

# BALLOT ACCESS NEWS

San Francisco, California

December 12, 1993

Volume 9 Number 10

## 1924 NY TIMES STUDY FOUND; SHOWS DECAY OF US LAW

### BACK IN 1924, MOST STATES HAD OCTOBER PETITION DEADLINE

Timothy Coughlin, a historian with a special interest in U.S. presidential elections, recently found a significant 1924 article in the *New York Times*. The article, on page two of the July 12, 1924 issue, tells the number of signatures, and the deadline, for an independent presidential candidate to get on the ballot in each state in 1924. The article is titled "LaFollette Needs 50,000 State Aids". The article was prompted by the previous week's Progressive Party founding convention. The new party had just nominated U.S. Senator Robert LaFollette for President.

Although ballot access activists had been aware that the number of signatures needed to qualify a new party, or to place an independent presidential candidate, on the ballot in 1924 was only one-fourteenth as many as were required in 1992, the deadline information is new. Thirty of the 48 states in 1924 didn't require new parties or independent presidential candidates to turn in their petitions until October of the election year! The *Times* article, written in mid-July, shows that the deadline for getting LaFollette on the ballot had not passed in any state.

Nowadays, if a new party were formed in mid-July of a presidential election year, and it nominated a presidential candidate, it would already be too late for the candidate to even attempt to get on the ballot in ten states: Arizona, Florida, Georgia, Indiana, Maine, Michigan, Nevada, North Carolina, Oklahoma, and Texas. This is despite a U.S. Supreme Court ruling in 1983 saying that petition deadlines for independent presidential candidates must not be earlier than the date the Republicans and Democrats nominate their presidential candidates (the major parties always nominate in July and August).

The number of signatures to get LaFollette on the ballot of all states in 1924, according to the *Times*, was 50,000, which was one-sixth of 1% of the number of people who voted for president that year. In 1992, the number was 697,188. This was more than two-thirds of 1% of the number of people who voted for president in 1992.

Why is it so important that the 1924 discovery has been made? Unfortunately, there are no published articles or books which document the extent to which ballot access for new political parties in the U.S. is much more difficult than it was fifty or sixty years ago. Present-day writers sometimes make the most outlandish errors of fact when they discuss the subject. Examples:

1. E. J. Dionne, well-known writer on politics, stated in the May 21, 1992 *Washington Post*, "It is easier than ever for third-party presidential candidates to qualify for state ballots." Even though the error was brought to his attention, no correction was run. If the 1924 *New York Times* study had been available to ballot access activists last year, it would have been easier to win a correction.

2. *Third Parties in America*, a well-respected book published in 1984 by Princeton University Press, states on page 23, "Ballot access laws are now as lenient as they have ever been in this century".

3. An article in the *Harvard Law Journal* of April 1975, on page 1138, states that severe ballot access restrictions prevent the "two-party system" (which is not defined in the article) from disintegrating. U.S. history between 1792 and 1931 shows that this is not true; ballot access laws were easy before 1931 but the U.S. still had a two-party system. The 1924 *Times* study makes this easier to demonstrate.

Anyone wishing a copy of the 1924 *Times* state-by-state description of ballot access laws, can obtain one by sending a self-addressed stamped envelope to B.A.N.

### OKLAHOMA BILL TO BE INTRODUCED

Representative Jim Holt, a Republican from Ponca City, has agreed to introduce a bill next year, providing that independent presidential candidates can get on the Oklahoma ballot simply by paying a fee of \$2,000. Currently, independent candidates for other Oklahoma office can get on the ballot with no petition, by paying a fee; but independent presidential candidates have no such choice.

Since Oklahoma requires 41,711 signatures to qualify an independent or third party presidential candidate for 1996, this filing fee alternative would be a great improvement.

### ILLINOIS BILL TO BE INTRODUCED

Representative Cal Skinner, a Republican from Crystal Lake, has agreed to introduce a bill next year to ease the petitioning burden for third party candidates in Illinois for Congress, the State Legislature and County Office.

Current Illinois law provides that third party candidates for these offices must get signatures equal to 5% of the last vote cast for that office (this law does not apply in years after reapportionment, *i.e.* 1982 and 1992). The Skinner bill would lower the these petitions from 5%, to one-half of 1%. That percentage was chosen because it is the same percentage requirement under existing law for Republicans and Democrats to get on their own party's primary ballot.

However, the Skinner bill would only apply to third parties which were simultaneously qualifying statewide candidates for the ballot. A separate petition of 25,000 signatures qualifies third party candidates for statewide office; no change is proposed in this requirement.

