

JK
2446
.S5
1987

The Short Ballot in Iowa

Occasional Research Papers No. 6

Institute of Public Affairs

Division of Continuing Education

The University of Iowa

August 1987

STATE LIBRARY OF IOWA



3 1723 02106 2435

WITHDRAWN

75
WITHDRAWN
ABOUT THIS REPORT

How long should an election ballot be so that voters can give their attention to contests that really matter? That is a continuing question in Iowa and in other states for legislators, political parties, citizens, and the media.

George Mather has traced in this report the short ballot changes in Iowa and discusses related principles that have influenced those changes. He has also discussed possible future changes in the ballot in Iowa. George Mather did the background research and wrote this report as research associate on the Institute staff.

Mr. Mather's chronological list of ballot changes at the beginning of the report illustrates the concern Iowans have had through the years about this topic. The list, in itself, is a significant contribution to my discussion of election reform in Iowa and a useful tool for scholars, teachers, and civic-minded citizens.

For their guidance, comments, and suggestions in preparing and editing this report, the Institute wishes to thank Lawrence E. Gelfand of The University of Iowa history department, Russell M. Ross of the political science department, Loren N. Horton of the State Historical Society of Iowa, and Virginia C. Mather.

Clayton L. Ringgenberg, Director
Institute of Public Affairs
Division of Continuing Education
The University of Iowa
Iowa City, Iowa

August 1987

FOREWORD

The purpose of the short ballot is to reduce the number of choices presented to the voters at any one time so they can concentrate their attention on the contests that really matter. The objective is better informed and more independent voting.

The short ballot was one of many ideas for achieving governmental and political reform that were developed in this country during the Progressive Era, roughly the period from 1900 to 1915. This review of Iowa ballot changes traces how the short ballot and related principles influenced these changes.

First it is necessary to describe the system of government and politics that existed before these changes began to take place. The crucial change was the adoption of the secret ballot in this country; without that basic reform, none of the other ideas for change was possible.

The ballot changes described in this report were not the result of short ballot principles alone; in fact, as far as we can tell, there was no organized short ballot movement in Iowa. Many of the ballot changes described here resulted from combinations of political and other factors.

However, a short ballot theme is clearly evident. Through the years, there seems to have been a determined attempt to reduce the length and complexity of the ballot.

No attempt has been made here to list the factors involved in each ballot change, to describe the arguments for and against each proposal, or to identify the groups that proposed and opposed each change. Such considerations are beyond the scope of this report but should be the subjects of future research.

The record shows that there has always been strong opposition to short ballot proposals. Progress in gaining acceptance for these proposals has been slow and intermittent. Indeed, the chronological list of ballot changes shows a twenty-eight year period (1919-1947) during which no significant changes were adopted.

Whenever possible, I have cited the sources of opinions expressed in this report. Any other opinions that remain are my own and not those of the Institute or the University.

I hope that thoughtful consideration of the material in this report will aid in current and future discussions about various issues and proposals for improving governmental and political processes.

George B. Mather

August 1987

CHRONOLOGICAL LIST OF IOWA BALLOT CHANGES

- * These changes tended to shorten ballot
- ** These changes tended to lengthen ballot

- 1892--Australian ballot adopted, page 3
- 1900--Presidential electors removed from ballot,
voting machine counties only,* page 8
- 1906--Biennial general elections became effective, page 9
- 1907--Direct primary adopted,** page 12
- 1907--Commission form of city government authorized,*
page 22
- 1911--County surveyor removed from ballot,* page 14
- 1913--Direct election of U.S. senators,** page 10
- 1913--Clerk and reporter of supreme court removed from
the ballot,* page 13
- 1913--State superintendent of public instruction removed
from the ballot, reinstated in 1917 and removed
again in 1953,* page 13
- 1913--Township road supervisors removed from ballot,*
page 16
- 1913--Elections by ballot required in all independent city
and town school districts, page 24
- 1915--County superintendent of schools removed from the
ballot,* page 14
- 1915--Council-manager form of city government authorized,*
page 23
- 1915--Election of county school boards discontinued,
reinstated in 1948 and discontinued again in 1975,*
page 25
- 1919--Presidential electors removed from the ballot, paper
ballot counties,* page 9
- 1919--One vote for president and vice president,* page 9
- 1947--Township assessors removed from the ballot,* page 17
- 1947--City assessors removed from the ballot,* page 21
- 1951--City administrative officers removed from the ballot
(except for mayor),* page 21
- 1959--State commerce commissioners removed from the ballot,*
page 14
- 1959--County coroner removed from the ballot,* page 14
- 1959--Legislature authorized combining county offices,
page 14
- 1963--Direct election of judges replaced by nominating
commissions and "retention in office" votes, page 18
- 1963--Delegates to party conventions selected by precinct
caucuses, rather than in primary,* page 12
- 1963--Terms of county supervisors changed from three years
to four years,* page 14

1963--Terms of township trustees changed from three years to four years,* page 17
1965--Merged area schools authorized,** page 26
1972--Four-year terms for state and county officers,* page 9
1973--Township justices of the peace and constables abolished,* page 17
1973--City courts abolished,* page 17
1973--Directors of regional library boards added to ballot,** page 19
1974--Party precinct committee persons selected by precinct caucuses,* page 12
1974--Term of township clerk changed from two to four years,* page 17
1975--Soil district commissioners added to ballot,** page 19
1983--Clerk of the district court removed from the ballot,* page 14

Some Recent Proposals That Would Affect Ballot Length

Electing the governor and lieutenant governor as a team, page 30
Removing state administrative officers from the ballot, page 31
County government reorganization, page 32
Eliminating township governments, page 34
Removing regional library trustees from the ballot, page 35
Removing soil district commissioners from the ballot, page 35
Combining school and city elections, page 35
Removing judges from the ballot, page 36
An illustrative short ballot, page 38
A unicameral legislature? page 40

INTRODUCTION

As a political reform, the short ballot had moderate success initially, then continued to have results sporadically over a long period of time. Although the idea swept the country soon after its formulation, its successes came only in particular areas and at particular times. In many places, the debate continues today.

The basic idea is simple, and that is the basic idea: to simplify the ballot to the point that only a few offices are voted on at any given election. The purpose is to enable voters to investigate and make informed decisions about the candidates for the few offices on the ballot. Woodrow Wilson has been quoted as saying:

Simplification! Simplification! is the task that awaits us; to reduce the number of persons voted for to the absolute workable minimum, knowing whom you have selected; knowing whom you have trusted, and having so few persons to watch that you can watch them. That is the way we are going to get popular control back in this country, and that is the only way we are going to get political control back.[1]

Iowa was the first state to adopt some aspects of the short ballot; through the years, other applications of short ballot principles have been adopted, and many others proposed. Certain proposals now before the people and the legislature embody short ballot principles.

The Beginning of the Short Ballot Movement

The short ballot was one of the many concepts for poli-

tical reform that marked the Progressive Era, roughly the fifteen or twenty year period beginning around the turn of the twentieth century. In addition to the short ballot, these ideas included the direct primary, the presidential preference primary, the initiative, referendum, and recall, the commission and manager forms of city government, regulation of campaign expenditures, and the popular election of U.S. Senators.

The basic principle behind these reforms was to return control of government to the people by concentrating authority in a few officials directly responsible to the voters. The administration of government would be in the hands of non-partisan experts selected by and responsible to policy-making officials elected by the people.

Popular control was to be strengthened by opening the electoral process and the partisan procedures. Elections were to be simplified and purified, and the political parties brought under governmental regulation.

The proposed reforms were a response to the graft, corruption, patronage, and other abuses then rampant in the country. The reforms were attempts to wrest control of government from the political machines and bosses, and their allies in business, transportation, public utilities, and other areas of the private sector.[2]

The first victory was the widespread adoption of the Australian secret ballot. This was a major revolution in the manner of conducting the people's business, and it triggered the other reforms. Secret elections were such a marked con-

trast to the way in which elections had been conducted, and the reform was adopted so quickly by so many states, that there was great optimism that other, similar reforms that would clean up politics and government could be adopted.

