



# LIBERTY PLEDGE NEWSLETTER

Published exclusively for members of the Libertarian Party's Monthly Pledge Program

NOVEMBER 1990

## Election Results Bring Big Ballot Access Gains

Ballot Access efforts were significantly aided by this month's election results in a number of states. Ballot status was retained in several states where it was thought to be in question and ballot status was added in several others.

The positive election results around the country are estimated to have saved the LP about \$250,000 in ballot access expenses.

States with ballot status as of now are California, Delaware, Georgia, Hawaii, Idaho, Michigan, Mississippi, Nevada, New Hampshire, New Mexico, Oregon, South Carolina, Texas, and Wisconsin. Status in Montana was still unclear at press time..

Perhaps the most positive ballot access result in the elections was in Massachusetts, where Libertarians were instrumental in passing the "Fair Ballot Access Initiative." The initiative, which slashes ballot access requirements by 75 percent, won with 52 percent of the vote. Radio ads for the initiative were done by popular Boston radio personality and Libertarian, Gene Burns. The initiative was also endorsed by both major newspapers.

There is also on-going petitioning in Maine, Alabama, and Alaska, as well as petitioning under the direction of "51-92" in North Carolina. Additional ballot drive activity is scheduled for before the Chicago convention in Arizona, South Dakota, Nebraska, and Wyoming.

## Campaign Shows Impressive Gains for Libertarian Party

Preliminary studies of the recent election returns indicate that about two million voters—of the 30 million who had the opportunity—chose to vote Libertarian this November, nearly seven percent.

This figure is the highest for the LP in any election since its formation. LP candidates also won more double-digit percentages than in any previous election.

*Some of the candidates who had particularly impressive showings were:*

Sandi Webb	<b>Winner</b>	Simi Valley, CA City Council
Eric Ewing	<b>Winner</b>	Marana, AZ School Board
Jerry Douglas	<b>Winner</b>	Topanga-LasVirgines, CA Res Conservatn Distrct Brd of Dir
Ted Brown	6%	Ins Commissnr (CA)
Paul Gautreau	3.5%	Attorney Genrl (CA)
Tom Tryon	4%	Controller (CA)
Dennis Thompson	2%	Governor (CA)
Carol Caul	15%	Crim.AppealsCt (TX)
Jeff Daiell	3.3%	Governor (TX)
Greg Johnson	19%	StateRep (ID) (3 way)
Anthony Bajaba	3%	Lt. Governor (CA)
Joe Shea	27%	US Cong (CA) (2 way)
Miriam Luce	5%	Governor (NH)
Robert Marshall	21%	US Congr (IL) (2 way)
Elizabeth Goldin	19%	PubServCommsn(GA)
John Elsnau	3.7%	U.S. Senate (NH)
Carole Ann Rand	3%	Governor (GA)

LIBERTARIAN PARTY NATIONAL HEADQUARTERS

1528 Pennsylvania Avenue, S.E. • Washington, D.C. 20003 • (202) 543-1988

# Atlanta Journal, Sept. 21, 1990.

## She's talking about change — real change

Libertarian's Rand has some bold ideas

By Carrie Teegardin  
Staff writer

When Carole Ann Rand outlines her plan for Georgia's future, she sounds a bit like some dorm-room philosopher, a clear-eyed visionary with a sure-fire plan to save the world.

Like her two competitors in Georgia's race for the governor's office, she stumps the state, taking on the issues — education, gun control and drugs — and making her pitch for change.

But Ms. Rand is talking about real change. The Libertarian Party nominee would legalize marijuana and cocaine, free drug offenders from prison, get rid of the state income tax, privatize Georgia's school system and encourage people to become their own police force by buying guns.

"Yes, our ideas are bold," said Ms. Rand, leaning on the dinner table at a recent engagement and looking straight at a dozen potential converts. "And yes, our ideas are different from the mainstream politicians."

And that, the 45-year-old insurance executive argues, is exactly why voters should pick her for governor come Nov. 6 — even if they know the third-party candidate doesn't have a chance in a state just starting to accept a two-party system.

