

FLORIDA LOSS

On August 23, U.S. District Court Judge William T. Hodges, a Nixon appointee, upheld Florida law which requires new political parties to pay the government's cost of checking their petition signatures. *Fulani v Krivanek*, no. 88-671, Middle District, Tampa Division.

Judge Hodges had refused to issue an injunction against the fees, back in 1988, when the case was first filed. He then delayed the case for almost three years. He has now upheld the constitutionality of the fees, despite the fact that they are waived for Democrats, Republicans, independent candidates, and even committees sponsoring initiative petitions, when those groups cannot afford them. Only third parties must pay them in all circumstances, whether they can afford them or not.

Judge Hodges based his decision on some casual language in a 1983 decision by the U.S. Court of Appeals in *Libertarian Party v State of Florida*, even though in that case, no one was challenging the fees! The comments in that 1983 case were mere incidental remarks (the technical term for such language in a decision is "dicta").

There are two unanimous U.S. Supreme Court decisions which hold that mandatory filing fees are unconstitutional, one from Texas and one from California. Judge Hodges paid so little attention to these decisions that he confused them, referring to the California case (*Lubin v Panish*) as a Texas case. He wrote that the Supreme Court precedents don't control this case because the chief determinant of whether a new party has any support in Florida is whether it can obtain the needed signatures. "The fee is incidental to that requirement and necessary to assure that the signatures are genuine and valid", he wrote. In other words, mandatory fees are O.K. as long as they are an *additional* requirement for ballot access! Under this reasoning, the Supreme Court would have upheld mandatory filing fees if they were accompanied by severe petition requirements which were also mandatory!

Judge Hodges' statement that the fees are necessary in order to learn whether the signatures are valid, is absurd. Obviously, the signatures can be checked by the government, even if checking fees are not paid. Only two states, Florida and North Carolina, require petitioners to pay the government for the cost of checking the signatures.

Judge Hodges also failed to mention that these same Florida checking fees were held unconstitutional in 1972 by a 3-judge U.S. District Court. That decision, *Jenness v Miller*, 346 F Supp 1060, was won by the Socialist Workers Party in 1972. The state claims that the *Jenness* decision only applies to the Socialist Workers Party, but there is nothing in the opinion to suggest such a conclusion, and if there were, there would be obvious equal protection problems with such a decision.

Lenora Fulani and the New Alliance Party plan to appeal, and hope that the appeal will be won in time for 1992.

HARVARD ATTACKS THIRD PARTIES

On August 30, a unit of Harvard University released a proposal for "Better Presidential Campaign Coverage" titled "Nine Sundays". The Joan Shorenstein Barone Center on the Press, Politics and Public Policy, which is part of the School of Government at Harvard, advocates that the major TV networks devote at least one hour on each of the nine Sunday evenings immediately preceding presidential elections, to coverage of the Democratic and Republican Party presidential candidates. The report recommends that no coverage be provided any other candidates unless they have at least 10% support in public opinion polls.

The report, written by John Ellis, states "What about third party candidates? Third party candidates would be excluded from participation in all of the proposed formats unless, like George Wallace in 1968, their candidacies could reasonably be considered crucial to the outcome of the race. How does one measure whether a third party candidate is viable or not? We would suggest that a third party candidate who is able consistently to garner a double-digit poll rating (10% or better) in nationally-recognized independent polls, qualifies for inclusion in the overall plan. Those third party candidates (like Gene McCarthy in 1976 and John Anderson in 1980) whose poll numbers wallowed in the single digits and who were in fact inconsequential to the final outcome of the race would be excluded from participation in the Nine Sundays Plan. By getting a legal waiver from the FCC prior to the general election campaign, the networks could avoid frivolous legal challenges from allegedly aggrieved third party candidates."

The "Nine Sundays" plan calls for "conversations" with each of the major party candidates and TV news anchor personalities, on each of five Sunday nights; presidential debates on each of two Sunday nights; a vice-presidential debate on one Sunday night; and final speeches by each of the two presidential candidates on the last Sunday night.

The plan proposes that the commercial TV networks take turns broadcasting the programs, and that they be paid for by ordinary commercial advertising. The plan also assumes that public TV would carry all of the programs.

