

The International Observation of the U.S. Elections

The Carter Center

November 1992

For the last four years, the Council of Freely Elected Heads of Government, chaired by former U.S. President Jimmy Carter, and based at the Carter Center, has been observing elections throughout Latin America and the Caribbean. Last July, representatives from eight civic groups in Mexico that have observed elections in their own country invited the Council to send a team to witness their observation of the elections in Michoacan and Chihuahua. We found the experience immensely rewarding and decided to invite these groups plus representatives of the three major political parties to observe the U.S Presidential elections in November.

The attached report by Eric Bord provides an excellent summary of the project to observe the elections, including the conference where we briefed our guests on the U.S. electoral process, and what they would do to observe the election on voting day. I would like to thank Frank Boyd and Nancy Berry, who helped organize the project and David Carroll, the Assistant Director of the Program, and Felicia Agudelo, the Administrative Assistant, for all their help in making the project so worthwhile.

I would also like to thank Mr. Mark Feierstein of the National Democratic Institute in Washington, D.C., Dr. Jennifer McCoy of Georgia State University, and Dr. Jennie Lincoln of Georgia Tech for their help as election day coordinators, as well as a number of student interns and other volunteers who contributed their time and efforts to this project: Chester Bedsole, Cathleen Caron, Sarah Childress, Tom Crick, Paul Fabrizio, Kenneth Goldberg, Kanaen Hertz, Sigurd Johnson, Bernadette May, Tanya Mazarowski, and Kattia Sigui.

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

- **Jimmy Carter**, former U.S. President, and Chairman of the Council
- **George Price**, Prime Minister of Belize, and Vice-Chairman
- **John Compton**, Prime Minister of St. Lucia, (1987-present)
- **Luis Alberto Lacalle**, President of Uruguay, (1989-present)
- **P.J. Patterson**, Prime Minister of Jamaica, (1992-present)
- **Carlos Andrés Pérez**, President of Venezuela (1974-1979, 1989-present)
- **Erskine Sandiford**, Prime Minister of Barbados, (1987-present)
- **Raúl Alfonsín**, former Argentine President, (1983-1989)
- **Oscar Arias Sánchez**, former Costa Rican President (1986-1990)
- **Rodrigo Carazo**, former Costa Rican President (1978-1982)
- **Nicolas Ardito-Barletta**, former Panamanian President (1984-1985)
- **Fernando Belaunde Terry**, former Peruvian President (1963-1968, 1980-1985)
- **Rafael Caldera**, former Venezuelan President (1969-1974)
- **Vinicio Cerezo**, former Guatemalan President (1986-1990)
- **Gerald Ford**, former U.S. President (1974-1977)
- **Oswaldo Hurtado**, former Ecuadoran President (1981-1984)
- **Michael Manley**, former Jamaican Prime Minister (1972-1980, 1988-1992)
- **Edward Seaga**, former Jamaican Prime Minister (1980-1988)
- **Alfonso López Michelsen**, former Colombian President (1974-1978)
- **Julio Maria Sanguinetti**, former Uruguayan President (1985-1989)
- **Pierre Elliott Trudeau**, former Canadian Prime Minister (1968-1979)

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 Sheet*
 - Appendix I: *Observer Forms used in the U.S. (with Terms of Reference)*
 - Appendix J: *Deployments for U.S. Election Observation*
 - Appendix K: *Selected Clippings from the Mexican Press*
 - Appendix L: *Selected Clippings from the U.S. Press*

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

and for the U.S. organizers who have learned and continue to learn about their democracy through the eyes of their Mexican guests.

The Council was represented by former President Jimmy Carter, former Canadian Prime Minister Pierre Elliott Trudeau, Joaquin Daly, representative of Council member and former Peruvian President Fernando Belaunde Terry, Rodolfo Terragno, representative of Council member and former Argentine President Raul Alfonsin, and Dr. Robert Pastor, the Executive Secretary of the Council. The Mexican delegation included representatives of the two leading opposition parties in that country, the National Action Party (PAN) and the Party of Democratic Revolution (PRD). In addition invitations were extended to officials from the ruling Institutional Revolutionary Party (PRI) and the Mexican electoral commission. Regrettably, after initially agreeing to participate, both declined to send delegates. The PRI has long opposed the presence of international election observers in Mexico, and PRI leaders were apparently concerned that taking part in this activity would establish a precedent for international observers to monitor elections in Mexico. Their decision not to participate was made notwithstanding assurances from the Council that there was no corresponding requirement or expectation that the Council would be permitted to observe future elections in Mexico.

While the invitation to Mexican observers was not intended to generate a corresponding invitation to international observers for Mexican elections, a clear goal of the project was to exchange information, ideas, and perceptions regarding elections in Mexico and the United States. Often that exchange focused on the respective strengths and weaknesses of the two electoral systems, with an eye toward areas in need of reform. Some of those observations are summarized in the report issued by the Mexican delegation at the conclusion of the mission.

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, on lever-type voting machines that date to the 1940s, on data-processing punch-cards that use 1950s technology, and with optical scan ballots that were developed in the 1960s. In each case, the technology is familiar to the voter and flaws in the system have been resolved over time.

Redundant security procedures for the detection of fraud give voters faith that their vote will be respected. Since 1965, Georgia has had in effect an electoral code that is modified annually to incorporate improvements in the voting process. The code mandates the following checks on the system: (1) a voter affidavit of eligibility; (2) verification of the voter's name on a registration list; (3) recording of the voter's name on a list of voters; (4) a tally of all unused, spoiled and cast ballots that must match the number of ballots issued to the precinct; (5) an equal number of ballots and voter affidavits; (6) an equal number of ballots and voters verified on the registration list; and (7) an equal number of ballots and names recorded on the voter list.

Lending further credibility to the system is a requirement that all of the ballots be counted at the polling place and in full public view. Additionally, throughout the day of the vote, the ballot box must remain in public view at all times, and poll watchers are allowed to accompany the transport of the ballot box to the counting location.

Most voting in Georgia takes place in small voting precincts of 500 to 2000 voters, and community volunteers direct the process. Consequently, particularly in rural areas, the official managing the procedure and the voters know one another and would recognize attempts at, for example, multiple voting or voting for another person.

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 directed to a private booth in which to mark the ballot. After marking the ballot, the voter takes the ballot to the ballot box (station 5). Immediately before depositing the ballot in the box, the voter is instructed to remove the stub with the serial number and give it to the poll official watching the box who keeps the stubs as a means of verifying the number of ballots and whether an individual who received a ballot actually voted. The ballot itself has no serial number. ¹³

At 7:00 p.m., the polls close and poll managers count the number of ballot cards, verifying that there are no discrepancies. ¹⁴ The ballots are then transported to a central counting facility and results are relayed to the office of the Secretary of State.

A number of factors influence the actual voter turnout, among them the importance of the issues on the ballot, the tradition of voting in the family and community, the level of confidence in government and the election process, the efficiency of the election process, and the weather. ¹⁵

Monitoring Elections

The Council's Experiences in Latin America ¹⁶

The Council's first experience in monitoring elections was in Panama in 1989. It was also among the more dramatic. The visibility of international observers

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. [17](#)

It is important that observers be invited by all sides and that they be perceived as fair and impartial. They should be beholden to no party or individual but committed solely to a free and fair democratic process. Finally, any observer team should be comprised of individuals from a variety of nationalities. These conditions were satisfied by the Panama experience, but a number of lessons were learned from Panama that were eventually incorporated into future observation missions. One lesson was the importance of an observer presence in the country for weeks if not months prior to the actual elections. Arriving just a few days beforehand leaves observers unable to build trust among the parties and also unable to evaluate the fairness of the pre-election process, the campaign, and voter registration.

The lessons learned in Panama were subsequently applied by the Council in Nicaragua's national elections of February 1990. Invitations to observe the elections were received from all parties, and The Carter Center established an office in Managua ten months in advance of the elections. Council delegations made monthly visits to Nicaragua to address and mediate issues that threatened the elections, including problems with voter registration, access to campaign funds, and allegations of campaign violence. The outcome of those elections resulted in the first peaceful transition of power in Nicaragua's history with all parties agreeing both in advance and after the elections to accept the results. Members of the Council also observed the presidential election in the Dominican Republic in 1990. The outcome of that election was extremely close, with a margin of victory of about 1%. Because of the closeness of the vote, and the detection of some irregularities in the process, the Council was unable to make

an early determination on the validity of the process. However, after several weeks, none of the parties presented conclusive evidence that there was a pattern to the irregularities that demonstrated fraud.

