive tools, like biometric screening and specialized vetting processes, to address fraud and security risks.</p>
USCIS-2025-0003-1058	Comment Submitted by Anonymous	<p>Good way of vetting foreigners. You never know who's coming into our house or what kind of nexus they have with terrorist or radical groups. Or what their intentions are.</p>
USCIS-2025-0003-1059	Comment Submitted by Private Lawfirm	<p>You don't have the time, resources, or money for the lawsuits that would result from allowing this to take place.</p>

USCIS-2025-0003-1060	Comment Submitted by Leigh H	<p>I write as a concerned and engaged citizen who deeply values both national security and the constitutional freedoms that define the United States. I respectfully oppose the proposed collection of social media identifiers on immigration forms by the U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services.</p> <p>While I understand and appreciate the agency’s intent to safeguard our nation, this proposed policy represents a dangerous overreach into constitutionally protected freedoms”most notably the First Amendment right to free speech and association.</p> <p>Social media is today’s public square. It is a space where individuals express personal beliefs, share opinions”sometimes unpopular or critical of governments”and connect across cultures and ideologies. The knowledge that these expressions may be monitored and scrutinized by government agencies creates a chilling effect on free speech, not only for non-citizens but also for American citizens who engage with them.</p> <p>The U.S. has long held itself as a beacon of freedom, where people can speak without fear and criticize authority without reprisal. Collecting social media identifiers under threat of immigration consequences undermines that legacy and erodes our moral authority on the global stage.</p> <p>Furthermore, this policy risks promoting discrimination by disproportionately targeting individuals from specific countries, cultures, or faiths. Algorithms and subjective interpretation of online content are unreliable and prone to implicit bias, raising further civil liberties concerns.</p> <p>The strength of America lies not in suspicion, but in the freedom we afford all who seek to be part of our nation. We must not compromise these freedoms in the name of security, especially when the efficacy of such monitoring is highly questionable.</p> <p>I urge USCIS to withdraw this proposal and to seek methods of ensuring national safety that do not trample on the very rights that define and distinguish the United States of America. Respectfully.</p>
USCIS-2025-0003-1061	Comment Submitted by Lindsey Hull	<p>Requiring an individual to grant the government free access to one's social media accounts in order to be considered for entry into the United States is a violation of free speech. A person's words since the beginning of social media accounts should not be used against them in determining their worthiness to live, work, or study in this country. In addition, this rule (and the Executive Order which has required it) is a slippery slope to the mass requirement for US Citizens to do the same. I am opposed to any intrusion upon the free written, artistic, or verbal speech of any individual, whether they are a US Citizen or a citizen of the world.</p>
USCIS-2025-0003-1062	Comment Submitted by Anonymous	<p>I am very against this. This is censorship.</p>
USCIS-2025-0003-1063	Comment Submitted by Anonymous	<p>I believe this regulation will create a chilling effect on speech protected by the First Amendment. Current legal precedent suggests that noncitizens are still entitled to Constitutional Rights. Social media platforms are an essential tool for public discourse. On the other hand, social media surveillance will impact what people say, who they interact with, and who they follow. The regulation does not define what constitutes "terrorism" and this broad definition will silence any discourse that the government in power at that time is not in favor of. The proposed regulation will also inevitably lead to the violation of the right of privacy for those in the US regardless of their immigration status. Monitoring the social media handles of those applying for immigration benefits through USCIS will require further monitoring of the applicant's following. It will likely be the case that many noncitizens follow U.S. Citizens as well as legal permanent residents. The regulation does not specify the extent of the search that will need to be done to properly vet noncitizens applying for immigration benefits. This will sacrifice American citizens' right to privacy in the name of suppressing speech that the government does not agree with. Besides the fact that the regulation seems unconstitutional on its face, it also will waste government resources. I would prefer that the estimated 285,999 hour burden this regulation would create be spent trying to process those who are otherwise eligible for legal status but caught in lengthy procedural backlogs.</p>

USCIS-2025-0003-1064	Comment Submitted by Anonymous	<p>This proposal raises serious concerns, including no limitations to social media monitoring after the initial vetting process and suppression of speech and expression, specifically in opposition toward the political party in power.</p> <p>This proposal seems to allow for indefinite monitoring, even after an immigrant has achieved citizenship. The DHS has stated that social media information collected before an immigrant is naturalized remains on file after they have become a US Citizen. Why?</p> <p>We are also already seeing examples of the Trump Administration abusing the powers of the executive branch by retaliating against immigrants who are not supportive of Trump. Mahmoud Khalil, a US permanent resident with a green card, is currently being held in detention after being arrested for organizing pro-Palestine protests at Columbia University. Though there is no evidence of Mr. Khalil supporting Hamas, the Trump administration is labeling him as a threat to US foreign policy and trying to deport him.</p> <p>On March 9 of this year, a French scientist was denied US entry to attend a conference in Houston, reportedly due to anti-Trump messages discovered on his phone during a search of his electronics at border security.</p> <p>There are many US Citizens who support Palestine and many who are openly critical of President Trump. Are they also threats to US Foreign Policy? This proposal, if placed in action, opens the door to monitoring US Citizens and retaliation against those exercising their First Amendment rights to speak out against the administration in power under the guise of "monitoring threats to national security and public safety". It is a common practice for dictators to seek to silence and persecute those who speak against them, and this government overreach should elicit alarm bells in freedom-loving Americans.</p>
USCIS-2025-0003-1065	Comment Submitted by Anonymous	<p>This shouldn't even be a question for discussion as it violates the First Amendment. Everyone has the right to criticize those in power - we're not always going to agree. Removing someone's right of expression in this country would be a further step towards authoritarianism.</p>
USCIS-2025-0003-1066	Comment Submitted by Anonymous	<p>I am opposed to this notice, on the basis that our constitution upholds protections against these practices via the 1st amendment and the 4th amendment, and those protections should be extended to anyone entering the US.</p>
USCIS-2025-0003-1067	Comment Submitted by Anonymous	<p>This doesn't make sense because it's unclear as to the extent of what accounts need to be declared. Some people have or have had many social media accounts over the last 5 years especially alt accounts. It is ambiguous and opens the door to fraud for no reason if you do not declare exhaustively each and every account</p>
USCIS-2025-0003-1068	Comment Submitted by Anonymous	<p>It's not exactly a bad idea, per se... but I would not recommend it. While the reasons are understandable, it still invaded a person's privacy. Not to mention how unclear the process is for immigrants. Also, having to provide social media used in the last 5 years is generally unrealistic and not a good way to measure a person's present behaviour. It is also an invasion of privacy.</p>
USCIS-2025-0003-1069	Comment Submitted by Anonymous	<p>This is a dangerous practice, especially when it's not a uniform one. Some people share accounts with family. Some people only have business social media that could represent more people than themselves, including US citizens. Some people may not have social media. Some people have abandoned accounts that were hacked and never recovered because of social media companies failing their users. Some people simply have aged abandoned accounts because they got tired of social media and don't know how to close the account.</p> <p>All of these scenarios paint an inaccurate portrait of the person applying for citizenship/residency.</p> <p>To top it all off, social media is a form of speech. Speech evolves and it's protected from government prosecution. To attempt to add something as fluid as a social media profile to someone's residency consideration is unintelligent at best</p>

USCIS-2025-0003-1070	Comment Submitted by Andrew Richardson	<p>I am providing feedback on the proposed regulation regarding the collection of social media identifiers on immigration forms. While the intent may be to improve national security and vetting, there are significant constitutional concerns related to the First, Fourth, and Fifth Amendments.</p> <p>1. First Amendment: Freedom of Speech and Association Requiring the disclosure of social media identifiers raises concerns under the First Amendment:</p> <p>Chilling Effect: Knowing that their social media activity could be monitored by the government may lead individuals to self-censor and avoid expressing themselves freely, especially on sensitive topics.</p> <p>Freedom of Association: Social media serves as a platform for forming associations. Requiring social media identifiers may infringe upon the ability to freely associate and communicate, particularly if individuals fear government surveillance.</p> <p>2. Fourth Amendment: Protection Against Unreasonable Searches The Fourth Amendment protects against unreasonable searches. Requiring social media identifiers could infringe on privacy rights:</p> <p>Privacy Violations: Social media profiles often contain private, personal information. The collection of this information may be seen as an unwarranted search without clear justification.</p> <p>Overreach: Collecting social media identifiers without probable cause or specific reasons may be overly broad and intrusive.</p> <p>3. Fifth and Fourteenth Amendments: Due Process and Equal Protection The Fifth and Fourteenth Amendments ensure due process and equal protection:</p> <p>Arbitrary Decisions: The lack of clear standards for using social media information could lead to arbitrary decision-making in immigration proceedings.</p> <p>Disproportionate Impact: The collection could disproportionately affect certain groups, particularly those more active on social media, potentially leading to unequal treatment.</p> <p>4. Recommendations</p>
USCIS-2025-0003-1071	Comment Submitted by Anonymous	<p>I believe this measure would undermine fundamental constitutional rights, including the right to privacy, and create unnecessary barriers for immigrants seeking to contribute positively to our society. Green card holders are already subject to rigorous vetting procedures, including background checks, interviews, and security screenings. To extend this scrutiny to their social media activity goes beyond reasonable security measures and disproportionately targets individuals based on their online presence rather than actual evidence of wrongdoing or concern.</p> <p>The bill could have a chilling effect on free speech, particularly for immigrants who may feel compelled to censor or alter their online behavior in order to avoid potential discrimination or rejection. Additionally, it raises concerns about the potential misuse of private data, leaving green card holders vulnerable to identity theft, online harassment, and unwarranted surveillance.</p>
USCIS-2025-0003-1072	Comment Submitted by Peter Sciuto	<p>I am vehemently opposed to the inclusion of collecting social media identifiers on immigration forms. This is a violation of free speech and flies against the face of what this nation is supposed to stand for.</p>
USCIS-2025-0003-1073	Comment Submitted by William Bowerman	<p>I cannot possibly imagine what value there would be in monitoring an individual's social media as part of letting them into the country, that would not already be accomplished by the other means we already have for background checking new immigrants to the United States. This is plainly setting up to have an excuse to punish people who express views contradictory to that of the president by denying them entry to the country, and it's disgusting.</p>
USCIS-2025-0003-1074	Comment Submitted by Samantha H	<p>Not only is this a completely useless thing to require submission of, considering anyone can make a new handle in seconds, but it is also a massive violation of privacy (and not just of the person submitting their handle). Not every social media account is intended for use by entertainers. Many everyday people use social media as a way to connect with family and friends to share life events & memories with. Requiring this would be cruel and unusual, as surveillance takes over our lives enough already. I oppose the requirement of providing social media handles for this or anything similar. All this requirement would do is increase discrimination against people and our right to free speech. Please stop wasting time and taxpayer dollars with nonsense like this.</p>

USCIS-2025-0003-1075	Comment Submitted by We The People	<p>Social media handles are not owned private property or registered license. How would the agency screen mistaken identity? Duplicates are a possibility.</p> <p>Some social media platforms auto generate name suggestions and information entered on platform is not verified for authenticity.</p> <p>Unlike your social security number, a person's social media activity can be fabricated as a alter-persona or character. Also, is it intellectual property that may be bought or sold by for example a public relation agency or individual?</p>
USCIS-2025-0003-1076	Comment Submitted by Katie Donoviel	<p>I'm writing to oppose the proposed information collection in Docket ID: 2025-03492.</p> <p>The United States has long stood as a beacon of freedom, privacy, and individual rights. This proposal, which is vague in scope and purpose, threatens those very values. It risks violating core constitutional protections, especially the right to free speech and association under the First Amendment and the right to equal protection under the Fourteenth.</p> <p>This request is too vague and lacks transparency about what data will be collected and how it will be used. Collecting broad personal data without clear limitations, especially information like social media handles, echoes the same surveillance tactics used in authoritarian regimes. It risks stifling lawful free speech and creating fear among citizens, lawful permanent residents, and all others within US jurisdiction.</p> <p>Many people in our communities already hesitate to engage with public systems. Proposals like this deepen that fear and erode trust. We should be creating opportunities for people to participate fully and safely, not opening the door to surveillance or selective enforcement.</p> <p>Please withdraw this proposal.</p>
USCIS-2025-0003-1077	Comment Submitted by Jean Clark	This is such a violation of privacy and free speech. I can't believe I live in a country that would do such a thing.
USCIS-2025-0003-1078	Comment Submitted by Anonymous	I oppose this rule because it threatens free speech. No one should be judged for what they post online especially without clear rules or a fair process. This kind of surveillance could silence immigrants and unfairly target communities based on views or identity.
USCIS-2025-0003-1079	Comment Submitted by Anonymous	I believe it is wrong, everyone has a right to their opinion and free speech, I believe it is a slippery slope because, it is taking away a person right to privacy and free speech and expression. Some people share their opinion and views that is how we learn, why is it that government wants to invade people private thoughts on social media, like I said slippery slope!
USCIS-2025-0003-1080	Comment Submitted by Anonymous	<p>This literally stops free speech. This is unapologetically unamerican.</p> <p>This type of proposal is terrifying and creepy.</p>
USCIS-2025-0003-1081	Comment Submitted by Anonymous	Completely unacceptable!
USCIS-2025-0003-1082	Comment Submitted by Anonymous	See attached file(s): https://downloads.regulations.gov/USCIS-2025-0003-1082/attachment_1.pdf
USCIS-2025-0003-1083	Comment Submitted by Katrina Rost	<p>I'm writing to oppose the proposed information collection in Docket ID: USCIS-2025-0003.</p> <p>This proposed rule violates the first amendment right to free speech and allows for a dangerous and unconstitutional level of surveillance that will impact citizens and non-citizens, alike. The proposed rule is a step in the wrong direction and is incompatible with the values of a democracy. I strongly urge for the proposal, OMB Control Number 1615-New, to be withdrawn.</p>

<p>USCIS-2025-0003-1084</p>	<p>Comment Submitted by Anonymous</p>	<p>This new requirement raises significant legal and constitutional issues, which I believe must be carefully reconsidered.</p> <p>The U.S. Constitution guarantees the right to privacy and protection from unreasonable searches and seizures. Forcing applicants to submit social media identifiers presents a clear risk of violating these rights, especially when social media content is often informal, outdated, or not representative of an individual's current situation. Social media profiles can be personal, often containing information that is irrelevant to an applicant's eligibility for immigration benefits and could be subject to misinterpretation or misuse.</p> <p>From a procedural standpoint, this policy introduces a new and unnecessary hurdle for applicants. Social media identifiers are not directly relevant to evaluating an individual's admissibility or eligibility for immigration benefits. Requiring them could lead to arbitrary denials or delays based on extraneous information that does not pertain to the applicant's legal qualifications. This burdens the legal process, potentially increasing the risk of wrongful denials or unjust delays in processing claims.</p> <p>Finally, I am particularly concerned that the proposed collection of social media data may disproportionately target certain communities, resulting in discrimination or profiling. This is especially worrisome given that many immigrants have family members who may be otherwise in precarious immigration situations. The collection of social media handles could inadvertently expose family members to heightened scrutiny or retaliatory actions, which could further marginalize already vulnerable populations.</p> <p>I respectfully urge USCIS to reconsider this policy and withdraw the requirement for applicants to provide social media identifiers. The focus should remain on the legal qualifications and security checks relevant to eligibility, without encroaching on personal privacy or exacerbating the risk of discriminatory practices.</p>
<p>USCIS-2025-0003-1085</p>	<p>Comment Submitted by William Arighi</p>	<p>I oppose the use of social media for reviewing immigration and visa documents. The proposed rule is in contradiction of the First Amendment principles that undergird American society. This is an anti-American proposal that will harm American research and economic power for generations, if not permanently.</p>
<p>USCIS-2025-0003-1086</p>	<p>Comment Submitted by Sarah Cochran</p>	<p>A template if you'd like:</p> <p>I'm writing to oppose the proposed information collection in Docket ID: 2025-03492.</p> <p>The United States has long stood as a beacon of freedom, privacy, and individual rights. This proposal, which is vague in scope and purpose, threatens those very values. It risks violating core constitutional protections, especially the right to free speech and association under the First Amendment and the right to equal protection under the Fourteenth.</p> <p>This request is too vague and lacks transparency about what data will be collected and how it will be used. Collecting broad personal data without clear limitations, especially information like social media handles, echoes the same surveillance tactics used in authoritarian regimes. It risks stifling lawful free speech and creating fear among citizens, lawful permanent residents, and all others within US jurisdiction.</p> <p>Many people in our communities already hesitate to engage with public systems. Proposals like this deepen that fear and erode trust. We should be creating opportunities for people to participate fully and safely, not opening the door to surveillance or selective enforcement.</p> <p>Please withdraw this proposal.</p>
<p>USCIS-2025-0003-1087</p>	<p>Comment Submitted by Randy Amos</p>	<p>This another slash in the "death by a thousand cuts" of our privacy. I do not support this new collection of social media ID and info on immigration forms.</p>
<p>USCIS-2025-0003-1088</p>	<p>Comment Submitted by Katelyn Hoskyns</p>	<p>I'm writing to oppose the proposed information collection in Docket ID: 2025-03492.</p> <p>The United States has long stood as a beacon of freedom, privacy, and individual rights. This proposal, which is vague in scope and purpose, threatens those very values. It risks violating core constitutional protections, especially the right to free speech and association under the First Amendment and the right to equal protection under the Fourteenth.</p> <p>This request is too vague and lacks transparency about what data will be collected and how it will be used. Collecting broad personal data without clear limitations, especially information like social media handles, echoes the same surveillance tactics used in authoritarian regimes. It risks stifling lawful free speech and creating fear among citizens, lawful permanent residents, and all others within US jurisdiction.</p> <p>Many people in our communities already hesitate to engage with public systems. Proposals like this deepen that fear and erode trust. We should be creating opportunities for people to participate fully and safely, not opening the door to surveillance or selective enforcement.</p> <p>Please withdraw this proposal.</p>