The Australian Ballot

Massachusetts adopted the first Australian ballot law in 1889; by 1892 thirty-five states had enacted it, and by 1904 all but three states had.[3] Iowa passed this ballot reform in 1892.[4]

The operation of this reform was simple: there was an official, uniform ballot, printed at public expense, and voting was secret within the polling place, under official supervision.[5] To appreciate what a radical reform this was it is necessary to consider the system it replaced.

Before the Australian ballot came into use, voters were required to produce, as well as prepare, their own ballots:

Elections were informal, often viva voce. Sometimes party adherents took the trouble to print ballots--lists of the names of candidates of that party's ticket. These ballots were mere slips of paper. Only with the adoption of the Australian ballot in 1892 was the voter given on one large sheet the entire list of candidates--not to mention the blank spaces.[6]

The election laws in effect in Iowa in 1888 indicate how elections were conducted at that time:

The ballot shall designate the office for which the persons therein named are voted for.

In voting, the electors shall deliver their ballots to one of the judges, and he shall deposit them in the ballot box.

During the receiving and counting of the ballots . . . it shall be unlawful for persons to congregate or loiter within one hundred feet of the voting place, or to hinder or delay in any manner any elector in reaching or leaving the place fixed

for casting his ballot. It shall be unlawful for any person within such distance of one hundred feet, to give or offer to give any ticket or ballot to anyone not a judge of elections, or to fold or unfold, or display any ballot which he intends to cast so as to reveal its contents or to solicit the vote of any elector, or attempt in any way to influence him in the matter or casting his vote.[7]

Newspaper accounts describe instances where partisans would prepare ballots listing the candidates of the opposition party in which names were misspelled, candidates omitted, and the like. Election day in Des Moines in 1888 is described this way;

Fully three-fifths of the vote was cast before noon and there was little occasion for the politicians to use the hacks they had employed. The Democrats were out with an unusually large number of hacks, placarded, [horse-drawn taxis decorated with political posters] and the names of the county and township candidates conspicuously printed on red cards. The Republicans had a few hacks but not so many and there was less display and bluster in their work. The representatives of the jobbers seemed to have the most workers with the tickets. They had alleged Democratic and Republican tickets with the names of the present Railroad Commissioners all on. They were the only ones working hard against the straight tickets. All day long the election proceeded very quietly, and in no case were there any disturbances. The polls were kept clear of workers beyond the 100-foot limit, and perfect order prevailed. . . . The vote was hard to count in the city because of the large amount of scratching and the number of fraudulent tickets put out.[8]

After the first election in which the Australian ballot was used, the Iowa State Register commented:

The Australian ballot law passed by the last legislature was tried yesterday. There will be varying opinions in regard to its utility to-day. The man who, after casting his vote discovered that he had made a mistake serious enough to disfranchise him, as many did, is apt to have a very poor opinion of the law. But we believe that the general verdict will be favorable to the new system. Peop-

le seem to like it. The seclusion of the booth wherein the mandate of the sovereign people was prepared seemed to be compatible to the average man who entered it. Nine out of ten came out with a satisfied air that seemed to indicate that he had a high opinion of the importance of the vote he was casting and the circumstances under which he cast it.

There is no doubt that the quiet which reigned at the polls yesterday was largely due to the new system of voting. The crowd which had generally collected around the ballot-boxes or polling places was entirely absent. The very hacks which have been conspicuous agents at polling places seemed to be vacant. Men went to the polls quietly, cast their ballots and left, often without exchanging a word with anyone. The Australian system is an expensive one for a state like Iowa, but it is likely to be permanent. People who have once used it will want to use it again. It is a great step in the direction of a purified ballot.[9]

In another column on the same page is this comment:

Iowa's new Australian ballot law has destroyed the occupation of the blowers and strikers at the polls. Yesterday's election was the quietest there has ever been held in Des Moines, the votes were polled rapidly and with less delay than ever before, and if the ballots count out all right, the Register is going to be satisfied with the new law, even if the booths do resemble the toilet room of a modern hotel.

Writing some fifty years after the events, Emory English commented:

In the matter of the Australian ballot reform, the voters previously were bewildered and annoyed by the multiplicity of ballots offered them, some being thrust into their hands even when they were in the act of voting. All manner of pressure and intimidation were practiced, and high-handed methods of voting and counting of votes were indulged in and tolerated. . . .

Voting conditions had become intolerable; the imposition and intimidation practiced were unbearable; and under operation of the new law their disappearance was a distinct relief.[10]

Why the Long Ballot?

The long ballot developed in the second and third

decades of the nineteenth century. It grew out of the belief that the people could best control those officials they elected directly, so all officials, especially at the state and local level, should be elected by the people. Short terms and frequent elections were other features of this theory.

Later in the century, politicians were able to build strong political machines by controlling the means by which candidates were selected. Nominations for office were made in caucuses and conventions controlled by the party leaders.

Party tickets were designed with two or three outstanding candidates at the top of the ticket and the remainder filled up with loyal party supporters. The long, non-secret ballot virtually forced voters to vote the straight ticket.

When proposals were made to remove minor offices from the ballot, the response from the politicians was that to do that would deprive the people of the right to vote for their public officials.

Reform efforts thus focused on two approaches: enact the direct primary, so that nominations were made by rank-and-file party members, and adopt the short ballot to encourage voters to examine and choose from opposing candidates rather than simply accept the party's choices, to "vote for the man, not the party."

Writing in 1913, A. Lawrence Lowell described the situation this way:

The plain fact is that in America democracy

undertakes more work, tries to attend to more details for which it is not fitted, than in any other country in the world. The excessive burden comes mainly from two things: the great number of temporary offices and the system of special legislation; and both are derived from the same source, the dislike of the people to intrust public duties to anyone but their direct representatives or to persons who are kept in touch with public opinion by constant fear of removal. The American citizen is far less attracted by the idea of experienced public servants who retain their positions so long as they are faithful and efficient than he is repelled by the dread of bureaucracy. A natural result has been the creation of a vast number of elective offices and the principle of rotation in all offices. But a not less natural consequence is the inability of the people to control either the selection of men for office or their conduct after assuming their duties. It is a simple case of being paralyzed by trying to do too much. . . . The growing demand for a short ballot is a recognition that the people have undertaken to elect to office more men than they can judge intelligently; and it is a step toward simplification of popular government that ought to be carried far.

* * *

We are told that the cure for the ills of democracy is more democracy, but surely that depends upon the disease from which it is suffering. . . . The cure for the ills of popular government is more attention by the people to the things they undertake, and that object is not promoted by undertaking too much. There is a limit to the total amount of labor the whole people can expend on public affairs, and that amount must be divided among the different matters they are called upon to consider. A fraction is diminished by increasing the denominator.[11]

The National Short Ballot Organization was founded in 1908 by Woodrow Wilson, then governor of New Jersey, and others. Its influence spread throughout the country, and there were state organizations in New York, New Jersey, Virginia, Illinois, Indiana, and many of the new states in the west. (I have not been able to find any record of the existence of a state short ballot organization in Iowa,

although there are many references and comments about short ballot ideas in the published records.)

The basic principles, quoted in many publications, were:

1. That only those offices should be elective which are important enough to attract (and deserve) public examination.
2. That very few offices should be filled by election at one time, so as to permit adequate and unconfused public examination of the candidates.[12]

The basic concept was to centralize authority and responsibility in a few elected officials, and let those officials appoint other officers to carry out the details of government; the elected officials were to be responsible to the people for the actions of the persons they had appointed. In this way the people would be free to concentrate their attention on the selection of able policy-making officials. As Herbert Croly said,

A democracy has no interest in making good government complicated, difficult, and costly. It has, on the contrary, every interest in so simplifying its machinery that only decisive decisions and choices are submitted to the voter. Every effort should be made to arouse his interest and to turn his public spirit to account; and for that reason it should not be fatigued by excessive demands and confused by complicated decisions.[13]

BALLOT CHANGES

Presidential Electors

For many years voters in all the states voted for members of the electoral college individually, sometimes without reference to the names of the candidates for president and vice president. The names of the candidates for electors were listed at the top of each party's ticket.