This will be the first bill that has been introduced in the Illinois legislature, in at least twenty years, to improve ballot access for third parties (except in instances at which courts forced the Illinois legislature to improve the law).

## OTHER GOOD BILLS LIKELY IN 1994

1. California: The Assembly Elections Committee will hold a hearing on AB 814 in January. It would let a small, qualified party nominate by convention instead of by primary, if it wished.
2. Georgia: HB 606, which has already passed the House, will receive a hearing in the Senate early in 1994. It reduces the number of signatures needed for a statewide third party or independent candidate from 1% of the number of registered voters, to .5%. However, it also changes the format of the petition, so that petition sheets would be postcard-sized and only one signature would fit on each form. Petitioners would be required to alphabetize the signatures, by county, before submitting them.
3. Hawaii: the Lieutenant Governor plans to ask the legislature to legalize write-in voting next year. In the past, bills to legalize write-ins have failed to pass.
4. Iowa: the Natural Law Party is seeking a legislator who will introduce a bill, permitting voters to register as a member of a non-qualified party. For the last twenty years, Iowans have been unable to register to vote unless they chose one of these three categories: Democrat, Republican, or Independent. Iowa is one of only six states which forces voters to make this limited choice.
5. Kansas: the Secretary of State's office is considering whether to ask the legislature to amend the petition deadline for new parties, which is now in April. Since new parties nominate by convention, not by primary, there is no administrative reason why the deadline should be so early in the year.
6. Nebraska: Senator DiAnna Schimek, chair of the Committee which handles election law changes, is working on an omnibus bill to revamp parts of the election code. The bill made legalize write-ins for president at the general election (Nebraska is the only state with a law providing for write-in declarations of candidacy, which specifically excludes presidential write-ins from its provisions).
7. New Hampshire: the bill to make it easier for a party to remain on the ballot has been introduced and will receive a bill number very soon.
8. Pennsylvania: Senator J. Barry Stout is working on a bill to redo write-in procedures. Under current law, all write-ins are supposed to be canvassed; there is no law that write-in candidates who wish to have their write-ins counted, must file a declaration of write-in candidacy.

While this sounds permissive, in practice, half of Pennsylvania's counties fail to count any write-ins for state or federal office. The state Bureau of Elections has confirmed in writing that 33 counties (comprising 43% of the state's voters) failed to report any write-ins in the November 1992 election. Furthermore, the official state election returns always omits write-in candidates from the official state canvass, no matter how many write-ins they receive, even when the counties do count them. A write-in filing law would probably solve these problems.

9. South Carolina: Senator James Bryan has tentatively agreed to introduce a bill to legalize presidential write-ins at the November election. South Carolina permits write-ins generally, but in 1982 banned them for president.

10. West Virginia: Secretary of State Ken Hechler plans to ask the 1994 legislature to repeal the law which provides that voters who sign a petition to get a third party or independent candidate on the ballot, cannot vote in the primary. A similar bill passed the House in 1993 unanimously, but the Chair of the Senate committee which handles election law bills, Senator William R. Wooton, stopped the bill.

Senator Wooton, a Democrat, must run for re-election next year; perhaps the issue could be raised during his campaign. If any reader wishes to write him, his address is 117 Granville Ave., Beckley, W.V. 25801. West Virginia and Texas are the only states which enforce a law that says that voters cannot sign a ballot access petition and also vote in the primary; and at least Texas lets the petition be circulated after the primary. West Virginia does not permit this, except for presidential petitions.

## PENNY RAISES COPENHAGEN ISSUE

On December 3, Congressman Tim Penny, sponsor of HR 1755, the ballot access bill, wrote a letter to U.S. Secretary of State Warren Christopher. The letter briefly describes the ballot access problem in the U.S., and asks the State Department to investigate whether the U.S. is in compliance with the Document of the Copenhagen Meeting. The United States signed the Document of the Copenhagen Meeting in 1990, thereby pledging that it would not discriminate for or against any political party. For more on the Document, see page five and the entry on page six for The Democracy Project.

The Czech Republic, Russia and Ukraine have already asked to see evidence collected by The Democracy Project.

Congressman Peter Hoekstra, a Michigan Republican, recently recently co-sponsored HR 1755, the Ballot Access bill. The bill now has 18 co-sponsors besides Penny.