<p>USCIS-2025-0003-1089</p>	<p>Comment Submitted by C Evans</p>	<p>Hello, I am commenting on the proposed regulation listed in Docket ID USCIS-2025-0003. I am addressing the Department of Homeland Security -- U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services. This submission is also required to reference the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) Control Number 1615-NEW in the body of the text. I am commenting on this proposed regulation due to great concern over the effects it will have on the rights of legal residents and immigrants to the United States of America.</p> <p>Based on the information provided in the proposed regulation of Docket USCIS-2025-0003, I believe that it would be highly unlikely to improve the quality in which the USCIS performs screening of immigration applicants. Social media is not an effective tool to sussing out criminal activity. I also believe that the agency has not considered how this collection of personal information could affect potential immigrants' freedoms: namely, the Freedom of Speech and Freedom of Privacy. As a legal resident, immigrants are afforded some of the same basic freedoms as full citizens of this country. This proposed regulation interferes with that right, and offers no benefit in return.</p> <p>For recommendations: I would implore the agency to consider more closely what ramifications this regulation could have in the future. As legal permanent resident Mahmoud Khalil remains detained for his *protected, legal* pro-Palestinian activism, I would like the agency what this regulation could do to further shake the confidence immigrants in this country have on their Right to Free Speech in this country.</p>
<p>USCIS-2025-0003-1090</p>	<p>Comment Submitted by Anonymous</p>	<p>There are several potential violation regarding this collection</p> <p>1. Privacy Concerns Invasion of Personal Privacy: Social media profiles contain personal information, opinions, and activities that may not be directly relevant to immigration decisions. Forcing applicants to disclose social media handles could be seen as an infringement on privacy, especially if the collected data is used beyond the stated purposes (identity verification, national security, and public safety screening).</p> <p>Lack of Consent: Applicants may not feel comfortable providing their social media information or may not fully understand the implications of sharing this information. There's also a risk that people could be discouraged from applying for immigration benefits due to concerns about the privacy of their online activities.</p> <p>Unnecessary Data Collection: The collection of social media identifiers may seem overly broad, as not all applicants may have social media profiles or use them for identity verification. The requirement could be seen as collecting more data than is necessary for immigration decisions.</p> <p>2. Freedom of Expression and Association Chilling Effect on Free Speech: Some applicants might self-censor their online behavior or refrain from expressing opinions or engaging in certain activities for fear that their social media presence could be scrutinized negatively by the government.</p> <p>Freedom of Association: By requiring social media handles, applicants might feel that their associations (such as membership in political groups, community organizations, or social causes) are being examined and judged in ways that may not be directly relevant to their immigration status.</p> <p>3. Discrimination and Profiling Bias and Discrimination: The government's review of social media could be subjective. For example, certain social media posts or associations could be unfairly scrutinized, leading to racial, ethnic, or political profiling, potentially violating anti-discrimination principles.</p> <p>Risk of Racial or Political Profiling: If certain social media content is used to evaluate an individual's eligibility for immigration benefits, there could be an increased risk of bias or discrimination, especially if algorithms or human reviewers focus disproportionately on specific racial or political groups.</p> <p>4. Data Security</p>
<p>USCIS-2025-0003-1091</p>	<p>Comment Submitted by Anonymous</p>	<p>Stop using our tax dollars to spy along with being just unethical and unnecessary.</p>
<p>USCIS-2025-0003-1092</p>	<p>Comment Submitted by Eunita Uy</p>	<p>Requiring social media handles as a verification process is not only useless but an invasion of privacy. People can easily falsify information and edit vital information. Using AI for confirmation and recognition is not the solution. I am very much against the movement towards using social media and AI as requirements for green cards, visa, and citizenship applications.</p>
<p>USCIS-2025-0003-1093</p>	<p>Comment Submitted by Anonymous Anonymous</p>	<p>No. I am against this. This is supposed to be a country that allows free speech, including criticism of regimes. Unless the person is planning or encouraging violence on social media, they should not be excluded for expressing opinions. And who is going to define what is not acceptable? Is simply criticizing policies that enable genocide grounds for exclusion? How long before this starts applying to US citizens who don't agree with the policies of the current administration? You cry foul when people refer to you as fascists but then you do fascist things so what are we supposed to think?</p>

USCIS-2025-0003-1094	Comment Submitted by Anonymous	The idea that we would require immigrants to submit their social media accounts for government review is not only ineffective, it's fundamentally unAmerican. Our nation was built on the belief that people should be free to speak, express themselves, and engage in dialogue without fear of government surveillance or retaliation. Singling out immigrants for this kind of scrutiny sends a dangerous message, that free speech is a privilege reserved only for some, not a right guaranteed to all. This proposal does nothing meaningful to improve national security. In fact, it creates the illusion of action while diverting resources away from evidence based intelligence methods. The government already has access to tools and technology to identify real threats, tools that do not require destroying free speech. Policies like this erode the moral foundation we claim to stand on as Americans. If we care about security and liberty, we must reject approaches that sacrifice one for a false sense of the other.
USCIS-2025-0003-1095	Comment Submitted by Leah Bush	Homeland Security should not be demanding access to social media handle so they can spy on people trying to come to the United States. This is an invasion of privacy and should not be done. Again, homeland security has no right to access any social media information other than what's publicly posted for anyone to read.
USCIS-2025-0003-1096	Comment Submitted by Anonymous	USCIS needs to look at social media accounts because there are DACA recipients using social media platforms to make fake accounts so they can create fake exchanges or conversations to make their relationships/marriages look real. It is common for military members to marry civilians for BAH benefits. They are representing themselves as different individuals through social media.
USCIS-2025-0003-1097	Duplicate Comment Submitted by Anonymous	I understand that it does violate the first amendment. HOWEVER, there are USCIS applicants that are only married for the papers to obtain citizenship and obtain additional benefits especially in a military spouse and civilian spouse green card based marriage. USCIS should definitely consider looking into social media accounts.
USCIS-2025-0003-1098	Comment Submitted by Anonymous	<p>The proposed collection of information is completely unnecessary for the proper performance of the functions of the agency. The issue lies in the inherent meaning of the word "antisemitic." This language, like other terms now prevalent in the Trump administration, is being weaponized to include any language that shows a dissenting view. As a result, broad sections of people are being categorized as "antisemitic," when they are clearly only showing a desire for an end to violence, which surely should not be cause for denying benefits to "tired, poor masses, yearning to be free" from the tyranny of their own country's oppressions.</p> <p>Furthermore, the collection of this information is a drain on resources as well as the time commitment necessary to evaluate this information. Where will each evaluator draw the line as to what constitutes "antisemitic" activity? Will it be according to the legal definition, or the definition given by the Trump administration? If solely relying on the latter, the methodology will fail; The current administration's definition is too broad.</p> <p>This current interpretation of "antisemitic" activity is unclear, unreliable in a legal sense, and fundamentally counter to first amendment speech.</p> <p>Finally, as many of these cases will come down to the speaker, each speaker must have the right to challenge the questioning of their speech in a fair and legal manner, just as with deportations in cases of "terrorist" activity. The words "terrorist" and "antisemitic" are being used extremely liberally here, which is cause for legal interpretation under the Constitution.</p>
USCIS-2025-0003-1099	Comment Submitted by Connor Jacobs	<p>I am opposed to the new requirements as they are described for the screening of social media content of immigrant applicants through the USCIS. Social media is far too easy to take out of context. This poses several risks that I find are unmitigated by the current proposal.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Violation of privacy. Many people on social media have certain privacy settings that may be violated by unknown access by USCIS personnel. 2. Punishment for the exercise of the freedom of speech. Especially in light of the current administration's willingness to consider any criticism of the Israeli government as antisemitic, I am concerned about how this policy will play out when reviewing the social media content of immigrant applicants. This may be even more dangerous for those seeking asylum in the United States. 3. The immigration visa application process is already overburdened in terms of resources. The average wait time for approval continues to climb and this will only cause further delay resulting in continued hardship for those trying to make a life as valuable citizens in the United States. <p>I understand the interest in vetting immigrant applicants, but we need to ensure that our policies do not put excessive burden on them or the reviewers of the</p>

USCIS-2025-0003-1100	Comment Submitted by Anonymous	<p>Comment on Docket No. USCIS-2025-0003:</p> <p>I am writing to express my concerns about the proposed collection of social media identifiers on immigration forms. While the intention may be to strengthen security measures, I believe this policy could have unintended and potentially harmful consequences particularly when it comes to the reliability of social media identities.</p> <p>Currently, social media platforms do not require users to verify their identity with official documents. As a result, it is relatively easy for individuals to create accounts using someone else's name or likeness. This opens the door to impersonation, identity theft, and the spread of misinformation under someone else's digital footprint.</p> <p>Immigrants, asylum seekers, and other vulnerable populations could be especially impacted by errors stemming from mistaken identity. In today's interconnected world, where one's digital presence is often global and traceable, even a false or misattributed account can have real-world consequences. A person may be judged based on content they never created, simply because their name or photo appears on a social media profile.</p> <p>Without rigorous procedures to verify and distinguish between legitimate and fraudulent accounts, this policy risks misjudging applicants based on incomplete or incorrect data. It also raises broader concerns around fairness, due process, and the reliability of social media as an evidentiary tool.</p> <p>I urge USCIS to reconsider this approach or, at minimum, to implement strict safeguards and review protocols that account for the unreliability of social media identifiers. Policies intended to protect national security should not come at the cost of individual rights or create additional barriers for people who are already navigating complex immigration systems.</p> <p>Thank you for considering this perspective.</p>
USCIS-2025-0003-1101	Comment Submitted by Anonymous	<p>I oppose this rule because it threatens free speech. No one should be judged for what they post online—especially without clear rules or a fair process. This kind of surveillance could silence immigrants and unfairly target communities based on views or identity.</p>
USCIS-2025-0003-1102	Comment Submitted by Anonymous	<p>I cannot believe that the United States is being a surveillance state en route to China and Russia and other authoritarian states. A party that states it is small government, and pro state rights is rapidly becoming a big brother surveillance state. How disappointing, not even to mention the most likely unconstitutional violations. How dare you - this is disgusting.</p>
USCIS-2025-0003-1103	Comment Submitted by Jose C	<p>This is an overreach and an invasion of privacy. The information that immigrants choose to share on social media should not be used to determine the future of their status. This surveillance will not make our nation safer, but it may accomplish the opposite goal, and make it less safe for both immigrants and citizens.</p>
USCIS-2025-0003-1104	Comment Submitted by Anonymous	<p>This proposal appears to expand the government's reach in social media surveillance to people already vetted and in the U.S. legally. This includes asylum seekers, student visas, green card and citizenship applicants...so not just those applying to enter the country. This suggests that people who have been living legally in this countries for YEARS could be booted out because this administration does not like what they post on social media, something they have the freedom of speech to do in this country.</p> <p>Not only is one's social media (which is unreliable and is only a reflection of thoughts and not actions) apt to be used erroneously to remove legit people from our country...it's excessively burdensome and vague, is apt to chill speech, is discriminatory against Muslims, and has no security benefit.</p> <p>This is a bad policy and should not be enacted.</p>
USCIS-2025-0003-1105	Comment Submitted by Rachel J	<p>This is infringement on the constitutional right to free speech. This administration should uphold the right to free speech and reject this policy. Do not monitor social media accounts as an excuse to further detain or deport innocent immigrants without due process.</p>
USCIS-2025-0003-1106	Comment Submitted by Dale Pontz	<p>This is an assault on freedom of speech. This administration seems dedicated to making rules that they don't have to follow but if we don't, we end up in an El Salvador prison. Please do what's right and uphold the US Constitution.</p> <p>This is still a free country, and I'm expecting our civil servants to fulfill their duties and obligations, which means supporting freedom of speech.</p> <p>Thank you</p>

USCIS-2025-0003-1107	Comment Submitted by Nancy Hoffart	<p>This regulation should NOT be approved because 1) it is contrary to the US First Amendment, and 2) the general unreliability of social media platforms. Many, in essence, are the breeding grounds for disinformation on all manner of content, and spread this content in ways that perpetuate the disinformation, lies, accusations, etc. Such information is not a sound basis for making decisions about whether or not a person is eligible for a US Visa.</p> <p>This comment is in regard to the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) Control Number 1615-NEW, Docket ID USCIS-2025-0003.</p> <p>Regarding these 4 points:</p> <p>1) Evaluate whether the proposed collection of information is necessary for the proper performance of the functions of the agency, including whether the information will have practical utility; As noted above, the proposed regulation is likely to provide unreliable information because of the heavy thread of misinformation in social media.</p> <p>(2) Evaluate the accuracy of the agency's estimate of the burden of the proposed collection of information, including the validity of the methodology and assumptions used; No evidence is provided about how the 0.08 hr time was determined.</p> <p>(3) Enhance the quality, utility, and clarity of the information to be collected; see my response to #1 above. and</p> <p>(4) Minimize the burden of the collection of information on those who are to respond, including through the use of appropriate automated, electronic, mechanical, or other technological collection techniques or other forms of information technology, e.g., permitting electronic submission of responses. This is a new requirement and no mention is made that it replaces a prior requirement so it is likely to increase the burden.</p>
USCIS-2025-0003-1108	Comment Submitted by Anonymous	<p>The attached filed below, alone, should bring awareness to USCIS officers and officials that they need to consider looking into the social media accounts of applicants trying to obtain green cards or US citizenship. Do we really want to allow individuals who commit marriage fraud and military benefits into the country? These are just as criminalized as other crimes, so why allow this from immigration. These people are creating stories to validate their relationship that are non-existent. Sham marriages are so common with the US military. More needs to be done in this sector.</p>
USCIS-2025-0003-1109	Comment Submitted by Rachel Blackmer	<p>I think that this is a terrible idea. I have worked with immigrants for decades and many of them are my dear friends. They are already anxious enough about the immigration process. Why add to it with unnecessary work that will prolong their process and make them even more anxious about their immigration status? This feels xenophobic and anti-immigrant. I hope that you will consider my feedback.</p>
USCIS-2025-0003-1110	Comment Submitted by Sara Edwards	<p>How in the world is this efficient? Who sets the guidelines for what is considered a threat? Will AI, which makes mistakes and hallucinates, be used for this? This will be completely arbitrary, and an administration that has bastardized the First Amendment has no right to put systems in place to make these decisions.</p> <p>Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof; or abridging the freedom of speech, or of the press; or the right of the people peaceably to assemble, and to petition the Government for a redress of grievances.</p>
USCIS-2025-0003-1111	Comment Submitted by Claire Curry	<p>This is a horrifying idea! People should be free to say what they want and engage in public debates and discourse, including on social media. This has nothing to do with identity and identification. These folks are already here and are our friends, neighbors, co-workers, and family. As an American who wants this country to keep being a wonderful place to live, this proposed data collection does not make me feel safe. I feel the opposite! I am from Texas and live in Oklahoma and we have so many lovely folks here via the immigration system. I am so worried for all of my wonderful neighbors and the students at the university and coworkers, everyone. Are you going to come for citizens next? Our first amendment rights should be first! And they are for everyone! I want people to say things I disagree with, I agree with, and being able to have conversations about this online. This is a classic case of the government trying to restrict our rights.</p>
USCIS-2025-0003-1112	Comment Submitted by Anonymous	<p>Can the government publish a list of social media platforms that falls under this reporting obligation? Nowadays it looks like every website is adding some kind of social feature allowing internet users to interact with each other. Like every news outlet allows user comments and every shopping portal allows buyer posting products reviews and even this regulations.gov allows user to post and share content. Where do we draw the line on what is social media and what is not?</p>
USCIS-2025-0003-1113	Comment Submitted by Benjamin Hughes	<p>USCIS's proposed measure of collecting immigrants' social media handles and examining social media accounts to vet visa applicants is entirely unnecessary. Such information has been determined by multiple judicial precedents to be protected speech, and therefore should not be taken into account as a factor to consider in a visa application or when determining whether to revoke a visa. It would also be highly impractical for USCIS to collect information from social media; each given visa applicant, of whom there are thousands if not millions, is likely to have more than one social media account and have long histories of posting and commenting, which would take wasteful amounts of time and resources to vet. While AI tools might speed up the process, they are still largely inaccurate and will likely waste USCIS officers' time with false flags that turn out to be nothing after human verification, and in some cases, they may put US citizens in danger based on false information. In short, the pursuit of social media accounts to examine protected speech would be a waste of time that ultimately leads to nothing because such speech is protected from retaliation. USCIS should not waste its time and resources when those could be put to better use finding other, more effective ways to secure the legal immigration process.</p>
USCIS-2025-0003-1114	Comment Submitted by G H	<p>Donald Trump posts nothing but hate speech and divisive rhetoric on all of his social media and no one has denied his citizenship. If this is truly a country that values free speech, we would not even be considering this. DO NOT PUSH THIS THROUGH.</p>