Due to the August 1 decision by the Federal Communications Commission in the King Broadcast matter (see *B.A.N.* of August 19, 1991), the Equal Time rule would not bar the "Nine Sundays" plan, on commercial television. Whether public TV could participate will be determined by lawsuits which are sure to be filed. The case now pending before the U.S. Supreme Court from Georgia might settle the matter, if the Court takes the case (*Chandler v Georgia Public Telecommunications Commission*). The Court will probably announce on October 7 whether it will hear the case.

Anyone who wishes to comment on the "Nine Sundays" plan may write to the Joan Shorenstein Barone Center at 79 JFK Street, Cambridge MA 02138, or telephone (617) 495-8269.

FISHKIN OK'S THIRD PARTY CANDIDATES BUT PBS SAYS "NO"

Last month, Dr. James Fishkin stated orally that in his opinion, his proposed new forum for presidential candidates should be open to any presidential candidate who has qualified for primary season matching funds.

Unfortunately, Dr. Fishkin has no power over his own idea. WETA-TV, the PBS Station for Washington, D.C., is in control, and WETA says that only Democrats and Republicans will be invited. If you wish to make comments about the policy, write Richard Hutton, Senior Vice-President, WETA, PO Box 2626, Washington, D.C. 20013, tel. (703) 998-2600. Lenora Fulani, the only non-Democrat, non-Republican presidential candidate who has raised enough money to qualify for matching funds, plans to fight the decision.

The August 19 *B.A.N.* covered the Fishkin Plan in more detail. It involves choosing 600 adult Americans at random, flying them free of charge to Austin, Texas on January 17-19, 1992, and letting them listen to the presidential candidates. The voters would then caucus into Democratic and Republican groups and express a preference. The whole session would be televised nationwide on PBS.

KENTUCKY HEARING

On September 13, a hearing was held in federal court in *Libertarian Party of Kentucky v Ehrler*, over several Kentucky ballot access laws passed last year: (1) a requirement that petition signers include their Social Security numbers; (2) a requirement that no one can sign the petition who is not a registered member of that group. The lawsuit also challenges the extremely early petition deadline for non-presidential third party and independent candidates, which has existed in the Kentucky law for almost twenty years. The hearing went well and a decision is expected within a few weeks.

DEBATE BILL GAINS CO-SPONSOR

HR 791, the "Democracy in Debates" Bill, gained two more co-sponsors in the last month, Bill Richardson of New Mexico, and Dennis Eckart of Ohio. Both are Democrats.

ARIZONA IMPROVEMENTS TO BE MADE?

The Commission established to re-write the Arizona election laws recommended on September 12 that ballot access requirements for both third parties and independents be eased. The petition to create a new party would be lowered from 2% of the last vote cast, to 1.33%. The independent candidate petition requirement of 1% of the last vote cast would not be reduced, but the number of days in which an independent may circulate petitions would be expanded from 10 days to several months. The registration requirement for a party to remain qualified would be lowered from 1%, to two-thirds of 1%. The legislature is about to go into special session and should act on the recommendations by mid-October.

FLORIDA, MISSISSIPPI WITHDRAW BAD ADMINISTRATIVE DECISIONS

Both the Mississippi and Florida Secretaries of State recently issued, and then retracted, informal opinions which would have restricted ballot access if they had not been withdrawn. The Mississippi Secretary of State issued an Election Calendar showing that the deadline for independent presidential candidates in 1992 is in January. However, after it was pointed out to him that such a deadline would be unconstitutional under *Anderson v Celebrezze*, he re-interpreted the deadline to be in September of 1992 (the language of the law itself is ambiguous; it says the deadline is 60 days before the election but doesn't indicate whether this is the March primary election or the general election).

Last week, Florida's Secretary of State told the Libertarian Party that it could not begin to collect petitions on its presidential petition until the first week of January 1992. However, on September 12 he acknowledged that there is no restriction on when a third party or independent presidential candidate can begin to circulate a petition. There is a limit on when petitions for *other* office can be circulated in Florida, but it does not apply to presidential petitions.

