

We are especially grateful to The John D. and Catherine T. MacArthur Foundation and The John and Mary R. Markle Foundation for their support for this project, as well as The Andrew W. Mellon Foundation and The Ford Foundation for their support for the Latin American Program.

As we had hoped, our Mexican guests returned home feeling enriched by the experience. We are interested in continuing to work with them to improve the communication between Mexicans and Americans and to increase the prospect that democracy in both countries is expanded and deepened.

Robert Pastor

Executive Secretary

Council of Freely Elected Heads of Government

COUNCIL OF FREELY ELECTED HEADS OF GOVERNMENT

Table of Contents

1. Preface
2. Introduction
3. The Mechanics of U.S. Elections
 - The Federal Role in U.S. Elections
 - The Role of the State Government in Elections
 - Anatomy of an Election
4. Monitoring Elections
 - The Council's Experiences in Latin America
 - Role and Presence of Observers Following Elections
 - Elections in Guyana
 - Access to the Media
 - Methodology for Observing the U.S. Elections
5. The Candidates, the Issues, and their Positions
 - Political Analysis of the Campaign
 - Additional Issues
 1. Tuesday Elections
 2. Composition of Federal Elections Commission
 3. Budgets for Government Election Agencies
 4. Complexity of Ballot
 5. Absentee Voting
 6. Appointment of State Elections Officials
 7. Lodging of Complaints and Protests
6. Election Day
7. Assessments and Conclusions
 - Initial Observations of the Mexican Delegation
 - President Carter's Remarks
 - Report of the Mexican Observers
8. Endnotes
9. Appendices
 - Appendix A: *Press Release, October 28, 1992, "Mexicans to Observe U.S. Elections"*
 - Appendix B: *Schedule for the Observation of the U.S. Elections*
 - Appendix C: *List of Participants*
 - Appendix D: *English Translation of the Report of the Mexican Delegation to Observe the U.S. Presidential Elections, November 1992*
 - Appendix E: *Informe de la Delegación Mexicana que Observó las Elecciones Presidenciales de Estados Unidos del 3 de Noviembre de 1992*
 - Appendix F: *Voter Registration Application*
 - Appendix G: *Authorized Identification for Applying to Vote*
 - Appendix H: *Sample Ballot Return Slip*
 - Appendix I: *Sample Ballot Return Slip*
 - Appendix J: *Sample Ballot Return Slip*
 - Appendix K: *Sample Ballot Return Slip*
 - Appendix L: *Sample Ballot Return Slip*
 - Appendix M: *Sample Ballot Return Slip*
 - Appendix N: *Sample Ballot Return Slip*
 - Appendix O: *Sample Ballot Return Slip*
 - Appendix P: *Sample Ballot Return Slip*
 - Appendix Q: *Sample Ballot Return Slip*
 - Appendix R: *Sample Ballot Return Slip*
 - Appendix S: *Sample Ballot Return Slip*
 - Appendix T: *Sample Ballot Return Slip*
 - Appendix U: *Sample Ballot Return Slip*
 - Appendix V: *Sample Ballot Return Slip*
 - Appendix W: *Sample Ballot Return Slip*
 - Appendix X: *Sample Ballot Return Slip*
 - Appendix Y: *Sample Ballot Return Slip*
 - Appendix Z: *Sample Ballot Return Slip*

November 2-4, 1992

Rapporteur's Summary [1](#)

The Council of Freely Elected Heads of Government

Latin American and Caribbean Program

The Carter Center of Emory University

Preface

The Council of Freely Elected Heads of Government is an informal group of 21 leaders from the Western Hemisphere. The Council is based at the Latin American and Caribbean Program of The Carter Center of Emory University, and is chaired by former U.S. President Jimmy Carter. In keeping with its objective to support democratic processes in the Hemisphere, the Council has, on several occasions, responded to invitations from all parties in a country and organized non-partisan, international missions to observe the electoral process in countries throughout Latin America and the Caribbean. This Report summarizes a slightly different endeavor. For the first time, the Council organized a delegation to monitor the U.S. electoral process. [2](#)

From November 2 through November 4, 1992, a diverse group of Mexican political officials, academics, political analysts, and grass-roots organizers observed the pre-election and voting process in the U.S. presidential elections. [3](#) As part of their program, the observers heard presentations from experts on the mechanics of U.S. elections, experienced international election observers, representatives of the U.S. presidential candidates, and U.S. political analysts. On election day they traveled throughout Georgia to witness the voting process and to observe the vote count on election night. The morning following the elections, they shared their observations in a public forum co-chaired by President Carter and former Canadian Prime Minister and Council member Pierre Elliott Trudeau. [4](#)

Few if any of the observers expected to encounter the fundamental questions of legitimacy and fairness that Council observation missions have confronted in

other countries, and in the end there was no evidence of fraud or voter disenfranchisement. Nonetheless, the undertaking resulted in many surprises and lessons for both the U.S. hosts and the Mexican delegation, and it also deepened the desire for collaboration between Mexicans, particularly the observer groups, and the Council. This Report attempts to summarize what was shared and learned by the participants in the observer mission.

Introduction

Robert Pastor, Director of the Latin American and Caribbean Program at The Carter Center and Executive Secretary of the Council, opened the conference with a reference to Mexican Nobel Laureate Octavio Paz who once said, "A nation without free elections is a nation without a voice, without eyes, and without ears." Pastor noted that the right to free and fair elections is a universal right enshrined in the Charter of the United Nations and the Charter of the Organization of American States. In the spirit of honoring that right, the Council was formed in 1986 to lend support and assistance to the democratization movement in the Americas.

Since its inception, the Council has monitored elections in seven Latin American and Caribbean countries, most recently in Guyana in October 1992. In the Mexican states of Chihuahua and Michoacan, the Council witnessed the observation of the vote by Mexican observer groups in July 1992. A comment frequently heard by Council members, particularly U.S. members of observer missions, was that the United States wants to observe elections overseas without encouraging similar access to U.S. elections by observers from other countries. Partly in response to such comments, but more to reinforce a spirit of neighborliness and openness, the Council seized the opportunity of the 1992 presidential elections and invited observer groups and political party representatives from Mexico to observe the U.S. voting process. The exercise proved to be an immensely worthwhile endeavor, both for the Mexican observers

To have a meaningful dialogue required that Mexican and U.S. participants learn the mechanics of the system that was about to be tested in national elections. That learning process, which was the focus of the first full day of meetings, proved to be instructive to Mexican and also to U.S. participants.

The Mechanics of U.S. Elections

The Federal Role in U.S. Elections 5

Many participants were surprised by the degree to which elections in the U.S. are decentralized. Almost all responsibility for the conduct of election campaigns and voting rests with local county governments. In fact, it was not until 1974 that there was any meaningful federal government involvement in the electoral process.

The Federal Elections Commission (FEC) was created by Congress in 1974 following the Watergate scandal to restore faith and accountability to the financial aspects of federal elections. The FEC regulates the financing of presidential and congressional campaigns as well as the activities of over 4000 political action committees (PACs). As a federal agency, however, the FEC's jurisdiction is limited to elections for national office. Local campaigns and elections are conducted free of FEC supervision and rely on state and local laws for regulation. The regulatory activities of the FEC focus on the financing of federal campaigns, primarily by enforcing laws which place limits on contributions made to individuals campaigning for office. The FEC does not regulate "soft money" which consists of contributions made to political parties and to PACs. 6

Enforcement of other federal laws which impact on the non-financial aspects of campaigns and elections, in particular civil rights laws and reapportionment, is performed by the Department of Justice and the Bureau of the Census respectively.

In addition to regulating campaign financing of federal elections, the FEC provides public financing to qualifying presidential candidates. The FEC will provide federal funds to match contributions received by a candidate. Matching funds are conditional on qualification, performance, and the candidate's

willingness to accept certain federal campaign financing restrictions. In so restricting matching funds, the FEC seeks to accomplish four goals: (1) to limit the political influence of campaign contributions by disclosure requirements; (2) to increase citizen participation in campaign financing; (3) to increase the number of people involved in funding presidential candidates; and (4) to make a national campaign more accessible to viable grassroots candidates.

To qualify for federal matching funds, a candidate must receive contributions totaling at least \$5000 in at least twenty states. The contributions must be from individuals, and no single person may contribute more than \$250. In practice, this is a difficult threshold to clear, and only major party candidates and an occasional third-party candidate will qualify for matching funds.

Federal matching funds are contingent upon performance in the election as well. Candidates must receive at least 20% of the vote in two consecutive primary elections to qualify for federal funds. Acceptance of federal matching funds requires candidates to obey the contribution limits imposed by federal law (presently \$250 per individual). A few presidential candidates elect to forego federal funds in order to avoid the federal restrictions on campaign contributions. In the 1992 presidential elections, block grants of \$55.2 million were made to the Democratic and Republican parties. Independent candidate Ross Perot declined federal matching funds. Other third-party candidates failed to qualify.

The FEC is composed of six commissioners. No more than three may be from a single political party. Consequently, no political party can obtain a majority on the commission. Each commissioner is appointed to serve a six-year term. Four votes are required to pass a resolution on the commission.

The Role of the State Government in Elections 7

Each state has the authority to promulgate its own laws governing elections. The only uniform requirement is that states comply with federal constitutional and legislative provisions such as civil rights, equal protection, and due process. So long as they satisfy the constitutional threshold, states can, and do, legislate often unique laws governing qualification as a candidate, voter eligibility and registration, and the voting process.

In Georgia, state authorities rely on county governments to conduct the elections. The counties hire election officials, print ballots, staff polling places, count ballots, and report results. As a result, within Georgia, compliance with state and federal laws can vary from one county to another. State officials are charged with enforcing compliance with state laws, and federal officials assure conformity to federal requirements. In some counties the election boards are extremely partisan, and federal and state officials must be alert to possible abuses of power and violations of law.

On the whole, however, there is widespread faith in the integrity of the voting process in Georgia and elsewhere in the United States. Several reasons can be cited for this level of confidence, and no doubt many others exist. One explanation is that, while there have been many incidents of fraud and misconduct in the past, voters are largely confident in the system because these instances are now very infrequent, and voters have no doubts that their votes will be counted freely and fairly.

Confidence is also bolstered by the extent to which the process is open to public scrutiny. Georgia law requires that every stage of the vote, except for the actual casting of the ballot, be public. Any citizen may observe the process leading to the vote as well as witness the vote count. Party poll watchers are also allowed similar access. In actuality, however, few citizens and poll watchers avail themselves of this opportunity.

Yet another factor that fosters voter confidence in the process is, perhaps paradoxically, the slowness of technological innovation. There are four ways to vote in Georgia, depending upon the county. Votes may be cast on paper ballots,

There is also confidence that an independent judiciary will intervene in the event of proven fraud or irregularities. In those rare instances where judicial intervention has been required, culpable individuals have received severe punishments and elections, when necessary, have been voided.

Finally, whether by design or as a byproduct, the overall decentralization of the voting process and the number of people involved renders it virtually impossible to perpetrate any systematic fraud. In most cases, no single individual has sufficient control to compromise the system without it being detected by more principled colleagues.