USCIS-2025-0003-1115	Comment Submitted by Anonymous	<p>Agency: U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services (USCIS) Title: Agency Information Collection Activities; New Collection: Generic Clearance for the Collection of Social Media Identifier(s) on Immigration Forms Office of Management and Budget Control Number: 1615-NEW Document ID: USCIS-2025-0003-0001.</p> <p>Comment: I am completely against this violation of rights within the United States. Adding "Generic Clearance for the Collection of Social Media Identifier(s) on Immigration Forms" leads our country into a slippery slope of violating the first and fourth amendment rights of immigrants as they read: "First Amendment - Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof; or abridging the freedom of speech, or of the press; or the right of the people peaceably to assemble, and to petition the Government for a redress of grievances." "Fourth Amendment - The right of the people to be secure in their persons, houses, papers, and effects, against unreasonable searches and seizures, shall not be violated, and no Warrants shall issue, but upon probable cause, supported by Oath or affirmation, and particularly describing the place to be searched, and the persons or things to be seized. All people in this country are protected by the Constitution, and a violation of their rights does not benefit ANY person within our borders. While immigration law needs to be updated, this violation of their rights to free speech and unreasonable search, will only create more problems. The path to legally living in the United States is already encumbered by a strenuous vetting process that had astronomical costs and time. Furthermore, the "This data will be collected from certain populations of individuals," is too vague and will put more of the immigrant population at risk by leaving the definition of "certain" open to any and all interpretation. Adding "social media accounts" to the immigration forms will lead down a path of numerous lawsuits as it violates their rights within our borders.</p>
USCIS-2025-0003-1116	Comment Submitted by Anonymous	Do not collect information this way! I strongly object to this kind of monitoring and data collection. And the attack on immigrants!
USCIS-2025-0003-1117	Comment Submitted by Anonymous	Completely unacceptable. Makes me feel like we are living in North Korea or something. Very unconstitutional.
USCIS-2025-0003-1117	Comment Submitted by Anonymous	Completely unacceptable. Makes me feel like we are living in North Korea or something. Very unconstitutional.
USCIS-2025-0003-1118	Comment Submitted by Anonymous	The first amendment of our constitution protects free speech. This proposal jeopardises that protection. To claim that it is fair to deny admission to our country based on political dissent is to move away from the very founding principles of this country.
USCIS-2025-0003-1119	Comment Submitted by rota safiri	This proposal violates free speech. Free speech is essential in a democracy.
USCIS-2025-0003-1120	Comment Submitted by Anonymous	<p>Social media is often hacked and modified to add misinformation, disinformation, deep-fake imagery, text, and voice data.</p> <p>What exactly would be considered a threat, political opinions? A friends political opinion. Being tagged in an unflattering photo of Trump?</p> <p>What happens if they say they have no social media account and you find account's with the same name and spelling? Is it the same person, or just another person on social media with the same name. How can a fair assessment be based on this type of unreliable data. This proposal reads more like a way to facilitate a witch hunt than a way to protect anybody.</p> <p>The proposal to require immigrants legally residing in the United States to submit social media profile handles for government review is an obscene overreach of authority.</p> <p>The current administration is already deporting without due process. Mistakes have already been made, and as of this date, have not been corrected.</p> <p>That this has even been proposed, and is under consideration is a shame on the history of our democratic institutions and an insult to every immigrant who has ever contributed to our society.</p>
USCIS-2025-0003-1121	Comment Submitted by Elizabeth Fuller	See attached file: https://downloads.regulations.gov/USCIS-2025-0003-1121/attachment_1.pdf
USCIS-2025-0003-1122	Comment Submitted by Anonymous	These immigrants both send and receive correspondence with American citizens. Some also send work emails from the companies who employ them. This means that this order will give the government access to virtual all US emails. This is unconstitutional, violating not only the immigrants right to privacy, but everyone else's as well. This is unreasonable search and seizure. The government should have to apply to a court for warrants to collect this data, one warrant for each individual application, citing valid reasons. I cannot think of any such reasons.

USCIS-2025-0003-1123	Comment Submitted by Anonymous	<p>A particular concern is that many social media platforms allow a renamed or deleted username to be reused by anyone. This could mean someone on the other side of the world could unknowingly reuse the applicant's previous username and post content that could be detrimental to the applicant - or an abusive ex could maliciously do so with intent to prevent the applicant from obtaining the immigration benefit. Please consider either narrowing the collection requirement to not apply to former usernames, or allowing a clarification for former usernames.</p> <p>Another concern is that not all platforms have a formal username - some may use a display name which is not unique. (e.g. there are many people whose name is John Smith.)</p>
USCIS-2025-0003-1124	Comment Submitted by Anonymous	<p>I think the govt should not be using people's social media to determine eligibility. It's a direct violation of first amendment rights.</p> <p>They should be utilizing known criminal background and ask for full submission for proof rather than using extremely broad and subjective ways to determine someone's eligibility.</p>
USCIS-2025-0003-1125	Comment Submitted by Anonymous	<p>The ambiguous and broad way in which collection of this information could be utilized to deny immigrants' visa and naturalization applications based on rights they are exercising under the First Amendment is chilling. Legal immigrants in this country are already screened heavily and held to a high standard. This would discourage talented individuals from coming to the US and contributing to the economy and scientific innovation. It also creates a double standard in which non citizens have fewer rights than citizens to free speech. This proposed action is not in the spirit of the United States that took so many in for generations who were seeking refuge or opportunity from elsewhere, nor in the spirit of the founding fathers who spoke up against a king.</p>
USCIS-2025-0003-1126	Comment Submitted by Anonymous	<p>I am opposed to the proposal. This section "Whenever information is identified that would support the exclusion or removal of any alien described in subsection 2(b), the Secretary of Homeland Security shall take immediate steps to exclude or remove that alien unless she determines that doing so would inhibit a significant pending investigation or prosecution of the alien for a serious criminal offense or would be contrary to the national security interests of the United States." Immediate exclusion or removal takes away the ability of the accused to defend herself and make a case that the government is wrong in the assessment that she is a threat. This "threat" assessment can be arbitrary.</p>
USCIS-2025-0003-1127	Comment Submitted by Anonymous	<p>I am a U.S. citizen, and this surveillance plan is not okay. The United States stands for freedom, doesn't it? Reconsider in light of the U.S. Constitution.</p>
USCIS-2025-0003-1128	Comment Submitted by Marie S	<p>I oppose this proposal to collect social media identifiers of legal immigrants applying for visas and Green Cards. It is a gross overreach of government power and violates the free speech and privacy rights of these legal residents. As a US citizen, I am appalled at this blatant violation of the Fourth Amendment, which explicitly applies to all PERSONS in the US, not exclusively citizens: "The right of the people to be secure in their persons, houses, papers, and effects, against unreasonable searches and seizures, shall not be violated..." It also threatens to violate the First Amendment if the private communications and personal opinions of lawful residents were to be used against them in the review of their residency application.</p>
USCIS-2025-0003-1129	Comment Submitted by Anonymous	<p>Here is an example of why USCIS should scrutinize green card based marriages and deeply monitor the social media applicants. They are married to a civilian spouse yet claiming to be single in their posts and clearly identify as another sexuality.</p>
USCIS-2025-0003-1130	Comment Submitted by Anonymous	<p>USCIS needs to do deeper investigations and reinstate interviews. There are applications with conditional green cards thinking they will get away with it.</p>
USCIS-2025-0003-1131	Comment Submitted by Anonymous	<p>See attached file(s) of a couple committing green card marriage</p>
USCIS-2025-0003-1132	Comment Submitted by Anonymous	<p>The attached files are more reasons why USCIS should definitely look into the social media of green card applicants. They should also scrutinize the green card based marriages between civilian spouses and military spouses.</p>
USCIS-2025-0003-1133	Comment Submitted by Anonymous	<p>I am against this idea. Not only does it violate the privacy of citizens, but it also can violate free speech. Collecting media handles to monitor the people can make it risky for others to voice their own opinions. It suppresses the freedom of expression through the use of fear. The fear that what you may say online may be used against you by the government.</p>
USCIS-2025-0003-1134	Comment Submitted by Anonymous	<p>I am against this idea. Not only does it violate one's privacy, it also violates one's freedom of speech. Actively collecting media handles that connect back to a person can cause fear. It suppresses one's freedom of expression, making them hesitant to express their own opinions due to knowing that there is a chance that the government could use it against them.</p>
USCIS-2025-0003-1135	Comment Submitted by Anonymous	<p>What people post on their personal, non-professional social media pages is protected by the First Amendment and should have no bearing on people's citizenship eligibility. Everyone knows this. You know you should not do this. Stop it.</p>

<p>USCIS-2025-0003-1136</p>	<p>Comment Submitted by Kathleen Brommage</p>	<p>I strongly oppose the proposal to update the US Immigration Process by gathering information concerning the "online social media presence" for the past 5 years of foreign nationals who apply for certain immigration benefits.</p> <p>The USCIS notes that this data will be collected from certain populations of individuals on applications for immigration related benefits and is "necessary for the enhanced identity verification, vetting, and national security screening and inspection conducted by USCIS.</p> <p>These proposed changes will force applicants to disclose unnecessary information and make immigration forms harder to complete. They indicate significant government overreach by collecting information that has no bearing on applicant's eligibility for citizenship.</p> <p>The naturalization process follows previous thorough vetting of individuals for legal permanent residence, and possibly for temporary status before that. It is already a slow and deliberative process that requires extensive reporting of recent movements, educational and work history, and any prior acts relating to naturalization eligibility. All of this is in addition to the appearance of the applicant for interviewing and testing.</p> <p>The Paperwork Reduction Act requires that information collections by federal agencies are necessary. The information collections proposed are not necessary or useful, which would violate the Paperwork Reduction Act, and result in a waste of taxpayer resources.</p> <p>Do not formalize this proposed rule change.</p>
<p>USCIS-2025-0003-1137</p>	<p>Comment Submitted by Anonymous</p>	<p>This proposed legislation is a small piece of Trump's master plan to create a white ethnostate full of rich Christian nationalists who are at every beck and call of the so-called democracy in the Middle East. Allowing for something as rudimentary as social media "handles" to be collected by a federal agency is a form of mass surveillance. Mass surveillance specifically deployed a group that has constantly been targeted by this administration: undocumented immigrants, immigrants, and visa holders. This is not in the name of safety, this is in the name of weaponizing ICE with personal information that they can use to "track down" individuals, which is a complete violation of their First and Fourth Amendment. Not to mention those who participate in social media are engaging with a private company separate from the control of the federal government. The government cannot force you to disclose something only available in the private sector. Also, this brings the question up that social media analysis may have already been used by ICE to locate individuals and deport them, making this bill a protection to continue to abuse the private business sectors' patrons' rights? FACEBOOK 2020?????? The fact that this bill would include those filing the naturalization papers to officiate the process is insane. This is a way for the government to keep track of all those who were not born in the US. Trump will not stop his war on immigration. Once he deports all undocumented individuals, it will become those with legal status (which he has already started), then non-US-born naturalized citizens, and so on till he gets what he wants, a rich white ethnostate.</p>
<p>USCIS-2025-0003-1138</p>	<p>Comment Submitted by Natalie Teague</p>	<p>After an hour of attempting to post comment on this notice, I would like to note for the record that both this platform and regulations.gov are throwing error messages and not allowing the submission of comments.</p> <p>The browsers of Chrome, Edge, and Firefox were all attempted on both platforms; both platforms failed to accept any submission. Comments were attempted to be added both as files, such as pdf's, Word documents, compressed pdf's, as well as plain text in the comment box. Not a single attempt has been successful.</p> <p>This technological failure has not previously occurred under prior administrations. It is likely frustrating the ability for the public to comment on this proposed regulation. For the public to have a meaningful opportunity to provide comments, these technological problems should be remedied immediately and/or the comment period should be extended.</p>

<p>USCIS-2025-0003-1139</p>	<p>Comment Submitted by Natalie Teague</p>	<p>Agency Information Collection Activities; New Collection: Generic Clearance for the Collection of Social Media Identifier(s) on Immigration Forms N-400, I-131, I-485, I-751, I-730, I-590, I-589, I-829 or I-192:</p> <p>Comment submitted on 04/29/2025 on USCIS Notice dated 03/05/2025 - Part 1 of 6+</p> <p>Opposition to New Collection: Generic Clearance for the Collection of Social Media Identifier(s) on Immigration Forms</p> <p>The requirement for immigration applicants to provide a comprehensive history of their social media activity, including handles and memberships on various platforms, raises significant concerns about privacy and the potential for government overreach. While the supporting statement in the Federal Register alleges that such measures are necessary for national security, there is no articulable legal justification for the collection of this information and the implications of this invasive approach will be harmful, counterproductive and unlawful. This proposed collection of information is unlawful because it violates the Paperwork Reduction Act (PRA), the Administrative Procedures Act (APA), the Immigration and Nationality Act (INA), and the Privacy Act; and it will have extremely adverse economic impacts on US citizens and businesses as well as on USCIS.</p> <p>Background:</p> <p>The proposed collection will allow USCIS to obtain broad swaths of information concerning every applicant's online footprint, without providing any legal basis to justify the collection for each of the nine forms impacted. (These include Forms N-400, I-131, I-485, I-751, I-730, I-590, I-589, I-829 or I-192.) Instead of articulating a specific legal requirement that justifies collection of the information, the Federal Register notice indicates that such information is necessary for "vetting," generally, without explaining how the collection relates to any legal requirement for the impacted forms. The Federal Register notice states:</p> <p>"Execution of E.O. 14161 requires U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services (USCIS) to collect social media identifier(s) data on immigration forms and/or within information collection systems. This data will be collected from certain populations of individuals on applications for immigration-related benefits and is necessary for the enhanced identity verification, vetting and national security screening, and inspection conducted by USCIS and required under the E.O."</p> <p>The notice goes on to state:</p> <p>"In a review of information collected for admission and benefit decisions, U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services (USCIS) identified the need to collect social media identifiers</p>
-----------------------------	--	---

USCIS-2025-0003-1140	Comment Submitted by Natalie Teague	<p>Part 2 of 6+:</p> <p>Violation of 5 CFR 1320.9(a):</p> <p>The proposed collection of information identified as "social media identifiers" is in violation of 5 CFR 1320.9(a) because there is no practical utility to the proposed collection and the information is not necessary or relevant to determining eligibility of the requestor for the benefit(s) sought. 5 CFR 1320.3 defines "practical utility" as the actual, not merely the theoretical or potential, usefulness of information to or for an agency, taking into account its accuracy, validity, adequacy, and reliability, and the agency's ability to process the information it collects (or a person's ability to receive and process that which is disclosed, in the case of a third-party or public disclosure) in a useful and timely fashion. In the case of record keeping requirements or general purpose statistics (see 5 CFR 1320.3(c)(3)), "practical utility" means that the actual uses can be demonstrated. The questions identified as "social media identifiers" violate the practical utility requirement of 5 CFR 1320.3(a) because no actual use—not even potential or theoretical—can be demonstrated between this proposed information collection and an individual's eligibility for any of the nine (9) forms that will be impacted. The "social media identifiers" of an applicant or beneficiary have absolutely no relevance or utility to determining the statutory or regulatory eligibility of a benefit requestor for Form I-485, N-400, I-730, or any of the other forms that this collection is being added to. USCIS has not even attempted to identify a minimally articulable link between an applicant's "social media identifiers" and the applicant's eligibility. "Social media identifiers" have no relevance to the eligibility requirements for the nine impacted forms. For example, whether an applicant has an Etsy or Instagram account does not bear on a single element of statutory or regulatory eligibility for Forms N-400, I-131, I-485, I-751, I-730, I-590, I-589, I-829 or I-192. The only explanation included in justification of the proposed collection is a vague statement that the information will be used for "vetting." However, the "vetting" must be related to an element of statutory or regulatory eligibility in order to meet the practical utility requirement and justify the proposed information collection. Instead of providing any explanation of how the proposed collection will have practical utility, the supporting statement for this "generic form revision" states that the collection is mandated by Executive Order 14161 and that, "data will be collected from certain populations of individuals on applications for immigration-related benefits and is necessary for the enhanced identity verification, vetting, and national security screening and inspection conducted by USCIS and required under the E.O." Nonetheless, an EO is not law. An executive order is a statement of executive policy and does not supersede the statutes and regulations which apply to the adjudications of Forms N-400, I-131, I-485, I-751, I-730, I-590, I-589, I-829 and I-192. There is no statutory or regulatory authority which requires any of the information about applicants' social media handles in order to determine eligibility for any of the impacted immigration benefits requests and the does not create new law to support the collection.</p>
----------------------	-------------------------------------	--