Before 1900, voters in Iowa had elected one elector from each congressional district, and two at large. In 1900 the legislature changed this procedure so that all electors were elected at large, although all but two for each party were nominated by congressional districts.[14]

This arrangement could hardly be described as a short ballot. However, in 1900 Iowa made a major breakthrough in this regard. As Albright tells it,

The introduction of the voting machine with limitations as to arrangement and space led Iowa in 1900 . . . to provide in the voting machine law that the names of electoral candidates might be omitted, that the ballot label might contain only the words 'Presidential Electors' preceded by the party name.[15]

Eliminating the names of individual electors from paper ballots came later. Nebraska did it first in 1917, and Iowa did in 1919.[16]

These ballot changes did not sweep the country; Albright reports that by 1930 only six states had removed the names of electors from their ballots, and by 1940 sixteen states had done so. He comments: "This acceleration of the presidential short ballot movement is one of the most important ballot trends of recent times; and it serves as one of the most effective ways of reducing the size of the ballot." [17]

In the 1919 statute, the Iowa legislature made another innovative change that resulted in shortening the ballot by one office: the ballot format was arranged so that each voter cast only one vote for both president and vice

president; the two offices were bracketed under each party label.[18]

Biennial Elections

At the turn of the century Iowa had a general election every year. Because most officers were elected for two-year terms, only half the officers were up for election each year. While this arrangement resulted in a relatively short ballot, annual elections were felt to be a burden on officials and voters alike, as well as an unnecessary expense, and the constitution was amended to require biennial elections effective in 1906.[19]

The net effect of the change was fewer general statewide elections, but longer ballots, almost double. In 1972, through constitutional and statutory amendments that changed the terms of most state and county officers from two to four years, the ballot was shortened.[20]

After the change to biennial elections in 1906, the normal general election ballot consisted of thirty-seven to fifty offices, depending on whether it was a presidential year or not. Most other states had similarly long ballots.

The normal Iowa ballot in a presidential year listed thirteen presidential electoral contests, one contest for representative in Congress, fifteen contests for state offices, eleven for county offices, nine for township offices, and various numbers of contests for district court judges.[21]

An example of a "short" ballot for that time is that voted in Polk County in the presidential election of 1908;

only twenty-eight contests were on the ballot, and that includes two contests to fill vacancies. The shortness was achieved because Polk County used voting machines. Instead of listing the presidential electors individually, the voting machines had just one lever for each party, labeled "Presidential Electors." [22]

The ballot for Linn County for the same election, reproduced as the centerfold of this report, illustrates the ballot format for counties where paper ballots were used. In both examples, the township ballot is not included.

Popular Election of U. S. Senators

Another election reform that received a great deal of popular support at this time was the campaign to amend the U. S. Constitution to require popular election of U. S. Senators, as opposed to election by the state legislatures. Many persons who supported short ballot principles also supported this proposal on the grounds that it would strengthen popular control of public officials even though it required the voters to consider candidates for yet another office.

The reason this movement peaked at this time was dissatisfaction over ruling by some federal judges. Many persons felt federal judges were much too favorable to business, particularly monopolies, trusts, and corporations. But federal judges were appointed by the President, who generally accepted the appointees recommended by the senators of the state in which the appointment was to be made, and the senators were elected by the legislatures. Therefore, the way to get at changes in federal judges was to take the election

of senators out of the hands of the legislatures, which were dominated by business and railroad interests.[23]

To its credit, the Iowa legislature did its part to bring about this reform. In 1904, in 1909, and again in 1911, the Iowa legislature petitioned Congress to present to the states the amendment to the U.S. Constitution necessary for changing the method of electing senators.[23]

In adopting the direct primary in 1907,, the legislature included a provisions for popular "nomination" of senatorial candidates. The choices by the voters were to be advisory. The act stated: "The vote upon candidates for the office of senator in the congress of the United States shall be for the sole purpose of ascertaining the sentiment of the voters in the respective parties."[24]

Before the federal amendment for electing senators was ratified, the legislature had set in motion a plan for nomination of senatorial candidates in the primary and election in the general election; legislative candidates would have been required to pledge themselves to be bound by the popular votes.[25] These special procedures were never used.

Direct Primary

For reformers of this period, the short ballot was one approach to breaking the stranglehold of political bosses on government. The second approach was the direct primary, a means for taking the power of nominations away from the party leaders and giving it to ordinary party members. Before this point, all nominations for partisan offices were

made by caucuses or conventions of party delegates. The direct primary meant setting up another election, and in many cases a long ballot. However, this was a vital step in breaking the control of the political organizations over politics and government.

As William L. Bowers commented:

Thus, after more than ten years of struggle, Iowa had a statewide primary election law which allowed the people to nominate candidates directly for public office. The law also provided for a preferential vote for a party candidate for United States Senator.[26]

In most respects today's primary law resembles the 1907 statute. However, there have been some changes that have short ballot overtones. Under the original act, delegates to the county convention and precinct committeemen were elected in the primary. In 1963 the law was amended to require that delegates were to be elected at precinct caucuses, and in 1974 that precinct committee members also were to be elected at caucuses.[27] These changes resulted in shortening the primary ballot.

Shortening the Ballot

Many changes in the ballot were deliberate attempts to shorten it by removing minor administrative offices in accordance with the short ballot principle of fewer and, it was hoped, better choices. Other reform motives, however, gave rise to other efforts which resulted incidentally in ballot shortening. One such reform replaced untrained, elective coroners with trained, appointive medical

examiners. Many changes, no doubt, were motivated by political considerations.

In this review, it is not practical to include all the background factors for each ballot change. I have included here those changes that had implications for short ballot principles.

Reducing the State Ballot

Advocates of the short ballot had some early successes in reducing the number of offices on the state general election ballot. As Frank Edward Horack reported:

In the legislation of the Thirty-fifth General Assembly [1913], a notable beginning has been made in the direction of the adoption of the short-ballot principle. Three state officers, namely, the Superintendent of Public Instruction, the Clerk of the Supreme Court, and the Supreme Court Reporter were made appointive officers. The County Superintendent was also removed from the list of elective officers; but a cumbersome method of selection was provided to take the place of the popular vote.[28]

The office of state superintendent was made elective again four years later, but removed from the ballot again in 1953.[29]

The only other state offices to be removed from the general election ballot since 1913 have been the members of the state commerce commission, formerly the board of railroad commissioners. The three members were made appointive in 1959.[30]

Names of candidates for state executive offices now appear on the ballot at fewer elections. The amendment of 1972, which lengthened terms to four years, meant that candidates for these seven offices appeared on the

non-presidential year ballot but not on the ballot in presidential years.

Shortening the County Ballot

The only county offices actually to be removed from the ballot since 1900 are the county surveyor in 1911, the county superintendent of schools in 1915, the coroner in 1959, and the clerk of the district court in 1983.[31]

In 1959 the legislature authorized counties to combine various offices, including elective offices, but proposals for such changes need to be presented by petitions signed by 25 percent of the voters in the county, then approved by a popular vote.[32] No proposals have been adopted that resulted in removing any elective county offices from the ballot.