Anatomy of an Election ⁸

The making of an ultimately successful election is a complicated and time consuming undertaking. To help explain the process, Bill Northquest, supervisor of Elections for Gwinnett County, summarized the steps involved in Gwinnett. The first stage of the process is voter registration. the voter's n To register, an individual must be a U.S. citizen, a resident of the county in which registering, and at least 17 1/2 years old (18 years old to actually vote). Registration takes place at a variety of public locations and is performed by completing a voter registration application. ⁹ Persons registering to vote must also have proof of identification. A driver's license or a birth certificate are the most commonly used forms of identification. Interestingly, it is not necessary that the identification bear a photograph, or more significantly, have proof of citizenship. ¹⁰ Within a few weeks of registering, the individual will receive a voter identification card. This card is only for informational purposes. It is not required to vote. In Gwinnett County approximately 75% of eligible voters are registered to vote. ¹¹

Political districts for both state and federal legislatures are formed based upon census results. Districts are created for the federal legislative elections, for state Senate and state House of Representatives elections, and, depending upon the county, for local legislative and school board districts. In keeping with the constitutional principle of "one person - one vote," each district is required to have approximately the same number of citizens. Districts are re-drawn according to population every ten years in a process known as reapportionment. Each district is divided into precincts where the voting takes place. As a general rule, precincts include a minimum of 100 and a maximum 2000 voters. A minimum of one voting booth or private screen is required for every 200 registered voters. The actual vote takes place in a variety of public settings. ¹² Polling places are staffed by at least one poll manager, two assistant managers, and from three to eight clerks. Managers are required to attend a ten-hour training session, and are paid \$150 for their day's work at the voting site. Assistant managers and clerks are paid \$95 and \$70 respectively.

On election day in Georgia the polls open at 7:00 a.m. By that time, the poll officials will have verified that the ballot box is empty, locked and sealed the ballot box, and arranged the polling site in a manner that facilitates the voting process. Each polling area is organized into five stations. The voter will go from one station to the next to complete the process.

At the first station, the voter completes and signs a voter certificate. This is an affidavit under oath that requires voters to provide their names, addresses, and signatures attesting that they are legally authorized to vote at that site in this election. Once the voter certificate is completed, voters proceed to station 2. At station 2, a poll official compares the name on the voter certificate to a computerised list of individuals registered to vote in that precinct. If the name appears in the list, the polling official initials the entry and the voter proceeds to station 3. If the name does not appear on the list, the poll manager is called and

checks a master list of voters registered in the county. It may be that the voter is at the wrong polling site, in which case the voter is referred to the correct site. If the name does not appear on the master list, the poll manager calls the county election board. If the election board does not have a record of the person's registration, the person cannot vote.

At station 3, the voter turns in the voter certificate and in exchange receives a ballot card. Each ballot card has a stub with a unique serial number. The number of the ballot is marked on the voter's certificate and the voter proceeds to station 4. At station 4, the voter's name is hand-written on a voters list, and the voter is

helped to encourage voters to turn out in large numbers, but when the government saw it was losing, it tried to manipulate the results. President Carter, on behalf of the Council, announced that he had detected substitution of election results, and he denounced the fraud.

ballots at each polling site, and an impartial Elections Commission. A free and fair vote was held on October 5, 1992, and the main opposition candidate, Dr. Cheddi Jagan, was elected President. He assumed office shortly thereafter in a peaceful transition.

If the process leading to the election is acceptable to the competing parties, they are more likely to accept the results of the vote, regardless of the outcome. Consequently, many of the Council's efforts seek to assure that all parties have an opportunity to communicate their points of view to the voters, and that they are satisfied with the registration and financial aspects of the elections. Once that is in place, the parties are asked to state publicly, in advance of the vote that, barring fraud in the actual vote and count, they will respect the outcome of the elections.

With that commitment in place, the final task for the observers is to identify irregularities in the vote and count and to be alert to patterns of systematic fraud. It is important to note that no process is perfect. The concern is that any irregularities not be the result of an organized effort to thwart the will of the voters. To reach a conclusion on this crucial factor requires not only international observers, but party poll watchers. Because the number of Council observers is limited, they must rely on party poll watchers to observe and document any irregularities in areas in which Council observers are not present.

Role and Presence of Observers Following Elections

International observer delegations organized by the Council remain in a country at the invitation of the political parties and the government. After the elections, the forms that observers fill out are reviewed and studied for the presence of any systematic fraud or irregularities. Once the vote is counted and analyzed, the Council delegation issues an initial report at a press conference. A more detailed report is prepared in the weeks immediately following the election. In the case of

The last component to the successful outcome in Guyana was the presence of an elections commission that was independent of the government and impartial. Though this did not prevent periodic accusations of favoritism, it was certainly superior to a government-dominated commission.

In summarizing these four elements - the registration list, observers, a quick-count, and a neutral elections commission - Dr. Basa! ez concluded that the success in Guyana could be replicated in other countries that are willing to undertake similar reforms and permit similar access.

Access to the Media [19](#)

Ideally, the media, and particularly television, will provide voters with a fair and comprehensive opportunity to learn about the candidates and the issues. In recognition of the uniquely powerful role of television in the democratic process, The Carter Center has organized the Commission on Television Policy. The Commission includes some of the world's preeminent leaders in television broadcasting, policy-making, and analysis. Its role is to suggest democratically oriented television policy options, primarily for newly emerging democracies in which the media is either operated by the government or in the process of privatization.

The creation of television policy concerning campaign and elections necessarily involves a trade-off of rights: the candidate's right to access; the media's right to autonomy; and the electorate's right to information. Granting full rights to one has a detrimental effect on the others. The challenge to those creating these policies is to find the best balance of rights for a given community and to adjust these rights so as to maximize all three.

Different policies have been tested in various countries. Some systems require that all parties have equal time on television. In fact, in one such country a

stopwatch actually appears on the television screen to assure the viewer that no single party or candidate receives an inordinate amount of time. Another option is to provide free air time to parties and candidates. This is the most common method. In the United States, however, where television is a private commercial enterprise, candidates and parties are required to purchase air time.

No system is without its problems. Where the law provides for equal access, a series of perhaps 30 five-minute statements does little to educate the viewer. Where air time is allocated on the basis of legislative representation or the number of votes received in a recent election, many parties feel that to be an unfair baseline. Apportionment based upon public opinion polls is likewise suspect because of the unreliability and dynamic nature of the poll results. Finally, the system in the United States has been challenged repeatedly because it favors well-funded and established political parties at the expense of smaller grassroots organizations.

Another issue that arises in connection with the role of the media in elections concerns debates. Opinion is divided on whether debates should even take place, whether they should be compulsory for candidates, which candidates should be allowed to participate, and whether television should be required to broadcast the debates.

This is just a brief look at the issues confronting policy makers in both established and emerging democracies. The ultimate concern, however, is common to all and indeed is a prerequisite to a healthy democracy: an informed electorate.

Methodology for Observing the U.S. Elections [20](#)

Once observers are familiar with the electoral system, the next step is to learn what to look for on election day and how to document their observations. The

only half of those registered actually vote. According to Mr. Perot, changes in leadership are superficial because government remains in the hands of a political and power elite subject to the pressure of special interest lobbies. Meaningful change must take place at the grassroots level with increased citizen involvement in local and national government.

Political Analysis of the Campaign

According to Alan Abramowitz, Professor of Political Science at Emory University, election results are somewhat predictable, notwithstanding the tendency to focus on the ebb and flow of the campaign arising from poll results, advertisements and debates. In fact, the patterns observed in the 1992 election are largely consistent with those observed in the past. Three forces can be seen as central to the outcome of the 1992 campaign.

The condition of the U.S. economy is the primary influence on election outcome. Incumbents are hurt when voters perceive the economy as unhealthy. In 1992, the U.S. economy is recovering from a recession at a 2% annual growth rate, substantially slower than the 5% to 6% experienced in past rebounds. Consequently, the perception of the economy among the electorate is negative.

Based upon this analysis, Professor Abramowitz predicted that Governor Clinton would win the election by six to eight percent of the popular vote, and that the presence of third-party candidate Ross Perot would ultimately have no impact on the outcome.

Merle Black, Professor of Political Science at Emory University and an expert on politics in the South, predicted a Clinton victory as well. Historically the South is the most Republican region of the country, and in August 1991, a poll by the *Atlanta Journal-Constitution* showed President Bush with a 70% approval rating. Based on Bush's strength, prospective southern Democratic candidates Lloyd Bentsen, Al Gore and Richard Gephardt chose not to run. Five months later in January 1992, another *Journal-Constitution* poll showed that fewer than one-half of southern voters would vote for President Bush's reelection.

This loss in support was based on voters' anxiety about the economy and the belief by three-fourths of them that the economy was on the wrong track. Voter uneasiness about the economy was magnified by a belief that President Bush was too slow in realizing the severity of the economic problems. Average Americans were experiencing an economic slowdown while the President reiterated that the country was not in a recession because growth rates did not fit economists' definitions of a recession. To many voters, President Bush seemed out of touch with the reality they were experiencing. In the days preceding the election, a majority of Americans felt the United States was in worse economic condition than when President Bush took office. Only 10% felt things were better, and less than 40% thought the situation was the same.

Recognizing that President Bush was vulnerable on the economy, Clinton's campaign sought to attract moderate and conservative democrats who had voted for Ronald Reagan and George Bush in previous elections. He advocated positions that were socially liberal and fiscally conservative, a combination that largely mirrors the feelings of southern Democrats. Clinton also sought the

support of moderate Black southern Democrats while distancing himself from the more liberal Rev. Jesse Jackson.

Clinton's strategy of attracting the predominantly moderate to conservative southern white vote was aimed at shattering the hold that Republican candidates have had in recent elections. Just as Clinton's key to success was attracting a southern coalition of former Reagan/Bush Democrats, the challenge he faces is to keep that coalition intact and, as President, to govern in a way that appeals to the socially liberal, fiscally conservative southern Democrat.

Additional Issues

After presentations were completed, a lively discussion ensued among the observers, the political experts, and the audience. The following issues were discussed:

1. Tuesday Elections

Many of the Mexican observers questioned the holding of elections on a working day as opposed to Saturday, Sunday, or weekend voting. The issue has been debated for several years in the United States, and there is increasing pressure to switch from Tuesday voting. However, there are several reasons for not changing. In the first place, many religious groups celebrate either Saturday or Sunday sabbaths. Not only does that make it difficult for those individuals to vote, but it means that churches, a common voting site, would be unavailable. Additionally, weekends are often reserved for doing chores and running errands, particularly in urban areas. Similarly, there is resistance to making election day a holiday because of the economic costs of not doing business. To make Tuesday voting more convenient, laws require that employees be given time off to vote.

2. Composition of Federal Elections Commission

One observer asked for comments on the criticism by Ross Perot that the composition of the Federal Elections Commission (FEC) is unfair because it excludes independents from the Commission. The FEC is headed by a six-person group of three Republicans and three Democrats. Danny McDonald, one of the commissioners, re

entertain complaints raised either externally or on the basis of internal investigation.

In Georgia any voter has the right to bring a complaint so long as the irregularity at issue is sufficient to place the outcome of the election in doubt. Complaints must be filed within five days of the certification of the final results by the Secretary of State. The complaint must be heard by a neutral judge in an expeditious manner.

At the County level, in addition to exercising any state and federal remedies, a voter may, at the polling site, challenge the right of another person to vote. The poll manager has authority to decide on the protest, and appeals to that decision may be taken to the Board of Elections and ultimately the Superior Court. Additionally, any voter witnessing an irregularity may lodge a complaint with the poll manager.