"If you're fed up and you've had enough, then it's time for you to send a message down to the gold dome that you want government off your back and out of your pocket," said Ms. Rand, the first woman to make Georgia's general election ballot for governor.

Cutting back government — drastically — is what the Libertarian Party is about. Followers believe that taxes are sanctioned stealing, redistribution of wealth is evil and the burden of a wasteful and ineffective government beats down individual potential.

"Libertarianism is probably what you already believe," Ms. Rand tells most of the people she meets, in an approach designed to take off the radical edge. "It's probably what your parents taught you when you were growing up."

Libertarians would undo the New Deal. They would get government out of any service that private industry could provide. They ask those expecting hand-



### Carole Ann Rand

**Birthplace:** Atlanta  
**Age:** 45  
**Residence:** Lilburn  
**Family:** Married to Kenneth S. Rand for 12 years. Two children, two stepchildren and three grandsons  
**Church affiliation:** Atlanta Unity Church  
**Job:** Agency manager with Maryland Casualty Insurance Co.  
**Education:** Graduate of DuPage College in Illinois.  
**Political experience:** Former chairman of the Georgia Libertarian Party. Has not held public office.

outs to take care of themselves.

"Taking responsibility for your own life works," Ms. Rand said.

A vegetarian, gardener and grandmother who lives in Lilburn, Ms. Rand breaks the Libertarian stereotype of the abrasive, hard-edged scientist as she preaches a trinity of individual choice, personal responsibility and tolerance.

"Libertarians are not geeks," Ms. Rand said, good-naturedly. "We're not crazy kooks with impossible ideas."

While striving for legitimacy and recognition this year, the party plans to focus in the future on less-expensive local campaigns and bids for the Georgia Public Service Commission, where its goal is to break up the utility monopolies.

But the Libertarians say the two dominant political parties and the news media have put laws and traditions between Libertarians and the ballots by encouraging requirements that third-party candidates gather thousands of signatures to qualify to have their names on ballots.

To protest the party's exclusion from debates this fall, Walker Chandler, running for lieutenant



Steve Deal/Staff

Carole Ann Rand, the Libertarian Party's candidate for governor, sits outside her office. "Libertarians are not geeks," she says, good-naturedly. "We're not crazy kooks with impossible ideas."

governor, filed a federal lawsuit this week.

"We're here to stay as Georgia's third party," Ms. Rand said. "But the Democrats and Republicans can put us out of business if they want to."

"It is frustrating," said Chris Voss, an Atlanta Libertarian and Rand supporter. "Some people in the party say maybe we should just infiltrate the major parties."

"The third parties in the history of this country have fared quite poorly in terms of winning office," said Loch Johnson, a University of Georgia political

scientist. "But they've made significant contributions now and again by providing some ideas that proved useful and tended to be absorbed by the major parties."

That is — at least for now — what Georgia's Libertarians have in mind. And it's one reason Ms. Rand sounds so unlike the candidates who operate in the world of sound-bite philosophy.

"I'm not sure we even want to be a major party," Mr. Voss said. "They have to sell out. The focus is different. Ours is not to be elected but to change society."

THE STANFORD DAILY

## Viewpoint

# National service proposal deserves attention and debate

**I**N THE NEAR FUTURE, will all American young people — both boys and girls — have to perform service work under the guidance of the federal government? Although the prospects for such an all-inclusive program might seem remote, they have become more likely in recent months as Congress has passed bills that proponents of universal service see as a beachhead from which they hope to move on to establishing a program that requires all young people to enlist.

The House passed a \$183 million national service bill (H.R. 4330) on Sept. 13. The Senate passed a \$125 million bill (S. 1430) on March 1. Now a conference committee is reconciling the differences. Sen. Sam Nunn, D-Ga.; Sen. Charles Robb, D-Va.; and Congressman Dave McCurdy, D-Okla., say that a 1990 national service act should be the first step toward a broadly inclusive, large-scale national service program.