Now that Congress has adjourned, it should be easier for anyone to meet with any member of Congress. If you are interested in asking your member of Congress to co-sponsor either HR 1755 (or HR 1753, the Penny Debates bill), contact either *B.A.N.* or Ross-Green Associates (address on page 6) for material to help you. Anyone who sends *B.A.N.* a copy of a letter from a member of Congress commenting on HR 1755 (if the member of Congress isn't already a co-sponsor) will receive a 3-month extension of a *B.A.N.* subscription.

## DECEMBER 7, 1993 ELECTIONS

1. Michigan held a special election for U.S. House, 3rd district, on December 7: Republican 66.6%, Democratic 23.2%, independent 10.2%.
2. Wisconsin held a special election for Assembly, 59th district, on December 7: Republican 78.7%, independent 14.4%, Libertarian 6.9%.

## POLITICAL PARTY RIGHTS HEARING

On November 10, a hearing was held in the U.S. Court of Appeals, D.C. Circuit, in *Freedom Republicans v FEC*, no. 92-5214. This is the case over whether the FEC must draw up procedures which will force the Republican Party to have more African-Americans in delegations to its national convention. If such regulations were in place and the Republican Party did not abide by them, the FEC would then be instructed to cut off funding for the Republican Party's general election presidential funding.

The basis for the lawsuit is Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, which forbids the federal government from funding any organization which discriminates against anyone on the basis of race, color or national origin.

Back on April 7, 1992, U.S. District Court Judge Charles Richey had ordered the FEC to adopt such regulations. The FEC appealed. The three judges hearing the case in the Court of Appeals are Patricia Wald (a Carter appointee), James Buckley and Douglas Ginsburg (Reagan appointees).

Judges Wald and Ginsburg seemed to suggest by their questions that they doubt that Freedom Republicans organization has standing to bring the lawsuit. A decision is expected in a few months.

## TERM LIMITS CONGRESSIONAL HEARING

On November 18, a Subcommittee of the House Judiciary Committee held its first hearing on congressional term limits. The only members of the Subcommittee in attendance were Don Edwards (D-Cal), Henry Hyde (R-Ill), Bill McCollum (R-Fl) and Bob Inglis (R-SC). Testifying against congressional term limits were Norman Ornstein of the American Enterprise Institute, and Thomas Mann of the Brookings Institution. Testifying in favor were Mark Petracca, a political science professor at the University of California at Irvine, and David Mason of the Heritage Foundation.

The only discussion relating to the issue of free choice for voters was by Mann, who said "Alexander Hamilton said it best: It is a 'fundamental principle of our representative democracy that the people should choose whom they please to govern them, and that this principle is undermined as much by limiting whom the people can select as by limiting the franchise itself."

However, Mann has not responded to a letter, sent by *B.A.N.* shortly after the hearing, that he express an opinion about other restrictive ballot access laws, specifically laws which usually give the Democratic and Republican Parties a monopoly on the ballot in half of all congressional races.

Congressman Hyde said that members of Congress do need to be professionals, and that it is appropriate for service in Congress to be a life-time job. Congressmen Inglis and McCollum support the idea of congressional term limits. Congressman Edwards, chairing the meeting, promised to hold additional hearings on the subject in 1994.

## FLORIDA FEE LAWSUIT FILED

On November 29, a lawsuit was filed against Florida law which specifies that the Republican and Democratic Parties receive over half of the candidate filing fees that their members pay, whereas the government keeps all of the filing fee paid by candidates of other parties. *Libertarian Party of Florida v Smith*, no. 93-5017, Leon County Circuit Court. A similar lawsuit was won last year against Georgia.

## CAROLINA PARTIES CAN CHANGE NAME

Last month, the South Carolina Election Commission ruled that a qualified party may change its name. The American Party of South Carolina was told it may change its name to the U.S. Taxpayers Party. Other states which have ruled that a qualified party may change its name, without having to re-qualify, since 1980 (or which provide by law that a party can do this) are Alabama, Arkansas, Kansas, Kentucky, Massachusetts, Michigan, Minnesota, New Mexico, Oregon, Pennsylvania, Utah and Wisconsin.

## LaROUCHE WINS FUNDS & RELEASE

On November 29, the U.S. Supreme Court announced that it would not hear the Federal Election Commission's appeal of Lyndon LaRouche's primary season matching fund case. That means that the FEC must now process LaRouche's application for 1992 primary season matching funds. The FEC had refused to do so earlier, on the grounds that earlier LaRouche campaigns had a history of non-compliance with the federal campaign act.