Recently, a Talbott County, Georgia election was overturned by the court where the margin of victory was 200 votes. The loser of the election for Judge of the Probate Court was able to prove the presence of illegal absentee voting, votes cast by individuals who were not legal residents of the county, and theft of absentee ballots that affected a total of more than

the elections, the Mexican delegation presented a summary of their observations.

[23](#)

Assessments and Conclusions

The morning following the elections and the victory of Bill Clinton in the presidential race, Council members Jimmy Carter and Pierre Elliott Trudeau co-chaired a public session that included the Mexican observers and members of the press. Their comments were followed by a preliminary report presented by one of the Mexican observers on behalf of the entire delegation from Mexico. The session ended with a press conference.

Initial Observations of the Mexican Delegation

The delegates' initial observations focused on the minimal role of the government and the apparent confidence and trust that voters had in the process. It appeared to the observers that there were far fewer rules in operation than in elections in Mexico. At the same time, the observers were surprised at the complexity of the ballot, the number of candidates and questions at issue, and the likelihood that lesser-educated and lower-income voters were unlikely to understand the process. [24](#) In addition, observers were surprised to hear news reports of results in some areas while polls were still open in other regions of the country.

President Carter's Remarks

President Carter thanked the international observers for their timely and helpful efforts, not only in monitoring the U.S. elections, but in bringing added insight and understanding to Mexico and the United States, in terms of their respective electoral systems. It was regrettable that the PRI was unable to benefit directly from this exchange, but the presence of representatives from Mexican opposition parties and civic groups made for an invaluable experience.

On behalf of the Council, President Carter explained that citizens in the U.S. generally have a high degree of confidence in the integrity of the electoral process.

Report of the Mexican Observers

Following President Carter's remarks, Dr. Miguel Basa! ez presented the initial report of the observer delegation. ²⁵ The Mexican observers were in the United States to do what the Council has done throughout the Hemisphere. Yet the decision to participate was, for many of the Mexican delegates, a sensitive political decision. Those who took part in the mission did so in the same spirit of openness, friendship, and respect with which they were invited. And it was in that same spirit that they made the following observations of the U.S. system as it compares to Mexico's as well as several proposals for areas which might be considered for future reform.

In sharp contrast with their experience in Mexico, they observed an electoral process in which government and political parties are largely absent and, primarily due to the decentralization of the system, the vote belongs to civil society. Their report also commented on the considerable degree of competition in U.S. elections - an element often missing from Mexican elections. Particularly surprising to the observers was the role of independent media in announcing the election results rather than the information emanating from an official source. Finally, the observers were astonished at the breadth of decisions that confront a voter, not just with respect to the number of elected offices at issue, but on referenda concerning constitutional amendments, public financing, and amendments to local government charters.

The observers also identified a few areas for possible reform. They noted that the voter registration mechanism leaves open the possibility of registering in more than one county. Officials should consider devising safeguards to assure against multiple registration. With respect to campaign financing, the observers agreed with many of the panelists during the briefing on the electoral process that there is work to be done in bringing the financing of campaigns closer to the grassroots and diminishing the disproportionate role of special interest lobbies.

To increase voter turn-out and citizen participation in the electoral process, the observers propose that elections be held on Saturday and Sunday rather than Tuesday. Similarly, it was suggested that voting hours be adjusted so that West coast voters could vote before the media announced the results in the east. What the visit of the Mexican observers lacked in duration was outweighed by the intensity of the experience and the invaluable opportunity it presented for exchange and learning. It also offered a refreshing validation of the human spirit, particularly when Mexican observer Cecilia Romero reminded us that free and

President Carter and three former Latin American Presidents to witness the observation of two Mexican state elections on July 12. "We invited leaders of observer groups and representatives of the major political parties in Mexico, partly as a reciprocal gesture, but mostly because we wanted to work with them and explain how the U.S. electoral system works," Carter said.

On Nov. 2, CCEU will host an all-day seminar to brief the group on the U.S. electoral system, election observing, and the 1992 campaigns. (See agenda.) On Nov. 3, the group will observe the vote and the count at several precincts and at the state election office. Some members of the group will observe President and Mrs. Carter vote in Plains, followed by a visit with the president to some nearby precincts. On Nov. 4, from 10 a.m.-noon, President Carter and former Canadian Prime Minister Pierre E. Trudeau will co-chair a panel in which the foreign observers will summarize their views of the election and discuss its implications for relations in North America. President Carter also will comment on the election results and on their meaning for U.S.-Latin American relations.

Dr. Robert Pastor, CCEU fellow and the organizer of the Council's observer groups in Latin America, admitted that he knew less about how the U.S. electoral system worked than he did about elections in Latin America. For example, Pastor said, many people cannot answer the following question: "Who in the federal government is officially responsible for receiving and announcing the results of the Presidential election?" That question and others will be answered at the conference.

"We realized that an invitation to Latin American leaders to observe the U.S. elections offered us Americans an opportunity to learn about how the U.S. system works and how it handles irregularities," Dr. Pastor said. "At the same time, it shows Latin America that we are willing to open our electoral process to international observers as they opened their's to us."

David Carroll and Frank Boyd, Carter Center, "How to Observe the U.S. Election"

1:00-2:00 P.M.

- Lunch

Afternoon

- Choices for 1992: The Candidates and the Issues

Co-chaired by:

Robert Pastor, Executive Secretary, Council of Freely-Elected Heads of Government

Rodolfo Terragno, Director of the 21st Century Argentina Foundation and Representative of Council member and former President of Argentina, Raul Alfonsin

2:15 -3:30 P.M.

- The Candidates and Their Positions

Panelists:

Fred Cooper, State Chairman for Georgia, Bush/Qualye '92

Gordon Giffin, Chair, Clinton/Gore Campaign of Georgia

Ken Kendrick, State Chairman of the Georgia Perot Campaign

3:30-3:45 P.M.

- Break

3:45-5:00 P.M.

- Political Analysis of the Campaign

Panelists:

Alan Abramowitz, Professor of Political Science, Emory University

Merle Black, Professor of Political Science, Emory University

5:00-6:15 P.M.

- Break

6:15-7:00 P.M.

- Reception (limited number)

7:00-8:30 P.M.

- Dinner (limited seating)

Keynote address by **William Schneider**, Political Analyst for CNN and Thomas P. O'Neil Professor of American Government at Boston College

"The Campaign - What Happened? What Follows?"

Wednesday, November 4, 1992

10:00-12:00 Noon

- Election Assessment and Implications for North American Relations

Co-chaired by:

former U.S. **President Jimmy Carter**

former Canadian **Prime Minister Pierre Trudeau**

12:00 Noon

- Meeting adjourns

Appendix C

List of Participants

magazine. Political writer and commentator.

Dr. Hector Aguilar Camin, Director of *Nexos* magazine. (unconfirmed)

Party Representatives

Rene Creel, Member of the Partido Acci#n Nacional (PAN) since 1957. PAN Executive Committee for 15 years. Member of PAN Foreign Relations Committee.

Cecilia Romero Castillo, Secretary General of the National Executive Committee of PAN. Former Deputy to the National Assembly (1985-88).

Amalia Garcia, PRD Federal District Deputy to the National Assembly and President of the Assembly's Public Security Commission.

Ricardo Pascoe Pierce, Spokesman for the Party of Democratic Revolution (PRD).

Antonio Mondrag#n, Advisor to the PRD.

Conference Speakers

Danny McDonald, Commissioner, U.S. Federal Elections Commission.

Jeff Lanier, State Elections Supervisor, State of Georgia.

Bill Northquest, Gwinnett County Elections Supervisor.

Fred Cooper, State Chairman for Georgia, Bush/Quayle `92.

Gordon Giffin, Chair, Clinton/Gore Campaign of Georgia.

Ken Kendrick, State Chairman of the Georgia Perot Campaign.

Alan Abramowitz, Professor of Political Science, Emory University.

States for many months before the election and to have had the personnel and resources to systematically observe the entire national election. We are here because we view this project as a mutually enriching experience that benefits both Mexicans and Americans by exchanging information and ideas from different perspectives.

During our three day visit, we listened to fourteen panelist explain to us how U.S. elections are conducted and show us how to monitor this one by using an observation form (attached). We heard the State Chairmen of each of the three major candidates explain positions, and we benefitted from the expert analyses of U.S. politics and the campaign from Merle Black and Alan Abramowitz of Emory University and William Schneider of CNN.

On election day, we deployed in five groups and visited 34 polling stations around the metropolitan area of Atlanta and deep into southern Georgia. We were at precincts when they opened and when they closed. We observed the tabulation of the votes at the County Headquarters in Fulton, Gwinnet, and DeKalf, and we visited the Secretary of State's office and its computer facilities for compiling the complete and certified returns for the state of Georgia. We were also given an exclusive tour of CNN offices where we saw how they were compiling and analyzing the returns. It was a brief but intense and extremely interesting visit.

Last night, our group assembled to discuss our impressions, and there was a consensus around the following points:

First, we were surprised at the absence of government and parties from the electoral process. Elections are clearly in the hands of society.
Second, we were surprised at the degree of decentralization in the U.S. electoral process. The federal role is limited to regulating campaign finance and investigating and adjudicating irregularities, particularly related to voting rights.

The state government sets the rules through its electoral code, but the individual counties - 159 in Georgia - are the ones that conduct the elections.

These two points contrast sharply with the case of Mexico, where elections are heavily centralized by the federal government. Our conclusion as to why the parties are relatively uninvolved and uninterested in the machinery of the elections is because of the high degree of trust in the system, and this trust is due to a long history of free elections, the active involvement of the media and the fear of adverse publicity, and very effective judicial remedies when irregularities occur. The process is transparent and the American people trust the process, and so they don't need to look at every procedural detail of the elections to make sure it is fair.

Third, compared to our experiences in our own country, we were impressed by the large amount of competition and the openness of the whole process. Fourth, we found encouraging and essential the role played by an independent media. Most of us had asked what federal agency was responsible for announcing the official results on election night. The answer is that there is no such office. The media produces and publicizes the results that inform the nation. Fifth, we also found interesting the procedures for all the people voting on amending the state constitution or approving specific proposals (referendum).

There are many more aspects that attracted our attention and will stimulate further discussion among ourselves. But we want to use this opportunity to share with you some thoughts and proposals that might benefit the U.S. system. We have no interest in interfering in the American political system. We offer these criticisms and suggestions in the same

3. **Moving the election day.** In order to increase voter turnout, it might be desirable to either move the election to a weekend or to make the day of the election a holiday.
4. **The Timing of Announcement.** We believe it is unfortunate for the media to project results before people have had a chance to vote; it denies people the right of thinking that their vote counts. We suggest that either the closings be timed to coincide throughout the country, or alternatively, to obtain an agreement from the media that no projections will occur until all the voting has been completed.

Miguel Basa! ez, ACUDE, on behalf of

Leader of Observer Groups:

Sergio Aguayo
Julio Faesler
Rogelio Gomez
Jorge E. Ortiz Gallegos

Representatives of Mexican Political Parties

Cecilia Romero, PAN

Centro Carter de Atlanta Georgia-- para observar las elecciones presidenciales en Estados Unidos del 3 de noviembre de 1992.

El propósito del viaje fue hacer lo que el Consejo ha hecho en diversas ocasiones: observar un proceso electoral. El aceptar la invitación en un país como México no dejó de tener sus complicaciones porque debido a razones históricas y políticas todavía no termina en nuestro país el debate sobre la observación internacional de elecciones.