Whether Congress establishes a program that encompasses massive numbers of young people in the near future depends in part on the shape of the 1990 bill that comes out of the conference committee.

But, more importantly, it depends in the long run on the attitude of pro-military members of Congress and on the attitude of American young people.

What kind of bill comes out of the conference committee is important because the Senate bill includes an experimental

program to pay participants \$5,000 vouchers for each year of service. The House bill would cancel the obligation of those in national service to repay certain federal student loans.

This voucher plan and this debt cancellation plan are slightly different approaches, but each is part of an effort by proponents of all-inclusive national service to put in place substantial rewards and penalties (at present, short of the threat of a jail sentence for refusal to enlist) in order to encourage massive numbers of young people to enlist.

The 1989 Nunn-McCurdy bill, for example made federal aid for most college students conditional on doing service work.

Indeed the Bush administration has threatened a presidential veto of the 1990 national service bill not only because of its probable price tag, but also because its measures run counter to President Bush's ideal of unpaid altruism.

If Congress were eventually to establish a large-scale civilian labor program under the rubric of national service, the civilian program and the U.S. military would compete to attract young people to their ranks.

This may be a less important problem than it is now, given reduced tensions between the United States and the Soviet Union and hence reduced U.S. military manpower needs.

But Sen. John McCain, R-Ariz.; Sen.

6A THE DETROIT NEWS TUESDAY, OCTOBER 16, 1990

## For State Board of Education

Although education has become an increasingly important issue, the state Board of Education remains one of the more obscure elected bodies in Michigan. It shouldn't be. The eight-member board appoints the superintendent of public instruction, for whom the board provides general guidance and advice. It acts as a watchdog on state education policies and oversees the certification of teachers.

This year's election is particularly crucial. The board, consisting of four Republicans and four Democrats, has deadlocked on several issues, such as computers in the classroom and the choice of superintendent, which were eventually settled. Voters will have a chance to avoid further policy impasses by selecting two members to fill eight-year terms.

For the State Board of Education, we recommend Dick DeVos and Mary Ruwart.

Dick DeVos, a Republican, would bring a badly needed business perspective to the board. He is chief executive officer of a Grand Rapids company and a former vice-president at Amway Corp. But Mr. DeVos is not a newcomer to education issues. He is a member of the Business Advisory Council for the Forest Hills Public Schools and Grand Rapids area co-chairman for the United Negro College Fund drive.

Mr. DeVos, 34, says parents should be able to select the school their child may attend within a district. He has a more cautious approach to "educational choice" than we do, but is open to expanding the concept as districts experiment. Mr. DeVos supports expanding alternative certification to professionals with subject matter expertise in all teaching areas, so schools may select from the best people available. He also favors having children pass both an oral and written test showing they have mastered certain skills before graduating.

Ms. Ruwart, a 40-year-old senior research scien-



tist for Upjohn Corp. in Kalamazoo, is a Libertarian Party candidate. She has a long list of honors and published papers. She also is a former assistant professor at the St. Louis University Medical School who would bring a refreshing "outsider" perspective to a board where the educational establishment's views are frequently heard.

Ms. Ruwart says "giving control of education back to parents and teachers through choice is the proven way to better quality education." She would ultimately allow parents to choose among private and public schools. Ms. Ruwart favors expanding alternative certification. And she opposes raising the school-leaving age from 16 to 18, pointing out that it allows troublemakers who aren't learning to disrupt the education of dedicated students.

The other candidates are Republican Lowell Perry, a Michigan Bell employee, and two Democrats, Barbara Roberts Mason, a Michigan Education Association teacher union employee, and Rolie Hoppood, a Michigan Federation of Teachers employee. Mr. Perry seemed to lack a sure grasp of the key issues. Ms. Mason endorsed cross-district choice, but that was her only deviation from the union line. Mr. Hoppood was less dogmatic but his support of choice hinged too much on equity in school financing. Voluminous research shows more money is not what causes student achievement to improve.

Republican Dick DeVos and Libertarian Mary Ruwart would do the most to improve state education policies and break the gridlock on the board.

