

Approved 3/23/89
Date

MINUTES OF THE House COMMITTEE ON Elections

The meeting was called to order by Representative Kenneth R. King at
Chairperson

9:07 a.m./p.m./on Tuesday, March 21, 1989n room 521-S of the Capitol.

All members were present except:

Committee staff present:

Myrta Anderson, Legislative Research Department
Fred Carman, Revisor of Statutes Office
Ron Thornburgh, Office of the Secretary of State
Ellie Luthye, Committee Secretary

Conferees appearing before the committee:

Lee Kinch, Democratic County Chairman from Sedgewick County
Professor Kathryn P. Griffith, Department of Political Science, Wichita
State University
Horace Eubank, Topeka, Kansas

The meeting of the House Election Committee was called to order by
Chairman Kenneth R. King at 9:07 a.m. on Tuesday, March 21st, 1989.

The order of business for the day was continuation of hearings on
SB 1 with the opponents of the bill appearing before the committee.

The Chair called first on Lee Kinch, Democratic County Chairman from
Sedgewick County who was speaking in an individual capacity, not
as County Chairman. He presented written testimony in opposition
to SB 1, stating the proliferation of the presidential primary, rather
than building the parties, has weakened the influence of state and
local party leaders with respect to the choice of presidential dele-
gates and has increased the influence of the media. (Attachment
I).

Professor Kathryn P. Griffith, Department of Political Science at
Wichita State University, was next presented to the committee. She
presented written testimony listing eighteen ways she believed presi-
dential primaries have eroded the role of parties in political life
and has had a negative impact on candidate selection. (Attachment
II)

The next conferee to present testimony before the committee was Horace
Eubank, a citizen of Topeka, Kansas. He made a brief statement,
in addition to the written testimony, (Attachment III), that there
was surely a better way to elect people and suggested the bill be
tabled for more study.

Written testimony in opposition to SB 1 was presented to the committee
from Professor Kenneth N. Ciboski, Department of Political Science,
Wichita State University, James Sheffield, Jr., Associate Professor
of Political Science, Wichita State University and Richard L.
Friedeman, a member of the Republican State Committee. (Attachments IV, V, VI)

There being no other conferees to appear before the committee, either
in support or opposition of SB 1, the Chair closed the hearings on
SB 1.

CONTINUATION SHEET

MINUTES OF THE House COMMITTEE ON Elections,
room 521-S, Statehouse, at 9:07 a.m./~~p.m.~~ on Tuesday, March 21, 1989

The minutes of the meeting on March 16th, 1989 were presented to the committee for approval. Representative Lucas made a motion the minutes be approved as presented. The motion was seconded by Representative Cates. The motion carried.

Chairman King thanked the conferees for their presentations and adjourned the meeting at 10:10 a.m.

The next meeting of the House Election Committee will be held on Thursday, March 23rd at 9:00 a.m. in Room 521-S.

Testimony Before the House Elections Committee

THE CASE AGAINST THE PRESIDENTIAL PRIMARY

By E. L. Lee Kinch

Since the mid-1790s, our political parties have played a central role in preserving democratic values. From building coalitions, formulating and articulating policy agendas, recruiting and electing candidates to implement its policy agenda to providing a vehicle by which government is held accountable and by providing coherence in the administration of government, the parties have played a critical role, albeit insufficiently noted, in preserving and protecting our democracy.

Several well-intentioned reforms have, however, led to the decline of the political party by eroding its role of nominating its candidates. The direct primary is one such reform. It is expensive, divisive and has robbed the party organization of its capacity to nominate candidates that appeal to and unite all of the disparate factions of the party. The loss of that capacity has eroded the party's ability to build and maintain its coalitions.

As the role of the parties in nominating and electing its candidates has declined, political campaigns have concomitantly become candidate-centered. These historic responsibilities of the party organization have been usurped by political consultants, political action committees and the media, none of whom are dedicated primarily to the preservation of democratic values.