La delegación estuvo integrada por diez personas. Cuatro de ellas pertenecen a organismos no-gubernamentales que han observado elecciones en México (Sergio Aguayo, Miguel Basaléz, Julio Faesler y Jorge Eugenio Ortiz). Otros representaron al Partido Acción Nacional (Renée Creel y Cecilia Romero) y al Partido de la Revolución Democrática (Amalia García y Ricardo Pascoe). También fue miembro de la delegación un analista político independiente (Federico Reyes Heróles).

Para realizar nuestro trabajo contamos con el apoyo de dos representantes de miembros del consejo: Rodolfo Terragno, representante del ex-presidente de Argentina Raúl Alfonsín y Joaquín Daly, representante del ex-presidente peruano Fernando Belaúnde Terry.

Desde un primer momento fuimos conscientes de que la observación no se apegó a las prácticas usuales en este tipo de ejercicios. Por ejemplo, no estuvimos en los Estados Unidos desde meses antes de la elección, y no contamos con el personal y los recursos que nos hubiera permitido observar sistemáticamente la elección en todo el país. Pese a estas limitaciones aceptamos porque vimos este proyecto como una experiencia que podría enriquecer a mexicanos y estadounidenses al permitirnos intercambiar información e ideas desde diferentes perspectivas.

En los tres días que duró la observación escuchamos a 14 panelistas que nos explicaron la forma en que se organizan las elecciones en Estados Unidos. Ello nos permitió afinar un formato que llenamos el día de los comicios. Por otro lado, también nos reunimos con los responsables en el estado de Georgia de conducir las campañas en Georgia de los tres principales candidatos a la presidencia. Finalmente, nos beneficiamos con los análisis de la situación política estadounidense por parte de especialistas Merle Black y Alan Abramowitz de la Universidad Emory y William Schneider de la Channel News Network.

El día de la elección nos dividimos en cinco grupos que visitaron 34 casillas en el área metropolitana de Atlanta y en las zonas rurales del sur de Georgia. Estuvimos en las casillas desde que se abrieron, durante el día y en el momento en que se cerraron. También observamos el conteo de votos en las oficinas correspondientes de los Condados de Fulton, Gwinnet y DeKalb y visitamos el centro de cómputo de la Secretaría del Estado de Georgia donde se compilan y certifican los resultados electorales del estado. Finalmente, realizamos una visita a la sede de la Channel News Network y testificamos la forma en que compilaban y analizaban los resultados. En resumen, fue una visita breve, pero intensa y extremadamente interesante.

Con base en la información que reunimos, la delegación de observadores mexicanos obtuvo un consenso sobre los siguientes puntos:
Primero, nos sorprendió la ausencia de los partidos y del gobierno federal en el proceso electoral. Resultó evidente que las elecciones están en las manos de la sociedad.

Segundo, nos llamó la atención el grado de descentralización del proceso electoral estadounidense. El papel del gobierno federal se limita a regular las finanzas de las campañas y a investigar y resolver irregularidades, sobre todo

las que se relacionan con los derechos de los votantes. Los gobiernos de los estados fijan las reglas a través de un código electoral, pero los condados --159 en Georgia-- son los que manejan las elecciones.

Estos dos aspectos contrastan mucho con lo que pasa en México, en donde las elecciones están fuertemente centralizadas en el gobierno federal.

Concluimos que si los partidos no se involucran ni se interesan en la maquinaria electoral es porque hay una gran confianza en el sistema, y que esta confianza se debe a un historial de elecciones libres, a la participación muy activa de los medios de comunicación y a que el sistema judicial funciona eficientemente en la resolución de aquellas irregularidades que se dan. El proceso es transparente y el pueblo estadounidense confía en él. Por ello, no sienten la necesidad de escudriñar la equidad de todos y cada uno de los detalles del procedimiento electoral.

En tercer lugar, en relación a las experiencias que tenemos en nuestro país, nos impresionó el nivel tan intenso de competitividad y lo abierto de todo el proceso.

Cuarto, nos pareció fundamental y positivo el papel que juegan medios de comunicación independientes. Cuando preguntamos sobre el organismo federal responsable de anunciar los resultados oficiales la noche de la elección, nos enteramos que no existe y que son los medios de comunicación los que informan a la nación de los resultados.

Quinto, también nos pareció muy importante que durante las elecciones se aprueben o rechacen modificaciones a la constitución del estado y propuestas muy específicas (referendums).

Existen algunas críticas y sugerencias sobre aspectos que se podrían mejorar el sistema electoral estadounidense. Aunque no tenemos el menor interés en intervenir en los asuntos electorales de ese país, los incluimos con el mismo

espíritu de amistad y apertura de quienes nos invitaron y porque creemos que todas las partes se benefician de un libre flujo de ideas e información.

1. Empadronamiento, Aunque el proceso de empadronamiento es muy impresionante, creemos que existen formas que --cuidando la posibilidad de que se cometan abusos-- podrían facilitarlo aun más lo que redundaría en una mayor participación ciudadana.
2. Financiamiento de campañas, Compartimos la opinión de muchos estadounidenses sobre la necesidad de que se impongan límites a los gastos en las campañas. De igual modo, creemos que el sistema electoral se beneficiaría con la desaparición de los Comités de Acción Política que influyen indebidamente en el proceso por las grandes cantidades de dinero que manejan. En general, nos parece que deberían seguirse explorando formas que limiten el efecto negativo que puede tener el flujo de recursos a uno u otro candidato.



AUTHORIZED IDENTIFICATION

- * VALID DRIVERS LICENSE
- * SCHOOL RECORD
- * BIRTH CERTIFICATE
- * WORK IDENTIFICATION CARD

* UTILITY BILL	* CREDIT CARD
* SCHOOL IDENTIFICATION	* SOCIAL SECURITY CARD
* DIVORCE DECREE	* CERTIFIED COPY OF LICENSE
* PUBLIC SAFETY IDENTIFICATION	* PASSPORT
* MEDICARE IDENTIFICATION	* REAL ID STAR IDENTIFICATION
* QUICK CASINO CARD	* MILITARY IDENTIFICATION
* CERTIFICATE OF CITIZENSHIP	* NATURALIZED CITIZENSHIP

Points Community Center. Enter the time at site by entering both the arrival time and the departure time as follows: 9:30/9:45.

When you arrive at the site, you should ask for the Polling Manager and introduce yourself, referring to your identification badge and to the letter from Secretary Cleland if necessary. If you have arrived at a particularly busy time, you should step back and wait until the Polling Manager can answer your questions without disrupting the process.

1. Each polling site should be staffed by at least three polling officers. Indicate the number of officers.
2. The polling officer's identification should be clearly visible to voters and observers. Answer yes or no.
3. According to the Georgia Electoral Code, there should be no campaigning within 50 feet of the polling site or within 25 feet of voters waiting in line. Answer yes or no.
4. Each party is allowed to have one poll watcher in the polling site. Indicate the parties which are represented, or if none are present indicate "0" on the form.
5. By marking each voter's name from the list of voters, multiple votes cannot be cast by an individual. Answer yes or no.
6. Please indicate your overall evaluation of the process.
7. If the conduct of the election was unsatisfactory, please describe the irregularities as specifically as possible.

Appendix J

Deployments for U.S. Election Observation

Daytime Deployment:

Joaquin Daly and Jennifer McCoy - coordinators
Chester Bedsole - driver
Observer 1: Miguel Basañez
Observer 2: Tatiana de Basañez
Deployment: 6 precincts in Fulton and Dekalb Counties

Group D:

Mark Feierstein - coordinator
Sig Johnson - driver
Observer 1: Jorge Eugenio Ortiz Gallegos
Observer 2: Rosa Alicia Velez de Ortiz
Deployment: 5 precincts in Fulton, Dekalb, and Gwinnett Counties

Group E:

Jennie Lincoln - coordinator
Ken Goldberg - driver
Observer 1: Antonio Mondragon
Observer 2: Federico Reyes Heroles
Deployment: 6 precincts in Fulton, Dekalb, and Gwinnett Counties

Group F:

Robert Pastor - coordinator/driver
President and Mrs. Carter
Observer 1: Sergio Aguayo
Observer 2: Ricardo Pascoe Pierce
Observer 3: Cecilia Romero Castillo
Deployment: 4 precincts in Sumter and Schley Counties

Evening Deployments:

In the evening, the observers toured the CNN complex and heard media analysis and projections of the early returns. Later, the group was divided into teams and observed precinct closings, the tabulation of votes at the counting headquarters in Fulton, Dekalb, and Gwinnett Counties, the computer facilities of the Secretary of State's office where the state's returns are compiled and certified, and the campaign headquarters of each of the three major candidates.

Appendix K

Selected Clippings from the Mexican Press

Summary of the Mexican Press Commentary on the "Observation of the U.S. Elections."

The delegation of international observers of the 1992 U.S. elections included representatives from two of the major political parties in Mexico, the *Partido*

Accion Nacional (PAN) and the Partido de la Revolucion Democratica

intervention and is not a violation of a state's sovereignty (*El Universal*, 31 octubre, 1992).

Aguayo returned to the issue in a subsequent article written on the day of the election in Atlanta, where he posed the question, "Could this observation mission be used in the future by the U.S. to interfere in our electoral affairs?" For Aguayo, the answer is negative, "since one of the criteria for carrying out an election observation in another country is that the mission be based on an invitation from the political parties and from the government" (*La Jornada*, 3 noviembre, 1992). According to Aguayo, it is the degree of Mexico's national unity and the solidity of its national institutions that will determine whether U.S.

A lesson that Basa! ez himself learned in observing the U.S. elections is the key role that an independent media can play in the democratic process. In the decentralized U.S. electoral system, where there is no federal authority that compiles official results, the media performs the important function of analyzing results and projecting the winner. No one really doubts the credibility of the media, because they are independent and objective. According to Basa! ez, if the Mexican media would assert its own independence, international observers might not be needed (*Excelsior*, 16 noviembre, 1992).

On the long-term prospects of the Mexican political system, Basa! ez writes that Mexico needs to recognize that its centrally-controlled political system is exhausted, and that the key to turning its potential calamity into an opportunity for further progress is to accept the "hidden biparty-ism" in society. Despite the proliferation of parties in Mexico, he argues there are really just two main political forces, corresponding roughly to the Democrats (pro-social welfare) and the Republicans (pro-business) in the U.S. What Mexico needs, according to Basa! ez, is to create a viable two-party system that respects the rule of law and the separation of powers and holds fair elections; an economy resting on modern capitalism, with the promotion of free competition, the internationalization of the economy, and the regulation of monopoly; and a society respectful of diversity, the promotion of social equity, and the separation of government and media (*Excelsior*, 23 noviembre, 1992).

Selected Clippings From the Mexican Press

"Invitapcis to accesrAccording to Bam7Tc 0o

"Clinton y la unidad nacional," *La Jornada*, 7 noviembre 1992.

"Delegacion mexicana de observadores a los comicios de Estados Unidos," *Excelsior*, 3 noviembre 1992.

"Bipartidismo velado," *Excelsior*, 23 noviembre 1992.

"Como lograr comicios creibles," *Excelsior*, 16 noviembre 1992.

"Un observador muy al norte," *La Jornada*, 3 noviembre 1992.

"Hubo presiones oficiales contra observadores de la eleccion en EU," *La Jornada*, noviembre 1992.