PENNSYLVANIA CASE FILED

On September 12, the U.S. Taxpayers Party filed a lawsuit in federal court against Pennsylvania law which requires a third party candidate for U.S. Senate this year to submit 41,306 signatures. *Perry v Grant*, no. 1:91-1193, Middle District. The November 5 election is to fill a vacancy. The case was given to Judge James McClure, a Bush appointee who has never before had a ballot access case.

The Taxpayers Party submitted 13,000 signatures (although 2,000 of them were turned in a few hours after the legal deadline), and argues that the normal petitioning requirement should be reduced because the petitioning period was so much shorter this year than it usually is. No one knew for certain that the election would be held, until August 6, and the signatures were due 30 days after that.

MISSOURI VETO UPHELD

On September 12, the Missouri legislature voted on whether or not to uphold Governor John Ashcroft's veto of HB 184. The veto was sustained in the House by 64-87 (a majority voted to override, but a two-thirds vote was required). HB 184 contained ballot access improvements as well as many other unrelated provisions, and had been vetoed for reasons which had nothing to do with the ballot access portion of the bill. Senator Frank Flotron and Representative Sheila Lumpe will re-introduce the ballot access improvements again next year.

CALIFORNIA PRESIDENTIAL PRIMARY

On September 13, the Senate Appropriations Committee defeated AB 1820, the bill to move the date of the presidential primary from June to March.

CALIFORNIA EASES INDEPENDENT LAW

On September 11, SB 608 passed the California legislature. It would somewhat ease ballot access for independent candidates. Current law prohibits anyone from being an independent candidate if that person was a member of a qualified political party at any time during the year before the date of the primary. The bill would change this to a year before the date of the general election.

The bill was introduced to help State Senator Lucy Killea of San Diego, who plans to run for re-election next year as an independent candidate. Killea still has not changed her registration from "Democrat" to "Independent" and therefore she is too late to run as an independent under existing law. Democrats, who control the legislature, are willing to help her because they'd rather have her re-elected as an independent, than to have a Republican win the seat. Her district is strongly Republican. Governor Pete Wilson is expected to sign the bill because he and Senator Killea have been friends for many years.

HEARING ON TERM LIMITS

On September 12, the California Supreme Court heard arguments in *Legislature v Eu*, the case over whether the term limitations passed by the voters last year violate the U.S. Constitution. A decision is three months away. It seems clear that the vote will not be unanimous. Two of the seven justices seemed disposed to hold the initiative unconstitutional, and three justices seemed inclined to uphold it. Two more justices gave little indication of their attitudes.

The court heard from three different sides in the case. The attorney for the California legislature attacked the initiative. The proponents of the initiative defended it. The third side was taken by the Attorney General of California, who defended it but argued that the initiative doesn't do what the proponents say it does. The proponents (and the opponents also) say that the initiative is a lifetime ban on anyone serving more than eight years in the State Senate, or six years in the lower house. The Attorney General reads the initiative differently, and says that all it does is prevent anyone from serving more than eight, or six, years in a row. The wording is ambiguous. The California Supreme Court must not only decide whether the initiative is constitutional, but interpret it.

Opponents of the measure argue that the First and Fourteenth Amendments to the U.S. Constitution prevent a state from banning anyone from serving in the legislature more than 8 years (or 6 years in the case of the lower house), especially if the ban is a lifetime ban.

FULANI CASE APPEALED TO HIGH COURT

1. On September 12, the New Alliance Party appealed *Fulani v Brady* to the U.S. Supreme Court. This is the case over whether organizations which sponsor debates between Republican and Democratic candidates only, may still be classified as "non-partisan", for purposes of possessing tax-exempt status.

MARXISTS WIN ON DISCLOSURE

In 1982, the U.S. Supreme Court ruled unanimously that small, unpopular political parties cannot be forced to reveal the names of their campaign contributors. The Court ruled that there is diminished public need to know who contributes to the campaign of candidates who aren't likely to win, and that unpopular groups have good reason to keep the names of their supporters private. The case was *Brown v Socialist Workers '74 Campaign*.