<p>USCIS-2025-0003-1141</p>	<p>Comment Submitted by Natalie Teague</p>	<p>Part 3 of 6+:</p> <p>Violation of 5 CFR 1320.9(c):</p> <p>The proposed information collection drastically increases the amount of time that benefit requestors must spend on the identified forms, creating an unjustifiable burden on the public in violation of the PRA under 5 CFR 1320.9(c). The calculation of the burden increase as stated in the Federal Register notice is .08 hours, or 4 minutes and 48 seconds. If this was true, this might be an acceptable burden increase because it is a small increase in the overall time that it would take to fill out each of the nine impacted forms. However, the .08 hour estimate is entirely unverifiable and disingenuous and it appears to be a gross underestimate of the actual increase in burden that will result from implementing this collection.</p> <p>Firstly, the estimate is unverifiable because the FRN has not identified the questions which will comprise the information collection, so there is no way to determine 1) how long an applicant would need to spend to research the information necessary to include the requested information, and 2) how long it would take to write that information down. How did USCIS even calculate the estimate? In order to be calculated in good faith, presumably someone in USCIS's policy division would need to attempt a response to the proposed collection and see how long it took to collect and write down the response. But since USCIS has not even announced what questions or "data elements" will specifically be included, it doesn't seem that such an attempt could have been made. Thus the .08 burden estimate is either uninformed or in bad faith.</p> <p>Second, the federal register description of the "new collection," does not indicate any time period associated with the collection. For example, many collections have a time limit such as "past 5 years residence history." But because the Federal Register announcement does not place any limitation on the new collection, presumably, applicants will need to include every "handle and platform" for each social media account that they've had in their entire life. How many video gaming platforms, arts and crafts forums, health and beauty forums, parenting forums, DIY forums will the average applicant need to disclose in addition to the obvious platforms like Facebook, Instagram and X? The time needed to conduct an entire inventory of one's own online footprint would easily take hours, not to mention the time needed to write down every platform and handle. The published estimate of .08 hours/4 minutes and 48 seconds clearly underestimates the burden increase "easily" by a factor of 10. Maybe by two factors of 10. By USCIS's own estimation, approximately 3.5 benefits requests were filed in 2024 which will be impacted by the new information collections. The aggregate burden increase will be astronomical and, as explained previously, without practical utility.</p> <p>Third, the requirement to disclose social media history places undue burden on applicants, because many applicants may not have the resources or knowledge to navigate the complex landscape of social media in order to respond. The digital footprint of an individual is often vast and interconnected, making it challenging to provide a complete and accurate account of one's online presence. This complexity could lead to unintentional omissions, resulting in negative repercussions for applicants who may be penalized for incomplete disclosures. Such a system could intentionally or inadvertently favor those with more sophisticated understanding of social media and its intricacies, creating an</p>
-----------------------------	--	---

<p>USCIS-2025-0003-1142</p>	<p>Comment Submitted by Natalie Teague</p>	<p>Part 4 of 6+:</p> <p>Finally, the supporting statement for this proposed collection disingenuously seeks to minimize the estimated increase in burden on the public by proposing a simultaneous, separate information collection for the same nine forms under another Federal Register announcement so that the estimated burden increase does not calculate the aggregate impact of both proposed new collections. This proposed collection violates 5 CFR 13.20.9(c) by proposing a simultaneous, separate information collection for the same nine forms under another Federal Register announcement so that the estimated burden increase does not calculate the aggregate impact of both proposed new collections. USCIS announced two separate proposed collections identified as 2025-03436 (90 FR 11054) and 2025-03492 (90 FR 11324), two days apart on March 3 and March 5, 2025, respectively. Both collections impact the same nine forms; Forms N-400, I-131, I-485, I-751, I-730, I-590, I-589, I-829 and I-192. Although USCIS could have announced both proposed Form revisions in a single announcement in order for the public to understand the cumulative impact of the two revisions in the aggregate, USCIS intentionally made separate announcements to confound the public and make it extremely difficult to ascertain the combined impact on each of the 9 forms. For example, under 90 FR 11054, the estimated increase in burden for Form I-485 is .73. Under 90 FR 11324 the estimated increase in burden for Form I-485 is .08 hours. USCIS has provided no justification for announcing simultaneous form revisions for the same forms in separate federal register notices. This subversive and disingenuous approach to providing notice through the federal register announcements violates 5 CFR 13.20.9(c) by creating an unjustifiable burden on the public. Although future generations may not be able to do the arithmetic involved in comparing the two concurrent announcements and calculating the aggregate burden increase since this administration is abolishing the Department of Education, the current population of US adults continues to have the requisite math skills to see through this misrepresentation.</p> <p>Adverse Economic Impact to Citizens and USCIS:</p> <p>The extraordinary economic impact of this form revision will result in increased costs that will adversely impact both US citizen and noncitizen applicants/petitioners, and will have a profound impact on USCIS's operating budget, drastically increasing expenses to the agency due to the time resources necessary to review the exponential increase in information collected on some of the agency's most numerous forms (N-400, I-485, etc.). The vast new information collection will drastically increase the amount of time that adjudicating officers must spend with each form in order to review and make a decision, increasing the amount of time, personnel resources and money the agency must dedicate to each application or petition in order to adjudicate it. Because the adjudication of USCIS benefits requests are paid for through a combination of applicant fees (for example, the I-751 and N-400) and congressional appropriation (for example, the I-590), the increased personnel resources needed to adjudicate the much lengthier forms will economically impact both the public and the related congressionally appropriated programs. The much lengthier forms will also certainly result in substantial increases to USCIS processing times, and create immense backlogs that will harm US citizens and US companies. Furthermore, the increased expense associated with the form collection may bankrupt the agency. This occurred in 2020 when the first Trump administration forced USCIS to engage in fiscally irresponsible policies. In 2020, USCIS announced that it planned to furlough 13,400 employees due to a</p>
<p>USCIS-2025-0003-1143</p>	<p>Unrelated Comment Submitted by Natalie Teague</p>	<p>Part 5 of 7:</p> <p>USCIS has not explained what it will do with the information it will collect on applicants' social media identifiers, however it must be presumed that the agency will be doing some type of comparative analysis, vetting or other scrutiny of this information. Conducting review of an applicant's individual use of potentially dozens of social media platforms of which USCIS will be collecting information however the agency ultimately implements its review of the collected information will take substantial resources. Even if not the express intent of this proposed collection, it is likely that the downstream economic consequences of this collection will plunge USCIS into economic ruin and destroy the US immigration benefits infrastructure which is critical for families, businesses and the public interest. Despite this, the supporting statement for the proposed information collection boldly misrepresents the monetary cost burden to the public. It states that, "An estimate of the total public burden (in cost) associated with the collection: The estimated total annual cost burden associated with this collection of information is \$0. No additional costs to the public are anticipated due to this action. Any costs to the respondents associated with the specific form filed are captured in those approved collections." The supporting statement further states, "The total estimated annual hour burden associated with this collection is 285,999 hours." Indeed, approximately 3.5 million forms falling in the impacted categories were filed with USCIS in fiscal year 2024, according to the USCIS statistics website (see https://www.uscis.gov/tools/reports-and-studies/immigration-and-citizenship-data). In assessing that there will be a total of \$0 increase in cost on the public of adding these numerous new information collections to 3.5 million forms per year, the supporting statement disingenuously infers that the only "cost" to the public is the amount of time that applicants will now have to spend on each form, discounting the fact that adding millions of hours to the time needed to adjudicate benefits will increase costs to the agency once USCIS has to find a way to pay for the added expense of completing each adjudication. Either USCIS will have to pursue another fee rule and increase filing fees to cover the shortfall which will cost the public, since they pay the filing fees, or, if USCIS does not seek to raise fees, the agency is likely to suffer fiscal collapse as it did in 2020 prior to being rescued by Congress.</p> <p>(Please continue to Part 6 because the system will not allow submission of file attachments (in pdf, Word, compressed pdf), in multiple browsers (including Edge, Chrome, and Firefox), and this text box only allows a submission of 5,000 characters (not words; characters) at a time.)</p>

USCIS-2025-0003-1144	Comment Submitted by Natalie Teague	<p>Part 6 of 8:</p> <p>Violation of the Privacy Act:</p> <p>The proposed information collection of "social media identifiers" violates the Privacy Act. The Privacy Act of 1974, codified as 5 U.S.C. Â§ 552a, is a federal law that protects individuals' privacy by limiting the collection, maintenance, use, and disclosure of personal information by federal agencies. The Privacy Act ensures that personal information collected by federal agencies is limited to what is legally authorized and necessary, and that it's maintained in a way that prevents unwarranted intrusions into individual privacy.</p> <p>Requiring individuals to disclose their entire social media history unnecessarily infringes on personal privacy rights by collecting information beyond the scope of what is legally necessary to adjudicate the affected immigration forms, and greatly increases the risk of impermissible use and inadvertent disclosure of information in violation of the Privacy Act. Many social media platforms serve as safe spaces for individuals to share experiences related to sensitive issues, such as chronic illnesses, mental health challenges, or learning disabilities. For instance, forums dedicated to issues like chronic disease management and survivors of sexual abuse provide communities where individuals can share their struggles and seek support without fear of judgment or repercussion. There is no legitimate use under the INA to support the government's collection of this sensitive information. Additionally, such invasions of privacy could discourage vulnerable populations from seeking necessary support or sharing their experiences openly, ultimately stifling dialogue and community-building that is crucial for those dealing with such issues. Moreover, the potential for abuse of this information is alarming. Government agencies, armed with detailed insights into an applicant's personal life, could misuse this data in various ways. For example, they could profile individuals based on their affiliations with health-related groups or social movements, leading to unjust scrutiny or denial of immigration benefits based on perceived "deviance" from societal norms that has nothing to do with applicable statutory and regulatory eligibility criteria. This profiling could disproportionately affect marginalized groups who often rely on these platforms for advocacy and support. The requirement for applicants to disclose their entire social media history is a troubling invasion of privacy. The potential for abuse, discrimination, and the stifling of support networks underscores the need for a more balanced approach that respects individual privacy rights while ensuring the integrity of immigration processes.</p> <p>The possibility of overreach and abuse is particularly concerning as unelected billionaires like Elon Musk, who owns one of the largest social media platforms in the world, now have access to executive agency data. There are many possibilities for abuse once USCIS begins collecting this information, including 1) will USCIS officers begin to "follow" applicant's accounts, 2) will they ask for password access to platforms during interview, and 3) will the unprecedented access to applicants' personal information incentivize unlawful criminal behavior by USCIS officers such as bribery and blackmail. (See examples of USCIS officers being convicted of such abuses HERE and HERE.) The focus of any information collection should remain on relevant legal requirements, rather than intrusive scrutiny of people's personal lives. Requiring individuals to provide their entire online footprint to the government is effectively like including an information collection that states, "tell me everything about yourself." USCIS needs to know everything that interests you, recreationally, professionally, and personally.</p>
----------------------	-------------------------------------	--

<p>USCIS-2025-0003-1145</p>	<p>Comment Submitted by Natalie Teague</p>	<p>Part 7 of 8:</p> <p>The scope of the information sought by this collection is breathtaking. Many social media platforms provide forums for individuals to discuss and research private issues that should be protected from government intrusion. For example, "The Mighty" is a platform that provides a "free online community for exploring health and mental health challenges. "Our Odyssey" is a medical platform that does online meetups for young adults with chronic illnesses, as there are unique challenges for being young and chronically ill. These are platforms where users almost categorically do not use their true name in their handle because of the extremely private, often heart-rending nature of the subject matter being discussed in the forum. Why should applicants need to provide the government with their handle for a medical forum that they are a member of because of their child's terminal medical condition? Handles for forums such as these allow the user to have privacy in order to engage with a community of similarly-situated people coping with similar hardships. But based on the vague description in this collection, USCIS purports to have some justifiable reason related to statutory or regulatory eligibility for an immigration benefit, to collect this data from applicants. However, because USCIS did not describe in the Federal Register how a social media handle could ever impact eligibility for an immigration benefit, this proposed collection is in violation of the practical utility requirement in 5 CFR 1320.9(a) as well as the Privacy Act.</p> <p>Aside from medical platforms, what about other, lawful but private and potentially embarrassing social media platforms might individuals be forced to disclose under this unjustifiable information collection? For example, there is one platform that rhymes with "CornHub." If an applicant doesn't provide their handle for this platform and it is later discovered by USCIS, will this omission be used as cause to deny benefits on the basis of material misrepresentation? What if the applicant is 16 years old, completing the I-485 application in the presence of his/her parents? USCIS effectively proposes to become every applicant's "government diary," subsequently possessing information about applicants that in many cases their own spouses, parents and therapists would not have access to.</p> <p>An information collection about a US citizen or LPR must be "legally authorized and necessary" in order to comply with the Privacy Act. This proposed information collection violates numerous aspects of the Privacy Act, including the Act's Fair Information Practice Principles (FIPPs). The FIPPs are a set of eight principles that are rooted in the tenets of the Privacy Act of 1974. The principles are:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Transparency: USCIS has provided no reason or justification related to actual statutory or regulatory eligibility, for requiring social media identifiers of applicants. 2) Individual participation 3) Purpose specification: USCIS has not identified any specific purpose for requiring social media identifiers, other than generally "increased vetting." But USCIS provides no example or justification as to how the collection of social media identifiers could legitimately support the "vetting" of an applicant.
<p>USCIS-2025-0003-1146</p>	<p>Unrelated Comment Submitted by Natalie Teague</p>	<p>Part 8 of 8:</p> <p>For all of these reasons, the proposed information collection of social media identifiers violates the Privacy Act.</p> <p>Conclusion:</p> <p>This is an unlawful proposed collection of information under the Paperwork Reduction Act (PRA), the Administrative Procedures Act, the INA, and the Privacy Act, and it will have extremely adverse economic impacts on US citizens and businesses as well as on USCIS. The government should not proceed with this proposed information collection since to do so would violate multiple laws and regulations.</p> <p>Edit of Part 6 previously submitted: Here are omitted hyperlinks:</p> <p>See examples of USCIS officers being convicted of such abuses: https://www.fbi.gov/contact-us/field-offices/losangeles/news/press-releases/immigration-official-sentenced-to-30-months-in-prison-for-soliciting-bribes-to-approve-applications-for-citizenship-and-green-card and https://www.adanvega.com/former-uscis-officer-sentenced-to-nearly-3-years-in-federal-prison-for-bribery/ "f</p>

USCIS-2025-0003-1150	Comment Submitted by Anonymous	We should not add these questions to immigration forms. It's irrelevant. It's a violation of privacy and just creates more work for everyone involved. Eligible applicants will feel discouraged to even apply. My dear friend works in immigration and helps clients who are trying to come here legally. There are enough aspects of the immigration process that make her job difficult enough already, and this will only make it more tedious. Above all else, it's extremely frustrating, disrespectful, even, that people who take the time and effort to go through the process are met with these unnecessary hurdles. I understand the importance of security, but truly, at some point, the policies are doing more harm to innocent people simply searching for a better life.
USCIS-2025-0003-1151	Comment Submitted by Anonymous	Requiring this information for collection will not only make it harder on immigrants who are coming in legally and correctly to the country, but on those around them. It is also irrelevant and a violation of privacy for this to be a part of the process. This should not be added to the regulations and requirements
USCIS-2025-0003-1152	Comment Submitted by CAIR-Washington	<p>CAIR Washington is writing to express our opposition to the proposed rule, (Docket No. USCIS-2025-0003) published in the Federal Register by the Department of Homeland Security on March 05, 2025. CAIR Washington is a Muslim Civil Rights and advocacy organization based in Washington state. This rule, if implemented, will have negative effects on Muslims, immigrants, and communities of color in our country, our state, and the communities we live in for the following reasons:</p> <p>Disproportionate Impact on Muslim Communities and Civic Engagement</p> <p>Muslim communities are already among the most heavily surveilled in the United States. In 2024, CAIR Washington conducted a survey of Muslims in Washington state, which provides crucial insights into the experiences of Muslims in Washington, with a focus on discrimination, political engagement, and policy priorities. The survey gathered responses from 684 Muslims across Washington state, with 542 completing the full survey. It highlights the diversity of Washington's Muslim community, which includes South Asian, Arab, East African, Black American, Indigenous, and Latino Muslims. The survey found that 9% of Muslim respondents reported encounters with the FBI in the past year, and 1.1% experienced unannounced home visits by federal agents. 91.7% of respondents have experienced discrimination in their lifetimes. 82.5% faced such discrimination within the past year, and 39% reported increased levels of discrimination since October 7, 2023, when the current violence against Palestine began. More than half of respondents expressed discomfort reaching out to public officials" citing fear of surveillance, retaliation, and lack of trust in institutions. Expanding government monitoring through mandatory social media disclosure would only deepen this divide, making it even harder for marginalized communities to participate fully in collective community life.</p> <p>Ineffectiveness</p> <p>There is little evidence to suggest that collecting social media identifiers meaningfully improves the immigration process, or national security. Immigration agencies already have access to comprehensive vetting tools. The immigration system is already underfunded and slow and immigration delays are extreme. Additional data collection will inhibit the government's ability to produce accurate and efficient work for immigrant communities. Furthermore, all the information the government needs to make a decision on immigration applications can be found in the materials already included in the application process. Going beyond those parameters is out of scope and risks exacerbating an already overwhelmed immigration system.</p> <p>Suppressive Impact on Free Speech and Advocacy</p> <p>This proposed rule poses a threat to First Amendment rights. Young people, immigrants, and marginalized communities frequently use social media platforms to engage in advocacy, political discourse, and grassroots organizing. Requiring individuals to disclose their social media handles would act as a deterrent to free expression, discouraging people from speaking openly and freely participating in virtual spaces. Immigration screening apparatus should not be used as a tool to prevent or inhibit freedom of speech</p>
USCIS-2025-0003-1153	Comment Submitted by Alexandra Olins	Collecting social media handles for LPRs is government overreach. There is no other way to put it. It's intrusive, and unnecessary. I work with clients to assist them in completing their N-400 application. Most of our clients use social media sparingly, if at all, but they use it to communicate with their families in their native country or to learn about jobs and life in the US. Their social media use is completely benign. But asking them for their accounts will make them feel under suspicion and they will be scared, even if for absolutely no reason. It's an unnecessary invasion of their privacy which will slow the process of adjudicating immigration applications enormously. This is unnecessary government overreach and will have the impact of discouraging immigrants from applying for immigration benefits for which they are eligible.
USCIS-2025-0003-1154	Comment Submitted by Anonymous	Social media is not an accurate way to vet individuals applying for such benefits as these accounts can be easily hacked and manipulated by third parties. This would be an invasion of privacy and right to freedom of expression.
USCIS-2025-0003-1155	Comment Submitted by Tiffany French	This is an attack on free speech, which the founding fathers held dear. It is a slippery slope and needs to be stopped now. Do not do this.
USCIS-2025-0003-1156	Comment Submitted by Anonymous	I am against this regulation because it violates the Fourth Amendment.