"Descentralizacion, la diferencia entre los comicios de ELU y Mexico," *La Jornada*, noviembre 1992.

Other International Press

"El reciente papel de las organizaciones internacionales en la supervision de elecciones en el Caribe," *Listin Diaro*, 13 noviembre 1992 (from the Dominican Republic).

EL UNIVERSAL, 31 de octubre 1992

Invitan a 15 mexicanos como observadores de los comicios de EU; los eligieron al azar

Por ALFREDO GRADOS

Reportaro de EL UNIVERSAL

Con el proposito de asegurar el proceso electoral del proximo tres de noviembre, 15 mexicanos han sido invitados como observadores a la eleccion presidencial de Estados Unidos por el Centro Carter de Atlanta, Georgia, donde tendran acceso a todas las etapas del suceso y al final de estas emitir un dictamen.

Asi lo establecio Sergio Aguayo Quezada, presidente de la Academia de los Derechos Humanos, quien agrego que los invitados fueron elegidos "al azar, intentando llevar a representantes de diversos rubros de la sociedad".

De esta forma entre los observadores se cuenta a cinco de instituciones no gubernamentales, cuatro de distintas revistas del "rden politico y seis de partidos politicos, entre los que se cuentan del Revolucionario Institucional, Acci"n Nacional y de la Revoluci"n Democr&tica.

Aguayo Quezada afirm" que esta es la primera vez que Estados Unidos hace una invitaci"n oficial a un grupo de extranjeros para ver su proceso electoral. Asimismo, refiri" que entre los invitados extranjeros tambi%n se encuentran el ex primer ministro de Canad&, Pierre Elliot Trudeau, un personaje argentino, otro peruano y algunos cubanos que se duda participen pues tienen- dificultades porque el Departamento de Estado estadounidense no les otorga las visas correspondientes.

Entre los mexicanos de organismos no gubernamentales que estar&n en las elecciones norteamericanas se encuentran: Julio Faesler, presidente del Consejo para la Democracia; Miguel Bas&! ez y. Jorge Eugenio Ortiz Gallegos, del Acuerdo Nacional para la Democracia; Rogelio G"mez Hermosillo, miembro de la Convergencia de Organismos Civiles por la Democracia, y el propio Sergio Aguayo, presidente de la Academia Mexicana de Derechos Humanos.

Al ser cuestionado sobre la posibilidad de que observadores extranjeros acudan a M%xico en las elecciones gubernamentales o presidenciales, Aguayo reconoci" que la postura de la Academia de Derecho- "es no invitar a observadores internacionales a elecciones, porque la democracia es fundamentalmente tarea de los mexicanos y de los propios ciudadanos de cada pais"

Sin embargo, acept" que cuando un grupo de observadores es invitado (como es el caso que a ellos les ata! e), esto no constituye un acto de intervenci"n, "no hay violaci"n a la soberania"

Aguayo Quezada estableci" que ya en otras ocasiones la academia ha sido invitada como observador como es el caso de Haiti en 1990, Guyana y Angola. Por otro lado, se refiri" a la Ley Torricelli como un acto de flagrante intervenci"n en otro pais. "La ley de un pais no tiene necesariamente que repercutir en injerencias extraterritoriales"

La invitaci"n para los observadores es de parte del Centro Carter en Atlanta, Georgia, donde estar&n por espacio de cuatro dias y para el mi%rcoles rendir&n un informe a la opini"n p' blica.

Al referirse a la declaraci"n del presidente Carlos Salinas de Gortari en el sentido de oponerse total mente a cualquier insinua ci"n de reelecci"n, Aguayo estableci" que: "lo admiti" en un buen momento polltico para apaciguar los diferentes rumores que apuntaban hacia ello"

SABADO 31 DE OCTUBRE DE 1992

Fueron invitados por el Centro Carter

Observar& las elecciones en EU, un grupo de mexicanos

V&ctor Cardoso Un grupo de 15 mexicanos miembros de organismos no gubernamentales, medios period&sticos y de los tres principales partidos pol&sticos asistir&n como observadores a las elecciones estadounidenses del pr"ximo martes 3 de noviembre.

Al dar a conocer la invitaci"n que les gir" el Centro Carter de la Universidad Emory de Atlanta, Georgia, el presidente de la Academia Mexicana de Derechos Humanos (AMDH), Sergio Aguayo Quezada, inform" que la participaci"n de los observadores mexicanos ser& en respuesta a la demanda de reciprocidad exigida a los estadounidenses.

Explicó que si ese país insiste en enviar observadores a calificar las elecciones en otras naciones, lo justo es que sus procesos electorales también sean calificados internacionalmente.

Al respecto aclaró que a pesar de su participación como observador en las elecciones estadounidenses, la AMDH mantiene su posición negativa a que en México participen observadores extranjeros "porque la democracia es tarea fundamental de los mexicanos".

Consideró que la invitación podría ser una arma de dos filos: en primer lugar, por ser la primera vez que se invita a observadores extranjeros a calificar las elecciones estadounidenses, podría representar un mecanismo de presión para que en las próximas elecciones en México también se exija la presencia de observadores extranjeros.

Durante la conferencia de prensa también participó Julio Faesler, del Consejo para la Democracia, y manifestó que la presencia de observadores extranjeros en un proceso electoral es un mecanismo de legitimación. "Mientras un gobierno no esté sustentado en procesos electorales creíbles, no puede ponerse a discutir áreas tan importantes como la economía o los cambios sociales", indicó.

Respecto al programa de trabajo, Aguayo Quezada dio a conocer que fueron invitados como observadores: Julio Faesler, por parte del Consejo para la Democracia; Rogelio Gómez Hermosillo y Miguel Basáez, de la Convergencia de Organismos Civiles para la Democracia, y él mismo, como representante de la AMDH.

De igual forma asistirán el director de la Revista *Este país*, Federico Reyes Heróles; el director de la revista *Nexos*, Héctor Aguilar Camón, y el subdirector de la revista *Vuelta*, Enrique Krauze. Además, asistirían representantes del PRI, PRD y el PAN. En esos organismos, se informó que las invitaciones fueron

De cualquier manera, nuestros observadores que se convertirán en "mirones", seguramente nos traerán severas críticas al quehacer electoral en aquel país y digo esto con certeza porque sé, muy bien, que son realmente críticos y que pondrán toda su atención y, desde luego, su capacidad de análisis en las crueles, duras y crudas imágenes que transmitan las televisoras estadounidenses.

Debería y estoy, por ello, por nuestros "mirones", verdaderamente orgulloso, pero me brotan dudas malvolas, incertidumbres que me hacen negar la bondad del trabajo prodemocracia que ejercen en su cruzada estos héroes de la democracia y nada más por no quedarme con mi veneno lo derramo todo en este espacio, para así también expiar mis culpas de duda.

Entonces, para ser más claro, debería empezar por decir que, como ya es sabido, uno de los anhelos de muchos políticos estadounidenses es sin duda

No es cuesti"n de si nuestras elecciones son buenas o malas, seguramente son perfectibles, pero entre nosotros a' n cabe fuerza para reformarlas, sin consejos que vengan acompa! a de intereses poco claros o que traten de filtrar mensajes ama! ados que busquen desprestigiar para permitir mayores intervenciones. En la lista que se da de nuestros "mirones" est& cl nombre H%ctor Aguilar Cam\$,n, quien hasta donde s% es el ' nico que clin" la magn\$fica oferta de convertirse en protagonista de evento que, por otro, lado tiene, quiz& por primera vez, una portancia fundamental para el mundo en su totalidad, pero H%ctor lo mismo podr& verlo por las televisoras mexicanas se encargaran de transmitir el hecho noticioso.

De cualquier forma, seg' n s%, Clinton y Bush estar&n muy pendientes de las opiniones de los "mirones" mexicanos que en uno de los sondeos se acusa de violaci"n de derechos human a los encuestadores de Gallup o a cualquier televisora de aquel pa\$s, de quienes han dependido estas elecciones \$\$Pages\$\$
LA JORNADA, noviembre 1992

Cecilia Romero, secretaria general panista

Hubo presiones oficiales contra observadores de la eleccion en EU

Roberto Zumarripa)??) Cecilia Romero, secrelaria general panistn, y observadora en los comicios estadunldenses, confirm" que hubo presiones del gobierno mexicano para que no asistieran algunos a la testificacion de esc proceso.

Asimismo, dijo que del informe signado por Sergio Aguayo; Ricardo Pascoc, Julio Fnesler y Jorge Eugento Ortiz Gallegos, destnca la consideraci"n que aquellos comicios son "de buena fe" y en contrasicocon los mexicanos, tienen resultados expeditos, la de les medios de comunicaci"n es grande y exisie unu descentraliznci"n en la organizaci"n del proccso que efectivos sus efectivos resultados.

Indicó que Miguel Basfiez, integrante del grupo de observadores mexicanos, invitado por el Consejo Carter que preside el ex mandatario estadounidense James Carter, fue advertido "por un funcionario del gobierno federal mexicano" de que no asistiera.

Se le dijo, contó Romero, que su presencia era "contraria al interés nacional". La queja fue conocida no sólo por el heterogéneo grupo de mexicanos asistentes, sino por el propio James Carter, quien habría considerado importante la presencia de este grupo nacional.

Carter consideró que el Consejo que preside siempre ha sido criticado porque participó como observador en comicios de distintos países pero no permitía la observación de las propias elecciones estadounidenses. Ahora, dijo Carter en versión de Romero, se demostró que eso es posible con la observación de los mexicanos.

Romero informó que se daría a conocer un informe con las conclusiones del grupo de observadores mexicanos. Lo fundamental es que se destaca la rapidez con la que se conocen resultados de la descentralización en la organización de los comicios; de la gente sobre lo que tiene que votar y cómo hacerlo.

La importancia de que los comicios se realicen en días hábiles; la claridad en el padrón electoral; y, sobre todo, que son comicios "basados en la buena fe".

Difficilmente se alegan irregularidades sobre gente que no está en el padrón o que vote de manera duplicada, por ejemplo.

En el grupo participaron René Creel y Cecilia Romero por el PAN; Ricardo Pascoc y Amalia García por el PRD; el ex panista Jorge Eugenio Ortíz Gallegos - "si nos saludamos", dijo Romero - , Sergio Aguayo y Miguel Basfiez.

Aun cuando estaban en la lista de invitados y se consideraban que podían asistir, Roberta Lajous y Guadalupe Pacheco, del PRI, no lo hicieron, confirm" Romero.

Insuficiente oferta

En la conferencia de prensa semanal de la directiva nacional panista, Diego Zavala, miembro del Consejo Nacional, y Luis Alvarez, presidente del partido, coincidieron en expresar que los ofrecimientos del presidente Carlos Salinas, de regular el gasto en campañas electorales y otras cuestiones colaterales, si bien son aceptables, resultan a todas luces insuficientes"

Respecto al llamado para que los partidos obtengan consenso para una reforma electoral, Alvarez dijo que lo principal es que esto se discuta entre "verdaderos partidos políticos". Se le preguntó sobre cuáles no eran "verdaderos partidos"

Los observadores mexicanos se declararon sorprendidos porque son los medios de comunicaci3n los que proporcionan resultados inmediatos de la elecci3n, que adem4s son crebles.

Las conclusiones de su trabajo de observaci3n fueron leídas el 4 de noviembre ante James Carter, ex presidente de Estados Unidos, y Pierre Trudeau, ex premier de Canada, así como ante miembros del Centro Carter.