Most cities in the United States hold non-partisan elections for city office. Some of those cities have been reluctant to accept the idea that the Supreme Court decision applies to Marxist candidates for non-partisan city office. A few years ago, a federal court told Miami that it couldn't enforce disclosure laws against a member of the Socialist Workers Party, and Socialist Action forced the city of San Francisco to yield as well.

On September 5, 1991, the Socialist Workers candidate for Mayor of Des Moines, Iowa, also won an exemption from mandatory disclosure laws. And on September 11, Freedom Socialist Party candidates for Seattle City Council also won an exemption. Both cities, like Miami and San Francisco, have non-partisan elections. The Seattle decision was noteworthy because the Freedom Socialist Party candidates have received enough contributions to qualify for city matching funds, and their opponents argued that anyone receiving that much support, should not be exempt from the disclosure requirements.

OHIO STILL STALLING ON LABEL ISSUE

Last year, a U.S. District Court ruled that it is unconstitutional for Ohio to refuse to let independent candidates have any partisan label on the November ballot (such as the word "Independent"). The state filed a notice of appeal, but has still not filed its appeal brief. Instead, the state has asked the Appeals Court for extension after extension. The Court has just granted an eighth extension of time. The state's brief is now due October 31. The delay is because the state can't make up its mind whether to give up and amend the law, or whether to fight the decision.

Third party activists hope that the legislature will pass a bill letting petitioning candidates choose any label they wish, other than the name of a fully-qualified party, of course. In Ohio, independent candidate ballot access is much easier than new party ballot access, so most Ohio "Independent" candidates are really candidates of third parties, forced to appear on the ballot with no party label.

BALLOT ACCESS NEWS (ISSN 10436898) is published by Richard Winger, Field Representative of the Coalition for Free and Open Elections, \$6 per year, thirteen times per year, every 4 weeks, at 3201 Baker St., San Francisco Ca 94123. Second class postage paid at San Francisco CA. © 1991 by Richard Winger. Permission is freely granted for reprinting *Ballot Access News*.

POSTMASTER: Send address changes to *Ballot Access News* at 3201 Baker St., San Francisco Ca 94123.

POLL HEARING SET IN HIGH COURT

2. The U.S. Supreme Court will hear arguments in *Burson v Freeman*, no. 90-1056, on October 8. This is the case from Tennessee over whether it violates the First Amendment, for a state to outlaw campaigning on election day within 100 feet of a polling place. The Tennessee law does not bar campaigning within 100 feet of a polling place for candidates who are not on the ballot on that day; does not bar petitioning in that space on election day; does not bar exit polling. It merely outlaws campaigning for or against someone who is on the ballot, on that election day. The Tennessee Supreme Court struck it down because the ban is not content-neutral. Generally, bans on speech which selectively permit certain kinds of speech but not other kinds, violate the First Amendment. Twenty-three other states submitted an *amicus* brief on the side of the Tennessee law.

BAN ON PARTY SPEECH ATTACKED

On August 21, the Peace and Freedom Party of California and its candidate for Mayor of San Francisco, Gloria LaRiva, filed a lawsuit against a California law which makes it illegal for a political party to endorse or oppose a candidate for non-partisan office. *LaRiva v Wong*, no. 935788, Superior Court. A hearing will be held on September 27. In California, all city and county elections are technically non-partisan. No other state makes it illegal for a political party to express an opinion about candidates for non-partisan office.

LIBERTARIAN PARTY CONVENTION

On August 29-September 1, the Libertarian Party national convention was held in Chicago. The convention nominated Andre Marrou of Nevada for President and Dr. Nancy Lord of Washington, D.C. for Vice-President.

The convention attracted a good deal of publicity. Much of the convention was broadcast on C-SPAN (the cable television network which usually covers Congress). Unfortunately, the UPI story about the convention stated erroneously that the party has never polled as much as 1% of the presidential vote. The truth is that in 1980 the party polled 1.1% of the presidential vote.