USCIS-2025-0003-1157	Comment Submitted by Anonymous	<p>I am writing to register my strong opposition to the proposed information collections.</p> <p>The proposed information collections are completely unnecessary to processing and adjudicating the forms, as USCIS clearly has been perfectly capable of processing and adjudicating the forms without collecting this information in the past. The proposed information collections are also irrelevant. The proposed information that would be collected about applicants' social media accounts has no bearing on the applicants' eligibility for the benefit sought, and would increase significantly the time burden on applicants and their legal representatives.</p> <p>The proposed information collections are plainly intended to allow for enforcement against individuals who have engaged on social media in speech not in line with the administration's political views. The administration has already violated the free speech of several individuals by deeming "dangerous" and impermissible political views that differ from those endorsed by the administration. These unconstitutional attacks will only increase if applicants for immigration benefits are made to include their social media account information in their applications. The proposed information collections will deter individuals who are legally eligible for immigration benefits from applying for and accessing those benefits out of confusion and fear as to what will be done with their personal information.</p> <p>The proposed information collections are invasive, overreaching, and ripe for violations of applicants' free speech. They will create more work and even more backlog for all parties, including USCIS. They are merely another step in the administration's plan to keep immigrants from accessing benefits for which they are legally eligible. I vehemently oppose these proposed information collections.</p>
USCIS-2025-0003-1158	Comment Submitted by Anonymous	No. This against the constitution.
USCIS-2025-0003-1159	Comment Submitted by Anonymous	I oppose this policy. Expanding federal surveillance in this way is an overreach. It doesn't make us safer. We have already seen people mistakenly arrested or deported, and this federal administration seems to believe it is above the rule of law, so I do not believe personal social media information would be used responsibly.
USCIS-2025-0003-1160	Comment Submitted by The Advocates for Human Rights	<p>Please see full comment, attached.</p> <p>The Advocates for Human Rights urges the Department to withdraw its proposed information collection request requiring individuals to provide their social media account information. Requesting, which is in practice is requiring, social media account information will infringe on freedom of speech, expression, association, and privacy rights for noncitizens and put the U.S. in violation of international and federal law in that regard. It is also likely to result in improper denials of benefits for those who fail to provide such information or based on incorrect conclusions drawn by USCIS from information in social media accounts. Particularly for people whose accounts are controlled or hacked by exploitative individuals or abusers—such as many of our clients who are victims of trafficking or other crimes and asylum seekers--this presents significant concern. Despite these risks, the Department fails to identify how it will mitigate such concerns or provide information about how it will analyze and utilize this data. Instead, it cites vague national security vetting needs, referring only to its own conclusion that such information is necessary for national security vetting. This is an insufficient justification for a change that will have significant human rights impacts. Further, the Department's time and cost burdens are inaccurate. Therefore, it must be withdrawn.</p>
USCIS-2025-0003-1161	Comment Submitted by Anonymous	The changes proposed to the immigration forms are terrible. The new information they would request is irrelevant and exists only to create unnecessary barriers. The government should stay out of social media accounts. That is personal information. Finding five years of telephone numbers is difficult and absolutely unnecessary. Stop treating immigrants like terrorists.
USCIS-2025-0003-1162	Comment Submitted by Anonymous	The changes proposed to the immigration forms are terrible. The new information they would request is irrelevant and exists only to create unnecessary barriers. The government should stay out of social media accounts. That is personal information. Finding five years of telephone numbers is difficult and absolutely unnecessary. Stop treating immigrants like terrorists.
USCIS-2025-0003-1163	Comment Submitted by Anonymous	Using social media handles to determine if an individual is a threat to national security is such an invasion of privacy and violates freedom of speech which completely goes against our Constitution. Given that information DHS is already privy to has been used to target immigrants and abuse their rights to due process, trust that DHS would use this information in a lawful and ethical way has been decimated. "To collect information from certain individuals" also indicates that it will be used for racial profiling. Keep systemic racism out of governmental institutions. This is also just another way to provide even more barriers to an already vulnerable population.
USCIS-2025-0003-1164	Comment Submitted by American Immigration Lawyers Association	See attached file(s)
USCIS-2025-0003-1165	Comment Submitted by Jay Martin Steinman	<p>Please see the attached letter. Note that the letter contains comments on two separate information collection activities and is thus being submitted for each.</p> <p>* Agency Information Collection Activities; New Collection: Generic Clearance for the Collection of Certain Information on Immigration Forms (document ID USCIS-2025-0002-0001, Federal Register Number 2025-03436)</p> <p>* Agency Information Collection Activities; New Collection: Generic Clearance for the Collection of Social Media Identifier(s) on Immigration Forms (document ID USCIS-2025-0003-0001, Federal Register Number 2025-03492)</p>

USCIS-2025-0003-1166	Unrelated Comment Submitted by Anonymous	One day, Trump will be gone, but your great shame and violations against immigrants' First Amendment rights will remain. You could just choose to stop violating the Constitution to appease a felon who only ran for election again to stay out of jail.
USCIS-2025-0003-1167	Comment Submitted by The Legal Aid Society of Cleveland	See attached file(s)
USCIS-2025-0003-1168	Comment Submitted by The Identity Project	See attached comments of The Identity Project (IDP), Privacy Times, and Government Information Watch
USCIS-2025-0003-1169	Comment Submitted by Anonymous	It is hard to believe USCIS will look into Social Media posts to determine someone's life We all know, most of the things people post are either false or just pretending to be someone they are not. The same applies to Dating Apps. Most of the people post fake photos and inflate their lives to attract more attention.
USCIS-2025-0003-1170	Comment Submitted by Anonymous	This is ridiculous and unnecessary. You are to going to get any information from this. We will just put N/A. Most applicants don't even have the information, even if they wanted to supply it. This is a huge waste of taxpayer money. This is where waste, fraud, and abuse really exists. Further, the addition of this extra information is burdensome, unnecessary, and will cause a chilling effect on applicants, particularly for low-income immigrants who may have mixed status family members, which is probably the point- but don't think we aren't noticing. Authoritarian regimes always collect information early on to use against their enemies and perceived "undesirables" to silence them. We know what you're up to and we don't approve.
USCIS-2025-0003-1171	Comment Submitted by Miriam Michalski	This new rule allowing our government to collect information from social media is an invasion of privacy and ripe for misuse by border agents and immigration officers. There have already been too many incidents of innocent tourists being caught up in this nonsense and held for days or weeks in detention centers for no good reason. All of this is just aiming to start sending people to camps. Just stop it.
USCIS-2025-0003-1172	Comment Submitted by Anonymous	While the government should do everything possible to vet applicants, this is a wrong way to vet someone. Sure you can try to privately look for social media presence but asking to provide handles is unfair. No national security threat will be doing dubious things online and applying for something with you and say here you go see what I had been. However, A LOT of innocent applicants will be anxious because they could have been sharing their political opinion, religion etc. Because there are lot of discretionary factors mentioned in lot of your policy manuals, why should anyone applying for a benefit should not feel threatened that they will be looked upon differently and denied discretion based on their political opinion or religion especially given the current media reports? Also, a lot of people have their privacy settings enabled and anyone who isn't their contact are not able to see anything. You will specifically have to ask them to disable the settings which then potentially violates their rights. And if the government TRULY suspects anything wrong, I am sure you have your ways to get into the accounts through court orders.
USCIS-2025-0003-1173	Comment Submitted by amalia bernardo	I am strongly opposed to this regulation. It is not clear how the collection of information like email and telephone history is relevant to naturalization eligibility, and this regulation cannot move forward without justifying these practices to the public. As it stands, this regulation is unfairly invasive to individuals seeking a legal path to citizenship in the United States, and I have serious concerns that the data that DHS collects would be used to affect applicants in a biased and prejudicial way. As others have noted, this regulation also appears to violate first amendment protections, affecting legal residents.
USCIS-2025-0003-1174	Comment Submitted by Anonymous	I strenuously object to the proposed collection of social media identifiers on immigration forms. This information is not necessary because it infringes upon the rights of others on social media platforms who may have been tagged by the applicant. The social media information could become an abused form of tracking for illegal detention or deportation. Taking this step to collect social media data would be a form of surveillance and infringement upon personal privacy.
USCIS-2025-0003-1175	Comment Submitted by Anonymous	When I first saw this proposed change, I was in a state of disbelief. In a supposed first nation that values freedom of speech and opinion, how does it make any sense to monitor social media use as a means to approve or deny citizenship or any other immigration benefits. An encroachment of freedom of speech or opinion for some is an encroachment on the rights of all. This change would only push the surveillance state that immigrants have already been long subjected to. My comment along with the hundreds of others points to the hypocrisy in allowing for such a change to occur to immigration forms. This along with other proposed changes is ushering in an era of heightened surveillance that will be seen as grotesque in history books to come. There is absolutely no need for this type of overstep into the lives of those seeking safety and support.
USCIS-2025-0003-1176	Comment Submitted by The Legal Aid Society of New York	See attached file(s)
USCIS-2025-0003-1177	Comment Submitted by Anonymous	See attached file(s)
USCIS-2025-0003-1178	Comment Submitted by Social Justice Collaborative	See attached file(s)
USCIS-2025-0003-1179	Comment Submitted by Naturalization Working Group (NWG)	See attached file(s)
USCIS-2025-0003-1180	Comment Submitted by Martin Goyette	This proposal is excessive and impractical and can be manipulated for political ends and should be rejected.
USCIS-2025-0003-1181	Duplicate Comment Submitted by Martin Goyette	This proposal is excessive and impractical and can be manipulated for political ends and should be rejected.

USCIS-2025-0003-1182	Comment Submitted by Jessica Dalton	<p>I respectfully submit this comment in strong opposition to the implementation of Executive Order 14161 and its requirement for U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services (USCIS) to collect social media identifiers from individuals applying for immigration-related benefits.</p> <p>This policy raises serious concerns about privacy, civil liberties, and the potential for discriminatory impacts. Mandating the disclosure of social media handles creates a chilling effect on free expression and association, as applicants may feel pressured to self-censor or avoid lawful speech out of fear it may be misconstrued or used against them. The practice of monitoring and evaluating individuals based on their social media activity is highly subjective and prone to error, and could result in unjust denials of immigration benefits based on misunderstood context, satire, or language barriers.</p> <p>Furthermore, there is little evidence that the collection of social media data meaningfully contributes to national security. Past reviews, including government audits, have shown such vetting procedures to be resource-intensive with limited effectiveness. Rather than improving safety, this measure risks overburdening USCIS, slowing down legitimate immigration processing, and undermining trust in the immigration system.</p> <p>This policy also threatens to disproportionately impact individuals from certain countries or backgrounds, raising concerns of profiling and unfair treatment. Immigration policies must be rooted in fairness, transparency, and evidence—not suspicion and surveillance.</p> <p>I urge USCIS and all relevant agencies to reconsider this approach and prioritize methods that respect human rights while achieving legitimate security objectives through proven and proportionate means.</p>
USCIS-2025-0003-1183	Comment Submitted by NAACP Legal Defense and Educational Fund, Inc.	See attached file(s)
USCIS-2025-0003-1184	Comment Submitted by Andrea Pietrzyk	<p>The proposal does not explain how collecting social media identifiers will be effective. People can easily delete social media accounts, create fake ones, or make their settings private. Applicants already endure much vetting during the visa process and during adjudication for benefits. The additional collection will add to the length of processing and create more burden for USCIS, which is already extremely understaffed.</p> <p>Furthermore, the president of the United States photoshopped a fake tattoo on someone's hand. Why should anyone believe this administration when they make claims about applicants' social media?</p>
USCIS-2025-0003-1185	Comment Submitted by Anonymous	<p>I oppose the proposal to collect social media identifiers from people applying for immigration benefits.</p> <p>This kind of surveillance crosses a line. It treats people, many of whom are simply seeking a better life, safety, or to reunite with loved ones, as potential threats based on how they express themselves online. That is not fair or reliable, especially across cultures, languages, and digital platforms.</p> <p>It is important to vet people who hold public authority, like law enforcement or officials with decision-making power. But scanning immigrants' social media profiles is not the same. It creates the risk of misinterpreting jokes, opinions, or cultural references, and it may discourage honest expression out of fear.</p> <p>We should not take flawed practices from the private sector and turn them into public policy. Government should set a higher standard, especially in systems that affect people's futures.</p> <p>Please reconsider this proposal. There are better and more respectful ways to approach security.</p>
USCIS-2025-0003-1186	Comment Submitted by Anonymous	<p>USCIS-2025-0003-0001 CBI</p> <p>This collection needs review due to non-compliance with cost basis requirements. The government agency should not be part of social media in terms of contracts under OMB.</p>
USCIS-2025-0003-1187	Comment Submitted by Absolutely Not	ABSOLUTELY NOT. This is unacceptable there is ZERO reason to collect this, especially with the current practices of this government.
USCIS-2025-0003-1188	Comment Submitted by Kaela R	I am strongly against this proposal. I do not see the relevance of collecting this Information on immigration forms and I believe that the Trump administration only wants to collect this information for the sole purpose of policing free speech and punishing those who speak out against the US government. This rule is bad for everyone in the USA. It sets us on the path of a larger police state than we already have. First it's collecting this information from people applying for citizenship, next it's collecting this information from current US citizens. The government has already proven to be irresponsible with people's data. I am against this rule.
USCIS-2025-0003-1189	Comment Submitted by Anonymous	This is absolutely absurd. Official documentation (already arduous and rigorous) is the only source that should be relevant to determine immigration status. Social media is completely irrelevant. Gathering this information is just giving undue surveillance to the government. How can social media possibly be used as a barometer? Irresponsible and ridiculous requirement. I'm ashamed that an American lawmaker could consider this edict, and I'm ashamed to be an American today.
USCIS-2025-0003-1190	Comment Submitted by Alan Alderman	This regulation is horrible and fascistic.