Friday, October 12, 1990 ♦ 5

Williamson M. Evers

**Adopting a large-scale, broadly inclusive program of national service is one of the few proposals on the public policy agenda today that would markedly change the American way of life as we know it.**

Rudy Boshwitz, R-Minn.; and Sen. William Armstrong, R-Colo., pointed out in debate on the Senate floor on Feb. 27 that the vouchers that would be awarded under the Senate national service bill were worth more than the benefits provided military veterans under the Montgomery G.I. Bill, and Senator McCain said on Feb. 27 and March 1 that little thought had been given to measuring the Senate bill's effect on military recruiting.

The end of the Cold War gives proponents of national service a chance to emphasize civilian service programs. But the end of the Cold War may detach pro-military politicians from the coalition supporting national service.

Many members of Congress who have supported a large, well-funded military have also supported establishing national service — often as a way of bringing back a military draft.

Recently, because of U.S.-Soviet rapprochement — and despite the apparent

At the same time, young people are participating in increasing numbers in volunteer public service work. If this flow of young people into volunteer public service becomes a popular social-political movement that unambiguously demands a full-scale, comprehensive national service program, such a development would alter the attitude of now-exceptional lawmakers.

Yet both such possible developments run counter to the normal American pattern. Usually the American people want demobilization in times of peace, and American young people value individual liberty and personal independence. Young people may well prefer to pursue their interest in public service as independent volunteers rather than as participants in government-run national service.

The proponents and opponents of national service are debating fundamental issues — individual rights, civic duties, and the scope of government authority.

Adopting a large-scale, broadly inclusive program of national service is one of the few proposals on the public policy agenda today that would markedly change the American way of life as we know it. As such, national service is a proposal that deserves full and extended debate.

Williamson M. Evers is a visiting scholar at the Hoover Institution.

THURSDAY, OCTOBER 11, 1990 A21

I read with interest your list of federal closings resulting from the budget deadlock [news story, Oct. 8]. The obvious question to me was why the federal government is even in the museum business (Smithsonian Institution, National Gallery of Art), the library business (Library of Congress), the entertainment business (Ford's Theatre, Wolf Trap Farm

Park), the road-maintenance business (picnic areas along GW Parkway) and the park business (Rock Creek Park Nature Center, Great Falls Park, Assateague Island National Seashore)?

The services provided to patrons of these and many other federal recreational facilities should be paid for by user fees and contributions, or the facility in question should be shut down. There is nothing so essential about these services that taxpayers should be forced to pay for them.

Better still, why doesn't the federal government sell off these and other businesses that could be handled just as well, if not better, by the private sector, and stick to its primary function, protecting the lives, liberty and property of American citizens on American soil?

MARY GINGELL  
Annandale



## Footing the Bill for 'American Treasures'

Randi Korn and J. Daniel Rogers [letters, Oct. 21] justify taxpayer funding of recreational facilities such as parks and museums by claiming that all Americans use these facilities.

Their analysis belies the fact that today very few people in this country who make \$10,000, or even \$20,000, a year can afford to travel with their families to Washington to visit the National Gallery of Art or to California to commune with nature in Yosemite.

Perhaps with massive tax and spending cuts and a strengthened free market economy more Americans would be able to afford to share in these so-called "American treasures." But until then, the average taxpayer should not have to pay for vacation facilities that they cannot afford to use.

KATHLEEN J. RICHMAN  
Woodbridge

I'm tired of the special-interest pleading of the upper middle class, who want the overburdened taxpayer to pay for their amenities and recreational pastimes.

The letter of Randi Korn and J. Daniel Rogers advocating financing parks and museums solely from tax revenues was a perfect example of such arrogance.

The people who go to museums like the Smithsonian and national parks like Yellowstone are wealthier than the average taxpayer. Shouldn't wealthier people pay for their own leisure activities instead of whining that their recreation is in the national interest and that therefore every taxpayer should have to subsidize them?

WILLIAM REDPATH  
Herdon

Barrington, IL Daily Herald, Sept. 9, 1990.