The 1906 law implementing the change to biennial elections set the terms of all county officers, except members of the board of supervisors, at two years. Three, five, or seven members of the board were to be elected for three-year terms. The ballot specified "For term beginning . . ."[33]

Terms of supervisors were increased from three to four years in 1963; while this did not shorten the ballot, it did remove the confusion about who was running for which term.[34] The law was amended in 1960 to permit no more than five member boards.[35]

Since before the turn of the century it was possible to divide the area of a county into districts, and to elect one member of the board from each district. As far as

individual voters were concerned, dividing the county into supervisor districts rather than electing the members of the board at large did mean shortening the ballot.[36]

One of the amendments to the state constitution adopted in 1970 removed the office of county attorney from the constitution but the office has been continued by statute. The term of office was increased from two to four years in 1971.[37]

Other Districts

Iowa law permits the formation of many special purpose districts, some of which, such as county hospitals and drainage districts, require popular election of boards of directors or trustees. Because creation of these entities is permissive and the areas involved so various, it is not possible to include them in this report. Creation of such districts does lengthen the ballot for voters in the areas involved, but it is not easy to calculate on a statewide basis what these effects are.

Shortening the Township Ballot

Only voters in rural areas vote for township officers; for these voters, the township ticket does add to the length of the ballot. Through the years, the length of the township ballot has been shortened by centralizing road, assessment, and other functions in the county, and by implementation of the unified court system.

Townships were important units of local government at the turn of the century. As the 1897 Code stated, township trustees were to serve as ". . . overseers of the poor,

fence viewers, and the township board of equalization, and board of health, and shall have charge of all cemeteries within the limits of the townships dedicated to public use, when the same are not controlled by other trustees or incorporated bodies." [38]

At that time there were three trustees for each township, one elected each year for a three-year term; a clerk, an assessor, and road supervisors who were elected for two-year terms in even-numbered years.[39]

The township trustees could divide the township into "such number of road districts as may be necessary for the public good." [40] Each district elected its own road supervisor, who acquired his own equipment and labor pool to maintain the roads in his district.

In 1902 the legislature acted to abolish the separate township road districts and centralize road maintenance under one road superintendent for each township. This action was modified somewhat in 1909, but reinstated in 1913. From that time, the township road superintendent was appointed by the trustees.[41]

All township responsibilities for roads, including all equipment and funds, were transferred to the county in 1929.[42]

The elected township assessor had responsibility for assessing all real and personal property in the township and reporting these assessments to the county for collection of taxes. The assessor also had charge of conducting the state census every year that ended in "5" until that function was

abandoned in 1936 by amendment to the state constitution. The office of township assessor was abolished in 1947 and all assessing functions were centralized in the county.[43]

The term of the township clerk was changed from two to four years in 1974, and the terms of trustees from three to four years in 1963.[44]

The Judicial System

The township ballot was shortened by four offices when the offices of justice of the peace and constable were abolished in 1973. The previous year the legislature had mandated: "All mayors' courts, justice of the peace courts, police courts, superior courts, and municipal courts and offices connected therewith, are abolished as of July 1, 1973." [45]

This action was part of the Unified Trial Court Act that continued the process of judicial reform that was put in motion by the passage of a constitutional amendment in 1962. Before that time, all judges had been elected on a partisan basis. Nominations were made by separate nominating conventions for each political party and the nominees were presented on the general election ballot under the party labels.

The primary objective of judicial reform was to have judges appointed on the basis of non-partisan nominations made by special judicial nominating commissions. Voters were no longer required to make choices from among partisan candidates for judges.

Under the new procedures, judges of the supreme,

appeals, and district courts are subject to a popular vote on whether they are to be retained in office; there is such a vote at the first election after their first appointment, and at the end of each term of appointment--eight years for supreme court judges, six years for appeals and district court judges, and four years for associate judges.

On a separate, non-partisan section of the ballot, there is the question "Shall the following judges . . . be retained in office?"

Whether these "automatic recall" procedures result in a net shortening of the ballot is open to question; the voters still are required to make decisions on the merits of each judge.

Lengthening the Ballot

So far we have considered actions by the legislature to reduce the length of the ballot. However, two acts of the legislature in the 1970s resulted in adding two positions to the ballot. These actions were the creation of the regional library system in 1973 and requiring in 1975 that members of soil district commissions be elected.[46] Members of both entities were required to be elected on a non-partisan ballot at the general election.

Seven regional library districts were created, and within each district seven director districts were created; the voters in each district elect one member of their regional board for a four-year term. Thus, the ballot is increased by one office once every four years.

There are 100 soil conservation districts; each elects

five commissioners at large for staggered six-year terms. This means an addition to the ballot of one or two positions every two years.

City Elections

Ballots for city elections in Iowa never have been particularly long, and over the years they have become shorter. The traditional mayor-council form of government has been, and still is, the most prevalent form of government. However, Iowa made a significant contribution to experimentation with new forms of city governance that had a tremendous impact on the short ballot movement.

City government was a special target of the reformers of the Progressive Era because that was the scene of much graft, corruption, patronage, and other abuses. Partisan elections prevailed everywhere, and party machines and bosses were in firm control in many cities.

Although corruption and scandals were relatively rare in Iowa cities, there still was great interest in reform of city government. Iowa became one of the leaders in the reform movement, and one of the state's early innovations was hailed and copied widely throughout the country.

At the turn of the century, city elections were held annually or biennially on the last Monday in March; elections were set biennially in odd-numbered years in 1907.[47] Terms of office were for two years.

In addition to members of the city council, cities over 15,000 elected a mayor, solicitor, treasurer, auditor, engineer, assessor, and judges of the superior or police court.

Cities between 2,000 and 15,000 elected a mayor, solicitor, treasurer, and assessor. Towns under 2,000 elected a mayor, clerk, treasurer, and assessor.[48]

Other officers, such as members of park boards, also were elected in some cities.

Cities were divided into wards of equal population for purposes of electing council members, although the number of wards and councilmen elected varied. Terms were for two years. In cities over 15,000, two council members were elected at large and one from each ward. Cities between 2,000 and 15,000 could have between three and seven wards, and elect two council members from each ward. In towns (places under 2,000), six councilmen were elected for three-year terms.[49]

Nomination of all candidates for city offices was made by party caucuses and conventions. In the early 1920s, primary elections were required in cities over 15,000 population.[50]

Through the years, various administrative officers, except for the mayor, were dropped from the ballot: solicitors in cities of the second class in 1913, assessors in 1947, for example.[51]

The municipal code of 1951 required that all administrative officers (except the mayor) be appointed unless the council by ordinance provided for election of certain officers. The date of municipal elections was changed to the Tuesday after the first Monday in November in odd-numbered years. Terms of office of elected officials were for two

years, unless by popular vote the terms were set at four years.[52]

Thus, city ballots became shorter through the years. However, for cities that chose to adopt the commission or city manager forms of government, short ballots became reality much earlier.

"The Des Moines Plan"

It was the commission plan of city government, authorized statewide by the legislature in 1907, that became the pet of reformers throughout the country, generated a great deal of publicity, and became a model for non-partisan, short ballot governance. It incorporated nearly all the reform features then popular.[53]

Following are some comments by writers of the period:

Another significant accomplishment of Iowa Progressivism was the enactment into law of provisions for cities having a population of 25,000 or over to adopt the commission plan of city government. This plan, commonly referred to as 'The Des Moines Plan,' had been adopted in the state capital the year before and seemed to be a successful way of controlling the problems of machine politics, inefficiency, and incompetency in larger city administrations.[54]

. . . the citizens of Des Moines did not content themselves with having a popular and workable government for its own sake, but advertised it far and wide as the city's chief civic asset.

* * *

In obtaining permission from the state of Iowa to adopt the commission form of government, Des Moines hit upon a device which has accelerated the movement in the country by several degrees. This was the adoption of a state-wide permissive law which made it possible for any city (within certain limits of classification) to put the plan into operation by a popular election, called upon petition of 25 percent of the qualified electors. Seven Iowa cities reorganized under this arrangement.