<p>USCIS-2025-0003-1191</p>	<p>Comment Submitted by Jay Libove</p>	<p>The proposed collection of information does not comply with the Paperwork Reduction Act (PRA), the First and Fourth Amendments to the U.S. Constitution, or the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights (ICCPR). This vague and overbroad collection of information from permanent residents, applicants for naturalization, and other non-U.S. citizens is inappropriate as a matter of policy and contrary to U.S. national and international interests in democracy and human rights. In many cases, it would be impossible for individuals to provide the requested information or to attest under penalty of perjury to its completeness. The proposed request for information, in its proposed form, would thus function as a pretext for denial of residency or naturalization as a citizen or other adverse decisions.</p> <p>The proposal for this collection of information by U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services (USCIS) should be withdrawn. If this proposal is submitted to the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) for approval, it should be rejected as failing to meet the statutory standard of necessity for an agency purpose and as a violation of the Constitutional and human rights of individuals about whom information would be collected, including U.S. citizens who engage in protected acts of assembly and speech with non-U.S. citizens.</p>
<p>USCIS-2025-0003-1192</p>	<p>Comment Submitted by Britney Laitinen</p>	<p>I oppose this new proposed condition.</p> <p>The First Amendment reads "Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof; or abridging the freedom of speech, or of the press; or the right of the people peaceably to assemble, and to petition the Government for a redress of grievances." People have been assembling peacefully voicing their concerns with knowledge of the First Amendment in mind. Isn't that what's supposed to make this country special and set us apart from other countries? Isn't it why people from all over the world want to come here and become citizens? People have the right to disagree with what the Government is doing and they have the right to post and be vocal about it. Trying to make people stay silent is a form of control. Threatening to dump all information from peoples social media looking for antisemitism, all while violating the First Amendment, is going to lead to more friction and citizens distrusting the government further. People voicing their opinions and wanting to educate others on what's going on in other countries shouldn't be punished. For example, there are still a lot of people in this country that don't know of the genocide that has been happening in Palestine. Saying or posting "Free Palestine" shouldn't be seen as being antisemitic if it's voicing for the support of ending violence.</p>
<p>USCIS-2025-0003-1193</p>	<p>Comment Submitted by Center for Democracy & Technology</p>	<p>See attached file(s)</p>
<p>USCIS-2025-0003-1194</p>	<p>Comment Submitted by Anonymous</p>	<p>On behalf of Buen Vecino, I submit this comment in strong opposition to the proposed revisions to immigration forms that expand requests for applicants' extended family information and historical contact details. We urge USCIS to reconsider these changes for the following reasons.</p> <p>The information being sought—such as personal details about parents, siblings, or previous phone numbers and email addresses—does not meaningfully contribute to evaluating whether an applicant qualifies for the immigration benefit requested. This is especially problematic in forms unrelated to family-based immigration, where such information serves no legal or procedural relevance.</p> <p>These proposed changes would significantly burden applicants, many of whom may struggle to recall or access the requested information. Vulnerable populations, including elderly individuals, survivors of trauma, and those with limited documentation, would be particularly affected. For legal service providers, assisting with these additional requirements would increase workload, reduce efficiency, and ultimately limit the number of clients we can support.</p> <p>Many of the individuals we serve at Buen Vecino live in mixed-status families—households where family members hold varying immigration statuses. For example, a lawful permanent resident (LPR) eligible to naturalize may be discouraged from applying if it means disclosing sensitive information about a spouse or parent without lawful status. Prior iterations of the N-400 form included similar questions, which were later removed due to their chilling effect and lack of relevance to eligibility. Reintroducing these questions is deeply concerning.</p> <p>The inclusion of these questions risks creating a climate of suspicion and discouragement. It sends the message that applicants following the legal process may nonetheless expose their loved ones to potential enforcement actions. Such fear will undoubtedly deter eligible individuals from applying, including LPRs pursuing naturalization, family members seeking adjustment of status, and refugees or asylees attempting to reunify with relatives or travel abroad for urgent reasons.</p> <p>Buen Vecino urges USCIS to withdraw the proposed changes and uphold application processes that respect the dignity and rights of all applicants.</p>

<p>USCIS-2025-0003-1196</p>	<p>Comment Submitted by Anonymous</p>	<p>On Civil Liberties and Free Expression</p> <p>Comment: Requiring social media identifiers from immigration applicants may suppress lawful speech and political expression, contravening First Amendment protections.</p> <p>Supporting Evidence: The Brennan Center warns that such surveillance can lead to self-censorship and unjust visa denials based on lawful online activity.</p> <p>WIRED</p> <p>On Discriminatory Impact</p> <p>Comment: This policy could disproportionately target individuals from Muslim-majority countries and political activists, echoing concerns about bias in previous travel bans.</p> <p>Supporting Evidence: Executive Order 14161 has been criticized for potentially reviving discriminatory practices akin to earlier travel bans.</p> <p>On Privacy and Data Security</p> <p>Comment: Collecting and storing social media data without clear safeguards raises significant privacy concerns and risks misuse of personal information.</p> <p>Supporting Evidence: Privacy advocates highlight the dangers of mass data collection without robust protections, potentially leading to misuse and abuse.</p> <p>On Effectiveness and Resource Allocation</p> <p>Comment: The efficacy of using social media data for security vetting is questionable and may divert resources from more effective security measures.</p> <p>Supporting Evidence: Experts argue that social media monitoring has limited utility in identifying genuine security threats and may lead to false positives.</p> <p>On Impact on Vulnerable Populations</p> <p>Comment: Asylum seekers and refugees may be unfairly penalized for their online activity, hindering their access to protection and due process.</p>
<p>USCIS-2025-0003-1197</p>	<p>Comment Submitted by Andrea R</p>	<p>This proposal is excessive and impractical and can be manipulated for political ends and should be rejected.</p>

<p>USCIS-2025-0003-1198</p>	<p>Comment Submitted by Anonymous</p>	<p>Comment on Docket ID USCIS-2025-0003 at Social Media Collection on Immigration Forms</p> <p>By Giovanni Rodriguez</p> <p>I am writing to share my opinion about a new rule from the U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services (USCIS). They want to start asking people applying for immigration to share their social media usernames also called social media identifiers. This means that if someone is trying to come live in the U.S., they would have to give the government the names they use on social media like Facebook, Twitter, or Instagram. I understand that the government wants to keep the country safe. That's very important. But I don't think this plan is a good idea for a few reasons.</p> <p>1. It Might Not Actually Help Catch Bad People</p> <p>The government says this will help them find people who are dangerous, but social media can be tricky. People might post jokes, use sarcasm, or talk in ways that don't mean what they sound like. This could lead to mistakes, where innocent people are seen as dangerous just because of something they said online. A study by Brayne (2017) showed that using online data for security doesn't always work well, especially when you're trying to understand different cultures or languages.</p> <p>2. It Could Make People Afraid to Speak Freely</p> <p>If immigrants know that the government is watching their social media, they might stop sharing their true thoughts or feelings. They might be scared that something they say could be taken the wrong way. This is called a chilling effect. People might feel nervous just using the internet like they normally would. According to the Brennan Center (Stanley, 2019), this kind of fear can hurt people's right to free speech.</p> <p>3. It Could Treat Some Groups Unfairly</p> <p>This kind of rule could affect some people more than others. For example, people from Muslim-majority countries or certain communities might get extra attention, even if they haven't done anything wrong. Akbar (2020) explains how rules like this can make certain groups feel targeted or judged just because of where they come from.</p> <p>4. It's More Work and Stress for Applicants</p> <p>USCIS says it will only take 5 minutes to give this information, but that's not true for everyone. Some people have lots of accounts or aren't sure what to include. Others may worry a lot about how their posts might be seen. Trying to explain or delete years of social media is stressful and takes time.</p> <p>My Suggestions:</p> <p>Only collect social media names if there's a strong reason to think the person is a risk.</p> <p>Explain clearly which social media accounts are needed and how the information will be used.</p> <p>Protect people's privacy and make sure their data is kept safe.</p>
-----------------------------	---------------------------------------	---

USCIS-2025-0003-1199	Comment Submitted by Anonymous	<p>I am writing as a concerned citizen and advocate to strongly oppose the proposed collection of social media identifiers as part of the immigration benefits application process, as outlined in the DHS proposal titled "Generic Clearance for the Collection of Social Media Identifier(s) on Immigration Forms."</p> <p>This proposal raises a number of serious concerns relating to privacy, due process, discriminatory impact, and the reliability of the systems likely to be used to carry out this screening. Although DHS claims that collecting and analyzing over 200,000 hours' worth of social media data will not result in added costs or burdens, this assertion is implausible without the use of automated systems such as artificial intelligence (AI). AI-based surveillance tools have consistently been shown to produce unreliable, inconsistent, and biased outcomes " often reflecting the subjective views of their creators. The risks of allowing flawed algorithms to influence immigration decisions cannot be overstated.</p> <p>Even if human review were to be incorporated, the proposal lacks critical information: Who will review the social media data? What criteria will be used to assess posts or profiles? What kinds of content will trigger adverse action? And most importantly, what recourse will applicants have if they are negatively impacted by an unfavorable or incorrect interpretation of their online presence?</p> <p>These omissions are alarming and deeply problematic. We have already seen the consequences of overreliance on flawed data analysis tools. One notable example is the mass termination of international students based on erroneous determinations from an automated background review system " a situation so egregious that the government had to reverse course after court losses. There is every reason to believe a similar scenario could arise here, at even greater scale and with more devastating consequences.</p> <p>Furthermore, DHS's own internal review of previous pilot programs involving social media screening concluded that such methods were inconsistent and unreliable. There is no credible evidence that collecting social media handles contributes meaningfully to national security or public safety. Those who pose genuine threats are unlikely to broadcast their intentions online, and this dragnet approach will only serve to penalize innocent individuals applying for immigration benefits in good faith.</p> <p>This policy risks introducing systemic discrimination, as marginalized communities " particularly immigrants " are more likely to be misjudged or scrutinized for online expression that is culturally nuanced, misunderstood, or taken out of context. If adopted, the program will likely chill free speech, deter lawful expression, and sow fear in immigrant communities already facing heightened surveillance.</p> <p>Finally, this proposal sets a dangerous precedent. If we allow the government to indiscriminately collect and analyze social media activity for immigration purposes, it is only a matter of time before such surveillance practices expand to other sectors of society. The erosion of rights for one group threatens the rights of all.</p> <p>For all of these reasons " the lack of transparency, the serious risk of error and abuse, the absence of due process, and the demonstrated ineffectiveness of social media</p>
USCIS-2025-0003-1200	Comment Submitted by Andrea R	<p>One concern I have is that the social media posts will be reviewed in a politically skewed view that is not well defined. My biggest concern is that access to social media posts/accounts will be used to scrape/mine contact information. If this secondary data is collected, it's use could be broad, undefined, and at the discretion of the collector. In the current political environment, it seems that social media companies like Meta and others would yield broad access to secondary data to avoid implied punishment. To view an individuals' posts is one thing; to then build a graph of connections to use for whatever reason would infringe on the secondary parties right to privacy.</p>
USCIS-2025-0003-1201	Comment Submitted by Niskanen Center	Please see attached for a copy of our comment. https://downloads.regulations.gov/USCIS-2025-0003-1201/attachment_2.pdf
USCIS-2025-0003-1202	Comment Submitted by Anonymous	<p>USCIS-2025-0003-0001 OMB 1615-NEW CBI</p> <p>The agency collections needs to be terminated immediately due to unlawful activity and noncompliance of regulatory rules. There are so many issues with this existing contract that are wrong and has lead to some extreme problems to have to resolve from the beginning of the agreement. It is definitely a waste of taxpayer dollars for such unethical practices in the media industry.</p>
USCIS-2025-0003-1203	Comment Submitted by Anonymous	Please see attached comment signed by multiple organizations https://downloads.regulations.gov/USCIS-2025-0003-1203/attachment_1.pdf

<p>USCIS-2025-0003-1204</p>	<p>Comment Submitted by Southern Minnesota Regional Legal Services</p>	<p>I write on behalf of Southern Minnesota Regional Legal Services (SMRLS). We are a civil legal aid organization that has provided free legal services to low-income and elderly residents of Southern Minnesota for over 100 years. Our Immigration Legal Services unit works with community members such as refugees and asylees adjusting their status and legal permanent residents naturalizing.</p> <p>We oppose the Generic Clearance for the Collection of Social Media Identifier(s) on Immigration Forms proposed by USCIS (OMB Control Number 1615-NEW, Docket ID USCIS-2025-0003, Federal Register Number 2025-03492). This proposed change places undue burden on applicants and adjudicators, lacks clarity on the use and utility of collected information, and will chill applicants from adjusting their immigration status.</p> <p>First, this is an extremely burdensome requirement for applicants. It is hard to imagine how the average American citizen would be able to create a complete and accurate list of all social media accounts they have had over their lifetime, let alone SMRLS' clients who live in poverty, may work multiple jobs, may have trauma-based mental health conditions, etc. It is also unclear what burden would be placed on applicants who do not use social media and how they would provide evidence that they have not had accounts.</p> <p>This change would create significant inefficiencies for adjudicators. It is unrealistic and likely impossible for USCIS staff to go through each applicant's social media accounts. It is likely USCIS would use artificial intelligence to vet activity, and it is well known that AI often produces inaccurate and biased assessments. This is even more concerning given the lack of clear criteria on how data will be assessed.</p> <p>It is not clear what the validity or utility of social media information is for adjudicating USCIS petitions. It is not clear why this information is necessary for USCIS's functions, given the robust vetting procedures that already exist for all applicants. It is questionable how valid social media information will be, given the likely use of AI to scan accounts and the lack of clear assessment measures.</p> <p>Lastly, the proposed change will chill applicants from adjusting their status, preventing them from continuing the legal process that is in the best interest of USCIS and the US government. This change poses severe risks to applicant's Constitutional right of protected free speech. Many applicants SMRLS works with are refugees or asylees, some of whom have fled their countries of origin based on persecution due to their political opinion. The US has long been a safe harbor for refugees and asylees who have expressed their disagreement with governments, and this change would seriously undermine applicant's right to free speech and expression.</p> <p>We urge USCIS not to implement these proposed changes.</p> <p>Sincerely,</p>
<p>USCIS-2025-0003-1205</p>	<p>Comment Submitted by AFL-CIO</p>	<p>The AFL-CIO opposes the proposed new information collections that raise serious concerns and unresolved questions about how the social media and family data required of visa applicants will be used, who will have access to it, and for how long. The lack of concrete parameters and boundaries for the data collection and use poses real threats to the privacy, expression, and association rights of U.S. citizens, visa seekers and all working people. For the reasons outlined in the attached comment, we urge you to retract the information collections entirely. https://downloads.regulations.gov/USCIS-2025-0003-1205/attachment_1.pdf</p>
<p>USCIS-2025-0003-1206</p>	<p>Comment Submitted by Josh Z</p>	<p>RE: Docket USCIS-2025-0003-0001 - Agency Information Collection Activities; New Collection: Generic Clearance for the Collection of Social Media Identifier(s) on Immigration Forms</p> <p>To Whom It May Concern,</p> <p>I strongly encourage the U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services (USCIS) to reject this proposed rule. Foreign nationals and/or any sponsors applying for immigration services, already submit an extraordinary amount of information to USCIS via the necessary forms required for their specific case. This provides no benefit other than adding an inflated amount of time to a process that is already thorough and sometimes excessive.</p> <p>In addition, social media review is an invasion of privacy and in many cases may also likely be a violation of the U.S. Constitution First Amendment.</p>
<p>USCIS-2025-0003-1207</p>	<p>Comment Submitted by New York Office for New Americans</p>	<p>See attached file(s) https://downloads.regulations.gov/USCIS-2025-0003-1207/attachment_1.pdf</p>
<p>USCIS-2025-0003-1208</p>	<p>Comment Submitted by Massachusetts Law Reform Institute</p>	<p>Please see attached comment. https://downloads.regulations.gov/USCIS-2025-0003-1208/attachment_1.pdf, https://downloads.regulations.gov/USCIS-2025-0003-1208/attachment_1.docx</p>

USCIS-2025-0003-1209	Comment Submitted by International Refugee Assistance Project (IRAP)	See attached PDF. https://downloads.regulations.gov/USCIS-2025-0003-1209/attachment_1.pdf
USCIS-2025-0003-1210	Comment Submitted by Immigrant Legal Resource Center	Please see attached from the Immigrant Legal Resource Center. https://downloads.regulations.gov/USCIS-2025-0003-1210/attachment_1.pdf
USCIS-2025-0003-1211	Comment Submitted by Anonymous	<p>I strongly urge USCIS not to expand the collection of social media identifiers from immigration applicants and petitioners.</p> <p>While the Department of State already collects this data via Form DS-260, further expansion—especially by USCIS or CBP—risks deepening public distrust in an already charged political climate, diverting resources from higher-priority enforcement efforts, and undermining constitutionally protected rights.</p> <p>Social media screening carries serious civil liberties risks. Non-citizens residing in the U.S. are still protected under the First Amendment (e.g. Bridges v. Wixon). Encouraging government review of personal and expressive content—often taken out of context—can chill free speech and expression, especially among vulnerable and marginalized communities. It also increases the risk of racial, ethnic, and ideological profiling.</p> <p>USCIS estimates this new collection effort will require nearly 286,000 hours of administrative time annually. That burden would be better spent on security measures with demonstrated effectiveness. I urge the agency to consider the following alternative approaches:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Improve background checks using biometric data and international law enforcement cooperation. These tools provide more objective, verifiable insights into applicants’ records than parsing personal social media posts. 2. Leverage structured character references. Just as USCIS already accepts affidavits attesting to good faith marriages, a parallel system could gather community-based testimonials regarding an applicant’s character and law-abiding behavior—offering more meaningful context than online profiles. 3. Consult peer nations to identify best practices in immigration vetting and applicant risk assessment. U.S. immigration policy should be informed by strategies that respect human rights and due process while ensuring national security. 4. Refer public comments to congressional oversight and subject matter experts in immigration law. This ensures that any data collection practice aligns with constitutional principles and maintains accountability through democratic processes. https://downloads.regulations.gov/USCIS-2025-0003-1211/attachment_1.pdf <p>In summary, this proposed expansion of social media surveillance would not meaningfully enhance national security, but would increase bureaucracy, raise privacy concerns, and alienate the very people the immigration system is meant to serve.</p> <p>Let’s keep this regulation outcome-based, not process-based by adding more red tape</p>
USCIS-2025-0003-1212	Comment Submitted by Electronic Privacy Information Center (EPIC)	Please find attached the comments of the Electronic Privacy Information Center (EPIC). https://downloads.regulations.gov/USCIS-2025-0003-1212/attachment_1.pdf
USCIS-2025-0003-1213	Comment Submitted by Anonymous	<p>I am against this initiative.</p> <p>We are the United States of America. We are supposed to stand against tyranny and oppression. We have historically seen ourselves as the "good" guys in the fight against fascism. How are we better than any other dictatorship if we start policing views and opinions? What happens when your party is no longer in power? Shall the other party be able to discriminate based on views they disagree with? Not actions others have taken, but opinions they make have voiced or merely clicked on and interacted with.</p> <p>One of the things that made us "great" was our ability, our freedom to dissent. This right is supposedly given to all individuals in the US. We need to welcome and listen to those that hold other view points and have different life experiences. People with power and money are being allowed and encouraged to shape the narrative. Google bends to governments and keeps citizens in the dark as to what is actually happening in our world. I say, no more! Shame, shame, shame!</p>