The next Council effort was in Haiti's election of Jean-Bertrand Aristide as President. In Haiti the Council worked with the National Democratic Institute (NDI) and coordinated efforts with the Organization of American States (OAS) and the United Nations (UN). Despite countless obstacles, the vote proceeded and the will of the Haitian people was recognized. Regrettably, however, that will was thwarted by elements in the Haitian military in a coup in September 1991. At the invitation of eight Mexican election-observer groups, the Council sent a team to witness the work of these groups during the July 1992 state-wide elections in Chihuahua and Michoacan. Prior to the elections, Dr. Pastor travelled to Mexico to discuss the invitation with the Mexican government, various political parties, including the Institutional Revolutionary Party (PRI), the Director General of the Federal Elections Institute, Lic. Emilio Chuayffet, and leaders from the Mexican election-monitoring organizations. Dr. Pastor found that there was strong interest in the Council's sending a team to Mexico, and that nobody objected to such a team. At the conclusion of their visit, the six person delegation, which included representatives of four Council members, reported that the local Mexican observers groups were well-trained in state electoral law and in the techniques of election monitoring, and that they carried out their work with dedication and courage. However, at the same time, the Council delegation registered serious reservations about statements made by the Mexican observer groups before the election. Despite the lack of strong evidence, the observer groups declared that conditions did not exist to permit a free and fair election. Most recently, the Council repeated and enhanced the model it developed in Nicaragua and applied it in Guyana. A Carter Center office was established in Georgetown well in advance of the elections, and periodic Council missions addressed and resolved serious issues concerning voter registration, counting of

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

Nicaragua, the Council maintained a presence in the country through the inauguration of the new president.

In the several elections observed by the Council, some common patterns can be identified. First and foremost is the symbolic effect of a distinguished group of international observers. Their presence helps give voters hope and confidence that the elections will be free and fair. It also draws international scrutiny to a government that more likely than not is eager to be perceived by other countries as open and democratic. The impact is also great on minority and opposition parties that may, for the first time, feel that the electoral system is not rigged against them and that they have recourse in the event of fraud.

Elections in Guyana [18](#)

Before commenting on his experience in Guyana, Dr. Miguel Basañez made the personal observation that the participants in the Mexican observer delegation included party and non-party activists who just four years ago might not have agreed to sit together in the same room. Their willingness to collaborate enthusiastically in this observation mission indicated the desire and willingness among many Mexicans for a fresh approach to old problems. Their optimism was tempered, however, by the absence of PRI representatives at the meeting. Dr. Basañez is a distinguished political analyst and pollster and was a member of the Council mission to Guyana. He observed three significant differences between the state of the electoral process in Guyana and that of Mexico. First, in Guyana he was surprised that social events were attended by leaders of both the ruling and the main opposition party. Such an occurrence was highly unlikely in Mexico. Secondly, he recalled that, unlike in Mexico, on the evening before the Guyana elections, opposition parties had substantial access to television airwaves for campaign advertisements. Finally, Dr. Basañez noted that international observers were invited and present in Guyana whereas Mexico does not allow international observers to monitor elections.

Though the Guyana elections were not perfect, and some irregularities existed, they were largely attributable to human error and not to any attempts at fraud. The only real threat to the elections occurred on election day when a small group of pro-government demonstrators rioted in Georgetown. Their apparent goal was to disrupt the operations at the Elections Commission and thereby force a cancellation of the vote. Though the incident did turn violent, it was controlled without any significant interruption to the work of the Elections Commission. Dr. Basañez concluded that there were four key factors at work that led to free and fair elections in Guyana. First, the voter registration list was acceptable to all parties. This was significant because initial lists prepared earlier were so flawed that the Council informed the Elections Commission that the list could not be the basis for a valid election. In order to construct an adequate list, the President of Guyana had to call a special session of the legislature and postpone the elections. Had the issue not been pressed by the Council and the elections not been postponed, it is inconceivable that an election acceptable to all parties would have taken place.

A second critical factor was a systematic monitoring of the election process. By mid-afternoon on election day, the observers' preliminary evaluation was that the process was free of fraud. This initial report helped to preserve the integrity of the elections when rioters sought to disrupt the process later that afternoon.

Another important element was the observer team quick-count. Using modern statistical sampling techniques based upon actual returns supplied by observers witnessing the vote count, the Council was able to predict the outcome of the election by 1:00 a.m., seven hours after voting stopped. The margin of error was about three percent. This information enabled Council members to work with the losing and winning candidates to secure their willingness and cooperation in starting a constructive and conciliatory transition.

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. Basañez 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

form used by observers of the 1992 U.S. elections was developed from previous observation experiences as well as from discussions with representatives of the candidates and parties. In addition to standard factual questions about the location of the polling site, number of registered voters on the list, etc., it is important that the observer form contain questions that reflect the major concerns of the parties and their representatives. Because issues of fairness in U.S. elections concern secondary issues such as campaign financing and access to media as opposed to fraud and manipulation in voting and counting, the form used in this exercise differed substantially from those used in Guyana and Nicaragua. [21](#)

The Candidates, the Issues, and their Positions

So that the observers could better understand the political context of the elections, representatives of the Bush, Clinton and Perot campaigns were asked to make brief presentations on behalf of their candidates. Fred Cooper, State Chairman for Bush/Quayle '92, emphasized President Bush's years of experience in a variety of senior government positions. He also stressed President Bush's philosophy of limited government, limited taxation, limited regulatory authority, and reliance on the private sector to identify needs and allocate resources.

Governor Clinton's representative, Gordon Giffin, Chairman, Clinton/Gore of Georgia, stressed his candidate's desire for increased cooperation between government and the private sector. He emphasized the need for a generational change in government and the importance of electing a President whose vision is future-oriented.

Ken Kendrick, Chairman of the Georgia Perot Campaign echoed Mr. Perot's call for a systemic change in government. He emphasized the importance of citizen involvement in decision-making and criticized a system in which approximately

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. In addition, consumer confidence is in decline.

Another element which fits a historical pattern is that no incumbent president has been reelected with an approval rating of less than 50%. In the days preceding the 1992 vote, President Bush's approval rating was below 40%. The third force affecting the outcome is the traditional desire for change among voters. Although George Bush has been President for only four years, his Republican predecessor was in office for eight years. There is a predictable eagerness among voters for change after twelve years of leadership by the same party.

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, responded that the criticism is more political than substantive. He explained that as a practical matter, most votes of the Commission are not based on party affiliation but upon the commissioners' interpretations of the election law. Furthermore, nominations for appointment are submitted by the party that is out of office. Finally, chairmanship of the Commission rotates among commissioners. Consequently, while the structure of the Commission does exclude independents, the practical effect, according to Commissioner McDonald, is negligible.

3. Budgets for Government Election Agencies

The FEC has 280 employees and operates on a budget of \$23 million. The State of Georgia employs 18 persons in the elections office with an annual budget of approximately \$1 million. In Gwinnett County, the regular staff of seven employees is supplemented with 30 temporary workers for elections. The annual budget for the Gwinnett County Board of Elections is approximately \$1 million, \$140,000 of which is spent on the actual vote and counting.

4. Complexity of Ballot

The typical Georgia voter will have 25-30 votes to cast on a single ballot. This is much higher than the national average, and does not include votes on constitutional amendments and referenda. Consequently, voters are

more likely to be familiar with national issues than with local issues, and there is a difference of 30%-40% between the number of votes cast in the presidential election which appears first on the ballot and the last issues or offices on the ballot.

5. Absentee Voting

Anywhere from five to ten percent of the ballots cast in an election are by absentee vote. A larger percentage of absentee voting suggests the presence of fraud, and indeed this is one area under particular scrutiny by federal, state, and local elections officials. Military personnel vote by absentee ballot as may any other citizen living or working away from the voting area on election day. Ballots are generally available 45 days in advance of the election.

6. Appointment of State Elections Officials

The senior elections official in Georgia and in most states is the Secretary of State, who is elected by the citizens. As a practical matter, the actual electoral process is overseen by lower-level government employees. In Georgia the government employee in charge of elections is appointed by the Secretary of State and serves at the Secretary's pleasure. At the County level, elections are usually managed by an individual appointed by the County Board of Elections.

7. Lodging of Complaints and Protests

At the federal level, any individual may bring a complaint if the complaint is based in fact and not made anonymously. In addition, the FEC can

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 200 votes.

Election Day

Having been briefed on election methodology, observation techniques, the positions of the presidential candidates, and benefiting from pre-election analysis by expert political scientists, observers were ready for election day. The delegation deployed in groups of two to four persons and, with a driver and escort, each group visited as many as seven different polling sites. Most of the observers remained in the Atlanta metropolitan area, but a group also travelled to Southwest Georgia where they visited precincts in rural areas in President Carter's hometown of Plains and in neighboring areas. ²² The morning following

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.