The Des Moines charter added to the structure

what were at the time unknown and untried 'devices' of the initiative, referendum, and recall, measures designed to make doubly sure that the people would control. This instrument also included civil service and corrupt practices provisions and a scheme of non-partisan elections. These features, however, were all taken from older forms; and they constitute no essential part of the commission movement, inasmuch as one or all of them are absent from virtually every law except the Iowa statute.[55]

It is this same simplicity which makes possible the non-partisan ballot. A non-partisan ballot must be short. In most of the cities, thanks again to the Short Ballot, the Des Moines plan of the non-partisan primary has been copied to advantage, and the people, big, unorganized and clumsy as they are, have been able to take over the function of weeding out the aspirants and deciding the contests, without accepting the help of private machinery.[56]

In the twenty-seven American states which have authorized the adoption of the commission form of city government sixty cities now have taken steps to operate under this system. The growth of the commission form of government has been so rapid that it has befuddled the politicians. And the provisions for government under the Des Moines plan of commission government are so radical that the city politician of the old school finds his occupation gone as soon as the new plan is in operation.[57]

Under the plan, a mayor and four council members were elected biennially. Voters in the non-partisan primary selected the top two candidates for mayor and the top eight candidates for council to run in the general municipal election. After the election, each commissioner was assigned a city department, or group of departments, to supervise. Other features of the plan were that franchises must be approved by popular vote and that no free passes could be issued by city franchised transportation firms.[58]

Another popular form of government, the city manager plan, was first adopted in Staunton, Virginia, in 1908, and

was authorized for all cities and towns in Iowa in 1915.[59]

Both the commission and the council-manager forms were short ballot plans of government from the start; through evolution, the mayor-council form as practiced in Iowa has become a short ballot form.

Although cities in Iowa now can have virtually any plan of governance they choose through adopting city charters, only variations on the three basic forms--mayor-council, commission, and city manager--have appeared, and nearly all charters incorporate short ballot principles.

School Elections

In earlier times school elections were relatively informal affairs; in fact, they weren't formal elections as such, just neighborhood meetings. As the 1897 Code stated: "A meeting of the voters of each school corporation shall be held annually on the second Monday in March." [60] At these annual meetings, directors were elected and other school business transacted.

In larger school districts, directors were elected by ballot. Three to seven directors were elected for three-year terms; in some districts, a treasurer also was elected. School districts of 5,000 or more population had formal elections, including voter registration in cities that had registration for other elections. Some districts were divided into subdistricts for purposes of electing directors.[61]

Later, elections by ballot in which the laws regarding

general elections were applicable were required of all independent city or town districts.[62]

The Des Moines school district was made a special case by a 1927 act: its elections were to be held biennially on the second Monday in March in odd-numbered years; nine directors were elected for six-year terms.[63] In other districts, seven, five, or three directors were elected for three-year terms.

School districts could elect directors at large, or from subdistricts, or a combination of both methods.[64]

In 1959 the date for school elections was changed from March to the second Monday in September each year, except for Des Moines which continued to have biennial school elections.[65]

Although the basic structure of school organization, including elections, has not changed much over the past 100 years, school organizations themselves have changed a great deal. Throughout this period, school district reorganization has been a major political issue. The state has tried numerous devices and strategies to encourage or mandate districts to merge or combine into larger and ever larger districts.

In the early years of this period, the state department of public instruction and the county boards of education were assigned the responsibilities for overseeing these mergers. This resulted in numerous changes in the organization of the county school boards.

Earlier, members of the county board and the county superintendent were elected. Effective in 1915, these offices

were removed from the ballot. Members of the county board were elected at conventions of local school district representatives. There were six members of the county board; for a time they were elected for three-year terms, then six year terms. These boards appointed the county superintendent.[66]

Then, in 1948, the county boards became elective again. There were five members, four elected from election districts and one at large; they were elected at the annual school elections in odd-numbered years for six-year terms. These boards continued to elect the county superintendent.[67] The terms of board members were changed from six years to three years in 1970.[68]

The county boards were abolished in 1975 and replaced by the area education agencies. Originally, these regional bodies were coterminous with the merged area school districts, the agencies charged with administering the state's system of junior and community colleges and vocational institutes. Directors of the AEAs are elected for three-year terms at conventions held two weeks after the regular school elections. Delegates to these conventions are local school personnel and cast votes proportionate to the enrollment of the districts they represent.[69]

Effective in 1981, the number of directors of both the area education agencies and the merged area schools were set at not less than five nor more than nine.[70] The AEAs and the merged areas are no longer coterminous.[71]

The merged area schools are governed by elected boards of directors; the directors are elected on a nonpartisan

basis by districts for three-year terms at the regular school elections.[72] Election of these directors thus lengthens the school ballot.

ELECTIONS BY DISTRICTS OR AT LARGE?

At several points in this history we have encountered the question of whether members of policy-making bodies should be elected by districts or at large. This has been a controversial question for political scientists and practical politicians for many years; there certainly is no consensus in either group. The answer to the question has an impact on the length of the ballot: whether voters select one representative or several at any given election.

In general, in this country we have favored election from districts, each electing a single representative, for representatives in congress and the state legislatures, but when it comes to local government bodies, there is no settled pattern.

From this review of Iowa laws and practices over the past 100 years it appears that the legislature has tended to prefer at-large election of boards of supervisors, city councils, and local school boards. At the same time, the legislature from time to time has permitted election to these bodies by districts; usually, such a change requires approval by the voters. In the case of regional library districts and the merged area schools, the legislature has mandated election by districts.

In accordance with short ballot principles, many reform-

ers of the Progressive Era, including Woodrow Wilson,[73]
 favored election from districts. As Richard S. Childs wrote:

We have a prejudice in this country against ward-elected aldermen, but the trouble lies in the pettiness and insignificance of the job rather than the pettiness of the ward. If our ward alderman were the 'head of the ticket,' the whole ticket in fact, and if he were to be one of the supreme board of directors of the city, we busy citizens would know about him just as we know about the mayor now. And, like the mayor, he would be a clear target for the active criticism of every voter.[74]

A new element of controversy has been introduced recently. A federal district court has ruled that the at-large election of members of the Springfield, Ill., commission-plan form of government is in violation of the federal 1964 voting rights act in that it tends to discriminate against racial minorities in certain circumstances.[75] Similar charges have been made in other jurisdictions.

DID SHORT BALLOT REFORMS MAKE A DIFFERENCE?

Before considering possible future ballot changes based on short ballot principles, it is fair to ask whether the reforms of the past had the effects their proponents promised. While this is a fair question, it is a very difficult one to answer. It is almost always difficult to say whether any governmental reform once adopted had the effects its proponents hoped.

Many persons probably would agree that replacing untrained, elective coroners with trained, appointive medical examiners was a good idea and probably resulted in better

government. Many persons also might agree that replacing the traditional mayor-council form of municipal government with a council-manager form would be beneficial. "Proving" the beneficial effects of such reforms is another matter.

The proponents of short ballot reforms hoped that implementing these principles would result in better informed, more independent voters. Has this happened? We do know that there are proportionately fewer voters now than there were 100 years ago; the percentage of eligible voters who participate in elections has declined, with some variations due to wars and depressions, since the introduction of the secret ballot. Is that good or bad, and what influence have ballot changes had on voter turnout?

We do know that contemporary voters are far more independent than those of 100 years ago; split-ticket voting has increased and straight party voting has declined. But is this the result of ballot changes or of the general decline in party loyalty?

Despite difficulties in evaluating governmental and political reforms, we must continue to make decisions based on the best information available to us at the moment. Short ballot principles made sense to many people ninety years ago and to many others during the years since then; they still make sense to many persons today.

Each proposal must be evaluated on its own merits, in terms of the needs and conditions of the day; that's the best we can do.

POSSIBLE FUTURE CHANGES IN THE BALLOT

In the concluding section of this review, we will consider some possible future changes in election laws and political procedures that have short ballot implications. In all of these matters, short ballot considerations are only one factor, usually a minor one, but that is consistent with the history of the concept. The short ballot principle is one argument for promoting reforms that have other merits as well.