Attachment I

The proponents of the presidential primary celebrate it as a democratic vehicle that increases voter participation, vests the decision to nominate in the people rather than "party big-wigs," and somehow builds the political parties.

While the presidential primary unquestionably increases voter participation, the studies of such notable political scientists as V. O. Key, Jr., document the fact that state primary electorates are not representative of the state electorate. Voters on the lower end of the socioeconomic scale, for example, are disproportionately missing from primary electorates. Interestingly, those who participate in presidential primaries possess the same socioeconomic qualities of those who participate in the caucus and convention system of nomination, namely, the affluent and the well educated. The two party system has paid a terrible price for the transparency of increased voter participation.

The proliferation of the presidential primary, rather than building the parties, has weakened the influence of state and local party leaders with respect to the choice of presidential delegates and has increased the influence of the media. Free and favorable publicity in the news media is likely to be more useful in influencing a primary electorate than the influence of a party leader.

The direct primary unquestionably has altered

the distribution of power within the party. When one speaks of party control of nominations, one means control of the party organization, and any weakening of that control obviously weakens the organization and enhances the power of the party candidates and the party in government. The inability of the party organization in the United States to control the party in government begins with its failure to control its nominations. The direct primary undercuts the ability of the party organization to recruit those partisans who share its goals and accept its discipline.

With the increased role of television, media image-building and the need for funds to pay for it have come to dominate campaigns, particularly primary campaigns where party labels do not function to guide voter choice. It would be the supreme irony if, in their quest to free the electoral process from control of party bosses, the reformers were to vest that control in the hands of an even more invisible and unresponsive group of "bosses", i.e., - media consultants and the special interests who are the most likely to finance political campaigns.

The case against the presidential primary, in summary, is impressive:

They consume an enormous amount of time, energy
and money before the presidential
campaign has ever begun.

They place a tremendous premium on campaign

strategy and candidate image-making rather than on the kinds of leadership abilities required by the presidency.

Their importance may frequently be distorted out of all perspective. In the circus of publicity surrounding the primaries, candidates and voters alike often fail to assess them dispassionately. The nation's first and most influential primary, indeed, is held in a state that has less than one-half of 1% of the nation's population.

The presidential primaries frequently result in internal divisions in state party organizations, in divided delegates at the national conventions, and in delegates not representative of the party organization and leadership in the state. As in the case of other primaries, they take an important party process out of the control of the party organization

and accordingly weaken them.

Finally, they frequently promote the candidate on the extreme, e.g. George Wallace, as well as fragmentation within the party and frustrate the nomination of consensus candidates.

If you value the two party system as an essential vehicle for preserving our democracy, you will oppose the proposed presidential primary. Thank you.

#

Statement Before House Elections Committee
Kansas State Legislature

On the Question of Instituting a
Presidential Preference Primary
in Kansas

by

Professor Kathryn P. Griffith
Department of Political Science
Wichita State University
March 21, 1989

Re: Instituting a Presidential Preference Primary in Kansas

Kathryn Griffith
Professor, Political Science
March 21, 1989

It may or may not be relevant that no other democracy in the world selects candidates for office through the direct primary. It is relevant that the primary was introduced in this country early in the 20th century by the Progressives in the hope of getting politics, that is, parties, out of government. They argued that leaving the choice of candidates to party bosses was undemocratic and should instead be trusted to the rank and file. As the appeal of individual autonomy has gained in the last half of this century, so has the popularity of the primary.

Until recently presidential candidates were largely selected by powerful party leaders at or before party conventions. Nelson Polsby in his book Consequences of Party Reform suggests that the great growth in presidential primaries is largely a consequence of the Democratic reforms beginning after 1968 and represents a movement away from effective party leadership. He points out that the result has not been more democratic. The primaries are dominated by a relatively small group of party activists who are in the process of becoming a new political elite. Moreover, the majority Democratic party has only won one presidential election in the intervening years.