In addition, he noted that although the rules and procedures can be complex, the system allows for judicial recourse in the event that there are specific complaints concerning any irregularities in the process. He also expressed the hope that Mexico would have honest, free, and fair elections in the presidential vote in 1994. The earlier a comprehensive program to assure the integrity of the process is in place, the better.

President Carter expressed his fullest confidence in the ability of Mexican officials and Mexican election observers to carry out free and fair elections without the presence of international monitors. Speaking for the Council, he emphasized that the Council has no desire to intrude and will not impose itself on Mexico. The Council sees its present role as limited to a continued willingness to provide any assistance or guidance should that be requested by Mexicans. In their preparation for the 1994 elections, President Carter was hopeful that Mexican parties, human rights groups, civic organizations and political leaders would organize a working committee to analyze the steps necessary for free, fair and transparent elections in Mexico.

There was some discussion of the North American Free Trade Agreement (NAFTA) and its relationship to economic and political liberalization in Mexico. In response to a question regarding NAFTA, President Carter said: "I think the NAFTA agreement opens up a new era for cooperation politically, economically, and socially. Bill Clinton is thoroughly aware of this. I have spent more time talking to Bill Clinton about NAFTA than I have any other issue, perhaps more than all of them put together. I think it was very likely early in the campaign that he was going to reject the agreement and because of Dr. Pastor's influence on me, and my minimal influence on Bill Clinton, he finally made a very balanced statement."

Report of the Mexican Observers

Following President Carter's remarks, Dr. Miguel Basañez 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 fair elections are not dependent on sophisticated technology, wealth, or power, but simply on good will and freedom of action.

Appendices

Appendix A.

FOR IMMEDIATE RELEASE

Contact: Deanna Congileo,
Wednesday, Oct. 28, 1992
Public Info., 404-420-5108

Mexicans to Observe U.S. Elections

Atlanta, GA....When former U.S. President Jimmy Carter casts his vote for the next U.S. president on Nov. 3 in Plains, Ga., it will be under the close scrutiny of election observers from Mexico.

After observing elections in Nicaragua, Haiti, and Guyana, President Carter and the Council of Freely Elected Heads of Government, which he chairs, invited a group of Mexican and other Latin American leaders to observe the 1992 U.S. general elections.

In response to an invitation from Mexican groups, the Council, based at The Carter Center of Emory University (CCEU), sent delegates representing

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."

"I have seen electoral fraud in Latin America and in my own state - in my first election for the state Senate," said Carter. "So I understand that we Americans should not take the electoral system for granted. I look forward to being with our Latin American guests as they observe our elections."

Appendix B

Observation of U.S. Elections, 1992

Monday, November 2, 1992

Morning- Election: Mechanics and Monitoring

Co-chaired by:

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

Joaquin Daly, Representative of Council member and former President of Peru,
Fernando Belaunde Terry

9:00-11:00 A.M.

- The Mechanics of U.S. Elections

Panelists:

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

Jeff Lanier, State Elections Supervisor, State of Georgia

Bill Northquest, Gwinnett County Elections Supervisor

11:00-11:30 A.M.

- Break

11:30-1:00 P.M.

- Monitoring Elections/Terms of Reference

Panelists:

Robert Pastor, "The Council's Experiences in Latin America"

Miguel Basañez, Mexican member of Council delegation to Guyana,
"Elections in Guyana"

Ellen Mickiewicz, Director, International Media and Communications,
Carter Center, "Access to the Media"

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

Council Members and Representatives

President Jimmy Carter, Chairman of the Council.

Prime Minister Pierre Elliott Trudeau, Former Canadian Prime Minister and member of the Council.

Joaquin Daly Arbulu, representative of former Peruvian President Fernando Belaunde Terry. Served in the OAS for ten years. Witnessed state elections in Mexico, July 1992.

Rodolfo Terragno, representative of former Argentine President Raul Alfonsin. Director of the Radical Civic Union.

Robert Pastor, Executive Secretary of the Council. Professor, Emory University, Fellow at the Carter Center.

Mexican Election Observer Organizations

Dr. Sergio Aguayo, Board of Directors of *Convergencia Nacional*, a Mexican grass-roots organization that observes elections.

Rogelio Gómez-Hermosillo, member of the Board of Directors of *Convergencia Nacional*. Member of the Ecumenical Center.

Julio Faesler, President of the Council for Democracy, a Mexican non-partisan election observation group in Mexico.

Dr. Miguel Bansañez, President of ACUDE, The National Accord for Democracy, a Mexican election-monitoring group.

Jorge Eugenio Ortiz Gallegos, Chairman of the Board, ACUDE; member of the Federal Electoral Commission, 1988.

Independents

Federico Reyes Heróles, Director of *ESTE PAIS, Tendencias Y Opiniones*

magazine. Political writer and commentator.

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

Party Representatives

Rene Creel, Member of the Partido Acción 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 Mondragòn, 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.

Merle Black, Professor of Political Science, Emory University.

Ellen Mickiewicz, Director, International Media and Communications, Carter Center. Professor of Political Science, Emory University.

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

Appendix D

English Translation of the Report of the Mexican Delegation To Observe the U.S. Presidential Elections, November 1992

November 4, 1992

Former President Jimmy Carter, Former Prime Minister Pierre Trudeau, Friends of the Carter Center of Emory University, Mexican Colleagues, Ladies and Gentlemen:

It is a double honour for me to speak on this panel. First because your invitation to our Mexican Delegation comes at a moment when the United States is witnessing the birth of a new era. The second honor is mine - to have been designated to speak on behalf of our entire, diverse delegation.

We came here by invitation of former President Jimmy Carter, the Chairman of the Council of Freely-Elected Heads of Government, a group of twenty Presidents and Prime Ministers from the Americas, based at the Carter Center. We have come here to do what the Council has done many times before, namely observe elections. Accepting this invitation in a country like Mexico is not exempt from complications. For both historical and political reasons, the debate within Mexico about international observation of elections is yet unfinished.

Our delegation is composed of ten people. Four of us come from Mexican Election Observer Organizations (Dr. Sergio Aguayo, Rogelio Gomez, Julio Faesler, Jorge E. Ortiz, and myself). Others are representatives of PAN and PRD, the main opposition political parties of Mexico (Rene Creel, Amalia Garcia, Ricardo Pascoe and Cecilia Romero). We also have an independent political analyst (Federico Reyes-Heroles), and we had the benefit of the advice and guidance of two representatives of the Council - Rodolfo Terragno as representative of former Argentine President Raul Alfonsin; and Joaquin Daly, representative of former Peruvian President Fernando Belaunde.

We are aware that this invitation does not accord with the standard practices of international observations. That would have required us to be in the United

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 spirit of friendship and openness with which we were invited and with a strong belief that all sides benefit from the free flow of ideas and information.

1. **Registration.** While the registration list is very impressive, we wondered whether the process for registering voters might not be made easier without opening the system up to possible abuse.
2. **Campaign Funding.** We share with many Americans the view that the amount of funds spent in the campaigns should be limited; PACs should be prevented; and new ways need to be found to keep money from tainting politics.

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 Basañez, 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
- Rene Creel, PAN
- Amalia Garcia, PRD
- Ricardo Pascoe, PRD

Independent Analyst

- Federico Reyes-Heróles, Editor, *Este País*

Appendix E

INFORME DE LA DELEGACION MEXICANA QUE OBSERVO LAS ELECCIONES PRESIDENCIALES DE ESTADOS UNIDOS DEL 3 DE NOVIEMBRE DE 1992

Un grupo de mexicanos fue invitado por el ex-presidente James Carter --
Presidente del Consejo de Jefes de Gobierno Elegidos Libremente, que agrupa
a 20 presidentes y primeros ministros del hemisferio y que tienen su sede en el

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 Basañez, Julio Faesler y Jorge Eugenio Ortiz). Otros representaron al Partido Acción Nacional (René Creel y Cecilia Romero) y al Partido de la Revolución Democrática (Amalia Garcia 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 Raul Alfonsín y Joaquín Daly, representante del ex-presidente peruano Fernando Belaunde 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 podía 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 octsdunidonco hochoc por troo copecialaotao Merle Black y Alan Abramowitz de la Universidad Emory y William Schneider de la Chanel 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 DeKalf 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 Chanel News Network y testificamos la forma en que compilaban y analizaban los resultados. En resumen, fue una visita brece, 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 milita 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 ~~Word~~ 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 facilitar 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.
3. Cambiar el día de la elección. Las elecciones se realizaron durante un día laboral normal. Como nos parece positivo que participe el mayor número posible de votantes, pensamos que sería deseable que consideraran mover la elección presidencial a un fin de semana o que la jornada electoral sea una festividad.
4. El momento en que se anuncia resultados. Dada la diferencia de horas entre regiones de Estados Unidos nos pareció desafortunado que los medios de comunicación informen sobre tendencias o resultados cuando todavía se vota en otras partes. Ello puede influir negativamente en el valor que algunos ciudadanos le dan a su voto. Sugerimos que se ajusten los tiempos del cierre de las casillas en todo el país o, por el contrario, que los medios de comunicación lleguen a un acuerdo de que no se informará de ningún resultado o proyección hasta que haya terminado todo el proceso electoral.