The convention voted to change the Bylaws to make it possible for the national committee to set the 1996 presidential nominating convention at any time from July 1995 through August 1996. Some members of the national committee will attempt to set the 1996 nominating convention in the summer of 1996, rather than the traditional timing of Labor Day in the year before the presidential election year. A later convention means that the party could make meaningful use of its presidential primaries. However, to make the change, it will be necessary for the party to get the laws of approximately twelve states changed, to a system whereby a new party can circulate a petition to get on the ballot *before* it has chosen its nominees (most states already have such a system). The party plans to lobby for the change in those twelve states, and to bring lawsuits if the lobbying doesn't succeed.

GREEN PARTY RE-ORGANIZES

The Greens met in Elkins, West Virginia on August 15-19 and reorganized their national structure. The official national name is now "The Greens/Green Party USA". The national address is Box 30208, Kansas City Mo 64112, tel. (816) 931-9366. The organization is divided into eleven regions. Each region consists of locals. Some of the locals are state party organizing committees; other locals represent states, but are composed of Greens who are not now interested in electoral activity.

This complicated structure results from the fact that many people in the Green movement in the U.S. do support the creation of a Green Party which would contest elections, whereas many others in the movement do not. The new structure, it is believed, will provide a means for all members of the movement to work together.

Plans to run a Green Party candidate in a special congressional election in Arizona ran awry when the petition failed to obtain enough valid signatures.

SOCIALIST PARTY NOMINATES

On August 31-September 2, the Socialist Party national convention chose Quinn Brisben of Illinois for President and William Edwards of California for Vice-President. Edwards, who is African-American, is the first non-Caucasian ever nominated for president or vice-president by the Socialist Party in its 90-year history. Brisben, a teacher, was the party's vice-presidential candidate in 1976.

OTHER PRESIDENTIAL CAMPAIGNS

1. Lenora Fulani, independent presidential candidate and the likely candidate of the New Alliance Party in 1992, has decided not to run in the Democratic Party presidential primaries. She has now raised \$400,000 which can be matched by federal funds.
2. The U.S. Taxpayers Party will name a presidential convention by committee on November 2, 1991.
3. The American Party will choose a presidential candidate in convention December 5-7, 1991, in Pensacola, Florida.
4. The Socialist Workers Party expects to announce a presidential candidate in January or February 1992.
5. The Populist Party expects to nominate Bo Gritz for president in August 1992. In the meantime, Gritz will attempt to qualify for federal matching funds.
6. Ron Daniels, who has been exploring the idea of running for president as an Independent, will make a formal announcement about his plans on October 14.

PEROT TO SPEAK AT THRO MEETING

H. Ross Perot, well-known businessman who once organized a successful raid to rescue some U.S. prisoners of war during the Vietnam War, will speak at the T.H.R.O. meeting in Tampa, Florida on November 2. T.H.R.O. was formed to make congressional elections more competitive, and stands for "Throw the Hypocritical Rascals Out." T.H.R.O. says fifty-eight other allied organizations will be promoting the meeting.