Political parties arose, uninvited, soon after the adoption of the Constitution as a practical necessity to narrow the choices for president to provide for an intelligent election. As I have witnessed the persistent decline in party power in the last thirty years, I have come to believe that strong viable political parties are essential to good democratic government. The question for me then becomes what practices and structures will strengthen the

Attachment II

parties and more importantly provide the best possible governors. I believe that primaries, in this case presidential primaries, undercut our parties and make them incapable of fulfilling their functions. (Contemporary textbooks do not even list the functions of political parties today.)

In addition to being the oldest political parties in the world, ours are surely among the weakest. This is not because of their age--but because of the changed legal rules and practices that have grown up around them. Let me list just some of the ways in which I believe presidential primaries have eroded the role of parties in political life and have had a negative impact on candidate selection.

1. Recruitment. Ideally parties recruit good candidates and provide support for their election. No doubt many people who will not become candidates under present conditions would if offered this support. Presidential primaries provides candidates who are self-selected. It denies a process through which party members and public officials can appraise possible candidates and nominate the most appropriate.
2. The party has no control over who the nominee will be for its ticket.
3. Since the candidate owes nothing to the party, he is not responsible to the party but to the personal following and interest groups that supported him.

4. The primary does not identify candidates who would beat other candidates in pair-wise comparisons. Sometimes no candidate would beat all others in such comparisons but the system does in fact produce what might be the wrong winner.
5. Primaries often cause conflicts among party members that are difficult to overcome in the general election.
6. Primaries tend to throw up extreme candidates who represent the interests of party activists at the extreme edges of both parties. These people are generally drawn from the better educated and affluent members of the party. Candidates who must appeal to these elites prior to the primaries find it difficult if not impossible to attract the support of the average party member in the general election.
7. Since the nominee is known before the convention, the platform is tailored to the candidate rather than directed toward a consensus that can be supported by all party candidates.
8. Since the party is not directly involved in the primary process, there is a void which is filled by PACS and interest groups. The very low turnout for primaries (estimated at about one half of that for the general election) means that it is relatively simple for single interest groups or pressure groups to dominate the election.

9. Outcomes of primaries are unduly influenced by the media. Under the primary system the task of the presidential hopeful is not to win a majority but to survive--which means getting as high ranking as possible among the candidates running for office. Coming in first in early primaries means achieving the visibility that ensures that a candidate will be taken seriously by the news media--makes it easier to raise money and contest the next primary. This success depends upon the ability to garner perhaps 29 percent of the vote in an early primary rather than say 24 percent. In a New Hampshire primary, the absolute number of votes between these 2 percentages may be less than 5,000 votes. A candidate must distinguish himself from others and encourage his supporters to come out to vote. This means personal support and factional support. Donald Matthews says: "More often than not, winning a presidential primary means doing better than expected; losing means disappointing expectations. The media find a winner in this curious contest by arriving at a rough consensus on how candidates should do and then measuring the vote and delegate outcomes against this rubbery yardstick."
10. Too much emphasis is placed on early primaries. It is estimated that in a recent election each Democratic vote in New Hampshire received 170 as much network news coverage as each Democratic vote in New York.

11. It makes it necessary for people to become committed to one candidate early in the campaign before their strengths and weaknesses have been demonstrated. Committee delegates have no standing to negotiate in the unlikely event that the convention decision is not automatic. Since 1968-1972 no deliberation has taken place at conventions. Dark horses and runners up have no chance, there is no coalition building--the one with a majority takes all. Today's national conventions are largely spectacles--not very interesting ones at that.
12. This system leaves each individual candidate to raise his own money and hire a campaign public relations firm which tends to dominate the campaign.
13. The long campaigns cost inordinate amounts of money which in turn tends to tempt corruption. Candidates must spend so much time raising money that they do not have time to spend in traditional campaign activities.
14. The cost of financing the presidential primary is an unwelcome burden on state budgets.
15. The long grueling campaign is a drain on a candidates' strength and health.
16. Presidential primaries deny party discipline.
17. Dispersion of power is great in the United States and presidential primaries make it difficult to collect power in the national party system which itself is based on local elections. The primary is a vast extension of dispersion of power.