Appendix F

<p>(COUNTY REGISTRATION) Nº 220753 V REGISTRATION RECEIPT (To be retained by voter)</p> <p>_____ (Name)</p> <p>_____ (Address)</p> <p>_____ (City) (County) (State) (Zip Code) applied to register to vote at</p> <p>_____ (Location)</p> <p>on the _____ day of _____, 19____.</p> <p>_____ (Deputy Registrar)</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">CANCELLATION OF PREVIOUS REGISTRATION</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Date: _____</p> <p>I hereby certify _____ has properly registered to (Name of Voter) vote in the county of _____ of the State of Georgia on (Month) (Day) (Year) _____ and therefore requests that his/her name be removed from the list of registered voters in your county.</p> <p>Voter's Date of Birth: _____</p> <p>Last Registration Address: _____ (City) (County) (State) (Zip)</p> <p>Last Polling Place (if known): _____</p> <p>Social Security Number (if known): _____ This _____ day of _____, 19____.</p> <p style="text-align: right;">_____ (Deputy Registrar) County _____</p>																																																			
<p>FOR CHANGE OF NAME OR ADDRESS ARE YOU PRESENTLY REGISTERED WITHIN THIS COUNTY?</p> <p>If YES, complete the following, plus entire registration card.</p> <p>NAME as registered _____</p> <p>ADDRESS as registered _____ Number Street Apt. City County State Zip Code</p>																																																				
<table style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <tr> <td style="width: 30%; border: 1px solid black; height: 20px;"></td> <td style="text-align: center;">REGISTRATION CARD <small>PLEASE PRINT OR TYPE</small></td> <td style="width: 30%; text-align: right;">Nº 220753 V</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;"><small>(For Office Use)</small></td> <td style="text-align: center;">Date: _____ <small>Month Day Year</small></td> <td style="text-align: center;"><small>(Precinct - For Office Use)</small></td> </tr> <tr> <td>Name: Last _____</td> <td>First _____</td> <td>Middle or Initial _____</td> </tr> <tr> <td colspan="2">Maiden _____</td> <td>Tel. No. (if Available) _____</td> </tr> <tr> <td colspan="2">Residence Address: _____</td> <td>Apt. _____</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Town or City _____</td> <td>County _____</td> <td>State _____</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Zip Code _____</td> <td colspan="2"></td> </tr> <tr> <td>Place of Birth: City _____</td> <td>County _____</td> <td>State _____</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Date of Birth: _____</td> <td colspan="2">Date of Birth: _____</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Sex: _____</td> <td>Height: _____</td> <td>Race: _____</td> </tr> <tr> <td colspan="2">Mother's _____</td> <td>Father's _____</td> </tr> <tr> <td colspan="2">Maiden Name: _____</td> <td>Name: _____</td> </tr> <tr> <td colspan="3" style="text-align: center;">QUESTIONS PROPOUNDED TO APPLICANT</td> </tr> <tr> <td colspan="3"> <p>Have you ever been convicted in any court of competent jurisdiction of any felony involving moral turpitude, punishable by the laws of this state or any other state with imprisonment in the penitentiary? If so, what was the offense, the place, and extent of conviction and the approximate date? If so, and if expunged, what was the date of the pardon? If sentence has been completed, what was the date of completion?</p> <p>_____ Georgia, _____ County</p> </td> </tr> <tr> <td colspan="3" style="text-align: center;">DATA OF APPLICANT</td> </tr> <tr> <td colspan="3"> <p>I do swear (or affirm) that I am a citizen of the United States, the State of Georgia and this county; that I am at least 18 years of age, or will be on the _____ day of _____, 19____; that I possess the qualifications of an elector required by the laws of this state; that I am not registered to vote in any other county, or I am registered in _____ County of the State of _____ and request cancellation of my registration; that I am not registered to vote under any other name; that I have correctly answered the questions appearing elsewhere on this card under the words: "Questions Propounded to Applicant;" and that the information contained on this card is true.</p> <p style="text-align: right;">SIGN HERE</p> <p>Sworn to (or affirmed) and subscribed before me this _____ day of _____, 19____ at the following location: _____ Identification Type: _____ Form No. PC-90 _____ (Deputy Registrar)</p> </td> </tr> <tr> <td colspan="3"> <p><small>Notice: The disclosure of your Social Security Number is mandatory if you know the number at the time of your registration. The disclosure is required under the authority of the Georgia Election Code (O.C.G.A. Ch. 21-2) and the Georgia Municipal Election Code (O.C.G.A. Ch. 21-3) and will be used for the purpose of identifying and verifying the identity of voters.</small></p> </td> </tr> </table>			REGISTRATION CARD <small>PLEASE PRINT OR TYPE</small>	Nº 220753 V	<small>(For Office Use)</small>	Date: _____ <small>Month Day Year</small>	<small>(Precinct - For Office Use)</small>	Name: Last _____	First _____	Middle or Initial _____	Maiden _____		Tel. No. (if Available) _____	Residence Address: _____		Apt. _____	Town or City _____	County _____	State _____	Zip Code _____			Place of Birth: City _____	County _____	State _____	Date of Birth: _____	Date of Birth: _____		Sex: _____	Height: _____	Race: _____	Mother's _____		Father's _____	Maiden Name: _____		Name: _____	QUESTIONS PROPOUNDED TO APPLICANT			<p>Have you ever been convicted in any court of competent jurisdiction of any felony involving moral turpitude, punishable by the laws of this state or any other state with imprisonment in the penitentiary? If so, what was the offense, the place, and extent of conviction and the approximate date? If so, and if expunged, what was the date of the pardon? If sentence has been completed, what was the date of completion?</p> <p>_____ Georgia, _____ County</p>			DATA OF APPLICANT			<p>I do swear (or affirm) that I am a citizen of the United States, the State of Georgia and this county; that I am at least 18 years of age, or will be on the _____ day of _____, 19____; that I possess the qualifications of an elector required by the laws of this state; that I am not registered to vote in any other county, or I am registered in _____ County of the State of _____ and request cancellation of my registration; that I am not registered to vote under any other name; that I have correctly answered the questions appearing elsewhere on this card under the words: "Questions Propounded to Applicant;" and that the information contained on this card is true.</p> <p style="text-align: right;">SIGN HERE</p> <p>Sworn to (or affirmed) and subscribed before me this _____ day of _____, 19____ at the following location: _____ Identification Type: _____ Form No. PC-90 _____ (Deputy Registrar)</p>			<p><small>Notice: The disclosure of your Social Security Number is mandatory if you know the number at the time of your registration. The disclosure is required under the authority of the Georgia Election Code (O.C.G.A. Ch. 21-2) and the Georgia Municipal Election Code (O.C.G.A. Ch. 21-3) and will be used for the purpose of identifying and verifying the identity of voters.</small></p>		
	REGISTRATION CARD <small>PLEASE PRINT OR TYPE</small>	Nº 220753 V																																																		
<small>(For Office Use)</small>	Date: _____ <small>Month Day Year</small>	<small>(Precinct - For Office Use)</small>																																																		
Name: Last _____	First _____	Middle or Initial _____																																																		
Maiden _____		Tel. No. (if Available) _____																																																		
Residence Address: _____		Apt. _____																																																		
Town or City _____	County _____	State _____																																																		
Zip Code _____																																																				
Place of Birth: City _____	County _____	State _____																																																		
Date of Birth: _____	Date of Birth: _____																																																			
Sex: _____	Height: _____	Race: _____																																																		
Mother's _____		Father's _____																																																		
Maiden Name: _____		Name: _____																																																		
QUESTIONS PROPOUNDED TO APPLICANT																																																				
<p>Have you ever been convicted in any court of competent jurisdiction of any felony involving moral turpitude, punishable by the laws of this state or any other state with imprisonment in the penitentiary? If so, what was the offense, the place, and extent of conviction and the approximate date? If so, and if expunged, what was the date of the pardon? If sentence has been completed, what was the date of completion?</p> <p>_____ Georgia, _____ County</p>																																																				
DATA OF APPLICANT																																																				
<p>I do swear (or affirm) that I am a citizen of the United States, the State of Georgia and this county; that I am at least 18 years of age, or will be on the _____ day of _____, 19____; that I possess the qualifications of an elector required by the laws of this state; that I am not registered to vote in any other county, or I am registered in _____ County of the State of _____ and request cancellation of my registration; that I am not registered to vote under any other name; that I have correctly answered the questions appearing elsewhere on this card under the words: "Questions Propounded to Applicant;" and that the information contained on this card is true.</p> <p style="text-align: right;">SIGN HERE</p> <p>Sworn to (or affirmed) and subscribed before me this _____ day of _____, 19____ at the following location: _____ Identification Type: _____ Form No. PC-90 _____ (Deputy Registrar)</p>																																																				
<p><small>Notice: The disclosure of your Social Security Number is mandatory if you know the number at the time of your registration. The disclosure is required under the authority of the Georgia Election Code (O.C.G.A. Ch. 21-2) and the Georgia Municipal Election Code (O.C.G.A. Ch. 21-3) and will be used for the purpose of identifying and verifying the identity of voters.</small></p>																																																				