Se indicó que haber sido un honor haber sido testigos del nacimiento de nueva era para Estados Unidos y que el haber aceptado la invitación del Consejo para Elecciones Libres y del Centro Carter no estaba exento de implicaciones en México, donde el debate sobre la observaci3n electoral externa es insuficiente. También se apuntó que el trabajo no tuvo la amplitud que se hubiera requerido de acuerdo con los estándares de la observaci3n internacional. En otras circunstancias hubiera sido necesario una estancia de meses, "pero aun así los beneficios eran muchos en el intercambio de experiencias y puntos de vista desde diferentes perspectivas".

El grupo estuvo integrado por Sergio Aguayo, Miguel Basaluz Jorge Eugenio Ortiz Gullagos, Julio Faesler y Rogelio Gómez, en representaci3n de organizaciones mexicanas de observaci3n electoral; también por los representantes partidistas René Creel y Cecilia Romero, del Partido Acción Nacional (PAN), y Ricardo Pascoe y Amalia García, del Partido de la Revoluci3n Democrática (PRD); también asistió el analista político Federico Reyes Heróles. Cinco son las conclusiones principales; la ausencia del gobierno y partidos respecto del proceso, el control ciudadano de los comicios, su descentralizaci3n, competitividad y apertura en la contienda; asimismo, los medios de comunicaci3n juegan un papel independiente esencial, particularmente en la informaci3n de resultados inmediatos.

LISTIN DIARIO, 13 noviembre 1992

Opini"n

POR BERNARDO VEGA

El reciente papel de las organizaciones internacionales en la supervisi"n de elecciones en le Caribe

Uno de los fen"menos politicos m&s importantes que han tenido lugar en nuestra region en los ' ltimos tres a! os, lo ha sido la supervisi"n de elecciones nacionales por parte de organismos internacionales y grupos extranjeros.

En el pasado, la costumbre habia sido que el gobierno del pais en cuesti"n, o su Junta Central Electoral, invitaba a un peque!o grupo de personalidades internacionales, asi como a la OEA. para que estuviesen presentes en el pais el d\$a de las elecciones y visitasen algunas mesas electorales. Era m&s bien una supervision simb"lica, como ocurri" en Santo Domingo en 1962, 1966 y 1978. Sin embargo, a partir de 1989 el papel de organismos y grupos internacionales en la supervisi"n efectiva de elecciones ha sido mucho m&s importante en el &rea del Caribe. Su presencia fisica ha tenido lugar varios meses antes de elecciones y han visto involucrados en todo el proceso, desde la preparaci"n del registro electoral, hasta la supervisi"n de la votaci"n y el conteo postertor.

Panama

Panama, en 1989, fue el \$\$\$Word\$\$\$ de ese proceso, aunque alli lo que logr" la presencia internacional fue confirmar lo fraudulento de las elecciones organizadas por el General Manuel Noriega. Un mes antes de las mismas. Noriega autoriz" la presencia el dia de la votaci"n de representantes del Consejo de Jefes de Gobiernos Elegidos Librementemente, una organizaci"n auspiciada y dirigida por el ex-Presidente Jimmy Carter y compuesta por otros diecisiete ex-presidentes y presidentes del hemisferio y que incluye a Rafael Caldera y Ra' l Alfonsin. Tanto el ex-Presidente Carter, como el ex-Presidente Gerald Ford, estuvieron en Panam& ese dia de las elecciones y las declararon fraudulentas.

La presencia allí de estos dos ex-presidentes norteamericanos, fue auspiciada por dos organizaciones norteamericanas de reciente formación, una vinculada al Partido Republicano y otra al Partido Demócrata, pero ambas financiadas por el *National Endowment for Democracy*, establecido durante el gobierno de Reagan. Esa es otra innovación importante en la política externa norteamericana, pues ahora se asignan recursos federales para promover la democracia en América Latina y el Caribe, pues se considera, por fin, que esa promoción ayuda tanto al bienestar económico como lo haría un préstamo para la salud o la educación. En nuestro país, por ejemplo, la AID ha donado US\$9 millones a la PUCMM para hacer estudios y diseñar programas para promover la democracia. Algo parecido está haciendo con el Congreso Dominicano.

A nivel de la OEA, su histórica resolución en Santiago de Chile, de junio de 1991, de oponerse a golpes de estado, representa el primer compromiso efectivo de esa organización regional de defender la democracia.

Nicaragua

Después de la experiencia panameña, tuvo lugar, en 1990, la supervisión de las elecciones en Nicaragua. En 1987, como resultado del Acuerdo de Esquipulas, se acordó pedir, como parte del cese al fuego, que tanto la OEA como las Naciones Unidas, supervisarán las elecciones que tendrían lugar tres años después. Fue esta la primera vez que las Naciones Unidas aceptaron supervisar unas elecciones y lo hicieron tan solo porque era parte esencial de un acuerdo de cese al fuego y, además, por la presión política ejercida por varios presidentes de la región sobre ese organismo.

Tanto la OEA como las Naciones Unidas ayudaron en la preparación del registro electoral, enviando personal a tiempo completo desde mucho tiempo antes. El día de las elecciones, la OEA tenía allí trescientos cuarenticinco observadores, cubriendo el 70% de las urnas y las Naciones Unidas, cuya misión la

encabezaou el norteamericano Elliot Richardson, tenian doscientos treintisiete observadores, en un 49% de las mesas electrales. Tambi%n estuvo Jimmy Carter, en represen. taci"n del Consejo de Jefes de Gobiernos Elegid"s Libremente, Incluso se llev" a cabo un muestreo de las votaciones en una cantidad de mesas electorales, representativas del total, para as\$ rapidamente conocer los resultados y no tener que esperar el conteo final \$\$Word\$\$ Las consecuencias de todo esto son bien conocidas; gan" la se! ora Chamorro.

Santo Domingo

Tres meses despu%s. tuvieron lugar las elecciones en Santo Domingo. Jimmy Carter y tres acompa! antes tan solo llegaron a nuestro pais un dia antes de las elecciones. por lo que no podian atestiguar sobre la confiabilidad del proceso de actualizaci"n de registro electoral. Aun asi, su presencia, asi como la de la OEA y el CAPE1. fue de suma importancia en la soluci"n del conflicto surgido por unas elecciones sumamepte re! idas.

Haiti

Siete meses despu%s, en el otro lado de nuestra isla, tuvieron lugar las primeras elecciones libres en la historia de Haiti Estuvieron presentes la OEA. el grupo encabezado por Carter y. por segunda vez. las Naciones Unidas. Este ' ltimo organismo incluso proveyo "consejeros de seguridad". para la ocasion. Las Naciones Unldas no querian participar en el proceso. por el precedente que le crearia, pero recibi" presiones. tanto de paises latinoamericanos como de grupos norteamericanos. Alli tanto la OEA como las Naciones Unidas tambien efectuaron un muestreo de los resultados en una cantidad de mesas representativas de la totalidad. para conocer los resultados rapidamente.

Surname y Guyana

En 1991, tanto la OEA como el grupo enca bezado por Carter estuvieron presentes en las elecciones en Suriname. Luego, en Guyana, el grupo de Carter

ayud" en la preparaci"n del empadronamiento de los votantes. Junto con representantes de la Mancomunidad Brit&nica. El resultado fue el retorno al poder de otro viejo veterano de la politica carbe! a. Cheddi Jagan. (quien habia gobernado alli en 1953). en las primeras elecciones libres en la historia de ese joven pais.

El futuro cercano

Las elecciones dominicanas de 1994 representar&n un momento decisivo en nuestra lucha por el fortalecimiento democr&tico. tan importante como el paso de la dictadura a la democracia de 1961 y la entrega del poder por un partido a otro. en 1978. pues todo indica que implicar&n un relevo generacional. El nuestro es un pais donde el candidato perdedor hace muchos a! os que no felicita publicamente al ganador: conde, segun encuestas efectuadas a nivel nacional este a! o. un 68% de los encuestados consider" que en las dos ultimas elecciones hubo enga! os y fraudes y apenas un 20% penso que esas dos elecciones fueron limpias y honestas. Estas dudas ponen en gran peligro la confianza en el proceso democr, tico nacional. Somos tambi% n un pais donde la jerarquia eclesiastica ya ha manifestado publicamente que no volver& a participar en una Comis"n de Notables. como la de 1986.

Ante la debilidad financiera y de recursos humanos de la Junta Central Electoral, ante las grandes dificultades y el poco tiempo que queda para poner en pr&ctica. los cambios que se requieren para mejorar el Registro Electoral, creemos que es imprescindible que dicha Junta solicite a la comunidad intermacional su ayuda para que las elecciones de 1994 sean consideradas, tanto por los dominicanos como por el resto del mundo, como limpias y honestas.

No podemos darnos el lujo de convertirnos en una excepci"n en el Caribe.

Appendix L

Selected Clippings from the U.S. Press

"Does U.S. Vote Meet World's Standards?" *The Atlanta Journal and Constitution*, 8 November 1992.

"Lawmakers Favor Voting Reforms," *The Atlanta Journal and Constitution*, 4 January 1993

"Feds Aim Crackdown on Election Fraud," *The Atlanta Journal and Constitution*, 3 November 1992.

"Polls' Sticker is Hot Ticket," *The Atlanta Journal and Constitution*, 5 November 1992.

"Cherokee's Election Nightmare," *The Atlanta Journal and Constitution*, 5 November 1992.

"Carter Gives Clinton All the Credit," *The Atlanta Journal and Constitution*, 5 November 1992.

"How 50 States Voted for President," *The Atlanta Journal and Constitution*, 5 November 1992.

"Feds Put Lid on Parties' Campaign Contribution for Fowler-Coverdell Race," *The Atlanta Journal and Constitution*, 7 November 1992.

"27,500 Votes for President Didn't Count in Metro Area," *The Atlanta Journal and Constitution*, 7 November 1992.

"Most New Ga. Voters are Democrats," *The Atlanta Journal and Constitution*, 8 November 1992.

"Polling Places Overwhelmed," *The Atlanta Journal and Constitution*, 8 November 1992.

"Mexico's Leader Cautiously Backs Some Big Changes," *The New York Times*, 2 November 1992.

Atlanta Journal/Constitution

11/08/92

Does U.S. vote meet world's standards?

By Jennifer McCoy and David Carroll

Voters need no identification to vote, and there is nothing to stop them from registering in multiple precincts. Intimidation and vote-buying occur, and the wealthy elite can buy their way into races that are closed to the average citizen. Does this sound like a description of Haiti, Nicaragua, Panama, Guyana or Mexico? Well, it isn't. These are problems we noted in the U.S. voting process when we watched it Tuesday with a group of Mexican observers.

Those five other countries are places where we've monitored elections and judged whether they were free and fair, acting on behalf of a group of hemispheric leaders chaired by former President Jimmy Carter. This time, we looked at the U.S. election, using the same criteria we apply elsewhere.

Highly decentralized

First we considered the neutrality and independence of the officials who organize and conduct elections. Most surprising from a foreigner's viewpoint is the extreme decentralization of the U.S. system. Each state has its own voting laws and procedures, and the elections themselves are run by county officials.

But local officials generally enjoy a high degree of independence, and there is no evidence of bias in the implementation of voting procedures.

Second, does the campaign offer all parties a reasonably equal opportunity to get their message out?