Many arguments, for and against, could be made for each of these proposals. To list the pros and cons is not the intent of this report, although the major arguments will always stand. On the one hand, many argue that each office removed from the ballot takes from the people a measure of direct control. By contrast, many others argue that voters can make better informed decisions if the ballot contains only major governmental offices.

In general, this presentation begins with proposals that seem to have the best chances of being adopted in the near future, then moves to proposals that seem to have lesser and more distant prospects.

Electing the Governor and Lieutenant Governor As a Team

The proposal for electing the governor and lieutenant governor as a team, as we do with the president and the vice president, has been around for a long time, certainly as long as the national model. A constitutional amendment calling for this change, and four-year terms for both officials, passed the 1965 session of the legislature.[76] It failed to

pass a second legislative session, so died for that time. However, four-year terms for all elective state officials were adopted later.

Another proposed amendment to achieve the "team" objective was passed in the 1984 legislative session; however, there was a defect in the timing of the proposed change.[77] A revised proposal passed the 1986 session.[78] If this proposed amendment passes again in identical form in 1987 or 1988, the amendment will be presented to the voters in the 1988 general election; if adopted by the people, the change will become effective with the 1990 election.

Shortening the State Ballot

Removing minor state administrative offices from the ballot has been a prime objective of reformers from the Progressive Era onward. Many such efforts have been made in many states, either through amending or revising state constitutions.[79]

Concerning efforts in Iowa to remove administrators from the ballot, Horack reported in 1921:

The primary will work at its best only when the principle of the short ballot is observed. And by the short ballot is meant the elimination of the minor State and local offices not only from the primary ballot but also from the general election. In respect to State offices the observance of this principle has not been possible under the Iowa Constitution; but the convening of a constitutional convention in the near future offers an unusual opportunity to shorten the ballot and to provide for an administrative system in the State similar to that employed in the Federal government.[80]

Horack and others were to be disappointed about the prospects of a constitutional convention; the convention,

which had been voted by the voters in the 1920 election, was never called.[81]

Another attempt to remove the state administrative offices from the ballot was initiated in 1965. The legislature that year passed a proposed constitutional amendment that would give the governor the power to appoint a secretary of state, treasurer of state and attorney general; the state auditor would be selected by the legislature. No further action was taken on this proposed amendment.[82]

Shortening the County Ballot

Proposals for shortening the county ballot by removing some of the administrative offices from the ballot also have been around for a long time. The office of county attorney was removed from the constitution in 1970. Now that all county offices are statutory, every office could be removed from the county ballot by the legislature.

In 1978, the voters of the state adopted a constitutional amendment extending to counties home rule powers granted by a similar amendment to cities a decade earlier. However, legislation to implement this amendment to allow counties to adopt alternate forms of government or charters has not been adopted.

Legislation has been proposed that would allow the voters of a county to choose from several forms of government provided by statute, or to adopt county charters. Consolidated governance of one or more cities and a county, or two counties, also would be possible.[83] If other forms or a charter were to be adopted by individual counties, one

or more current elective offices might be removed from the ballot.[84]

Eliminating Township Government

Elimination of township trustees was recommended as early as 1933.[85] Many of the traditional functions of township government have been transferred to the county since 1900, including the welfare, road, and assessment functions. Adoption of the unified court system eliminated the township law enforcement and judicial functions.

The U. S. census bureau does not regard Iowa townships as independent units of government. The 1982 Census of Governments states:

. . . the townships in Iowa have such limited discretion in the conduct of their affairs that they are classified as county government agencies rather than as independent governments[[86]

The township unit still operates as a taxing unit, precinct for election purposes, and performs some other functions. Some townships are charged with maintenance of cemeteries, town halls, parks, and playgrounds. Township trustees, by statute, serve as fence viewers.

At the present time, it is difficult to get people to run for township trustee or clerk; in many places, a totally write-in ballot is presented to the voters. In 1987 the legislature considered allowing the county board of supervisors to appoint township officers when no person is elected or when a vacancy occurs.[87]

It seems only a short step for the county to assume all remaining township functions, thus eliminating the township

as a unit of government and shortening the ballot in rural areas.

Eliminating Two Other Offices

The two new elective bodies created by the legislature in the 1970s--the regional library boards and the soil district commissions--might be removed from the ballot. Such changes have not been seriously considered by the legislature.

Combining City and School Elections

As a means of reducing the costs of holding separate elections and possibly increasing voter turnout, it has been proposed that city and school elections be held at the same time. Under this proposal, school elections would be moved from the second Tuesday after the first Monday in September to the first Tuesday after the first Monday in November, the same date as city elections. Instead of having school elections every year, a biennial nonpartisan local election would be held.

A bill to accomplish this change passed one house of the legislature a few years ago; similar legislation passed the senate in the 1987 session.[88]

An extension of this proposal is to move the observance of Veterans' Day from November 11 to the first Tuesday after the first Monday in November. Thus, election day would be a holiday, the same date every year, with the general election in even-numbered years and the local nonpartisan election in odd-numbered years.[89]

The current proposed legislation would change the terms

of school board directors from three years to four years. Some cities now elect officers for two-year terms. If offices for both cities and school districts are put on the same ballot, a ballot of ten or twelve offices would not be uncommon. However, if staggered four-year terms are set for both groups of officers, the length of the ballot could be reduced.

Removing Judges from the Ballot

The 1962 judicial amendment to the state constitution eliminated the partisan election of judges, substituting for it a system of appointment from lists of nominees proposed by special judicial nominating commissions. However, voters are required to decide whether or not individual judges should be retained in office when their terms expire.

Under the judicial amendment of 1972, the supreme court was given responsibility for disciplining all judges and providing for retirement of judges. In addition, the legislature retains the constitutional power of impeachment. Perhaps the "automatic recall" provisions of the 1962 amendment could be repealed, in the interests of reducing the length and complexity of the ballot.

HOW SHORT SHOULD THE BALLOT BE?

In his 1942 review, Albright reports that the ballots he examined ranged in length from one to seventy offices.[90] Ballots containing more than fifty offices were not uncommon at the turn of the century. Earlier in this report, we dis-

cussed ballots in Iowa ranging from thirty-seven to fifty offices.

How short should a short ballot be? In discussing this issue, the authors of the New York short ballot proposal in 1914 agreed that the fifty-seven offices on an Illinois ballot they examined was obviously too long, and that the fifteen or twenty then common in New York was probably too many. They commented:

You or I may think that the people ought to look up fifteen sets of candidates and pass careful judgment on each of them individually, but our opinion is of no importance. The simple fact is that a ballot of fifteen offices involves more work than his majesty, the citizen, cares to do. . . .

The workable limit of the ballot is about five offices.[91]

The authors of the Virginia short ballot proposal (1926) quoted from a booklet from the National Municipal League:

A long ballot . . . is not really democratic, but constitutes in effect a disfranchisement to the majority of workaday voters and accordingly there might properly be included in the bill of rights . . . a provision that . . . more than five offices should never be allowed to be submitted simultaneously to popular vote, lest the people thereby be prevented from giving to each elective office that effective public scrutiny by which they can protect themselves.[92]

How this ideal ballot of five offices was derived is not clear; however, it was generally accepted as the target for ballot length by the Progressive Era reformers.

An Illustrative Short Ballot for Iowa

Shown below is how the ballot would look if all the proposals discussed so far in this review for shortening the general election ballot were adopted--that is, electing the governor and lieutenant governor as a team, making the other

state administrative officers appointive, removing county administrative officers from the ballot, abolishing townships as units of government, removing the regional library boards and soil district commissions from the ballot, and dispensing with the vote on retention of judges:

PRESIDENTIAL YEARS

President and Vice President
U. S. Senator
U. S. Representative
State Senator
State Representative
One to three members of the county board of supervisors

NONPRESIDENTIAL YEARS

U. S. Senator
U. S. Representative
Governor and Lieutenant Governor
State Representative
One to three members of the county board of supervisors

Thus, the ballot would be shortened to six to eight offices in presidential years and five to seven in nonpresidential years. Some additional comments are in order:

We elect two U. S. Senators for six-year terms on a staggered basis. Over a period of three elections, we elect senators in two elections, and none in the third.