Appendix G



AUTHORIZED IDENTIFICATION

- * VALID DRIVERS LICENSE
- * BIRTH CERTIFICATE
- * CREDIT CARD
- * SOCIAL SECURITY CARD
- * CERTIFIED COPY OF MARRIAGE LICENSE
- * PASSPORT
- * FOOD STAMP CARD
- * CHECK CASHING CARD
- * SCHOOL RECORD
- * WORK IDENTIFICATION CARD
- * UTILITY BILL
- * SCHOOL IDENTIFICATION
- * PUBLIC SAFETY IDENTIFICATION
- * MEDICARE IDENTIFICATION
- * MEDICAID IDENTIFICATION
- * WELFARE IDENTIFICATION
- * NATURALIZED CITIZEN CERTIFICATE OF CITIZENSHIP

BALLOT RETURN SHEET
GENERAL AND NONPARTISAN ELECTION
NOVEMBER 3, 1992

Precinct _____ No. of Registered Voters _____
Time Last Voter Voted _____ Time Manager Left Poll _____

NUMBER OF PERSONS VOTING

1. Total Names on Elector's List Who Voted: * _____
2. Total Names on Numbered List of Voters: * _____
3. Total Voter's Certificates in Binders: * _____
4. Total Ballots Issued: _____
5. Total Spoiled, Void, and Cancelled Ballots: _____
6. Total Persons Voting (subtract Line 5 from 4): * _____

* Totals must be the same.

BALLOT RECAP

7. Total Ballots Received from Elections Office: ** _____
8. Total Spoiled, Void, and Cancelled Ballots: _____
9. Total Unused Ballots (subtract Line 4 from 7): _____
10. Total Valid Ballots in Ballot Box:
11. Total Invalid Ballots in Ballot Box: _____
12. Total Ballots in Ballot Box: * _____
(add Lines 10 and 11)
13. Total Ballots in and Out of Ballot Box: ** _____
(add Lines 8, 9, and 12)

** Totals must be the same.

WRITE-IN VOTES (GENERAL ELECTION ONLY)

14. Total Ballots With Write-in Votes: _____
(include this total in Lines 10 and 12)

CERTIFICATION

We hereby certify that the above information is true and correct.

(Manager) (Assistant Manager) (Assistant Manager)

Appendix I

TERMS OF REFERENCE FOR OBSERVATION FORMS

Election Observation Form

In addition to your name, enter the county and precinct name at the top of the form. There are 159 counties and 2452 precincts in Georgia. The precinct name is the name of the building or facility that houses the polling place, e. g. Little Five

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:

Group A:

Eric Bord - coordinator
Kattia Sigui - driver
Observer 1: Rogelio Gomez-Hermosillo
Observer 2: Rene Creel
Observer 3: Rodolfo Terragno
Deployment: 6 precincts in Fulton and Dekalb Counties

Group B:

David Carroll - coordinator
Cathleen Caron - driver
Observer 1: Julio Faesler
Observer 2: Amalia Garcia
Deployment: 7 precincts in Fulton, Dekalb, and Gwinnett Counties

Group C:

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* (PRD), plus representatives of a number of Mexican election-monitoring groups, including the *Consejo para la Democracia*, *Convergencia de Organismos Civiles para la Democracia*, and the *Academia Mexicana de Derechos Humanos*. Representatives of the governing party, the *Partido Revolucionario Institucional* (PRI) were also invited, but declined to attend due to the fear that accepting the invitation would suggest their acceptance, in principle, of the role of international observers.

As might be expected, the observation mission was covered widely in Mexico and generated a vibrant exchange in the press between critics and supporters of the mission. Before the departure of the delegation, Mexican officials pressured some of the observers not to go, even contacting one observer to advise him that the trip was not in the "national interests" of Mexico. On the day before the election, Miguel Angel Velasquez wrote an article (*El Nacional*, 3 November 1992), which derided the observer mission, arguing that while the opinion of the Mexican observers would not have any impact whatsoever on the U.S. election, the mission would give American politicians with a penchant for intervening in Mexican affairs a pretext to demand that Mexico permit U.S. observers to judge Mexican elections.

Dr. Sergio Aguayo, an observer representing the Mexican Academy of Human Rights, responded to some of these questions at a press conference held before the observers' departure from Mexico. When asked about the possibility of international observers coming to the Mexican elections in 1994, Aguayo noted that the position of the Mexican Academy of Human rights was "not to invite international observers to elections, because democracy is fundamentally the task of Mexicans, and of each country's own citizens." Nevertheless, Aguayo said that when a group of observers is invited, this does not constitute an act of

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. intervention is allowed. And, according to Aguayo, national unity can only be genuinely achieved by adhering to the principles of a plural society and a legitimate electoral process (*La Jornada*, 7 noviembre, 1992).

After returning to Mexico, Miguel Basañez, a delegation member representing ACUDE, the National Accord for Democracy (ACUDE), wrote several articles which reflected on some of the longer-term implications of the observation mission. Writing first about the roots of the debate over whether to accept or reject the presence of international observers in Mexico, Basañez points out the important role that Mexican civic organizations have played in monitoring elections and human rights concerns. Basañez argues that in the last several years, local Mexican monitoring organizations have learned a number of lessons through their observation missions in Mexican state elections. One of these is the importance of receiving support from public opinion. As a result, according to Basañez, these groups are becoming more and more convinced that to succeed in the presidential elections in 1994, they will also need the support of international public opinion, and hence international observers (*Excelsior*, 16 noviembre, 1992).

A lesson that Basañez 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 Basañez, 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, Basañez 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 Basañez, 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

"Invitan a 15 mexicanos como observadores de los comicios de EU; los eligieron al azar," *El Universal*, 31 de octubre 1992.

"Observará las elecciones en EU, un grupo mexicanos," *La Jornada*, 31 de octubre 1992.

"EU elige presidente, Mirones mexicanos," *El Nacional*, 3 noviembre 1992.

"Observadores en EU: el interes mexicano," *La Jornada*, 3 noviembre 1992.

"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 propósito de atestiguar el proceso electoral del próximo tres de noviembre, 15 mexicanos han sido invitados como observadores a la elección presidencial de Estados Unidos por el Centro Carter de Atlanta, Georgia, donde tendrán acceso a todas las etapas del suceso y al final de éstas emitirán un dictamen.

Así lo estableció Sergio Aguayo Quezada, presidente de la Academia de los Derechos Humanos, quien agregó 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 orden político y seis de partidos políticos, entre los que se cuentan del Revolucionario Institucional, Acción Nacional y de la Revolución Democrática.

Aguayo Quezada afirmó que esta es la primera vez que Estados Unidos hace una invitación oficial a un grupo de extranjeros para ver su proceso electoral. Asimismo, refirió que entre los invitados extranjeros también se encuentran el ex primer ministro de Canadá, 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 estarán en las elecciones norteamericanas se encuentran: Julio Faesler, presidente del Consejo para la Democracia; Miguel Basáñez y Jorge Eugenio Ortiz Gallegos, del Acuerdo Nacional para la Democracia; Rogelio Gómez 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 México en las elecciones gubernamentales o presidenciales, Aguayo reconoció 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 país"

Sin embargo, aceptó que cuando un grupo de observadores es invitado (como es el caso que a ellos les atañe), esto no constituye un acto de intervención, "no hay violación a la soberanía"

Aguayo Quezada estableció que ya en otras ocasiones la academia ha sido invitada como observador como es el caso de Haití en 1990, Guyana y Angola. Por otro lado, se refirió a la Ley Torricelli como un acto de flagrante intervención en otro país. "La ley de un país no tiene necesariamente que repercutir en injerencias extraterritoriales"

La invitación para los observadores es de parte del Centro Carter en Atlanta, Georgia, donde estarán por espacio de cuatro días y para el miércoles rendirán un informe a la opinión pública.