Here the U.S. system scores poorly. The lack of free access to television and the expense of paid advertising make it prohibitive for many to enter a contest, let alone win. And it's getting worse. Between 1990 and 1992, the money spent on congressional races rose by 25 percent.

Incumbents retain a tremendous advantage in fund-raising, free news coverage, and congressional franking privileges. Together with the winner-take-all system of the Electoral College, this contributes to the dominance of the two traditional parties, effectively blocking the emergence of third parties and more voter choice.

No ID necessary

Third, is the actual voting and counting of ballots honest and open?

It's striking to foreign observers that no identification is required here to cast a ballot. With cases of vote-buying and manipulation of absentee ballots reported in Georgia, why don't more people worry about holes in our system?

There are several answers to that. First is the fact that after 200 years of elections, most Americans take the integrity of the system for granted. They trust it. Second, the judicial system is effective in punishing electoral crimes with stiff penalties. Finally, while fraud does occur, it would take an almost insurmountable organizational effort to change the outcome of most elections.

While the high degree of citizen confidence is clearly a strength of the U.S. system, the fact that some loopholes exist should make us consider a few simple safeguards.

What about the compilation and announcement of official results? Unlike the countries we have observed, where the population often has to wait for days for results, in the United States it is the news media, not the government, that announces the winners the night of the election.

What is worrisome is that the media's early projections can discourage people from voting, especially on the West Coast.

A final criterion is the rate of participation. If we observed elections in another country and found that less than 70 percent of adults had registered to vote and only 50 percent of registered voters had actually cast ballots, as is common in the United States, we would be concerned about possible intimidation or lack of trust in the system.

On Tuesday, people turned out in larger numbers. Still, only 54 percent of all eligible voters, as opposed to registered voters, cast ballots nationwide, and only 46 percent in Georgia.

Ironically, with long lines of highly motivated voters waiting outside polling stations, the process resembled the "unsophisticated" first-time elections we have witnessed in Latin America.

Jennifer McCoy is associate professor of political science at Georgia State University. David Carroll is assistant director of the Latin American and Caribbean program of the Carter Center of Emory University.

Atlanta Journal-Constitution

January 4, 1993

Lawmakers favor voting reforms

But they'd keep runoff elections

By Mark Sherman

STAFF WRITER

Georgia lawmakers support reforms aimed at making it easier to register and vote, including moving elections from Tuesdays to Saturdays, according to a survey by The Atlanta Journal-Constitution.

However, legislators did express support for other measures that proponents say would increase voter participation - moving elections from Tuesdays to Saturdays and as is done in Texas, allowing absentee ballots to be cast up to three weeks before an election.

Asked about making it easier for Georgians to register and vote, a bare majority of those polled favored automatically registering people when they apply for licenses or government benefits.

President Bush voted a federal version of the so-called motor-voter bill last year, but supporters say they'll try again in the new Congress. A federal law would eliminate the need for corresponding state legislation.

Lawmakers were more receptive to innovative ways of drawing more people to the polls.

Saturday elections supported

Holding elections on Saturdays has the support of nearly two-thirds of those polled. Many European countries vote on the weekend. And a solid .0026 Te3yf

The proposed settlement will not come to a vote in the General Assembly, but legislators may be asked to vote on a change in the state constitution to make that settlement legal.

"It's not surprising at all to me that a majority of the membership would not support initiatives that would make for more diversity in the judicial branch," said Rep. Tyrone Brooks, a leader in the lawsuit. "Most of these Southern states have always resisted initiatives that open up

Federal prosecutors and FBI agents in the Middle District of Georgia will be on special duty today to receive and respond to complaints of election fraud. Edgar Ennis, U.S. attorney for the district, said such fraud "dilutes the worth of votes cast and corrupts the essence of our representative form of government." Although Mr. Ennis's announcement referred to a federal enforcement program that has been in effect since 1976, there have been charged of election irregularities this year in some counties in Middle Georgia.

FBI agents have seized election records from this summer's primaries in Hancock and Quitman counties.

Last month, The Atlanta Journal-Constitution reported that the issue of election fraud, particularly by the manipulation of absentee ballots of elderly voters in rural counties, has become the focus of both federal and state investigations. Among the obvious types of fraud that his office seeks to prosecute are vote buying, voter intimidation and ballot forgery, Mr. Ennis said. However, he added, it is also a federal crime to do things such as seeking out the elderly, the disadvantaged or the illiterate for the purpose of subjugating their free will in the casting of their ballot.

Mr. Ennis appointed Assistant U.S. Attorney Harry Fox as district elections officer, responsible for election-fraud investigations and prosecutions. Anyone who observes possible instances of election fraud during today's election is urged to call the U.S. attorney's office at (912) 752-3511, or the FBI at (912) 745-1271.

The Atlanta Journal / The Atlanta Constitution

Thursday, November 5, 1992

Polls' sticker is hot ticket

Voters brave waits good-naturedly, but some say polls poorly organized

FROM STAFF REPORTS

To see the thousands of people in lines snaking around school desks and church pews, winding through firehouses and grocery stores, throughout metro Atlanta, you'd think there were World Series tickets at the end of the line.

Instead, from Hall to Henry, Forsyth to Fulton, Barrow to Butts, Atlanta area voters turned out in record numbers Tuesday to get a small sticker that said "I voted."

While many cheered a triumph for the political system - with turnouts as high as 84 percent in the region - others faulted officials for not preparing for the onslaught of voters that forced some to wait as long as five hours and others to give up before reaching the ballot box.

"It was crowded, there were lines, and the lines were long," Cobb Elections Supervisor Sharon Dunn said. "But we expected it, and we tried to alert the public."

At 8:30 a.m. at Greater Atlanta Christian School on Indian Trail Road in Gwinnett County, the line was like a horseshoe, running the length of gymnasium and back again before people could even talk to poll workers.

"It was this long at 6:30 this morning," said Poll Manager Barbara Donald.

Last vote cast at 11:25 p.m.

Just as they were waiting when the polls opened, there were many in long lines when they closed at 7 p.m.

"The last person who voted voted at 11:25," said Fred Pauli, precinct manager for the Redan South poll in DeKalb County. "It took him from 7 to 11:45.... Once a person got in line they waited ... I think a lot of friendships were made, [at least] temporary friendships."

With so much time on their hands, plenty of voters came up with suggestions on ways to make voting more pleasant.

"They should give us a shorter line for those people who vote every year," said repeat voter Len Wayne, 34, district manager for a Norcross camera company. Meanwhile, Georgia State student Courtney Perkins, 21, said she craved coffee while she waited nearly two hours to vote. "I didn't expect the lines would be this long," she said. "A lot of people are just coming out to vote, but I wish they had given us all coffee when we were in line," she said.

Just before 7 p.m., voters lined a

Technology from the 1940s'

"We just didn't anticipate it; we didn't have enough machines," said an embarrassed J.O. Garrett, Cherokee's election superintendent. "Once we found out what was occurring, we didn't have time to react."

The Atlanta Journal / The Atlanta Constitution

November 5, 1992

Mr. Carter said that, while he was pleased with Mr. Clinton's victory, it was "not a mandate for Bill Clinton, but a rejection of George Bush."

There has been speculation that Mr. Carter would be offered a position in Mr. Clinton's administration, perhaps as a special envoy to the Middle East. Mr. Carter said he would not accept a permanent position but would be willing to serve as a part-time adviser.

Mr. Carter, who watched the election returns at his home in Plains, Ga., called Mr. Clinton a personal friend and said he talked to him by telephone about his victory.

"He's looking forward, as I did in 1976, to bringing together Democrats and Republicans from the House and Senate to begin addressing some of the major issues that face the country," Mr. Carter said, adding that the issues are "almost all domestic."

He asserted that stopping the government's flow of red ink will require "some sacrifices" and predicted that Mr. Clinton will have a difficult time getting his programs through Congress.

But he said that voters, in supporting tough-talking independent candidate Ross Perot, signaled willingness to make sacrifices. Mr. Perot advocated heavy taxes to bring down the deficit.

Meanwhile, the Mexican observers, invited through Mr. Carter's Council of Freely Elected Heads of Government, expressed admiration for the U.S. voting system but were troubled by how television networks projected winners even before West Coast polls had closed.

The visitors also suggested that the ease with which citizens of this country register allows voters to sign up in many places and vote repeatedly.

Atlanta Journal / The Atlanta Constitution

Saturday, November 7, 1992

Feds put lid on parties' campaign contributions for Fowler-Coverdell race

ASSOCIATED PRESS

Washington - The Federal Election Commission said Friday that political parties can't exceed general election contribution limits during Georgia's runoff campaign between Sen-Wyche Fowler Jr. and Republican challenger Paul Coverdell.

The decision means Mr. Coverdell can expect no more financial help from state or national Republican parties, which reached both the \$17,500 direct contribution limit and the \$537,600 coordinated spending limit during the general election campaign.

The Democratic Senatorial Campaign Committee, however, will be able to spend about \$200,000 more on the Fowler campaign, since it was that much short of the coordinated spending limit in the general election campaign.

Nehl Horton, spokesman for the DSCC, said the committee will provide Mr. Fowler "everything we can under our allocation authority."

Messrs. Fowler and Coverdell spent Friday campaigning around Georgia. Mr. Fowler told Columbus residents a Democratic senator would be better suited to pushing President-elect Bill Clinton's plans.

Mr. Fowler went on to Albany, where he pledged to continuing supporting programs that help rural Georgians.

Mr. Coverdell went to Ellijay in north Georgia for a radio talk show.

failure. The Atlanta Journal-Constitution's analysis of election returns also suggests that straight-ticket voting may be a culprit.

Whatever the reasons, the problem hits black voters hardest.

In Fulton County, the only local jurisdiction that tallies blank or spoiled votes by precinct, black neighborhoods accounted for 108 of the 125 precincts where more than 5 percent of presidential votes did not count.

Ninety of those 125 precincts were sandwiched between Lakewood Freeway to the south and the Interstate 75/85 interchange to the north. In 13 precincts, all but two of which were located in innercity neighborhoods, more than one in 10 presidential votes did not count.

Questions raised about straight-party ticket

The newspaper's analysis supports the results of a survey of primary returns conducted before Tuesday's election, which found that precincts with the highest percentage of uncounted or spoiled votes tended overwhelmingly to be in neighborhoods with low-education levels and high-poverty rates.

The newspaper's latest survey, however, raises new questions about the use of the straight-party vote option that has been on Georgia ballots since 1980. Voters who take the time to read the preamble to the straight-party option on the ballot learn that a straight-party vote does not include a vote for president. A voter must still cast a vote for the presidential electors if he or she wishes to vote straight party.

Four out of six Fulton polling officials who worked in problem precincts said they were unaware of that distinction when contacted by the Journal-Constitution.

"If you voted straight party, you voted for president," said Bettye C. Johnson, a poll worker at Joseph McGee Tennis Center, where 7.4 percent of presidential votes did not count. "That takes care of everybody."

Voided votes

For a variety of reasons, almost 28,000 presidential votes in the metro area were voided in Tuesday's election. An uncounted vote for president did not mean the entire ballot was spoiled.

Lorenzel Lawson had the same misunderstanding. Mr. Lawson, a 61-year-old resident of the McDaniel Glenn senior citizens high rise, said he voted a straight Democratic ticket, thinking he also was voting for Mr. Clinton.