1992 PETITIONING

STATE	REQUIREMENTS			SIGNATURES COLLECTED			DEADLINES	
	FULL PARTY	CAND.	LIBT	NAP	GREEN	POPULIST	PARTY	CAND.
Alabama	12,157	5,000	finished	2,700	0	0	law void	Aug 31
Alaska	2,035	2,035	*finished	0	already on	0	Aug 25	Aug 25
Arizona	21,109	10,555	*15,000	*5,000	*3,000	0	May 16	Sep 18
Arkansas	20,890	0	can't start	can't start	can't start	can't start	May 5?	Sep 1
California	(reg) 79,188	134,781	already on	0	*38,500	0	Dec 31, 91	Aug 7
Colorado	no procedure	5,000	*1,000	0	0	0	-	Aug 4
Connecticut	no procedure	14,620	can't start	can't start	can't start	can't start	-	Aug 7
Delaware	(reg.) 145	(es) 2,900	already on	141	0	0	Aug 22	Jul 15
D.C.	no procedure	(es) 2,600	can't start	can't start	can't start	can't start	-	Aug 18
Florida	180,935	60,312	0	0	0	0	Jul 14	Jul 15
Georgia	26,955	27,009	already on	0	0	*2,000	Aug 4	Aug 4
Hawaii	4,534	4,177	already on	0	3,100	0	Apr 22	Sep 4
Idaho	8,180	4,090	already on	0	*200	0	Aug 31	Aug 25
Illinois	no procedure	25,000	can't start	can't start	can't start	can't start	-	Aug 3
Indiana	no procedure	29,890	*3,000	0	0	0	-	Jul 15
Iowa	no procedure	1,000	0	0	0	0	-	Aug 14
Kansas	15,661	5,000	already on	0	0	0	Apr 11	Aug 4
Kentucky	no procedure	5,000	0	0	0	0	-	Aug 27
Louisiana	(reg) 110,000	0	approx 150	0	0	0	Jun 30	Sep 1
Maine	26,139	4,000	already on	0	0	0	Dec 12,91	Jun 2
Maryland	10,000	(es) 70,000	already on	*4,000	0	*900	Aug 3	Aug 3
Massachs.	(reg) 33,000	11,715	can't start	can't start	can't start	can't start	Jul 1	Jul 28
Michigan	25,646	25,646	already on	0	0	0	Jul 16	Jul 16
Minnesota	92,156	2,000	can't start	can't start	can't start	can't start	ap. May 1	Sep 15
Mississippi	just be org.	1,000	already on	0	0	0	ap. Jan. 2	Sep 4
Missouri	no procedure	20,860	0	0	0	0	-	Aug 3
Montana	9,531	9,531	already on	0	0	0	Mar 12	Jul 29
Nebraska	5,834	2,500	*7,300	0	0	0	Aug 1	Aug 25
Nevada	9,392	9,392	already on	0	0	0	Aug 11	Sep 1
New Hamp.	no procedure	3,000	already on	0	0	0	-	Aug 5
New Jersey	no procedure	800	0	0	0	0	-	Jul 27
New Mexico	2,069	12,409	already on	already on	0	0	Jul 14	Sep 8
New York	no procedure	20,000	can't start	can't start	can't start	can't start	-	Aug 18
North Carolina	43,601	(es) 65,000	*finished	*1,000	0	0	in doubt	Jun 26
North Dakota	7,000	4,000	0	0	0	0	Apr 10	Sep 4
Ohio	34,777	5,000	0	0	0	0	Jan 6	Aug 20
Oklahoma	45,566	35,132	0	0	0	0	Jun 1	July 15
Oregon	(es) 36,000	(att.) 1,000	already on	0	8,000	0	Aug 25	Aug 25
Penn.	no procedure	(es) 27,000	can't start	can't start	can't start	can't start	-	Aug 1
Rhode Isl.	no procedure	1,000	can't start	can't start	can't start	can't start	-	Sep. 4
South Carolina	10,000	10,000	already on	already on	0	0	May 2	Aug 1
South Dakota	6,419	2,568	0	0	0	0	Apr 7	Aug 4
Tennessee	19,759	25	0	0	0	0	ap. May 1	Sep 3
Texas	38,900	54,269	already on	can't start	can't start	can't start	May 25	May 11
Utah	500	300	already on	0	0	0	Mar 16	Sep 1
Vermont	just be org.	1,000	finished	organizing	0	0	Sep 17	Sep 17
Virginia	no procedure	(es) 14,500	can't start	can't start	can't start	can't start	-	Aug 21
Washington	no procedure	200	can't start	can't start	can't start	can't start	-	Jul 25
West Va.	no procedure	6,534	0	0	0	0	-	Aug 1
Wisconsin	10,000	2,000	already on	can't start	can't start	can't start	Jun 1	Sep 1
Wyoming	8,000	7,903	*finished	0	0	0	May 1	Aug 25

LIBT is Libertarian; NAP is New Alliance; POP is Populist. Other qualified national parties are American in S.C., Prohibition in N. M., Soc. Workers in N. M., and Workers World in Mich. and N.M. "FULL PARTY REQ." means a procedure by which a new party can qualify itself before it knows who its candidates are. Not every state has such a procedure. "CANDIDATE REQ." means a procedure whereby a petition names a particular candidate. * entry has changed since the last issue. The Pacific Party in Oregon has 5,000; the American Party in Utah is finished.