State senators are elected for four-year terms; half of the districts elect their senators in presidential years, the other half in nonpresidential years.

Two-thirds of the counties have three-member boards of supervisors, the other third have five-member boards.[93] This means that, with four-year terms, one or two members

are elected each election in most counties, two or three in the other counties. However, if a county chooses to elect its board members from districts, each district elects only one supervisor, and that can be only every four years.

Depending on the local method of choosing supervisors, implementation of the ballot changes listed above would reduce the length of the ballot to very close to the "ideal" five offices.

School and City Elections

The length of the ballot in the proposed combined city-school election in odd-numbered years is more difficult to project because of the local options involved. These include:

School boards consist of five members, except that the number can be increased to seven by local action. Also, some or all directors can be elected from districts rather than at large.

Election of the members of the merged area district boards is included here, but these directors are elected from districts. Directors' terms could be set at four years by legislative action.

Most cities operate under the mayor-council form of government, in which a mayor and five council members are elected at large for two-year terms. However, terms can be changed to four years, and some members can be elected from wards. Legislation has been proposed that would allow smaller cities to have three-member councils by referendum.

In addition, cities now have power to change to forms of

government under which only five council members are elected for four-year terms.

Depending on the options chosen by local officials and voters, the ballot for these combined elections could be as short as five to seven offices.

A Shorter Ballot Still?

The partisan general election ballot could be shortened further by adoption of a major constitutional change-- creation of a single-house legislature. Although a unicameral legislature has not been proposed recently in Iowa, the idea was very popular among Progressive Era reformers.

One reformer commented that the states, in adopting new or revised constitutions based on the federal model, had adopted one feature of the federal system that they should not have, the two-house legislative body, and failed to adopt another federal feature that they should have, letting the chief executive official appoint the cabinet and major department heads.

The authors of the New York state short ballot proposal commented:

Some day the states may go through the process which our cities have, of consolidating the unwieldy double legislature into a single and more watchable chamber in which membership is a bigger honor and less unattractive to men of high ability. A single house of, say, fifty would probably result in the election of men of the type who are now sent to Congress.[94]

The unicameral concept is consistent with the progressive goals of consolidation and simplification, centrali-

zing authority and responsibility, and focusing public attention on as few offices as possible.

So far, Nebraska is the only state to have adopted a unicameral legislature, and that state just completed fifty years of experience with it.

There are many arguments that can be made both for and against unicameral legislative bodies that are beyond the scope of this report. The proposal merits mention here because it is consistent with short ballot principles; eliminating one house of the legislature would indeed shorten the ballot.

CONCLUSION

In closing I would like to quote two more passages about the philosophy of government that guided the Progressive Era proposals. The first is from Derr's dissertation:

But the real thrust of progressive reform was toward order and centralization. The premise of idealistic reformers was that state power would be a countervailing beneficent shield for the people against harm done by monopolists, by corporations, and by apathy and indifference. . . . Opportunity would be re-introduced into American life. Entry to power would be public, and leaders accountable. Covert activities would be very difficult in such a system, which was based on the ideals of fairness and equal freedom of access. Randomness and variation in standards undermine fairness; government oversight was necessary to coordinate and ensure homogeneity of process. The ultimate goal was a more liberal and humane society.[96]

The reformers of the Progressive Era had a genuine concern for democratic institutions and processes, for political structures and procedures in themselves, quite apart from substantive concern for ideology, political phi-

losophy, or the particular candidates and issues of the day.

They shared with the framers of the constitution the belief that if the proper structure and procedures of government were firmly established, the people could take care of the business of government for themselves. For the short ballot advocates, a ballot that the voters could manage intelligently was an important ingredient of democracy.

William Allen White expressed this concern for process most eloquently when he wrote:

Democracy is arming itself with the full power of the ballot. It is vastly more important that it shall have weapons and equipment for the fight than that it shall have a programme. . . . The important thing, the paramount thing, manifest in our growth as a people is the growth of democratic institutions--the broadening and deepening of the power of the people . . . The deepening power of the people means that the people are preparing by some subconscious prescience for a great struggle. They do not know definitely what it is. In the nature of things they may have no programme. A cut and dried platform, a formal declaration of principles, economic or a social scheme would limit the scope of the movement and curtail its usefulness. . . . Coming events must be met, not by a party or a set of principles, but by an attitude of mind. The reaction must be simple, but inevitable.[97]

REFERENCES

1. Quoted in H. S. Gilbertson, "Short Ballot in American Cities," Review of Reviews, 45:82-85 (Jan. 1912), quoted in Edna D. Bullock, comp., Short Ballot, White Plains, New York, H.W. Wilson Co., 1915, p. 147
 2. For a lucid and gentle description of this situation, see William Allen White, The Old Order Changeth, New York, Macmillan, 1910, pp.8-24
 3. Philip L. Allen, "American Ballot Laws and Their Workings," Political Science Quarterly, XXI (1906), 38-58
 4. Laws 1892 (24th G.A.), ch. 33
 5. Spencer D. Albright, The American Ballot, Washington, D.C., American Council on Public Affairs, 1942, p. 86
 6. Ruth A. Galliher, "This Iowa," Iowa Journal of History and Politics, 39 (1941), p. 7
 7. McClain's Code, 1888, secs. 1077, 1078, 1053; the last provisions applied only in cities over 2,500 population
 8. Iowa State Register, Nov. 3, 1888, p. 4
 9. Iowa State Register, Nov. 9, 1892, p. 3
 10. Emory H. English, "Evolution in Iowa Voting Practices," Annals of Iowa, (third series), 29 (April 1948), p. 254
 11. A. Lawrence Lowell, Public Opinion and Popular Government, New York, Longmans Green and Co., 1926, pp. 105-7 (first edition 1913)
 12. Bullock, pp. 116, 119, 124, 147
 13. Herbert Croly, The Promise of American Life, New York, Macmillan, 1909, p. 349
 14. Code 1897, secs. 1106, 1173; Laws 1900, ch 38
 15. Albright, pp. 102-3
 16. Laws 1919, ch. 86
 17. Albright, pp. 104, 142
 18. There is a curious anomaly here. While Iowa voters have been casting one vote for candidates for both president and vice president since 1920, the official canvasses of the votes since that time have reported returns for both offices separately.
 19. Before the change to biennial elections, this is how the system worked: in odd-numbered years, the voters of the state elected a governor, lieutenant governor, and superintendent of public instruction; in even numbered years, they elected a secretary of state, state auditor, treasurer, and attorney general. One judge of the supreme court was elected each year for a six-year term. The clerk and reporter of the supreme court were elected in 1898 and each four years thereafter for four-year terms. One state railroad commissioner was elected each year for a three-year term.
- Judges of the district courts were elected "at a general election" for four-year terms. State senators and representatives were elected in odd-numbered years for four- and two-year terms respectively.
- In even-numbered years, the voters of each county

elected a clerk of the district court, county recorder, auditor, and attorney; in odd numbered years, they elected a treasurer, sheriff, coroner, county superintendent of schools, and surveyor--all for two year terms. Members of the board of supervisors were elected for three-year terms, one or more was elected each year, depending on the number of members of the board--three, five, or seven.