# Oregon to vote on school tax break

SALEM, Ore. — A petition drive has put a proposed constitutional amendment on Oregon's Nov. 6 ballot that supporters and foes alike call the most far-reaching school choice measure in the nation.

Backers of the Educational Choice Initiative, or Measure 11, say it would greatly broaden educational opportunity by giving parents the means to send their children to schools of their choice — public or private.

Opponents say it would severely weaken the public school system and violate constitutionally required separation of church and state. The proposal would allow parents to send their children across district lines to any public school. State school aid would follow the students.

More controversially, it also would grant state income tax credits of up to \$2,500 a year for pupils at private schools, including church-supported schools, and for children taught at home.

A poll of 600 registered voters conducted in late August for The Oregonian newspaper of Portland found 48 percent in favor of the proposal, 47 percent opposed and 5 percent undecided. The margin of error was plus or minus 4 percentage

points. Minnesota is the only state with statewide open enrollment for public schools. It also is the only one that gives tax breaks to parents of students who attend private schools, but the breaks aren't so generous as in the Oregon measure.

Minnesota permits taxpayers to deduct from taxable income up to \$1,000 in private school expenses. The Oregon measure would allow tax credits — a direct subtraction from taxes owed — of up to \$2,500 a year.

The Office of Legislative Counsel said Measure 11 is similar in most respects to the Minnesota law, which was upheld by the U.S. Supreme Court in 1984.

If the Oregon measure is passed, it will take effect in the 1991-92 school year.

The proposal "is certainly the most extensive" one of its kind, said Sister Catherine McNamee, president of the National Catholic Education Association in Washington, D.C. The association, which represents 200,000 Roman Catholic educators, strongly backs the proposal.

The idea for Measure 11, however, largely came from Libertarian Party adherents.

## Manchester, NH Union Leader 9/19/90

### Libertarian Candidate Criticizes Governor

Libertarian gubernatorial candidate Miriam Luce accused the incumbent of mismanagement of state finances.

In a recent speech in Manchester, Luce said, "In 1978, we had the lowest per capita taxes as well as a manageable per capita debt load of \$482.30. By 1988, we still had the lowest per capita taxes, but our per capita debt was over five times larger than it was in 1978. In fact, we had a higher per capita debt load than New York, New Jersey and even Massachusetts."

Luce said, "We need to ask ourselves what our government was thinking of when it planned a 37-percent increase in spending over a two-year period. Luce said "lower spending and working off the debt is the Libertarian alternative" and challenged New Hampshire residents to send a message in the November election by voting for Libertarian candidates as a call for change.

## For D.C. Mayor

**P**ity the next mayor of Washington. He or she will have to deal with a budget deficit of \$150 million to \$200 million or more, a Congress ready to slash away at D.C. appropriations, a tubby and entrenched local bureaucracy, a deflating economic base, a growing homeless population, a frightening violent crime rate and general disgust with city government. As the city and the nation wrestle with the possibility of a recession, the next mayor will have to find some way to balance the District's books, restore business community confidence in the city and hearthen a public that has been torn by the various triumphs, antics and tragedies of Marion Barry.

This year's mayoral race offers local voters the first competitive, two-party contest in years. Republican candidate Maurice Turner served for years in the District police force, including eight years as police chief. Although he understands the ways and politics of the department, his Republican affiliation has made him something of an outsider in local circles.

Sharon Pratt Dixon has close links to the local Democratic party but virtually no working experience in the trenches of D.C. government. She has worked as an attorney and official at Pepco. She also earned her place on the ballot by virtue of battling Marion Barry long before it became fashionable.

In both cases, the candidates' greatest shared strength, their willingness to take on the city establishment, represents their greatest shared weakness. The District has a city bureaucracy second to none in this nation, one that is much easier to criticize than to shrink. Mrs. Dixon's earlier promises to knock off 2,000 executives failed to take into account city hiring rules that make such things virtually impossible. Mr. Turner's proposal for a hiring freeze has more short-term promise, but he has no strategy for paring or redeploying the city workforce. He simply wants to use as his working document the reform proposals put together by a blue-ribbon panel headed originally by former American University President Richard Berendzen and later by former Congressional Budget Office Director Alice Rivlin.