Al referirse a la declaración del presidente Carlos Salinas de Gortari en el sentido de oponerse totalmente a cualquier insinuación de reelección, Aguayo estableció que: "lo admitió en un buen momento político para apaciguar los diferentes rumores que apuntaban hacia ello"

SABADO 31 DE OCTUBRE DE 1992

Fueron invitados por el Centro Carter

Observará las elecciones en EU, un grupo de mexicanos

Víctor Cardoso Un grupo de 15 mexicanos miembros de organismos no gubernamentales, medios periodísticos y de los tres principales partidos políticos asistirán como observadores a las elecciones estadounidenses del próximo martes 3 de noviembre.

Al dar a conocer la invitación que les giró el Centro Carter de la Universidad Emory de Atlanta, Georgia, el presidente de la Academia Mexicana de Derechos Humanos (AMDH), Sergio Aguayo Quezada, informó que la participación de los observadores mexicanos será 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 Basáñez, 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 Camín, 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

giradas - aunque no se precisó si se aceptaron - a los priistas Roberta Lajous y Jorge de la Rosa; a Porfirio Muñoz Ledo y Amalia García, del PRD; y por el PAN a René Creel y a Cecilia Romero, integrantes del comité ejecutivo del Distrito Federal.

El grupo se concentrará en Atlanta. El lunes sostendrán una plática con especialistas en elecciones de Estados Unidos y una entrevista con representantes de los tres candidatos presidenciales, donde al parecer se denunciarán prácticas antidemocráticas de cada uno de ellos. Para el martes se tiene previsto observar el desarrollo del proceso electoral.

El Nacional

Martes 3 de noviembre de 1992

POLITCA

Miguel Angel Velázquez

- EU elige presidente
- *Mirones* mexicanos

Para esta noche ya habrá un nuevo presidente en Estados Unidos y algún grupo de mexicanos habrá observado la lid política, en un afán protagónico que en nada servirá a mejorar la calidad de las elecciones en aquel país.

Mucho podría decirse de cómo son y qué pasa en las elecciones de aquella nación, pero lo más curioso es que ahora, igual que en la guerra del golfo, se dice que la lucha electoral será, como nunca, hecha para los televidentes.

De esa manera nuestros ingenuos observadores irán a cumplir con su cometido, pero frente a alguna pantalla de televisión, eso sí, de esas de muchas pulgadas para que no pierdan ningún detalle y tal vez por eso es que antes de salir de México anunciaron su importante presencia en una rueda de prensa.

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 relmente críticos y que pondrán toda su atención y, desde luego, su capacidad de análisis en las crueles, duras y crudas imágenes que trasmitan las televisoras estadounidenses.

Debería y estoy, por ello, por nuestros "mirones", verdaderamente orgulloso, pero me brotan dudas malévolas, 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 polfticos estadounidenses es sin duda meterse, hasta donde se pueda o hasta donde los dejen, en la política mexicana y es en este punto donde me saltan las dudas.

En los últimos intentos de los políticos de aquel lado de la frontera por internarse en los procesos electorales mexicanos han sucedido hechos importantes. Los más prestigiados observadores que han venido al país no han hallado tantos problemas como los que se les habían contado, pero tampoco han encontrado a una población que acepte ser juzgada con visiones fuera de la realidad nacional. Ahora, muchos de los que no han podido expresar, incluso su antimexicanismo, encontrarán en nuestros "mirones" un buen pretexto para exigir que se les permita hacer juicios sobre las elecciones en México y no es que se trate de esconder nada, sino simplemente que en los mexicanos deben existir las fórmulas y los métodos para componer lo que se deba componer.

No es cuestión de si nuestras elecciones son buenas o malas, seguramente son perfectibles, pero entre nosotros aún cabe fuerza para reformarlas, sin consejos que vengan acompañados de intereses poco claros o que traten de filtrar mensajes amañados que busquen desprestigiar para permitir mayores intervenciones. En la lista que se da de nuestros "mirones" está el nombre Héctor Aguilar Camín, quien hasta donde sé es el único que aceptó la magnífica oferta de convertirse en protagonista de evento que, por otro lado tiene, quizá por primera vez, una importancia fundamental para el mundo en su totalidad, pero Héctor lo mismo podrá verlo por las televisoras mexicanas se encargarán de transmitir el hecho noticioso.

De cualquier forma, según sé, Clinton y Bush estarán muy pendientes de las opiniones de los "mirones" mexicanos que en uno de los sondeos se acusa de violación de derechos humanos a los encuestadores de Gallup o a cualquier televisoras de aquel país, de quienes han dependido estas elecciones \$\$\$Pages\$\$\$
LA JORNADA, noviembre 1992

Cecilia Romero, secretaria general panista

Hubo presiones oficiales contra observadores de la elección en EU

Roberto Zumarripa \??\ Cecilia Romero, secretaria general panista, y observadora en los comicios estadounidenses, confirmó que hubo presiones del gobierno mexicano para que no asistieran algunos a la testificación de este proceso.

Asimismo, dijo que del informe firmado por Sergio Aguayo; Ricardo Pascoc, Julio Funes y Jorge Eugenio Ortiz Gallegos, destaca la consideración que aquellos comicios son "de buena fe" y en contraste con los mexicanos, tienen resultados expeditos, la de los medios de comunicación es grande y existe una descentralización en la organización del proceso que efectivos sus efectivos resultados.

Indicó que Miguel Basáñez, 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, como 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 participa 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 dará 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".

Definitivamente se alegan irregularidades sobre gente que no está en el padrón o que aparece 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 Ortiz Gallegos - "si nos saludamos", dijo Romero - , Sergio Aguayo y Miguel Basáñez.

Aun cuando estaban en la lista de invitados y se consideraban que podían asistir, Roberta Lajous y Guadalupe Pacheco, del PRI, no lo hicieron, confirmó 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" Dijo dos ejemplos; el PR1 y el PFCRN.

Informe de observadores mexicanos

Descentralización, la diferencia entre los comicios de EU y México

Roberto Zamarripa El grupo de mexicanos que observó los comicios estadounidenses del 3 de noviembre concluyó que, en contraste con los comicios de México, en Estados Unidos las elecciones presidenciales mostraron la "ausencia" del gobierno y los partidos en el proceso; "es claro" que los comicios "en manos de la sociedad" y éstos son realmente competitivos. Asimismo, contrasta el hecho de que fueron elecciones con alto grado de descentralización, pues es en el nivel del condado donde se tiene la mayor carga del proceso, a diferencia de México, donde los comicios "son fuertemente centralizados por el gobierno federal".

El informe dado por Miguel Basafiez en nombre de un grupo de diez mexicanos que observaron la elección estadounidense indica por otra parte que los medios de comunicación juegan un papel fundamental y mantienen su independencia.

Los observadores mexicanos se declararon sorprendidos porque son los medios de comunicación los que proporcionan resultados inmediatos de la elección, que además son creíbles.

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

Se indicó que había 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 observación 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 observación 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 Basañez Jorge Eugenio Ortiz Gullagos, Julio Faesler y Rogelio Gómez, en representación de organizaciones mexicanas de observación electoral; también por los representantes partidistas René Creel y Cecilia Romero, del Partido Acción Nacional (PAN), y Ricardo Pascoe y Amulla Garcín, del Partido de la Revolución 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 descentralización, competitividad y apertura en la contienda; asimismo, los medios de comunicación juegan un papel independiente esencial, particularmente en la información de resultados inmediatos.

LISTIN DIARIO, 13 noviembre 1992

Opinión

POR BERNARDO VEGA

El reciente papel de las organizaciones internacionales en la supervisión de elecciones en le Caribe

Uno de los fenómenos políticos más importantes que han tenido lugar en nuestra region en los últimos tres años, lo ha sido la supervisión de elecciones nacionales por parte de organismos internacionales y grupos extranjeros.

En el pasado, la costumbre habia sido que el gobierno del país en cuestión, o su Junta Central Electoral, invitaba a un pequeño grupo de personalidades internacionales, así como a la OEA. para que estuviesen presentes en el país el día de las elecciones y visitasen algunas mesas electorales. Era más bien una supervisión simbólica, como ocurrió en Santo Domingo en 1962, 1966 y 1978. Sin embargo, a partir de 1989 el papel de organismos y grupos internacionales en la supervisión efectiva de elecciones ha sido mucho más importante en el área del Caribe. Su presencia física ha tenido lugar varios meses antes de elecciones y han visto involucrados en todo el proceso, desde la preparación del registro electoral, hasta la supervisión de la votación y el conteo posterior.