On December 1, the U.S. Parole Commission announced that LaRouche would be paroled from federal prison, on the first day he is eligible, January 26, 1994. It is likely that his early parole came about partly because the LaRouche organization has done an effective job of persuading politicians and civic leaders outside the U.S. to protest LaRouche's incarceration. He has been in prison since 1988.

The LaRouche organization is not a political party. Its members are Democrats and they run in Democratic primaries. However, LaRouche usually runs for president as an independent after he loses his quest for the Democratic presidential nomination; and in Virginia the LaRouche organization runs its candidates as independents, since the Democratic Party in Virginia generally nominates by convention instead of by primary.

---

**BALLOT ACCESS NEWS** (ISSN 10436898) published by Richard Winger, Field Rep, Coalition for Free and Open Elections, \$7 per year, 13 times per year, every 4 weeks, at Bx 470296, San Francisco CA 94147. Second class postage paid at San Francisco CA. © 1993 by Richard Winger. Permission is granted for reprinting *Ballot Access News* with attribution. Prodigy address: BBJK79A. Internet: ban@igc.apc.org.

POSTMASTER: Send address changes to *Ballot Access News* at Bx 470296, San Francisco Ca 94147-0296.

## MORE ON NOV. 1993 ELECTIONS

The November 14 *B.A.N.* carried a chart giving the vote for third parties in state legislative elections on November 2, 1993. However, the chart omitted the New Party's legislative candidates in Missouri and New Jersey, since they used the ballot label "Independent" instead of "New Party" and *B.A.N.* didn't know they were New Party candidates.

In Missouri's 69th House District, the New Party's Bill Conway was the only third party legislative candidate in the U.S. to outpoll a major party candidate. The results: Democrat 49.1%, New Party 38.9%, Republican 12.0%.

The last *B.A.N.* accidentally put the Green Party Virginia vote on the New Jersey line. In reality, the Green Party had legislative candidates in Virginia, not New Jersey.

In local races, there were additional third party winners besides the ones mentioned in the last *B.A.N.* Robert Lewis, a member of the American Independent Party, won a seat on the Rowland Heights (Los Angeles County) Water Board. Two other Pennsylvania Libertarians won partisan races: John Erb won for Rapho Township Tax Collector (Lancaster County); and Ted Slampyak won for Election Judge, Warminster Township (Bucks County).

## LIBERTARIANS SET 1996 CONVENTION

The Libertarian Party National Committee, on December 11, will almost certainly set the party's presidential nominating convention for July 4-7, 1996. The site will be Dallas or Washington, D.C. This will be the first time since 1972 that any third party which hoped to be on the ballot in all the states, or even most states, has dared to choose its presidential candidate so late in the election year. Although third parties routinely chose their presidential candidates in the late spring or early summer of the election year in the 1920's and earlier decades, hostile ballot access laws enacted since then have virtually forced third parties to make their choice much earlier.

Advantages for the party in holding a late convention are:

1. The party will be able to use its presidential primaries. It will probably have presidential primaries in 1996 in California, Idaho, Massachusetts, Montana, Nebraska, New Hampshire, and South Dakota. A few other states are possibilities as well, depending on where the party qualifies for "party" status in 1994 and 1995: Maine, North Carolina, North Dakota, Ohio, and Oklahoma.

If there is a contest for the Libertarian presidential nomination, it will be the first time that a nationally-organized third party has used presidential primaries in more than just one state, to help it decide whom to nominate.

2. Candidates for the party's nomination won't need to begin campaigning at the beginning of 1995; instead they can wait until the end of 1995, or even later. This should increase the number of people who will consider running.

3. The party's decision as to whom to nominate can be made at a time when the issues and likely contenders from other parties are known.

## 1994 PETITIONING

The 1994 petitioning chart which usually appears will return in the next issue. In the last month, the only petition which has obtained more than 1,000 signatures is the New Alliance petition in Indiana, which is up to 36,000 signatures. The Libertarian Arizona registration drive won't start until February 1, 1994.

Also in the next issue will be an analysis of how the campaign finance bills, S.3 and HR 3, would affect third parties if they were enacted. Each bill has passed its own House of Congress, but the two bills are very dissimilar.

### BOOK REVIEW: *REAL CHOICES, REAL VOICES, The Case for Proportional Representation*, by Douglas J. Amy

*Real Choices, New Voices* is both interesting and scholarly. It is a book written to persuade the public that the U.S. would be better off if proportional representation were used to elect public officials.

There is a chapter showing that women would be represented in greater numbers in U.S. law-making bodies, if proportional representation were used. As evidence, Amy points to Ireland and Switzerland, nations where feminism lags behind the U.S., yet nations with substantially more women law-makers.