On substantive policy issues, the two differ more in nuance than in overall strategy. Neither wants to cut taxes now, although Mrs. Dixon has hopes of doing so in the future. Neither wants to abolish rent control, adopt public school choice, enact significant welfare or health-care reform or find sensible, low-cost ways

to address pressing local problems. Mrs. Dixon seems willing to draw a firmer line on what the city will and will not offer to keep the Redskins than does Mr. Turner. Indeed, the most significant difference seems to be that Mrs. Dixon wants to restore police foot patrols, while Mr. Turner wants tougher law enforcement and more cells at Lorton.

In short, this race has produced few bold ideas for getting the District out of its present straits. The only really interesting suggestions have come from Libertarian Candidate Nancy Lord, whose ideas on housing, welfare, health care, taxes and a host of other issues have the virtues of specificity and tremendous common sense. She deserves a closer look than she has received from many voters, and people tempted to select "none of the above" would do well to help the Libertarian Party establish a presence in the city.

Ultimately, however, this contest comes down to Sharon Pratt Dixon and Maurice Turner. The voting issues boil down to a judgment about who best can help ease the District out of its present straits and into a position of solvency and prosperity.

Maurice Turner, a Republican running in a Democratic stronghold, had to place clear distance between himself and the Democratic establishment. He had to produce policies that could eliminate today's welfare-state establishment with one interested in free markets and economic growth. He had to build a campaign so compelling that people would flock to his side — and force the establishment to take notice. Unfortunately, he has taken refuge in blue-ribbon commissions and study panels. On some issues, he actually has run to the left of Mrs. Dixon. He has run a fine campaign, but he has failed to establish himself as a distinctly Republican or distinctly conservative candidate.

In a close call, we endorse Sharon Pratt Dixon because we think she stands a better chance of building the political coalition necessary to start turning the District around. We have no illusions about the task she faces. No one will get the District squared away in three, six, 12 or even 24 months. What we do expect is a ruthless review of city programs, policies and payrolls. We expect a mayor as independent of the establishment after entering office as he or she was before. And we expect to see progress toward tidier, smaller, less ambitious government. Otherwise, the next mayor, no matter who he or she is, can only make matters worse.

Nov. 1990

### A Refreshing Change

Even though she remains the longest of long shots, Libertarian Nancy Lord has emerged as the Daniel Patrick Moynihan of the D.C. mayoral campaign this year, continuing to produce some of the most interesting ideas of any candidate.

Last week, Lord wrote a lengthy treatise in the City Paper on the District's budget problems that argued for a significant downsizing of the D.C. government and a redirection of resources away from what she believes to be the destructive "war on drugs." While not without flaws, the paper was far more detailed and comprehensive than any statement on the budget from Democratic nominee Dixon or Turner, the Republican nominee.

Now, Lord has issued "Freedom & Free Enterprise: Bringing Economic Opportunity to the District of Columbia." Among her controversial proposals: eliminating many of the city's licensing laws, reforming property taxes to put a heavier burden on undeveloped land and the abolition of rent control.

## Boston Herald

### Yes on Question 4

The Founding Fathers disapproved of political parties. James Madison assailed them as "faction[s]... adverse to the rights of other citizens, or to the... interest of the community." President George Washington warned "in the most solemn manner against the baneful effects of the spirit of party."

The Founders' ideal of non-partisan democracy never got off the ground. They themselves split almost at once into Federalists and Democrat-Republicans, setting the pattern of two-party competition that lasts to this day.

Yet there is nothing sacred about the two-party system. Around the world, the cry in the streets is not for two-party, but multi-party competition. True, too many parties can so splinter a society that political cohesion becomes impossible. But it is also true that smaller parties and independent candidates can be the yeast that leavens democracy. Alternative parties are vehicles that can empower ideas that are unconventional, candidates who go against the grain, perspectives that are unfamiliar, and independent points of view.