Panama

Panama, en 1989, fue el epicentro de ese proceso, aunque allí lo que logró la presencia internacional fue confirmar lo fraudulento de las elecciones organizadas por el General Manuel Noriega. Un mes antes de las mismas.

Noriega autorizó la presencia el día de la votación de representantes del Consejo de Jefes de Gobiernos Elegidos Librementemente, una organización 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 Raúl Alfonsín. Tanto el ex-Presidente Carter, como el ex-Presidente Gerald Ford, estuvieron en Panamá ese día 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, tenían doscientos treintisiete observadores, en un 49% de las mesas electrales. También estuvo Jimmy Carter, en represen. tación del Consejo de Jefes de Gobiernos Elegidós Libremente, Incluso se llevó a cabo un muestreo de las votaciones en una cantidad de mesas electorales, representativas del total, para así rápidamente conocer los resultados y no tener que esperar el conteo final \$\$\$Word\$\$\$ Las consecuencias de todo esto son bien conocidas; ganó la señora Chamorro.

Santo Domingo

Tres meses después. tuvieron lugar las elecciones en Santo Domingo. Jimmy Carter y tres acompañantes tan solo llegaron a nuestro país un día antes de las elecciones. por lo que no podían atestiguar sobre la confiabilidad del proceso de actualización de registro electoral. Aun así, su presencia, así como la de la OEA y el CAPE¹. fue de suma importancia en la solución del conflicto surgido por unas elecciones sumamente reñidas.

Haiti

Siete meses después, en el otro lado de nuestra isla, tuvieron lugar las primeras elecciones libres en la historia de Haití. Estuvieron presentes la OEA. el grupo encabezado por Carter y. por segunda vez. las Naciones Unidas. Este último organismo incluso proveyó "consejeros de seguridad". para la ocasión. Las Naciones Unidas no querían participar en el proceso. por el precedente que le crearía, pero recibió presiones. tanto de países latinoamericanos como de grupos norteamericanos. Allí tanto la OEA como las Naciones Unidas también efectuaron un muestreo de los resultados en una cantidad de mesas representativas de la totalidad. para conocer los resultados rápidamente.

Suriname y Guyana

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

ayudó en la preparación del empadronamiento de los votantes. Junto con representantes de la Mancomunidad Británica. El resultado fue el retorno al poder de otro viejo veterano de la política carbeña. Cheddi Jagan. (quien había gobernado allí en 1953). en las primeras elecciones libres en la historia de ese joven país.

El futuro cercano

Las elecciones dominicanas de 1994 representarán un momento decisivo en nuestra lucha por el fortalecimiento democrático. 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 implicarán un relevo generacional. El nuestro es un país donde el candidato perdedor hace muchos años que no felicita públicamente al ganador: conde, según encuestas efectuadas a nivel nacional este año. un 68% de los encuestados consideró que en las dos últimas elecciones hubo engaños y fraudes y apenas un 20% pensó que esas dos elecciones fueron limpias y honestas. Estas dudas ponen en gran peligro la confianza en el proceso democrático nacional. Somos también un país donde la jerarquía eclesial ya ha manifestado públicamente que no volverá a participar en una Comisión 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 práctica. los cambios que se requieren para mejorar el Registro Electoral, creemos que es imprescindible que dicha Junta solicite a la comunidad internacional 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 excepción 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.

But the Democratic-controlled Legislature isn't ready to scrap the state's system of primary and general election runoffs, nor do lawmakers support a plan to change the way judges are elected,

Without Georgia's majority-vote law, Democrat Wyche Fowler Jr. would be preparing today for his second term in the U.S. Senate.

But more than half the legislators polled for the Journal-Constitution want to retain runoffs in all Georgia elections. A third favor eliminating at least the general election runoff, which cost Mr. Fowler his seat.

"Traditionally, it has served us well," said Democratic Sen. Terrell Starr of Forest Park, a veteran legislator who favors no change in the law. "I just feel that equity would dictate you ought to have more than 50 percent of the final vote to be elected."

Answers to questions about voting and elections showed that the General Assembly for the most part is comfortable with the status quo - unsurprising, since these legislators won election under the current rules.

Legislators are not eager to change the way judges are elected, give weak support to automatically registering voters when they apply for driver's licenses and do not favor cutting the 30-day period between the end of voter registration and the election.

Just under half of the legislators polled support term limits, although three-fifths of the senators responded favorably. Lt. Gov. Pierre Howard, the Senate's presiding officer, is firmly behind term limits. House Speaker Tom Murphy is adamantly opposed.

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 majority of legislators said they favor relaxing rules on absentee balloting.

The strongest opposition to change emerged in response to a question about altering how judges are selected in Georgia. Critics contend the current system makes it hard for minorities to win judgeships.

More than three-fifths of legislators oppose the proposed settlement of a federal lawsuit. The settlement would give the governor power to appoint judges and eliminate contested judicial elections, replacing elections with a ballot question asking whether sitting judges should be kept on the bench.

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 the process to African Americans and other minorities."

Mr. Brooks is a key player in a lawsuit seeking to do away with the majority-vote law. No black candidate has won election to a statewide office, other than a judgeship, in Georgia. Black candidates, overwhelmingly Democrats, most often fail to win their party's nomination.

Less than a fifth of the legislators polled favored doing away with runoffs, which are held in primary and general elections when no candidate gets at least 50 percent of the vote.

The survey, answered by 178 of Georgia's 236 legislators, was conducted for the newspapers Dec. 10-22 by the Center for Urban Policy Research at Georgia State University.

The Atlanta Journal / The Atlanta Constitution

November 3, 1992

Feds aim crackdown on election fraud

Agens to be on call in Middle Georgia

By Bill Osinski

STAFF WRITER

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.

Susan Sevy, a catering coordinator from Norcross, fretted that she would be late to work after waiting an hour and a half to vote. "They should have had 10 more voting booths," she said.

Elderly voters sat on folding chairs that they scooted as the lines moved; some groups of voters, waiting their turn after the 7 p.m. poll closing, sent runners out for food. Others talked on portable phones or talked politics with their neighbors. In Marietta, more than an hour after the polls closed, 300 people still were waiting in line to cast ballots at one precinct.

"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 hallway and poured out under the covered walkway at Rockbridge Elementary in Norcross. But most voters, many reading books or going over sample ballots by the aim light of dusk, said they didn't mind. Steven Thomas, 25, a self-employed handyman, took advantage of the wait by going to a nearby fast-food restaurant for a soda and barbecue sandwich while his fiancée held their place.

In Fayette County, the longest lines were in Fayetteville and Tyrone, which also had city elections on the ballot, said Carolyn Combs, Fayette's elections manager.

Still in line at 11:15

Cherokee's election nightmare

Record turnout leaves officials unable to react

By Bill Torpy

STAFF WRITER

After waiting five hours in line to vote, Cherokee County residents Sydney and Jeff Dalman cast their ballots at about 11:15 p.m. Tuesday, just as President Bush appeared on TV to concede.

"We were hearing people say the electoral vote was a done deal and we thought, 'Great, we're here for nothing.'" said Mrs. Dalman. "I was voting for Perot, so I knew my vote didn't matter anyway," she said, laughing.

However, residents who voted at the E.T. Booth Middle School near Woodstock weren't laughing much Wednesday about delays that lasted more than five hours and kept voters going until midnight, two hours after California's polls closed.

"It was an outrage, just insane," said Lisa Bowlby, who held a 20-pound baby for three hours while waiting. "People walked away; this county took away people's right to vote because they were ill-prepared. They knew registration was up. They knew it would be a record turnout."

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."

Everything that could go wrong did go wrong in the Woodstock-A precinct. There were record turnouts in an area still scrambling to keep up with suburban growth. And voters were using lever machines that "represent technology from the 1940s," said Jeff Lanier, director of the Secretary of State's Elections Division. He said Georgia is slower than most states in phasing out the machines. To make matters worse, only nine machines were at a precinct with 5,000 registered voters. Mr. Lanier said that when an election director miscalculates the number of machines needed at a precinct, it's almost impossible to transport the bulky machines and reprogram them for a precinct's specific races.

Donna Mitchell, who waited five hours, said voters befriended each other and held places in line for others to go home and cook dinner or get babysitters. They even ordered pizzas and talked frustrated voters out of leaving. "Overall, the mood was good, except when people started asking who's in charge," she said. Mr. Garrett said his office took some 2,000 calls Tuesday and Wednesday. Mr. Lanier's office got a couple of dozen calls, and he is investigating the incident. "It's a very serious matter," said Mr. Lanier. "It needs to be corrected."