RECENT ELECTIONS

- 1. On September 3, a special election was held to fill a New Hampshire legislative vacancy in Derry. The vote was Katsakiores, Republican, 52.8%; Jubinville, Democrat, 25.8%; Gould, Libertarian, 21.4%.
- 2. On September 12, in the Democratic primary for city council, 17th district, New Alliance Party activist Rafael Mendez placed second in a five-candidate contest, losing the Democratic nomination by only XXX votes. He plans to run in November as a New Alliance Party candidate for the same seat.

FEC MAILS \$21 MILLION TO DEMS, REPS

During July, the Federal Election Commission authorized the U.S. Treasury to send \$10,600,000 each to the national Democratic and Republican Parties, to be used to pay for those parties' 1992 national conventions. A supplemental payment will be made next year. Only parties which polled at least 25% of the last presidential vote, are eligible to receive government subsidies to pay for their national conventions.

LEAGUE OF WOMEN VOTERS FEELS HEAT ON SAN FRANCISCO DEBATE

San Francisco chooses a Mayor on November 5, 1991. There are eleven candidates; the election is non-partisan. Five of the candidates are usually labelled "major" by the large newspapers because they are individuals who have already held important city positions.

The League of Women Voters of San Francisco recently announced that it would hold a Mayoral Debate, but that it would only invite candidates who have a 10% showing in polls. This announcement lead to an outcry against the League, since two "major" candidates, Supervisor Tom Hsieh and Assessor Richard Hongisto, are at 8% in the polls. On September 9, the League relented and said it would invite any candidate who has at least 5% standing in the polls.

BALLOT ACCESS GROUPS

- 1. **ACLU**, American Civil Liberties Union, has been for fair ballot access ever since 1940, when it recommended that requirements be no greater than of one-tenth of 1%. 132 W. 43rd St., New York NY 10036, (212) 944-9800.
- 2. **COFOE**, the Coalition for Free and Open Elections. Dues of \$10 entitles one to membership with no expiration date; this also includes a one-year subscription to *Ballot Access News* (or a one-year renewal). Address: Box 355, Old Chelsea Sta., New York NY 10011. Membership applications can also be sent to 3201 Baker St., San Francisco Ca 94123.
- 3. **COALITION TO END THE PERMANENT CONGRESS**, works for reforms to make congressional elections more competitive; has a 9-point platform which includes easier ballot access for independent and minor party candidates. P.O. Box 7309, North Kansas City, Mo. 64116. Membership is \$25 per year.
- 4. **COMMITTEE FOR PARTY RENEWAL**, a group of political scientists, party leaders, and elected officials who believe that strong political parties are needed for popular control of government. Membership is \$10 per year. Write John K. White, Dept. of Politics, Catholic Univ. of America, Washington DC 20064. The Committee filed a brief in support of fairer ballot access laws with the Supreme Court in 1991 in *Norman v Reed*.
- 5. **FOUNDATION FOR FREE CAMPAIGNS & ELECTIONS**, has non-profit status from the IRS. Consequently, it cannot lobby, but deductions to it are tax-deductible. The Foundation was organized to fund lawsuits which attack restrictive ballot access laws. 7404 Estaban Dr., Springfield VA 22151, tel. (703) 569-6782.
- 6. **RAINBOW LOBBY**, organized in 1985, initiated the Penny "Democracy in Debates" bill in Congress and maintains a lobbying office at 1660 L St., N.W., Suite 204, Washington, D.C. 20036, tel. (202) 457-0700. It also works on other issues relating to free elections.

RENEWALS: If this block is marked, your subscription is about to expire. Please renew. Post office rules do not permit inserts in second class publications, so no envelope is enclosed. Use the coupon below.

SECOND CLASS PAID AT SAN FRANCISCO CA

I want to receive **BALLOT ACCESS NEWS**.
I enclose \$6.00 for 1 year (overseas: \$10)
Make check out to "Ballot Access News".

To receive it by First Class Mail, enclose \$8.00

I want to join **COFOE**. Enclosed is \$ _____
(includes one-year subscription to this newsletter, or one-year renewal).
Make check out to "COFOE". Minimum dues are \$10.

Name _____

Address _____

City _____ State _____ Zip _____