Question 4, if passed, would enable more Massachusetts parties to offer candidates and compete for office on a level playing field. That

would be good for democracy.

What difference can a small party make? In 1854, a modest band of voters gathered in Ripon, Wis., to form a new political party opposing slavery. Six years later, that infant party got its candidate elected to the White House. He was a Republican; his name, Abraham Lincoln.

But these days, Massachusetts stacks the deck against the potential Lincolns. Independent parties and candidates here, forced to overcome absurdly steep hurdles just to get on the ballot, are chained with some of the nation's most restrictive laws. For instance, though Democrats or Republicans running statewide must collect only 10,000 signatures; independents or minor-party candidates must collect 40,000. The only party affiliation voters may choose is Democrat or Republican; for anyone else, from Socialists to Libertarians, the only permitted label is "unenrolled." (Today, 44 percent of Massachusetts voters — a plurality — choose "unenrolled".)

Question 4 goes over the heads of Democrats and Republicans eager to keep outsiders out and themselves in. It replaces exclusion and loaded dice with fairness, choice, and democracy. The Herald urges a Yes vote on Question 4.

BOSTON GLOBE  
THURS., OCT. 25, 1990  
p. 20

## Yes on Question 4

The Fair Ballot Access Initiative, better known as Question 4, would allow independent candidates and smaller political parties more access to the electoral process. It is a referendum worthy of support.

Massachusetts has some of the most restrictive voting laws in the US. It is one of only 10 states that limit registration to political parties with official status. It is one of only 12 states that prohibit voters from signing nomination papers for more than one candidate.

To be placed on the ballot, minor-party candidates for statewide office now need four times as many signatures as major-party candidates. Independent candidates must have signatures from 2 percent of the turnout from the previous gubernatorial election, about 33,000 signatures. The nominating signatures for major-party candidates are not tied to voter turnout. When voter participation increases, minor-party candidates are penalized.

If Question 4 is approved, independent candidates for statewide or federal offices would need half of 1 percent of the turnout from the previous gubernatorial election, approximately 8,000 signatures to get on the ballot.

Opponents of the referendum fear that the easing of requirements would result in a political system fraught with confusion and that voters would be forced to sift through a maze of little-known, peripheral candidates. Yet this does not happen in those states where ballot requirements are less stringent.

That more than 42 percent of Massachusetts' voters are registered as independents suggests that they are not happy with the choices before them. A more equitable and open electoral process may generate some enthusiasm for local and national politics. The Globe recommends a yes vote on Question 4.

Gwinnett Daily News, Lawrenceville, GA, Sept. 18, 1990.

## Libertarian candidate files suit to join debate

United Press International

ATLANTA — Walker Chandler, the Libertarian Party's lieutenant governor candidate, filed a federal lawsuit Monday to stop a televised debate between the Republican and Democratic candidates, because he was not invited.

Chandler, a Zebulon attorney, said he filed a motion for a temporary restraining order with U.S. District Judge Marvin Shoob. No hearing date has been set, but Chandler said he hopes there will be a hearing later this week.

Chandler said Georgia's Public Communica-

tions Commission, which oversees Georgia Public Television, cannot bar him from the debate because he and some other Libertarian candidates are on the November general election ballot.

"Unlike private broadcast entities, the GPIC receives over \$6 million a year from the state treasury — the taxpayers of Georgia."

"This is an instance of a public broadcast entity using its status to stifle the confrontation of political ideas," Chandler said.

GPIC Executive Director Richard Ottinger said he invited only Republican Matt Towery and Dem-

ocrat Pierre Howard because "they are the ones getting the attention."

Ottinger said GPIC offered to give the Libertarian Party 30 minutes of air time after the debate to outline its political philosophy, but Chandler said that was unacceptable because he wants to debate his opponents.

Chandler said the Libertarian Party of West Virginia won an almost identical suit in 1980, forcing that state's public television network to include the Libertarian gubernatorial candidate in a debate.