Mr. Garrett, on the job a year, passed up an opportunity last year to buy 30 lever machines at \$100 each from a county phasing them out. "I've regretted it ever since," he said, adding that he talked to county officials Wednesday about switching to a more modern system and splitting up some of the huge precincts on the county's south end.

"It's time we get out of the county and go to the city," he said.

The Atlanta Journal / The Atlanta Constitution

November 5, 1992

Carter gives Clinton all the credit

Parties 'insignificant,' former president says

By Elizabeth Kurylo

STAFF WRITER

Calling both major political parties "insignificant," former President Jimmy Carter on Wednesday credited Bill Clinton's victory to the candidate's individual effort. "There's really no such thing as an appreciable influence by the Republican Party or the Democratic Party," Mr. Carter said. "In our system of government it's - almost entirely a personal campaign"

He added, "As far as shaping policy or having a Democratic Party platform, that's totally insignificant. It's Bill Clinton's campaign, it's Bill Clinton's platform, it's Bill Clinton's administration. The Democratic Party is insignificant."

While he dismissed the party's influence, Mr. Carter praised its chairman, Ron Brown, for doing a "superb" job leading it.

Mr. Carter, the most recent Democrat to occupy the White House, made his remarks during a briefing at the Carter Presidential Center in Atlanta, accompanied by 10 Mexicans who had come to observe the U.S. elections. The former president, who ran outside the political establishment in 1976 and was accorded little respect by party regulars after Ronald Reagan defeated him in 1980, said the party was "a handicap, not an asset" during his campaigns. "It was kind of like a burden on my shoulders.

"I think the Democratic Party is not a major factor now or in the future, but at this point it's better than it has been in my lifetime," he said.

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. Also Friday, the FEC said Messrs. Fowler and Coverdell won't have to file any more campaign finance disclosure reports before the Nov. 24 runoff.

Each campaign, however, will have to disclose to the FEC within 48 hours each contribution of \$1,000 or more received between last Wednesday and Nov 21. Candidates generally are required to file disclosure reports 12 days before an election, detailing all contributions of \$200 or more and all expenditures through a cutoff date 20 days before the election.

John Surina, FEC staff director, said the 12-day report "would serve no useful public purpose" since it would not include any runoff-related contributions or expenditures.

Atlanta Journal / The Atlanta Constitution

Saturday, November 7, 1992

27,500 votes for president didn't count in metro area

By Ken Foskett

STAFF WRITER

In a state where President-elect Bill Clinton won by a slim 16,000 votes, more than 27,500 voters in metro Atlanta alone cast ballots for president that did not count, election returns show.

"That's too damn many," said Joe Jacobs, chairman of Fulton's Democratic Party and a member of the county's election board. "Who ever [the votes] should have gone for should have got them."

Election officials suggest a number of reasons for the blank or improperly punched votes, including voter error, deliberate omission or voter-equipment

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 mean that the new president is under an unusual amount of pressure.

"Clinton has an enormous burden to resurrect real hope in terms of action." Mr. Gans said.

The Atlanta Journal / The Atlanta Constitution

November 8, 1992

Polling places overwhelmed

Some counties weren't prepared for huge turnout

By Kathey Alexander

STAFF WRITER

Staging elections in metro Atlanta is a \$5 million business, and after Tuesday's long lines at the polls, many voters wonder why the government still can't get it right.

But elections officials insist that most of them did.

State and county elections officials say jammed parking lots and hours-long waits at many precincts were inevitable in a year when up to 80 percent of the electorate decided to elect.

"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 cumber- some 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.

Lessons learned

Even though voter registration is up 37 percent since 1980 in Clayton, the county has no full-time staff to deal with the tide of voters. Probate Judge Eugene Lawson and his secretary administer elections, hiring part-timers to run the polls. Still, they said, they spent the day Wednesday accepting congratulations for the

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.

	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	\$104,625	\$88,943	\$156,679
Registered	61,872	67,823	75,210
Turnout	67.5%	69%	79%
Cobb			
Budget	\$164,993	\$821,670	\$1,537,360
Registered	178,191	217,042	250,212
Turnout	73%	70%	80%
DeKalb			
Budget	\$1,195,620	\$1,539,428	\$1,747,996
Registered	263,676	274,086	289,933
Turnout	71.9%	71.4%	76.9%
Douglas			
Budget	n/a	\$156,395	\$151,963
Registered	23,706	28,681	33,274
Turnout	75%	70%	82%
Fulton			
Budget	\$292,931	\$382,075	\$501,869
Registered	350,942	365,229	367,153
Turnout	66.5%	64.35%	73.2%
Gwinnett			
Budget	n/a	n/a	\$952,000
Registered	106,856	107,346	188,754
Turnout	67.1%	53%	81.4%

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."

Staff writers Bill Torpy, Diane R. Stepp, Greig Guthey, Gary Hendricks, Donna Williams Lewis and Anne Rochell contributed to this report.

Mexico's Leader Cautiously Backs Some Big Changes

By TIM GOLDEN

Special to The New York Times

MEXICO CITY, Nov. 1 - President Carlos Salinas de Gortari today cautiously endorsed the sort of broad political changes demanded by the political opposition, including regulations on party financing, limits on campaign spending and more equal access to news outlets.

In his annual State of the Nation address, Mr. Salinas was not specific about what sort of measures he would support. He also said that "great political changes" were not what Mexico needed.

But in a two and a half hour speech that was otherwise notable for its emphasis on the need to carry forward policy changes already made, Mr. Salinas put the issue of political reform squarely on the agenda for the last third of his six-year term.

Could Undermine Own Party

If the political parties consider that it is necessary to adapt the electoral legislation, let us go ahead," he said. "While they build their consensus, I propose that we move forward in three fundamental aspects of Wednesday's political reform: making the sources of party financing transparent, placing limits on the cost of election campaigns, and working on the communications media and procedures that guarantee the impartiality of electoral processes."

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. For those reasons, opposition politicians and many political analysts have been deeply skeptical that the Government will take significant steps along those lines. And some of them, at least, remained so this afternoon after the President spoke. The leader of the country's main leftist party, Cuauhtémoc Cárdenas, in a telephone interview, said of the changes: "In the best-case scenario, they would be very short-term and limited reforms. The things he is talking about doing are things he should have done before and will not have time for now Let's see what his actions say in the future."

In overall tone, Mr. Salinas's remarks seemed to signal that the sort of dizzying changes he has engineered in Mexico's economy and society during the last four years are over. By contrast, the President used the same speech last year to unveil fundamental changes in the country's land-tenure system, sweeping educational reforms and formal recognition of the Roman Catholic Church after seven decades of official hostility.

"Before attempting additional uncontrolled transformations," he said today, "we must insure that the reforms already started become matters of everyday practice, that they become rooted in the lives of the Mexican people."

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 his own political plans.

With the peso weakening, Government officials last Tuesday announced a new wage and price agreement with labor unions and major employers that included a widening of the range within which the currency can rise and fall. The action appeared to reflect a decision to abandon the idea of eventually fixing the peso to the dollar, and movement toward a floating exchange rate.

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.

Notes

Note 1: This report was written by Eric S. Bord. Mr. Bord is a lawyer who has worked with Carter Center programs in conflict resolution and global development cooperation and was formerly the Assistant Director of the Latin American and Caribbean Program. The report was edited by Dr. Robert Pastor and David Carroll. Dr. Pastor is the Director of the Latin American and Caribbean Program and Executive Secretary of the Council of Freely Elected Heads of Government. Mr. Carroll is the Assistant Director of the Latin American and Caribbean Program. [Back.](#)

Note 2: Appendix A is a press release issued by The Carter Center regarding the election observation mission. [Back.](#)

Note 3: See the Schedule and List of Participants, attached as Appendices B and C. [Back.](#)

Note 4: An English translation of the Report of the Mexican Delegation to Observe the U.S. Presidential Elections, November 1992 is attached as Appendix D. Appendix E is the original report, in Spanish. [Back.](#)

Note 5: This presentation was made by Danny McDonald, Commissioner, U.S. Federal Elections Commission. [Back.](#)

Note 6: Laws restrict the extent to which political parties and PACs can expend funds on behalf of a particular candidate, but essentially do not limit spending on behalf of a political party or spending by PACs that wish to publicize a particular political issue. [Back.](#)

Note 7: This presentation was made by Jeff Lanier, State Elections Supervisor, State of Georgia. [Back.](#)

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 Basañez of Mexico. Dr. Basañez 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 and spoiled ballots in poor, predominantly Black precincts in Fulton County far exceeded the statewide average. See the Selected Clippings from the U.S. Press in Appendix L. [Back.](#)

Note 25: See Appendices D and E. [Back.](#)