There is a chapter showing that ethnic minorities would be better off; a chapter showing that gerrymandering would cease to be a problem; a chapter showing that under p.r., campaigns would be more issue-oriented and less centered on the personalities of various candidates. The book's conclusions are supported by historical evidence and evidence from nations which use p.r.

But the book's main thrust is that all voters would benefit, because the phenomenon of the "wasted vote" would almost cease to exist.

The book's most interesting chapter takes on the arguments against p.r. and shows why they have less validity than one would otherwise think. Finally, there is a chapter which discusses how p.r. might eventually be brought to the U.S.

The book suffers somewhat because it was obviously written before the November 1992 election, even though it only appeared in print two months ago. Some of the book's statements ceased to be true after the 1992 election. Also, the book will irritate Libertarians, since Amy has apparently never heard the Libertarian argument that Libertarian ideas are neither "left" nor "right", and that the a two-dimension chart of political ideas is the only meaningful way to talk about ideologies. Amy characterizes the party as "conservative" or "far right" almost every time he mentions it.

The chief drawback of the book is its cost, \$32.50 for a hardback copy (there is no paperback edition). Order from Columbia University Press, 35 S. Broadway, Irvington NY 10533, (800) 944-8648. The book has 278 pages.

## Copenhagen Violator of the Month: COLORADO

The Sep. 19, 1993 *B.A.N.* reported that the first hearings had been held, to establish that the U.S. is in violation of an international accord it signed in 1990, the Copenhagen Document, part of the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe (the "Helsinki Accords"). The Copenhagen Document pledges all the signing nations not to discriminate for or against any political party or any candidate, to guarantee equal suffrage rights to all citizens, and to ensure that votes are counted and reported honestly.

Since then, each *B.A.N.* carries an example of a state or federal law or policy which obviously violates the Copenhagen Meeting accord. This issue's example concerns the Colorado definition of "political party", and the state's lack of procedures for new parties.

If a new party wishes to run candidates for all federal, state and county partisan offices in Colorado in 1994, it would need a total of 279,057 valid signatures. When either the Republican or Democratic Party run party-endorsed candidates for the same offices, none of them need any signatures (except in Pitkin County, where each Democratic and Republican county slate needs 1,500 signatures).

Furthermore, in some counties, individuals who wish to help a new party get its complete slate of candidates on the ballot would be obliged to sign 16 separate petitions!

A party formed in 1992 would still need 279,057 signatures to run a full slate of 1994 candidates, even if it had outpolled the Democrats and Republicans in 1992 and even if it had the most registered members. Yet Republicans and Democrats with support from their party wouldn't need any signatures, outside of Pitkin County.

To show how outlandish the Colorado law is, below are the number of signatures needed for a new party to run a complete slate of candidates for all 1994 partisan federal, state and county offices in the other Western states:

Alaska	9,051 signatures to qualify the party's candidates for the general election ballot
Arizona	19,827 signatures to qualify the party (a party could then nominate by write-in at its own primary with no more signatures needed; there is no minimum number of write-ins to nominate candidates for a new party)
California	78,992 registrants + 6,760 signatures of party members to get the party's candidates on primary ballots
Hawaii	4,645 signatures to qualify the party + 1,405 signatures to get candidates on primary ballots
Idaho	9,643 signatures to qualify the party (it could then nominate by convention if it hadn't used its primary)
Montana	10,471 signatures to qualify the party (its candidates get on the party's primary ballot by paying filing fees)
Nevada	4,920 signatures to qualify the party (it then nominates by convention)
New Mexico	2,850 signatures to qualify the party + 11,400 signatures to qualify the party's candidates
Oregon	16,681 signatures to qualify the party (it then nominates by convention)
Utah	500 signatures to qualify the party (it then nominates by convention)
Washington	1,625 convention attendees at meetings could qualify all the party's candidates for the primary ballot
Wyoming	8,000 signatures to qualify the party (it then nominates by convention)

Colorado Rev. Statutes sec. 1-1-104(18): "'Political party' means any political organization which at the last preceding gubernatorial election was represented on the official ballot either by regular party candidates or by individual nominees only if it cast for its gubernatorial candidate at least 10% of the total gubernatorial vote cast in the state at such election."

There is a gap in the law: there is no procedure for a group to become a "party" until after it has polled 10% of the vote for Governor. Governor is elected only in the mid-term elections, *i.e.*, 1990, 1994. Thus it is impossible for a party to come into legal existence in an odd year or in a presidential election year.