18. Traditionally, political parties have been responsible for the aggregation of groups and reaching some consensus among them regarding policy positions prior to elections. Compromises now come after the election and are thus unknown to the voter at the time of the election.

I am aware that many of these undesirable consequences of the direct presidential primary are consequences of a primary system rather than a primary in Kansas. The question is then, should Kansas follow what I hope will be a temporary phenomenon. I believe the answer is "No, it should not." One of the strengths of the federal system is that it allows states to make some important decisions for themselves. This one should be made in light of our best judgment of what is good for Kansas' voters and Kansas' political parties. I am asking you to seriously consider the probability that a direct presidential primary is not good for Kansas.

1-29-89

To: Legislative Election Committees

From: Horace W. Eubank, retired, speech arts, Topeka

Having participated in elections since my first vote for Wendell Wilkie, I see no reason for a Kansas media presidential primary which may even impede the election process, a system established in the days of the horse and buggy; many people were driven from the polls by the unending, monotonous, and shaky premises.

This past year is such a good example of the waste of time and money on the local level and especially on the national level--\$90 million for the two presidential candidates; think of the time elected officials were off the job, chasing votes in Iowa or New Hampshire; it is really an event created by and for the media, especially electronic.

To solve this anachronistic custom, I offer these potential solutions:

1. Income tax credit for voting
2. Mandatory voting (look at the poor participation in 1988 and 1984)
3. Voting on Sunday--common in many countries
4. Cut and control election time
 - A. Primary on Labor Day or the first Tuesday of September
 - B. Look at the British system (six weeks)
5. Control costs--\$1 million spent in 1980 was silly and would have provided many scholarships for needy students. Few candidates came to Kansas, the record shows that
6. Eliminate presidential primaries across the nation; There are better ways to ensure voter turn out
7. Why should Kansas follow like a sheep?
8. It is time for Kansas to set an example nationally, update its priorities, forget the presidential primary, and get on with the business of governing.
9. Not one of my relatives in 15 counties supports the presidential primary.

Thank you for your kind considerations.

Horace Eubank
Topeka Attachment III

Statement Before House Elections Committee
Kansas State Legislature

On the Question of Instituting a
Presidential Preference Primary
in Kansas

by

Professor Kenneth N. Ciboski
Department of Political Science
Wichita State University
March 21, 1989

Attachment IV

In order to evaluate the nominating process or any process of party reform, we can suggest a set of goals which most Americans would accept as desirable and important.

The following six standards appear to meet the test:

1. What will aid in preserving the two-party system?
2. What will help secure vigorous competition between the parties?
3. What will maintain some degree of cohesion and agreement within the parties?
4. What will produce candidates who have a likelihood of winning voter support?
5. What will lead to the choice of "good" individuals?
6. What will result in the acceptance of the candidates as individuals who can govern?

As a political scientist, I wish to look at the consequences of political reform and see how they measure up to empirical tests. We must separate the work of the political scientist from the activities of the political advocate. Also, to point out weaknesses in reform does not mean that one has to disagree with everything the reformers advocate. This applies to a possible reinstitution of the Presidential preference primary in Kansas.

Presidential preference primaries, in theory, are supposed to bring the nominating process to the people, but in practice the process presents difficulties in reaching the goal of greater and more representative participation in the selection of Presidential nominees of the Republican and Democratic parties.