<p>USCIS-2025-0003-1214</p>	<p>Comment Submitted by Anonymous</p>	<p>I am writing to express my opposition to the proposed collection of information under docket USCIS-2025-0003.</p> <p>The collection of social media identifiers is an unnecessary measure that will create more inefficiency in the processing of applications and lead to bureaucratic strain. The USCIS has not provided any details on what constitutes "social media" that must be disclosed on applications, or how this data will be interpreted to determine eligibility. For example, it is not obvious if a service such as LinkedIn would count as social media and should be disclosed, or even an application such as Whatsapp which is primarily a messaging app but has social network-like features. In addition, due to the incredibly subjective nature of social media it would be up to the discretion of the officials processing applications to decide how to interpret posts, who may not be aware of ever-changing and obscure online slang and references that could easily be misinterpreted, all of which would likely lead to a large increase in appeals and decrease efficiency in processing applications and put more strain on governmental institutions. The vague and uncertain nature of this rule would also lead to a chilling effect among immigrants as they will be discouraged from applying out of fear of how their posts will be interpreted even if they are ultimately innocuous.</p> <p>The department has estimated the total annual hour burden associated with this collection to be 285,999 hours under the basis of an 0.08 hour burden per respondent. However, I estimate this burden to be much higher, again due to the very subjective nature of social media and the time it would take to review each profile effectively, as this would be very discrepant between each applicant depending on how extensive their social media presence is. Officials would also likely require new and constant training on how to review and interpret posts which would put an additional time and labor burden on the department. The current administration has identified both increasing government efficiency and immigration issues as top priorities, and this collection of information would run counter to both of those ideals.</p>
<p>USCIS-2025-0003-1215</p>	<p>Comment Submitted by Anonymous</p>	<p>This clearly infringes on the right to Free Speech. Social media usernames should never be employed to personally identify or vet individuals, as these accounts are not inherently secure against hacking or manipulation. Additionally, most social media platforms do not require users to verify their citizenship to create an account. For the government to start monitoring such details would violate existing privacy laws designed to protect personal identity.</p>
<p>USCIS-2025-0003-1216</p>	<p>Comment Submitted by Anonymous</p>	<p>I write to express my complete and utter opposition to this proposal. Probing social media accounts for content that the government finds objectionable is what repressive, authoritarian nations do. It is political persecution under the guise of protecting national security and public welfare. Ideological purity tests of this kind are precisely what we criticize in places such as China, North Korea, and Cuba.</p> <p>As noted by the Supreme Court, our Constitution guarantees rights including freedom of speech to anyone on US soil "citizen and noncitizen alike. And to quote Vice President J.D. Vance, "Democracy rests on the sacred principle that the voice of the people matters. There's no room for firewalls. You either uphold the principle or you don't." It follows then that the proposed policy is itself hostile to our founding principles by effectively silencing speech by immigrants faced with the terrifying prospect of being deemed out of bounds.</p> <p>Framing this policy as a means to ensure public safety is not credible as we have watched the current administration distort the meaning of antisemitism and abuse immigration laws to further its own political agenda. By labeling lawful protests as a threat to our national security or adverse to our foreign policy, our government hearkens back to the dark days when McCarthyist witch-hunts swept the nation in a shameful miscarriage of justice. Immigrants are now being threatened with deportation for simply joining in peaceful protest alongside millions of citizens. One of the many examples of this totalitarian policy is the detention of Turkish graduate student, Rumeysa Ozturk, who was arrested by immigration authorities for nothing more than co-writing an article calling on her university to uphold the student senate's decision on divestment from Israeli companies. If spurious claims of antisemitism are valid enough to warrant a loss of immigration status, then can you imagine when government officials start investigating social media accounts where the smallest gesture can be interpreted as a hostile attitude?</p> <p>Ironically, JD Vance warned European leaders against this type of government repression saying, "I believe deeply that there is no security if you are afraid of the voices, the opinions and the conscience that guide your very own people." In light of the current attack on our freedoms, we might also remember that our nation's first settlers left Europe due to ideological persecution. In this way, our founding principles lead us to conclude that scrutinizing social media accounts for opinions that government officials find objectionable should not be a part of the immigration process, and we should certainly not be instituting a thought police to probe people who reach our shores yearning for freedom.</p>

USCIS-2025-0003-1217	Comment Submitted by David Cooper	<p>I am a DOJ Accredited Representative working at a non-profit agency. While my interest in this new collection of information is professional, and while my opinions are based on years of experience in immigration law practice, all opinions and recommendations are offered in my capacity as a private United States citizen and do not represent the opinion of any organization or entity.</p> <p>I do not per se object to USCIS requiring disclosure of social media handles on immigration forms, although I do share the concerns expressed in many other comments that the government may intend to study the social media profiles of prospective immigrants in order to penalize 1st amendment protected speech. Recent arrests of students and LPRs who expressed pro-Palestinian sentiments publicly lead many immigrants, and, for that matter, many US citizens, to fear that the current administration will fail to uphold the rights enshrined in the constitution. Notwithstanding these concerns, I note that public postings on prominent social media platforms can (and may already) be routinely viewed by government officials even without disclosure of a handle on a USCIS form, and I can understand that voluntary disclosure of this information may streamline processing of forms. I do, however, urge USCIS to take privacy and free speech concerns seriously and to take affirmative steps to reassure the public that this information will be used appropriately. This could take the form of an FAQ on the USCIS website in which USCIS describes some of the routine checks conducted and provides examples of how these data may be used.</p> <p>I wish to also provide a pragmatic recommendation that may improve the quality of information collected. In conversations with other legal professionals, I have heard many express confusion as to what websites may constitute "social media." Some have wondered if a Venmo account should be disclosed because of its social elements and ability to publicly share certain payment information. (I take the position that Venmo is not social media because the social aspects are incidental to its primary use as a payment app.) One might feel similar confusion around something like Spotify (which I also do not consider social media). Because the State Department has long incorporated questions about social media into its forms (notably, the DS-260), I have certainly experienced this confusion myself. For a long time, I counseled my clients that Whatsapp was likely social media (because it is owned by Facebook/Meta) before I ultimately concluded that, notwithstanding its corporate structure, it is a messaging app, not a social media app, and I now counsel my clients not to include Whatsapp. The State Department has been somewhat helpful by providing some sample applications and a fairly rudimentary FAQ (see my previous recommendation), but there is significant room for improvement.</p> <p>Based on my own experience (as a fairly internet-savvy millennial trained in immigration law and fluent in English), I can easily imagine that attorneys with less experience on the internet, not to mention non-English-speaking applicants, may be unsure how to answer the social media questions on the forms. USCIS's proposed instructions are currently inadequate to clarify what is and is not social media. The only examples given are "Facebook, X, Instagram, etc." This is not nearly enough explanation (unless USCIS only wants applicants to focus on these three websites). I would strongly recommend that USCIS, at a minimum, provide a great deal more detail regarding what is and is not social media. An even better solution is available, however.</p> <p>Realistically, I anticipate that USCIS will be focused on applicants' presence on mainstream social media platforms. This may also include some less-common but still mainstream</p>
USCIS-2025-0003-1218	Comment Submitted by National Immigration Project	See attached file(s) https://downloads.regulations.gov/USCIS-2025-0003-1218/attachment_2.pdf
USCIS-2025-0003-1219	Comment Submitted by UnidosUS	See attached file(s) https://downloads.regulations.gov/USCIS-2025-0003-1219/attachment_2.pdf
USCIS-2025-0003-1220	Comment Submitted by Brennan Center for Justice	<p>To Whom It May Concern:</p> <p>Please see the attached file for comments from the Brennan Center and Knight First Amendment Institute regarding "Agency Information Collection Activities; New Collection: Generic Clearance for the Collection of Social Media Identifier(s) on Immigration Forms [OMB Control Number 1615-NEW, Docket ID USCIS-2025-0003]." https://downloads.regulations.gov/USCIS-2025-0003-1220/attachment_2.pdf</p>
USCIS-2025-0003-1221	Comment Submitted by Electronic Frontier Foundation	See attached file(s) https://downloads.regulations.gov/USCIS-2025-0003-1221/attachment_2.pdf

Short Name Bucket	Descriptor
Free Speech/1st Amendment/Chilling effect	The collection of social media identifiers will violate or produce a chilling effect on freedom of speech/association and personal views of individuals on applicant's "friends" list may result in the denial of travel, entry, or an immigration benefit.
Privacy	The collection is an invasion of privacy and/or the government has no authority to collect social media information.
Govt Burden	Produce extra burden and cost to the government. Waste of resources. (Do NOT include waste of taxpayer money here. It has its own bucket.)
Applicant Burden/Delays	The collection will cause delays in travel and the immigration process. DHS has underestimated the burden to applicants of providing five years' worth of social media identifiers or the burden is too great.
Connections Not Giving Consent Violating EOs	SM links to family and friends and they did not give consent to the collection of this information. Connections do not want the government looking at their profiles when they are not the ones asking for a benefit. This request is a direct violation of Trump Admin Executive Orders.
Overreach / 4th Amendment/Unconstitutional	Potential violation of the Fourth Amendment (unreasonable search and seizures), and abuse of government power; the government has no authority to collect social media identifiers. U.S./DHS lacks Statutory Authority. This is generally unconstitutional.
5th Amendment (Federal due process) Waste of tax payer dollars	Potential violation of the Fifth Amendment. Applicants don't receive due process. Applicants cannot contest information gleaned from SM. The time spent collecting and reviewing Social Media Information is too great and will waste tax payer money.
Hurt American Businesses/Society	The collection of social media identifiers will deter travel or immigration to the United States or harm its economy or international standing. May cause American SM Platforms to lose business. The best workers/thinkers won't come to the U.S.
Discriminatory/Safety Risk	The collection will be discriminatory and will result in the inappropriate targeting of certain populations including, but not limited to, Muslims and/or Arabs. May pose a security risk to the aliens.
Ineffective / Inefficient / Existing collection is sufficient / vague	The collection would be ineffective for its stated purpose, will gather no useful data, and is unlikely to be a helpful tool for finding any nefarious activity. This is an inefficient process, and the existing data collection is sufficient. There is no practical utility and violates 5 CFR 1320.9(a). Collection is too vague or does not provide enough detail.
Data Integrity	How the data is retained, used, and stored may result in misuse/abuse of sensitive data by government authorities (including contractors) or theft by third parties. Also to include the integrity of the data collected; concerns that social media handles and posts can be manipulated both to benefit and to harm.
No SM Presence / False Info / Not reliable	Many individuals will fail to provide or simply do not possess social media accounts, or will be untruthful in the accounts they provide in regard to their social media identifiers. Individuals may also post inaccurate or insincere information on social media. Individuals may have also changed their mind and no longer believe the things they previously posted. DHS may misinterpret what is posted (e.g. memes, lyrics, references). Handles can be sold/transferred. Cannot be properly attributed.
Police State/Fascism/Anti-Democracy	The public expressed concern that the collection will lead to a police state and excessive government oversight or are the actions of a military dictatorship, authoritarian, or a totalitarian state. Against Democratic Values. Against American Values.
14th Amendment (States Due Process/Equal Protection)	Collecting this information is a violation of the 14th Amendment as an unequal application of law to persons subject to the jurisdiction of the United States.
Not DHS' job	Other government agencies should be sifting through social media for bad actors, not DHS. DOS, FBI, DOJ should be doing the screening and vetting, etc.
Violates SM Platform TOS	There are numerous social media platforms with varying degrees of privacy settings and accessing such information would violate these settings.
Anonymous Platforms	This collection will be ineffective because the most dubious or dangerous online platforms are anonymous and do not use accounts or handles.
Imprecise/confusing SM terms + unreliable responses ESL (Applicant language issues)	The collection may use undefined or imprecise terms that could confuse applicants (e.g., identifiers, handles, usernames) and lead to unreliable responses. Applicants may not recognize the English-language names of some of the social media platforms.
DHS Complacency	DHS will become complacent by relying too heavily on the information provided and the mandatory nature of the question, and less time doing research/vetting.
AI Concerns	Use of automated computer systems, AI, or algorithms in social media vetting may result in bad decisions due to a lack of context or accurate information.
Generic Clearance Inappropriate	A generic clearance is inappropriate for this type of collection, as this collection is controversial and burdensome.
Embarrassing (international)/Reprisal General Opposition	This effort serves to damage the United States' global reputation and/or is embarrassing. This will lead to global reprisal/international retaliation. Hurts our moral authority on the global stage, etc. "No, just no" and the like.
Out of Scope Support	Comment is irrelevant, a personal attack that does not address a SM-related concern, or contains PII. I support the proposed collection of social media handles on DHS forms.

Public Comment Bucket

Our Response (NOTE: STILL IN DRAFTING MODE!)

The Department respects every individual’s right to maintain an opinion without interference and to seek, receive, and impart information and ideas through any available social media information to assist in determining admissibility or eligibility for immigration benefits is consistent with this commitment.

DHS will handle social media identifiers in the same manner as other information collected through DHS applications and is in the process of conducting Privacy Impact Assessments (SORN) and Privacy Impact Assessments (PIA), available on the DHS website (www.dhs.gov/privacy). To ensure compliance with these policies, DHS is providing training on the operational use of social media and sign a rules of behavior document. Additionally, DHS will not request user passwords in order to attempt to subvert individual privacy settings or controls the applicants may have implemented on social media platforms.

Consistent with the requirements of the Privacy Act (5 U.S.C. § 552a(e)(7)), DHS does not maintain records “describing how any [citizen of the United States or resident] exercises rights guaranteed by the First Amendment, unless expressly authorized by statute or by the individual about whom the information is collected, within the scope of an authorized law enforcement activity.” Furthermore, DHS policy directs that “DHS personnel shall not collect, maintain in DHS systems, or disseminate information under the First Amendment unless (a) an individual has expressly granted their consent for DHS to collect, maintain and use that information; (b) maintaining that information is necessary for DHS to perform its duties; or (c) that information is relevant to a criminal, civil or administrative activity relating to a law DHS enforces or administers. In addition, DHS will not collect, maintain, or disseminate, through any means, information relating to how an individual exercises his or her First Amendment rights unless one or more of the same conditions are met. DHS is not requesting login information nor will we access accounts through hacking or other unlawful means.

Free Speech/1st Amendment/Chilling effect

Consistent with the requirements of the Privacy Act (5 U.S.C. § 552a(e)(7)), DHS does not maintain records “describing how any [citizen of the United States or resident] exercises rights guaranteed by the First Amendment, unless expressly authorized by statute or by the individual about whom the information is collected, within the scope of an authorized law enforcement activity.” Furthermore, DHS policy directs that “DHS personnel shall not collect, maintain in DHS systems, or disseminate information under the First Amendment unless (a) an individual has expressly granted their consent for DHS to collect, maintain and use that information; (b) maintaining that information is necessary for DHS to perform its duties; or (c) that information is relevant to a criminal, civil or administrative activity relating to a law DHS enforces or administers. In addition, DHS will not collect, maintain, or disseminate, through any means, information relating to how an individual exercises his or her First Amendment rights unless one or more of the same conditions are met.

Federal laws, including the Immigration and Nationality Act (INA) and Homeland Security Act of 2002, provide authority for this information collection. 8 C.F.R. § 287.5(a)(2) empower officers and agents to “take and consider evidence concerning the privilege of any person to enter, reenter, or remain in the United States. Similarly, for naturalization purposes, INA § 335, 8 U.S.C. § 1446, empowers any employee of USCIS to conduct a personal investigation of the applicant concerning the admissibility of the applicant for naturalization, and require the production of relevant books, papers, and documents. For the purposes of 8 C.F.R. § 1187, and 8 C.F.R. § 217.5 authorize DHS to collect data elements as the Secretary deems necessary to issue a travel authorization. This collection of information is related to Fourth Amendment protections to the extent such protections are applicable in this context. CBP and USCIS personnel will only use publicly available social media information, and as the Supreme Court has explained, “What a person knowingly exposes to the public . . . is not a subject of the Fourth Amendment.” United States, 389 U.S. 347, 351 (1967); see, e.g., Palmieri v. United States, 72 F. Supp. 3d 191, 210 (D.D.C. 2014) (holding that a Plaintiff cannot claim a reasonable expectation of privacy in the information [the Plaintiff] made available to ‘friends’ on his Facebook page”); United States v. Mereish, 859 F.3d 904, 914 (9th Cir. 2017) (social media user disseminates his postings and information to the public, they are not protected by the Fourth Amendment.”). The Privacy Act does not protect an individual’s exercise of rights guaranteed by the First Amendment if they are “expressly authorized by statute or by the individual about whom the information is collected.” Social media checks will add a moderate amount of work for USCIS. This process includes a labor-intensive step to validate that the identifiers belong to the applicant. The collection of applicants’ social media identifiers and associated platforms will assist DHS by reducing the time needed to validate the information to the applicant and prevent mis-associations. It will provide trained DHS adjudication personnel with more timely visibility of the information provided by the applicant. While social media handles would be only one piece of a large mixture of information used in the analysis of the applicant, the process may reduce unnecessary delays and costs by preventing travel by persons who are likely to be deemed inadmissible to the United States. DHS is processing some persons. DHS has considered the costs of greater use of social media screenings and more in-person interviews of applicants in the adjudication process over the past few years and recognizes it takes more time for officers to adjudicate each case. DHS will recoup this by increasing the number of officers. On April 1, 2024, DHS has taken into account the costs involved in collecting this information and has found it reasonable and justified given the benefits. The proposed collection will not increase wait times at the port of entry, as Electronic System for Travel Authorization (ESTA) and EVUS applications are processed separately. Any checks of an applicant’s publicly available social media information will occur concurrently with and not after the current processing steps. The social media questions may reduce processing time in many situations because we currently use publicly available social media information in addition to supplementing other information and tools that trained DHS personnel regularly use in the performance of their duties. The collection of this information is not the burden, but DHS is confident in the accuracy of the Burden Estimate and the collection field will allow the applicant to provide as many identifiers as possible.