Furthermore, the procedures for independent candidates (the only procedures that can be used for ballot access, if a group is not yet a "party" under the law) specify that no more than one candidate can ever be named on a petition. Sec. 1-4-801 says "Each petition shall contain only the name of one candidate for one office" (except that president and vice-president are listed on a single petition, as are Governor and Lieutenant Governor).

NATIONALLY-ORGANIZED PARTIES

These are the nationally-organized parties which have run candidates in 1993 or 1992 (other than just for president):

- 1. American, Bx 25940, Richmond Va 23260
2. \*Communist, 239 W. 23rd St., New York NY 10011
3. Democratic, 430 S. Capitol, SE, Wash. DC 20003
4. Grassroots, Bx 8011, St. Paul Mn 55108
5. Green, Bx 30208, Kansas City Mo 64112
6. Independence, 16 S. Broadway, Windgap Pa 18091 (this party may change its name at its March 1994 meeting)
7. \*Libertarian, 1528 Pa. Ave. SE, Wash DC 20003
8. \*Natural Law, 51 W Washington St, Fairfield Ia 52556
9. \*New, 227 W. 40th St, #1303, New York NY 10018
10. \*New Alliance, Bx 889, New York NY 10014
11. Populist, Bx 15499, Pittsburgh Pa 15237
12. \*Prohibition, Bx 2635, Denver Co 80201
13. Republican, 310 First St SE, Washington DC 20003
14. \*Socialist, 516 W 25 St., 404, New York NY 10001
15. Socialist Workers, 406 West St., NY, NY 10014
16. \*US Taxpayers, 450 Maple Ave E, Vienna Va 22180
17. Workers League, Bx 5174, Southfield Mi 48086
18. Workers World, 55 W. 17 St, New York NY 10011

BALLOT ACCESS GROUPS

- 1. ACLU, has been for fair ballot access since 1940, when it resolved that petition requirements be no greater than of one-tenth of 1%. 132 W. 43rd St., New York NY 10036, tel. (212) 944-9800.

[ ] RENEWALS: If this block is marked, your subscription is about to expire. Please renew. Sorry, no envelope is enclosed. Use the coupon below.

2. CENTER FOR A NEW DEMOCRACY works to permit different parties to nominate the same candidate. 1324 Drake St, Madison Wi 53715, tel. (608) 256-1968.

3. CENTER FOR VOTING & DEMOCRACY, for proportional representation. 6905 5th St., NW #200, Washington DC 20012, (202) 882-7378.

\* 4. COFOE Coalition for Free & Open Elections. \* in the list of parties means the party is on COFOE's board.

5. COALITION TO END THE PERMANENT CONGRESS, favors more competitive elections; has a platform which includes easier ballot access. Bx 7309, N. Kansas City, Mo. 64116, tel. (800) 737-0014.

6. COMMITTEE FOR PARTY RENEWAL, scholars who believe that strong parties are needed for popular control of government. \$10 per year. Write Dr. Paul Herrnson, Dept. of Gov't. & Politics, Univ. of Maryland, College Park, Md 20742, tel. (301) 405-4123.

7. THE DEMOCRACY PROJECT, gathers documentation that the U.S. is violating an international agreement it signed in 1990, pledging not to discriminate for or against political parties. Bx 526175, Salt Lake City Ut 84152, (801) 582-3318.

8. FOUNDATION FOR FREE CAMPAIGNS & ELECTIONS, Funds lawsuits which attack bad ballot access laws. Donations to it are tax-deductible. Write vice-president Richard Winger, 3201 Baker St., San Francisco Ca 94123, tel. (415) 922-9779.

9. ROSS-GREEN ASSOCIATES, initiated the Penny ballot access bill (HR 1755) and the Penny debates bill (HR 1753) and has a lobbying office at 1010 Vermont, #811, Washington, DC 20036, (202) 638-4858.

SECOND CLASS PAID AT SAN FRANCISCO CA

[ ] I want to receive BALLOT ACCESS NEWS. I enclose \$7.00 for 1 year (overseas: \$12) Make check out to "Ballot Access News".

To receive it by First Class Mail, enclose \$9.00

[ ] I want to join the Coalition for Free & Open Elections. (includes one-year sub to B.A.N., or one-year renewal). Make check to "COFOE". Minimum dues are \$12.

Enclosed is: \_\_\_ \$25 \_\_\_ \$50 \_\_\_ \$100 \_\_\_ other

Name

Address

City State Zip