Some of the major disadvantages of Presidential preference primaries are:

1. There can be a large number of candidates on the ballot of either party. Even with a few candidates on the ballot, the winning candidate might have a small plurality of the vote if the candidates seem equally strong. Do we want winners with 30, 35 or 40 percent of the popular vote?
2. Interested voters might move into a primary of the winning party where their votes would count for more. This has happened at the state level. As a result, the political opposition might give up, and the winning party might stagnate without opposition.

3. There is the possibility of victories by extremist and demagogic kinds of candidates. Personalities, not parties or the qualifications of the candidates get emphasized. The familiarity of a name becomes even more important in a primary system.
4. Not all serious candidates run in primary elections. Senator Robert Dole, a candidate for President in 1980, did not choose to run in the Kansas Presidential preference primary in 1980.
5. Most often, candidates who have great potential to win a general election are "killed off" in primaries.
6. Primaries held at different times in different parts of the country are not necessarily representative of the voters turning out for the general election.
7. The American people are complaining more and more about the costs of campaigns and the length of the campaigns. Primaries add, too, to the strenuous physical demands placed upon candidates for national office such as the Presidency.
What salutary results or effects were realized from the Kansas Presidential preference primary in 1980, which cost approximately \$1,000,000? Large economic resources can enhance success in primaries.
8. The charge has been made in the past that primary voters will pick the "best" person and not a "winner" for the sake of winning. What is "best," however, is subjective.

About the only advantage I can offer to justify a primary is that an unknown candidate might be able to demonstrate a vote-getting capability that might go unnoticed by party leaderships, and party activists.

Participation and representativeness of voters in a primary are important considerations. In regard to participation, between 1968 and 1980 the number of people who took part in the parties' presidential nomination processes rose from 13 to 32 million. Over 90 percent of the increase is accounted for by primary participation, which simply indicates that when more states have primaries, more people do participate.

The primaries outdraw the caucuses by ratios between 10 to 1 and 18 to 1. Parties, on the average, draw about one-half of a party's eligible electorate, and caucuses tend to draw about one-twentieth. The literature is clear on a general trend: a smaller proportion of the population participates in the primaries than in the general election. The general rule of thumb is that the primary turnout is about half of the general election turnout for the same office.

A question of some interest to the observers of the primary system of selecting prospective candidates for President is the representativeness of primary voters.

In general, researchers have found the following:

1. Primary voters are likely to be unrepresentative in demographic characteristics, compared to the total electorate. Specifically, the voters in the primaries are likely to be somewhat higher on the socioeconomic ladder than are party identifiers or the electorate as a whole.
2. Strong partisans turn out for the primary vote at higher rates than the weak partisans or the independents. This might result in a partisan bias in favor of the most dedicated, loyal, and active elements of each party and against the lukewarm partisans and independents.
3. There is mixed support for the notion that those who turn out in primaries are ideologically more extreme and take issue positions that are unrepresentative of the parties' mass bases and of the entire electorate. In practice this means that the Democratic primary electorate can be expected to be more liberal and the Republican primary electorate more conservative than the general electorate.

These factors can affect the nature and strategy of a campaign in a primary election.

A successful candidate in a primary election might do the following:

1. Stress themes that will appeal to the most active and loyal partisans. Conservative for Republicans and liberal for Democrats.
2. Identify the candidate's image in terms of liberal for a Democrat and conservative for a Republican.
3. Do not emphasize specific issues.

Generally, then, the primary system of selecting Presidential candidates does not support the set of goals, which were stated at the beginning. The system which is likely to produce legitimate candidates and maintain vigorous party competition is not likely to be achieved through greater mass participation of citizens in the primary system. What strengthens political parties ultimately strengthens a democratic system and democratic values. In contrast to intense competition between parties, mass participation devices such as the direct primaries are more likely to be dominated by single issue-oriented, candidate-oriented, and ideological extremists who want to win for their positions and who care relatively less about the concerns of broader constituencies and the political positions they might represent.