Privacy

Govt Burden

Adding the proposed social media question to these DHS forms will have a minimal impact on the total time it takes a respondent to complete these applications. The average time burden to complete these applications will increase by an average of 40 minutes, as most social media users do not utilize multiple usernames regularly. Applicants are not expected to include accounts designed for use by multiple users within a business or other organization. If applicants use multiple platforms, they must provide that information to the best of their ability. Some commenters expressed concern that USCIS underestimated the burden of the addition of more in-depth form and instructional content, USCIS agrees that the initial burden estimate was insufficient and has increased the burden. Publicly available information is accessible to anyone, without a warrant. Anyone can view this data, and DHS is not unique in reviewing it. Social media provides valuable insights into aliens’ movements, relationships, and behaviors. DHS can use the content of aliens’ public social media to assess and identify potential national security and public safety threats. By combining geotags, relationship mapping, and other data, DHS can identify fraud, make more informed decisions on eligibility for immigration benefits, locate and apprehend aliens who are in the U.S. illegally, figure out how to better protect the American people to engage in constitutionally protected speech;

Applicant Burden/Delays

Connections Not Giving Consent

- (b) ensure that no Federal Government officer, employee, or agent engages in or facilitates any conduct that would unconstitutionally abridge the free speech of any individual;
- (c) ensure that no taxpayer resources are used to engage in or facilitate any conduct that would unconstitutionally abridge the free speech of any individual.

This EO also states in Section 4 - General Provisions, "Nothing in this order shall be construed to impair or otherwise affect:

- (i) the authority granted by law to an executive department or agency, or the head thereof..."

DHS maintains that the collection of the proposed data does not violate the First amendment to the U.S. Constitution and DHS notes that the collection of this information is specifically. Furthermore, Sec. 4 clarifies that it does not impair nor affect the authority granted to DHS to administer and enforce the United States immigration laws. The request does not relate to the above stated E.O., nor does the E.O. alter DHS's authority.

Violating EOs

Overreach / 4th Amendment/Unconstitutional	<p>Federal laws, including the Immigration and Nationality Act (INA) and Homeland Security Act of 2002, provide authority for this information and 8 C.F.R. § 287.5(a)(2) empower officers and agents to “take and consider evidence concerning the privilege of any person to enter, reenter, or remain in the United States. Similarly, for naturalization purposes, INA § 335, 8 U.S.C. § 1446, empowers any employee of USCIS to conduct a personal investigation of the applicant concerning the admissibility of the applicant for naturalization, and require the production of relevant books, papers, and documents. For the purposes of 8 C.F.R. § 217.5, 8 C.F.R. § 217.5 authorize DHS to collect data elements as the Secretary deems necessary to issue a travel authorization. This collection is not related to Fourth Amendment protections to the extent such protections are applicable in this context. CBP and USCIS personnel will only use publicly available social media information, and as the Supreme Court has explained, “What a person knowingly exposes to the public . . . is not a subject of a Fourth Amendment search.” <i>United States v. Jacobsen</i>, 389 U.S. 347, 351 (1967); see, e.g., <i>Palmieri v. United States</i>, 72 F. Supp. 3d 191, 210 (D.D.C. 2014) (holding that a Plaintiff cannot claim a reasonable expectation of privacy in the information [the Plaintiff] made available to ‘friends’ on his Facebook page”); <i>United States v. Mereish</i>, 859 F.3d 908, 914 (9th Cir. 2017) (“If a social media user disseminates his postings and information to the public, they are not protected by the Fourth Amendment.”). The Privacy Act does not protect an individual’s exercise of rights guaranteed by the First Amendment if they are “expressly authorized by statute or by the individual about whom the information is collected.” The entirety of the Fifth Amendment of the Constitution of the United States states, “No person shall be held to answer for a capital, or other crime, by indictment of a Grand Jury, except in cases arising in the land or naval forces, or in the Militia, when in actual service in time of War or public danger, nor shall be twice put in jeopardy of life or limb; nor shall be compelled in any criminal case to be a witness against himself, nor be deprived of life, liberty, or property, without just compensation.”</p>
5th Amendment (due process)	<p>However, DHS understands that these commenters are referring to the Due Process Clause located toward the end of the Fifth Amendment, “No person shall be deprived of life, liberty, or property, without due process of law...” Due process is listed under both the Fifth and Fourteenth Amendments. Both amendments guarantee the right to due process. The Supreme Court has construed the Fourteenth Amendment’s Due Process Clause to impose the same due process limitations on the states as it has on the federal government. As DHS is part of the Executive Branch, and thus, the Federal Government, the Fifth Amendment is the relevant amendment. Impact the due process rights that USCIS accords to applicants, petitioners, or benefit requestors. For example, in general, USCIS would not</p>
Waste of tax payer dollars	<p>Unlike many other federal agencies, USCIS is primarily (roughly 96%) fee funded, meaning its operations are funded by fees charged to applicants rather than taxpayer money, and this funding is used to adjudicate immigration benefit requests and related services. Fees collected by USCIS are used to cover the costs of adjudicating immigration benefit requests. Congress does provide a small portion (approximately 4%) of the agency’s budget. DHS seeks to balance its goals of securing the U.S. border and immigration system while facilitating legitimate travel and immigration benefits for the decisions of a limited amount of travelers or immigration benefit seekers, DHS’s top priority is the safety and security of the American people. DHS does not unnecessarily burden applicants, but rather seeks to obtain all information necessary to maintain a robust and dynamic screening system. social media identifiers will significantly affect processing times for most applicants.</p>
Hurt American Businesses/Society	<p>DHS is steadfastly committed to the highest standards of conduct, especially when it comes to the fair, unbiased, and transparent enforcement of immigration laws. social media identifiers will be used to help enforce our immigration laws by assisting in the adjudication of eligibility to travel to or be admitted to the United States for a related benefit. Existing DHS policy prohibits the consideration of race or ethnicity in our investigation, screening, and enforcement activities. Existing DHS policy is reaffirmed in manuals, policies, directives, and guidelines. Existing DHS policy also prohibits profiling, targeting, or discrimination against any individual based on race, ethnicity, or rights.</p>
Discriminatory/Safety Risk	<p>We will not use the information in a discriminatory manner that prevents entry into the United States or denies benefits based on the applicant’s race, national origin, or disability. DHS will handle social media identifiers in the same manner as other information collected for travel or immigration purposes. data point for vetting travelers and benefit requestors and is intended to complement other information, including other application data provided by the applicant. data point for vetting travelers and benefit requestors and is intended to complement other information, including other application data provided by the applicant. determinations based on the totality of the circumstances. In addition, generally, USCIS would not deny a benefit based on social media information. Social media is a prominent component of modern society, and DHS’s efforts to protect the homeland must evolve as society evolves. Give us the authority to ask for and review this information. All information provided by the applicant may be used to vet the applicant. In addition to checking against publicly available sources of publicly available information, including social media information, as part of the existing vetting process to screen the information.</p> <p>If an initial screening indicates possible information of concern or a need to further validate information, a trained officer will have timely visitation to social media platforms associated with the social media identifier(s) provided by the applicant, along with other information and tools these officers regularly use. We will review said platforms in a manner consistent with the privacy settings the applicant has chosen to adopt for those platforms.</p>
Ineffective / Inefficient / Existing collection is sufficient.	<p>Social media may be used to support or corroborate application information, which will help USCIS’ mission to administer the nation’s lawful immigration and facilitate legitimate travel by providing an additional means to adjudicate issues related to relevant questions about identity, occupation, previous travel, and potential deception or fraud. Further, it may help detect potential threats because criminals and terrorists, whether intentionally or not, have used social media that identified their true intentions. Social media may therefore help distinguish individuals of additional concern from those individuals who are eligible to travel to or entry into the United States or immigration benefits. In addition, generally, USCIS would not deny a benefit based on social media information. petitioner, or benefit requestor with the information and providing an opportunity to explain it or rebut any negative inferences USCIS may have drawn.</p> <p>DHS’s proposal is respectful of individual privacy and strictly adheres to Federal privacy laws and guidance and Departmental privacy policies. DHS will not be asked to violate any privacy settings or policies. DHS is updating the Privacy Impact Assessments (PIA) and System of Record Notices on the collection, use, and assessment of the privacy risks associated with these enhancements. DHS takes the protection and security of all Personally Identifiable Information (PII) in accordance with privacy laws and guidance and Departmental policies and procedures for protecting PII. CBP and USCIS take precautions to maintain the security of the information collected. Safeguards include controls that limit access of the information to only authorized users. These safeguards employ advanced security measures to protect our systems from unauthorized access. To ensure compliance with these policies, CBP and USCIS personnel complete training on the operation and use of Social Media Rules of Behavior before any social media use and annually thereafter, if operational use of social media is a continuing requirement. Social media information is collected and stored in accordance with the System of Records Notices (SORN) that describe CBP collection, see 84 FR 30746 (June 27, 2019) for EST-007 and the Visa Update System (EVUS). The data collected by USCIS will be safeguarded and stored in accordance with DHS/USCIS-007 Benefits Information System (BIS). DHS has a layered approach to security and any social media identifiers collected would be only one piece of a large mixture of information collected. Although the potential exists for an applicant to provide false or inaccurate information, the response (or lack thereof) the applicant provides to an inquiry pursued by the DHS officer. The potential for inaccurate/false social media or other application information does not render the collection of social media information by-case determinations based on the totality of the circumstances consistent with its authorities. In addition, generally, USCIS would not deny a benefit based on social media information. first confronting the applicant, petitioner, or benefit requestor with the information and providing an opportunity to explain it or rebut any negative inferences USCIS may have drawn. C.F.R. § 103.2(b)(16)(i) and (ii).</p>
No SM Presence / False Info / Not reliable	<p>Individuals who present a threat to national security or public safety are not eligible for certain benefits and U.S. immigration laws preclude the issuance of benefits to individuals with certain disqualifying characteristics including association with terrorist organizations. See, e.g., INA § 208(b)(2)(C) (INA § 245(a)(2), 8 U.S.C. § 1255(a)(2) (admissibility requirements for adjustment of status applicants and agency discretion); and INA § 316(b)(1) (requirement for naturalization). Investigation of social media activity will assist us in making sure that these requirements are met.</p>
Police State/Fascism/Anti-Democracy	

These commenters are referring to the Equal Protection clause located at the end of Section 1 of the Fourteenth Amendment of the Constitution. The clause states: "All persons born or naturalized in the United States, and subject to the jurisdiction thereof, are citizens of the United States and of the State where they reside. No State shall make or enforce any law which shall abridge the privileges or immunities of citizens of the United States; nor shall any State deprive any person of life, liberty, or property without due process of law; nor shall within its jurisdiction the equal protection of the laws."

14th Amendment

Due process falls under both the Fifth and Fourteenth Amendments and both amendments use the same language to different affect. The Supreme Court has used the Fourteenth Amendment's Due Process Clause to impose the same due process limitations on the states as the Fifth Amendment does on the federal government. Thus, the Federal Government, it is not clear how the Fourteenth Amendment is applicable in this instance. The commenters provided no explanation of how DHS's role in reviewing publicly available social media information accessed via social media identifier(s) provided by applicants is appropriate to protect the public from threats and facilitate legitimate trade and travel. This includes denying travel and immigration benefits to inadmissible aliens, as appropriate, and terrorists.

Not DHS' job

Violates SM Platform TOS

Anonymous Platforms

Imprecise/confusing SM terms + unreliable responses

CBP and USCIS officers make their decisions based on the requirements of U.S. immigration law. Information found on social media via the vetting process and identify potential threats. For example, social media may be used to support or corroborate a traveler's or benefit seeker's information. DHS adjudicates issues related to relevant questions about identity, occupation, previous travel, and other factors. It may also be used to identify potential threats. DHS will only be viewing publicly available information on the platforms associated with the social media identifier(s). DHS will not be making decisions based on an individual's privacy settings to help establish the individual's eligibility for travel, entry, or benefits. Additionally, DHS will not collect social media information. Social media information is one data point for vetting travelers or those seeking other immigration benefits and is intended to complement other information provided by applicants. Trained DHS personnel will review the publicly available social media information associated with the social media identifier(s) on a case-by-case determinations based on the totality of the circumstances. DHS has a layered approach to security and any social media identifiers are reviewed. DHS believes the term "social media identifier" is sufficiently descriptive and will be commonly understood by the public to signify one's "usual" social media. We think the terms used and the additional information in form instructions are sufficient, but we welcome public comments on additional terms. The platforms selected represent those which are among the most popular on a global basis. The platforms listed may be updated by the Department to evolve the U.S. Government's uniform vetting with emerging communication technologies and common usage; therefore, the list will change over time. The platforms are recognizable, but the form also offers the ability for the user to enter their preferred social media platform.

A person who does not speak English may prepare the form with the assistance of an interpreter. The interpreter must read each question to the applicant and explain the menu choices for section of the correct response. The applicant must certify that the interpreter named on the form has also read every question and her answer to every question, in a language in which he or she is fluent and that they understand every question and instruction on the form.

ESL (Applicant language issues)

DHS Complacency

AI Concerns

Generic Clearance Inappropriate

Embarassing (international)/Reprisal

General Opposition

Out of Scope

Support

PPC

Social Media as modern town square

DHS understands that the name of some social media platforms may not translate completely or exactly to a foreign language, but that is true for many names. We do not think that most social media companies go by a different name in different countries. To the extent that they do, DHS believes that the name referenced in the options provided is one that they have used. This is further strengthened by social media platforms' use of branding, a digital footprint, and other factors. DHS will make case-by-case determinations based on the totality of the evidence. DHS has a layered approach to security and any social media information is reviewed. A large mixture of information used in the analysis of the applicant's eligibility. Though there may be the potential for an applicant to provide false information (thereof) provided in conjunction with the other information considered will help inform our direction of inquiry. Determinations for travel, entry, and immigration benefits will be made by trained DHS officers and not by computer systems or algorithms. Social media information accessed via the social media identifier(s) provided by applicants as additional data points to assist in its vetting of the applicant. Information reviewed, and a case-by-case determination will be made by DHS officers based on the totality of the circumstances. **In addition, generally, information without first confronting the applicant, petitioner, or benefit requestor with the information and providing an opportunity to explain the information.** The process used by DHS to obtain this generic clearance is identical to the process to obtain any new OMB control number. The use of a blanket clearance is not appropriate for the public for responding by applying comments broadly to multiple individual Information Collections in one location. This method allows the public to respond at once rather than having to seek them all out individually. While the term "generic" may imply that the collection is minor or insignificant, it does not mean the same level of justification, support, need, analysis, and approval as any other package approved by OMB under the Paperwork Reduction Act. The United States is a beacon of admiration across the world. Our economic, cultural, military, and technological achievements remain unmatched. We will continue to lead the world in responding to new and emerging technologies to secure our homeland. If other nation states harbor a desire to retaliate against the U.S. government, then the U.S. government will address those parties. DHS will not limit our proactive and protective actions due to fear of reprisal. Commenters did not make clear objections so DHS cannot respond other than to acknowledge the number of general opposition public comments. DHS did not address these comments because they are outside the scope of the proposed generic clearance. DHS appreciates the positive feedback and comments.

To the commenter who wrote the entirety of the lyrics to "Pink Pony Club" by Chappell Roan: while this respondent does appreciate Ms. Roan's music, we cannot address this comment as it was out of scope.

Support
Oppose

Name	Estimate
CJ	3377
Joyce	4200
Cara	2000

Support

Support

Support

Support

Support

Support

Support

Support

Support

Support

Support

Support

Support

Support

Support

Support

Support

Support

Support

Support

Support

Support

Support

Support

Support

Support

Support

Support

Support

Support

Support

Support

Support

Support

Support

Support

Support

Support

Support

Support

Support

Support

Support

Support

Support

Support

Support

Support

Support

Support

Support

Support

Support

Support

Support

Support

Support

Support

Support

Support

Support

Support

Support

Support

Support

Support

Support

Support