When told he was wrong, Mr. Lawson shrugged his shoulders and said, "It doesn't make no difference. Either way it ain't going to help me none."

A call for greater education

Election officials in Fulton, where uncounted votes are consistently higher than in other metro counties, said they had not yet had time to focus on the problem there.

"I don't think that there is really a solution to blank votes," said Mack Dennis, Fulton's election supervisor.

Other election officials, including state elections supervisor Jeff Lanier, said the high numbers appear to indicate a need for more voter education.

"This is a situation I am concerned about, but I am trusting Fulton County to respond to it," Mr. Lanier said. "It sounds like these people are not voting because they don't understand the process."

At Wednesday's Fulton County Commission meeting, Chairman Michael L. Lomax requested that county attorneys recommend legislation to Fulton legislators that would simplify the language on ballots, particularly any proposed constitutional amendments.

"The ballot's language and the number of different kinds of decisions that have to be made wind up being very complicated for the inexperienced voter," Mr. Lomax said in an interview. "Either we are going to change that language...or we are going to have in place procedures for educating voters uniformly from one precinct to the next."

The Atlanta Journal / The Atlanta Constitution

November 8, 1992

Most new Ga. voters are Democrats

Trend reversed: For the past 12 years, young people across the nation had warmly embraced the Republican ticket.

By Carrie Teegardin

STAFFWRITER

Georgia's newly registered voters, many of whom went to the polls Tuesday for the first time in their lives, were an overwhelmingly Democratic, anti-Bush voting bloc.

While helping to build one of the highest turnouts in the state's history, these new voters - one in every seven who punched a ballot Tuesday - also helped give Bill Clinton his slender victory in Georgia.

Fifty-four percent of the new voters picked Mr. Clinton, an edge 10 points higher than the overall electorate gave him, according to the exit poll. Nearly half said they were Democrats. Only one-fourth identified themselves as Republicans.

"It behoves the Democrats to try to make sure they keep these people in the electorate," said Charles S. Bullock III, a University of Georgia political scientist.

The 3 R's did it

In a nation noted for apathy and low voter turnout, what made the difference this year?

"The three R's - Recession, Read My Lips and Ross," said Curtis Gans, director of the non-partisan Committee for the Study of the American Electorate. While the majority of these new voters were under 30, a third were baby boomers between 30 and 44.

The new voters were more likely to be women than men, and included substantial numbers of people from across the income spectrum.

Stefanie Harris, a recent Georgia State University graduate, was among those who voted for the first time.

Now 22, she was old enough to vote in 1988. But only this year did she feel strongly enough to go to the trouble. Even though she has a degree in business management, she had to accept a \$5-an-hour secretarial job.

Two weeks ago, her mother lost her job. And her father works for GTE in Korea, where he can make more than he could in this country.

'A vote against Bush'

When Ms. Harris went to the polls, she voted for Mr. Clinton.

"I wasn't excited about voting for him, but I felt like it would be a vote against Bush," she said.

Young people across the nation voted for Democrats this year, reversing the trends of the past 12 years, in which America's youth warmly embraced the GOP. The economy, combined with the solid anti-abortion position of the Republican Party, has turned away many of these baby busters, the post baby boom generation, according to analysts.

The burst of interest in the campaign has been driven, in part, by a sense of hope that new leadership could matter. Polls taken before the election showed that a remarkable number of people think government can improve their lives.

These expectations, particularly among the flood of new voters, may metnTw 18.67 0 Td(i-abortion

"They were maxed out, but the good news is they were prepared for the maximum turnout and for everything they thought could happen," Georgia Secretary of State Max Cleland said of most metro Atlanta counties. But not in every case. The secretary of state had harsh words for the "total breakdown" in Cherokee County, where voters waited four and five hours to cast ballots, some finally voting at close to midnight.

"They have to suck it up and take a good hard look at investing in brand new equipment," Mr. Cleland said.

`Didn't anticipate it'

"These growing counties used to be small, sleepy towns with politics as usual, but it's not going to be that way ever again," he said. "Welcome to the big leagues. You can't just use old voting equipment you've used for the last 10 or 20 years. They've got to buy new equipment and set up new precincts to handle the tens of thousands of new voters."

Most metro counties have rapidly increased spending on their elections offices to keep up with growing numbers of voters. Cobb's budget, for example, zoomed \$700,000, to \$1.5 million, from 1988 to 1992. In Cherokee, however, the budget went up \$1,833, even as the number of voters increased 67 percent.

Cherokee is perhaps the last of the fast-growing counties in the suburban doughnut to rely on the lever-style voting machines invented by Thomas Edison in the 19th century. And chagrined county elections officials said they passed up an opportunity to buy 30 more vote counters last year for \$100 each. They would have increased voting capacity by nearly 30 percent.

"We just didn't anticipate it," said Cherokee election board director J.O. Garrett. "We didn't have enough machines. Once we found out what was occurring we didn't have time to react."

'I need full-time help'

Douglas County phased out the old machines after facing their own disastrous day at the polls in 1988, when the cumbersome machines caused three- and four-hour waits.

But even though the balloting in the most recent presidential contest went smoother there, the lament of registrar Lou Burrell is a common refrain of elections officials.

"I need full-time help, desperately," Mrs. Burrell said.

When voting booths and ballot boxes are mothballed for most of the year, elections officials say they, too, are forgotten in the daily crush of other county activities. Most haven't seen significant increases in staffing during the past decade, even though population and the number of registered voters has mushroomed. Some, like Cobb County, are facing budget decreases as county commissioners plan across-the-board cuts.

"We're ignored until election time, and then we become mighty important," said Jeannie Hayden of the Cobb elections office.

way they handled polling: Waits there averaged between 30 minutes and an hour.

The high cost of democracy

In the wake of Tuesday's extraordinary voter turnout, here's a look at turnouts in recent presidential elections, plus an accounting of elections-office budgets for seven metro counties during those years.

County	1984	1988	1992
Cherokee			
Budget	n/a	\$141,000	\$142,833
Registered	23,877	28,508	42,306
Turnout	n/a	63%	71%
Clayton			
Budget	\$1,532,350	\$1,564,992	\$1,588,000
Registered	17,042	250,212	149,191
Turnout	70%	80%	73%
Dekalb			
Budget	\$1,756,200	\$1,559,428	\$1,572,996
Registered	263,676	274,086	289,933
Turnout	71.90%	75.40%	76.90%
Gwin			
Budget	n/a	n/a	\$156,355
Registered	33,774	25,708	28,390
Turnout	83%	75%	71%
Fulton			
Budget	\$28,531	\$28,707	\$28,707
Registered	95,072	38,743	50,733
Turnout	76.8%	64.5%	73.9%
Spalding			
Budget	n/a	n/a	n/a
Registered	346,188	387,754	416,856
Turnout	63%	61%	67%

Source: County elections offices

And Fulton officials said they learned their lesson years ago.

"Four years ago we were almost run out of town because of the long lines and we've been working on improving the system and implementing new programs," said Frank Davis, chief of the Fulton County election division. "We really saw the results this election."

Changes in the areas that Mr. Salinas cited could cut to the heart of the overwhelming advantage his Institutional Revolutionary Party has used to remain in power for 63 years.

Until now, the political reforms undertaken by the Salinas administration have mainly dealt with the voting process. They have reduced the possibility of blatant fraud without jeopardizing the party's hold on national power, But they have almost entirely avoided the Issue of the party's dependence on state resources.

Mr. Salinas made virtually no important announcements about economic policy, other than to state that as of Saturday, the country's foreign exchange reserves stood at \$18.258 billion - better than many economists expected.

With the Government certain to fall just short of its central economic goal bringing the annual inflation rate down to a single digit, Mr. Salinas vowed to reach that level instead next year. Inflation for 1992 is now expected to run just above 11 percent, still a striking contrast to the rates of a few years ago. For 1987, Mexican annual inflation reached a decade high of 159.2 percent.

While the economy is not expected to grow more than 2.5 percent for the year after growth rates of 4.4 percent in 1990 and 3.6 percent in 1991, he reiterated his commitment to a tight fiscal policy.

Mr. Salinas did say he would spend more money over the next two years on his large-scale anti-poverty initiative. The program, which finances every thing from elementary-school scholarships to electricity lines on an underlying philosophy of community participation, was already planned to cost \$2.3 billion this year.

Broader Range for the Peso

In the days leading up to his speech, Mr. Salinas deflated expectations by taking one important action in the economy and another regarding the peso. (The peso is the Mexican currency.)

Two days later, Mr. Salinas put to rest speculation that he might try to change a sacred rule of Mexican politics and seek a second term. Addressing party supporters, he categorically ruled out any possibility that he might seek re-election.

Note 8: This topic was presented by Bill Northquest, Supervisor of Elections for Gwinnett County, Georgia. Gwinnett County is located in suburban Atlanta and is one of Georgia's larger and more affluent counties. [Back.](#)

Note 9: See Appendix F for a copy of a typical voter registration application. [Back.](#)

Note 10: See Appendix G for a list of authorized identification. [Back.](#)

Note 11: The total population of Gwinnett County according to the 1990 census is 354,910. Of those, 254,196 are 18 years of age or older. Seventy-five percent of them, 192,122, are registered voters. [Back.](#)

Note 12: In the 1992 Gwinnett County general elections, there were 89 voting sites: 38 in churches, 29 in schools, 12 in other public buildings, and 10 in miscellaneous sites such as car dealership showroom floors. [Back.](#)

Note 13: To accommodate voters who, for various reasons, are unable to vote at their precinct on election day, absentee voting is allowed under special circumstances. [Back.](#)

Note 14: See Appendix H for a copy of the Ballot Return Sheet which poll managers complete at the close of the polls. [Back.](#)

Note 15: The national turnout for the 1992 general elections was the highest since 1960. Fifty-four percent of registered voters cast ballots in the presidential election. In Georgia, the turnout was even higher with 73% of registered voters casting ballots on November 3. [Back.](#)

Note 16: This presentation was delivered by Dr. Robert Pastor, Director of the Latin American and Caribbean Program at The Carter Center, and Executive Secretary of the Council. [Back.](#)

Note 17: A parallel quick-count was conducted by the Catholic Archdiocese in Panama and found a three-to-one margin of victory for the opposition. The government halted the count and publication of results, and subsequently annulled the election (See the Council's report, *The May 7, 1989 Panamanian Elections*). [Back.](#)

Note 18: This presentation was made by Dr. Miguel Basalez of Mexico. Dr. Basalez was a member of the Council delegation to Guyana and was spokesman for the Mexican delegation observing the U.S. elections. [Back.](#)

Note 19: This presentation was given by Dr. Ellen Mickiewicz, Fellow and Director of The Carter Center's Program in International Media and Communications. [Back.](#)

Note 20: This presentation was made by David Carroll, Assistant Director, Latin American and Caribbean Program at The Carter Center; and Frank Boyd, Doctoral Candidate in Political Science, Emory University, and Coordinator of the Project to Observe the U.S. Elections. [Back.](#)

Note 21: See Appendix I for a reproduction of the terms of reference and forms used by delegates to document their observations in the U.S. elections. [Back.](#)

Note 22: See Appendix J for a list of observer deployments. [Back.](#)

Note 23: See Appendices D and E. [Back.](#)

Note 24: This concern proved warranted. A report by the *Atlanta Journal-Constitution* on November 7, 1992 indicates that the percentage of incomplete

See A0d-89tage of /Sp0 1Clippings from