Testimony of

James F. Sheffield, Jr.
Associate Professor of Political Science
Wichita State University

to

HOUSE ELECTION COMMITTEE

regarding

Presidential Preferential Primary

March 21, 1989

Thank you for the opportunity to appear and comment on the proposal to provide for a presidential preferential primary in Kansas. Let me say at the outset that these are private views, and they should not be considered to represent those of my university, its administration, faculty, staff, or student body.

The principal thrust of my comments will be to argue that primaries weaken and threaten political parties, institutions which perform vital and complex political functions in a way no other agency can or does. If we succeed in eliminating parties from our system, we will have to invent a replacement or suffer the consequences of these tasks performed inadequately by other agencies. The major problem is that such agencies will be far less accountable to the public as a whole and thus, from the systemic viewpoint, perform these tasks less well.

Political parties exist to win elections and to govern. In a large, complex, diverse society such as ours, those are crucial and difficult tasks. If a specific party performs well, it is rewarded with additional opportunities to serve. If it does not, opposition parties have their chance. The competition between these parties serves as a constraining and policing mechanism; a party knows that if it fails to win or to govern well, it will be replaced.

How do these two goals translate into party functions? At this point we can see three categories of party responsibilities which are included: to select policy makers, to represent interests of constituent elements of the party, and to manage government. The first of these involves the recruitment, training, and designation of party nominees in the contest for various public offices. The trick is to merge personal ambitions of would-be candidates, interests and tastes of voters, and the party's need to be victorious in the selection of nominees. The second category involves the recruitment of members, their education and mobilization, their merger into a majoritarian coalition which can be successful in elections and in subsequent policy making, and

Elections
January 24, 1989

Attachment 4

Attachment V

their use of access to government that party provides. The third category involves the development of responses to issues, the sifting of alternative solutions to problems, the generation of public support for selected policy options, the coordination of government activity both vertically and horizontally so that policy implementation will be successful.

Primaries inhibit party activity in each of these areas and thus debilitate parties.

As to the selection of candidates: Primaries are candidate-centered. Parties are not, and often cannot, be involved organizationally in primary contests, the party leadership is thus excluded from providing cues to voters about the qualities of the candidates. Having obtained delegates, or the nomination, candidates owe little or nothing to the party leadership. At the national level, therefore, our conventions have become bodies of enthusiastic candidate supporters with agendas that may or may not correspond to the positions of the party and of interest group representatives who have their special narrow concerns, but little broad vision. These conventions are no longer serious meetings of party leaders wherein complex negotiations over candidacies and platforms are conducted.

Second, I am not suggesting that primaries eliminate elites from the selection of nominees, but rather that we have changed elites. Now they principally come from the ranks of interest groups and the media. They are not representative in the sense of trying to identify what the electorate as a whole wants, but they are constrained by popular fashion. Moreover, they are not accountable to anyone outside the narrow groups from which they come.

Third, primaries do not test the capacity of candidates to govern. They are good for evaluating a candidate's ability to obtain popular support, but that is not the same as performing the tasks of governance. Candidate appeal is no longer moderated by the peer judgment that was once integral to nominations when parties were stronger.

As to the second category of function, representing interests, primaries destroy the need for voters to see parties as organizations within which to become active. By simply going to the polls on primary day, the voter fulfills any civic duty he/she may have without regard to the party itself. The party is not viewed as essential or responsible, and each contest is conducted within a vacuum. Voters are discouraged, that is, from further political activity. Also, the voter appeals made by candidates are for the purpose of gaining attention for themselves; any coalitional efforts by party leaders would be discouraged as detracting from and obscuring individual candidacies.

Finally, as to managing government, the primary system encourages candidates to appeal to the new and different as a means

of distinguishing themselves from the opposition. This encourages government of short-term fad and piecework, rather than government of moderation, conciliation, and coordination. The president whose chief constituency is public opinion has few bridges to Congress or to the states and little means to build them. Government is not managed, it wanders about, and the crucible of public policy making ceases to work in any comprehensible fashion.