In townships, two justices of the peace and two constables were elected in even-numbered years for two-year terms. One township trustee was elected each year for a three-year term. Township clerks, assessors, and road superintendents were elected in even-numbered years for two-year terms. [Code 1897, secs. 1064-1075, 410-411]

20. Constitutional amendments of 1972, Laws 1973, ch. 136
21. Laws 1906, chs. 36-39
22. Des Moines Register and Leader, Oct. 26, 1908, p.7. This official publication of the ballot reveals an interesting feature of the voting machines of that time; above the party levers is a notice instructing voters to "pull to right until bell rings." Hardly a secret ballot!
23. White, pp. 27-28
23. Laws 1909, H.J.R. 9; Laws 1911, H.J.R. 2
24. Laws 1907, ch. 51, sec. 1
25. Laws 1913, chs. 105, 109, H.J.R. 7
26. William L. Bowers, "The Fruits of Iowa Progressivism, 1900-1915," Iowa Journal of History, 57 (1959), p. 48; F. E. Horack, "The Operation of the Primary Election Law in Iowa," Iowa Journal of History and Politics, 19 (1921), p. 94; Nancy Ruth Derr, "Iowans During World War I; A Study of Change Under Street," Ph.D. dissertation, George Washington University, 1979, pp. 10, 11; Loren N. Horton, "A Place in the Sun: Iowa Politics at the Turn of the Century," The Palimpsest, 64 No. 6 (Nov. -Dec. 1983) pp. 195-6; English, pp. 256-289
27. Laws 1907, ch 50; Laws 1963, ch. 78; Laws 1974, ch. 1101, sec. 3
28. Frank Edward Horack, "The Work of the Thirty-fifth General Assembly of Iowa," Iowa Journal of History and Politics, XI (1913), p. 552; Laws 1913, chs. 101, 106, 107
29. Laws 1917, ch. 318; Laws 1953, ch 114, sec. 11
30. Laws 1959, ch. 319
31. Laws 1911, ch. 24; Laws 1913, ch. 107; Laws 1959, chs. 92, 258; Laws 1983, ch. 185, sec. 10015
32. Laws 1959, ch 253; Iowa Official Register, 1985-1986, pp. 111-136
33. Code 1897, secs. 410, 411; Laws 1906, chas. 12, 39
34. Laws 1963, ch. 77
35. Laws 1969, ch. 218
36. Code 1897, secs. 410, 411; Laws 1951, ch. 135; laws 1953, ch. 150; Laws 1982, ch. 1091
37. Laws 1959, ch. 92; Laws 1971, ch. 93
38. Code 1897, sec. 574
39. Code 1897, secs. 1074, 1075
40. Code 1897, sec. 1528(3)
41. Laws 1902, ch 53; Laws 1909, ch. 98; Laws 1913, ch. 123

42. Laws 1929, ch. 20, secs. 59-64
43. Laws 1947, ch. 240
44. Laws 1963, ch. 77; Laws 1974, ch. 1101, sec. 2
45. Laws 1972, ch. 1124, sec. 45
46. Laws 1973, ch. 200; Laws 1975, ch. 229, sec. 3
47. Code 1897, sec. 647; Laws 1907, ch 26
48. Code 1897, secs. 647-649
49. Code 1897, secs. 645, 641,
50. Code 1927, sec. 639; Laws 49th G.A.Ex., ch. 7, sec. 2
51. Laws 1913, ch. 54; Laws 1947, ch. 140
52. Laws 1951, chs. 145-147, 149
53. Laws 1907, ch. 48. For a brief discussion of the efforts to form and adopt this legislation, see Samuel P. Hays, American Political History as Social Analysis, Knoxville, University of Tennessee Press, 1980, p. 211 (published originally as "The Politics of Reform in Municipal Government in the Progressive Era," Pacific Northwest Quarterly, 55 (1964) pp. 157-69
54. Bowers, "Fruits of Progressivism," p. 56
55. H. S. Gilbertson, "Short Ballot in American Cities," Review of Reviews, 45:82-5 (January 1912), quoted in Bullock, Short Ballot, pp. 142-4
56. Richard S. Childs, "Short Ballot and the Commission Plan," Annals of the American Academy, 38:816-22 (November 1911), quoted in Bullock, Short Ballot, p. 127
57. White, Old Order, pp. 109-110
58. Laws 1907, ch. 48, secs. 5, 8, 12, 13
59. Laws 1915, ch 180
60. Code 1897, sec. 2746
61. Code 1897, secs. 2745-2755
62. Laws 1913, sch. 245
63. Laws 1927, ch. 84
64. Laws 1957, ch. 130
65. Laws 1959, ch. 186, sec. 5
66. Code 1935, secs 4096-4102; Code 1939, sec. 4119
67. Laws 1947, ch 147
68. Acts 1970, ch. 1025, sec. 3
69. Laws 1974, ch. 1172, SEC. 10
70. Laws 1980, ch. 1075
71. Laws 1982, Ch. 1136, secs. 1, 3, 8
72. Laws 1965, ch. 247, secs. 5(13), 12
73. Woodrow Wilson, "Hide and Seek Politics," North American Review, 191 (1910), pp. 593-601
74. Richard S. Childs, "What a Democracy Would Be Like," Everybody's, 26 (March 1912), 372-3, quoted in Bullock, Short Ballot, p. 33; for a different interpretation of ward versus citywide representation in municipal government in the Progressive Era, see Hays, pp. 205-32
75. Public Administration Times, March 1, 1987, p. 1
76. Laws 1965, S.J.R. 21; Mary Osborne Bryant, "A Look at Nine Pending Constitutional Changes," Iowa City, Institute of Public Affairs, University of Iowa Extension Bulletin No. 836, March 1966, pp. 2-4
77. Laws 1984, S.J.R. 2001
78. Laws 1986, S.J.R. 1. Presumably, candidates for both

offices will be nnominated separately in the party primaries. However, another possibility is to nominate the candidates for governor in the primary, then have the candidates for lieutenant governor nominated by the parties' state conventions. This would allow each candidate for governor to have a voice in deciding who his running mate would be. It also would allow for ticket balancing and other partisan considerations.

79. "The Short Ballot in Illinois," City Club of Chicago, 1912, p. 18; "The Short Ballot in the State of New York," New York Short Ballot Association, 1914; Mary Elizabeth Pidgeon, "The Short Ballot Proposal in Virginia," Charlottesville, University of Virginia, 1926
80. Frank Edward Horack, "The Operation of the Primary Election Law in Iowa," Iowa Journal of History and Politics, 19 (1921), p. 119
81. John E. Briggs, "The Legislation of the Thirty-ninth General Assembly," Iowa Journal of History and Politics, 19 (1921), p. 586
82. Laws 1965, S.J.R. 11; Mary Osborne Bryant, "A Look at Nine Pending Constitutional Changes," Iowa City, Institute of Public Affairs, University of Iowa Extension Bulletin No. 836, March 1966, pp. 6-9. The secretary of agriculture was not included in the proposed amendment since that office is statutory, not constitutional.
83. SF 379, 1987 session
84. "County Government Charters and Optional Forms: The Next Step in County Home Rule?" Institute of Public Affairs, The University of Iowa, Local Government Series No. 27 (March 1985)
85. "New Directions for County Government," Report of the Iowa Advisory Council for Intergovernmental Relations, 1985, p. 2
86. U. S. Bureau of the Census, 1982 Census of Governments, Governmental Organization, vol. 1, p. xx
87. 1987 session, HF 47
88. 1987 session, HF 600, Des Moines Register, April 22, 1987, p. 2A
89. "Voting day should be a holiday," Des Moines Register, Sept. 7, 1986, p. 3C
90. Albright, p. 31
91. "The Short Ballot in the State of New York," pp. 3-4
92. Pidgeon, "Short Ballot Proposal in Virginia," p. 228
93. Iowa Official Register, 1985-86, pp. 111-136
94. New York short ballot proposal, p. 8
95. See, for example, City Club of Chicago, The Short Ballot in Illinois, p. 9
96. Nancy Ruth Derr, "Iowans During World War I", pp. 20-21
97. White, Old Order, pp. 246-7