Why worry about political parties? Because no better mechanism has been devised to nominate candidates, and because when they function properly, they link voters and the governing process in reliable fashion. Since their futures as organizations are at stake, they take that linkage function seriously. Caucuses mobilize the public and encourage citizens to engage in other party activities that contribute to the quality and success of government. They are preferable to primaries as means of achieving that within a political party system.

Richard L. Friedeman
Member, Republican State Committee
Great Bend, Kansas

THE KANSAS PRESIDENTIAL PRIMARY -
BAD FOR THE PARTY
BAD FOR THE SYSTEM

1. If we are to have a 2 party system, the grassroots of the 2 parties must have something to do; something of substance, something that amounts to more than merely serving candidates chosen for us by others. Exerting such influence as we can over the caucuses is about the only thing the local parties do of a policy-determinative nature. Take this away, and about the only thing left of substance is replacing legislators who die or resign in mid-term. This just isn't enough to maintain an active political party.

2. Primary proponents say that the party is enriched when unaffiliated voters declare their party at a primary.*** Their argument is that there are more Republicans and Democrats in the world after a presidential primary. They think a political party is a list of voters kept at the courthouse. While the size of each party's list is significant insofar as its strength relative to the other party, it is largely irrelevant to the strength of the 2 party system. To me, a political party is not so much a list kept at the courthouse as it is an organization of precinct people, college Republicans, party volunteers, and county chairmen, who are involved in the business of promoting the party, with varying degrees of commitment, and with a degree of influence commensurate with their work and commitment.

Primaries weaken parties. They may, in some temporary way, lengthen the list at the courthouse, but they rob the organized party of its most significant opportunity to have an impact.

It also robs local parties of a recruitment tool. Frequently, people first become active because of the excitement of a presidential campaign. With every caucus in Barton County, my home, we pick up a number of new people who remain active in the party. If the caucus is robbed of its substance, these people will have no reason to get active in the first place.

Office holders who seek the help of party voters at election time, should be loath to let the party atrophy.

3. One argument that is never made for the presidential primary is that it results in the selection of better candidates. Primary voters, faced with a large field of unknown candidates early in the season, are not as well suited to select from that field as are party

*** Of course, many, if not most, of these would declare a party anyway at the next "August Primary".

Elections
January 30, 1989
attachment 7

people and caucus participants who are more involved in the system and acquainted with the candidates. Persons who attend the caucus meeting often become publicly identified with their candidates in their communities, they are responsible for those candidates, and are therefore more responsible in their choice. Party people are forced to live with their choice, and make it with greater care. I believe in giving local party people, who have a stake in maintaining the good name and integrity of their organization, a large role in picking their standard bearer.

4. A primary focuses on candidates, to the exclusion of ideas and bodies of opinion. Depending on the party and on the year, it is often unclear which of a group of candidates representing any one general position will have the best chance of capturing the nomination. The caucus-convention system permits us to elect like-minded representatives at any level, who then have the flexibility to effect the desired result. Forcing a choice to be expressed in terms of personalities in the early stages of the process is not good for the process, or the party, or the country. The over-emphasis on personalities happens too often with caucuses, but it always happens with primaries.

Of course, no second choices are recorded at the primary ballot box. A primary makes impossible any kind of strategic voting so as to settle upon a satisfactory choice, which may not be the first choice of most voters. Compromise and cooperation have no place in a primary system. There is no mechanism for it.

5. Primary proponents argue that a primary would bring more campaign activity to Kansas. The 1980 presidential primary would indicate otherwise. We received almost no attention from the candidates and media. There may have been more advertising purchased, but not much more.

Even if we could, by passing a primary bill, experience more campaign hullabaloo earlier, is there any ordinary citizen left in our state, at this moment, who actually believes that we need more presidential campaign hullabaloo? - Or, that the Kansas legislature should spend good money so we can experience it?