

No. 20-1072

---

In The  
Supreme Court of the United States

---

CHAD THOMPSON, *et al.*,

*Petitioners,*

*v.*

RICHARD MICHAEL DEWINE, GOVERNOR OF OHIO, *et al.*,

*Respondents.*

---

On Petition For Writ Of Certiorari  
To The United States Court Of Appeals  
For The Sixth Circuit

---

BRIEF OF DIRECT DEMOCRACY SCHOLARS,  
THE INITIATIVE AND REFERENDUM INSTITUTE,  
AND CITIZENS IN CHARGE AS *AMICI CURIAE*  
SUPPORTING PETITIONERS

---

PAUL A. ZEVNIK

*Counsel of Record*

JASON Y. SIU

MORGAN, LEWIS &

BOCKIUS LLP

1111 Pennsylvania

Avenue, N.W.

Washington, D.C. 20004

(202) 739-3000

paul.zevnik

@morganlewis.com

Counsel for *Amici Curiae*

---

**TABLE OF CONTENTS**

TABLE OF CONTENTS..... i  
TABLE OF AUTHORITIES ..... ii  
INTEREST OF AMICI CURIAE.....1  
SUMMARY OF ARGUMENT .....3  
ARGUMENT .....4  
    I.    The Citizens’ Initiative Has  
          Become An Important Feature  
          Of The American Political  
          Process. ....4  
    II.   The Citizens’ Initiative Is And  
          Promotes Political Speech. ....7  
    III.  The Citizens’ Initiative Drives  
          Voter Engagement.....9  
    IV.  States Have Various Signature  
          Thresholds And Rules For  
          Qualifying Citizen-Driven  
          Initiative Petitions. ....10  
    V.   The Court’s Guidance On The  
          First Amendment’s Application  
          To Ballot Initiatives Is Needed,  
          Especially Given COVID-19  
          Public Health Restrictions. ....12  
CONCLUSION.....16

## TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

	<b>Page</b>
<b>CASES</b>	
<i>Ariz. State Legislature v. Ariz. Indep. Redistricting Comm’n</i> , 135 S. Ct. 2652 (2015).....	5
<i>Citizens United v. F.E.C.</i> , 558 U.S. 310 (2010).....	7
<i>City of Cuyahoga Falls Ohio v. Buckeye Cmty. Hope Found.</i> , 538 U.S. 188 (2003) .....	4
<i>City of Tucson v. Arizona</i> , 273 P.3d 624 (Ariz. 2012).....	6
<i>First Nat’l Bank v. Bellotti</i> , 435 U.S. 765 (1978).....	7
<i>Gonzales v. Raich</i> , 545 U.S. 1 (2005) .....	5
<i>Hollingsworth v. Perry</i> , 570 U.S. 693 (2013) .....	2
<i>Illinois Bd. of Elections v. Socialist Workers Party</i> , 440 U.S. 173 (1979) .....	16
<i>John Doe No. 1 v. Reed</i> , 561 U.S. 186 (2010).....	2
<i>Little v. Reclaim Idaho</i> , 140 S. Ct. 2616 (2020).....	16
<i>Lovell v. City of Griffin</i> , 303 U.S. 444 (1938).....	8
<i>Meyer v. Grant</i> , 486 U.S. 414 (1988) .....	7
<i>New State Ice Co. v. Liebmann</i> , 285 U.S. 262 (1932) .....	5

## TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

	Page
<b>OTHER AUTHORITIES</b>	
Caroline J. Tolbert, Daniel C. Bowen & Todd Donovan, <i>Initiative Campaigns: Direct Democracy &amp; Voter Mobilization</i> , 37 AM. POL. RES. 155 (2009) .....	9
Caroline J. Tolbert, Daniel H. Lowenstein & Todd Donovan, <i>Election Law and Rules for Initiatives</i> , in CITIZENS AS LEGISLATORS: DIRECT DEMOCRACY IN THE UNITED STATES (Ohio State Univ. Press 1998).....	11
Caroline J. Tolbert, Ramona S. McNeal & Daniel A. Smith, <i>Enhancing Civic Engagement: The Effect of Direct Democracy on Political Participation &amp; Knowledge</i> , 3 ST. POL. & POL'Y Q. 23 (2003).....	9
Daniel A. Smith & Dustin Fridkin, <i>Delegating Direct Democracy: Interparty Legislative Competition and the Adoption of the Initiative in the American States</i> , 102 AM. POL. SCI. REV. 333 (2008) .....	6
Daniel A. Smith & Joseph Lubinski, <i>Direct Democracy During the Progressive Era: A Crack in the Populist Veneer?</i> , 14 J. POL'Y HIST. 349 (2002).....	8
David B. Magleby, DIRECT LEGISLATION: VOTING ON BALLOT PROPOSITIONS IN THE U.S. (1984).....	5

## TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

	<b>Page</b>
Ellen Carol DuBois, <i>A Pandemic Nearly Derailed the Women’s Suffrage Movement</i> , NAT’L GEOGRAPHIC (Apr. 20, 2020), available at <a href="https://www.nationalgeographic.com/history/2020/04/pandemic-nearly-derailed-womens-suffrage-movement/">https://www.nationalgeographic.com/history/2020/04/pandemic-nearly-derailed-womens-suffrage-movement/</a> .....	14
Frederick J. Boehmke & Daniel C. Bowen, <i>Direct Democracy &amp; Individual Interest Grp. Membership</i> , 72 J. POL. 659 (2010).....	10
Henry Noyes, <i>Direct Democracy as a Legislative Act</i> , 19 CHAPMAN L. REV. 199 (2016).....	4, 5
<i>Influenza Mars Suffrage Plans</i> , NEW ORLEANS TIMES-PICAYUNE (Oct. 10, 1918) .....	14
Initiative and Referendum Institute, “Initiative Use,” Dec. 2019, available at <a href="http://www.iandrinstitute.org/docs/IRI-Initiative-Use-(2019-2).pdf">http://www.iandrinstitute.org/docs/IRI-Initiative-Use-(2019-2).pdf</a> .....	7
Janine A. Parry, Daniel A. Smith & Shayne Henry, <i>The Impact of Petition Signing on Voter Turnout</i> , 34 POL. BEHAV. 117 (2012).....	9
Jay Barth, Craig M. Burnett & Janine A. Parry, <i>Direct Democracy, Educative Effects, and the (Mis)Measurement of Ballot Measure Awareness</i> , POL. BEHAV. (Jan. 28, 2019).....	10

## TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

	<b>Page</b>
John Allswang, <i>The Origins of Direct Democracy in Los Angeles &amp; Cal.</i> , 78 S. CAL. Q. 175 (1996) .....	6
John G. Matsusaka, <i>Direct Democracy Works</i> , 19 J. ECON. PERSP. 185 (2005) .....	6
MONT. DECLARATORY ORDER, No. SOS-2020-DR-0001 (May 8, 2020) .....	15
N.J. EXEC. ORDER 132 (Apr. 29, 2020) .....	15
Sarah Holder, <i>How Coronavirus Is Killing Off Ballot Measures</i> , BLOOMBERG CITYLAB (Apr. 9, 2020), available at <a href="https://www.bloomberg.com/news/articles/2020-04-09/coronavirus-is-killing-off-2020-ballot-measures">https://www.bloomberg.com/news/articles/2020-04-09/coronavirus-is-killing-off-2020-ballot-measures</a> .....	14
Shaun Bowler & Todd Donovan, <i>Measuring the Effect of Direct Democracy on State Policy: Not All Initiatives Are Created Equal</i> , 4 ST. POL. & POL'Y Q. 345 (2004) .....	11
Thomas Stratmann, <i>Is Spending More Potent for or Against a Proposition? Evidence From Ballot Measures</i> , 50 AM. J. POL. SCI. 788 (2006) .....	8
Todd Donovan, Caroline J. Tolbert & Daniel A. Smith, <i>Political Engagement, Mobilization, and Direct Democracy</i> , 73 PUB. OP. Q. 98 (2009) .....	9

## TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

	<b>Page</b>
Todd Donovan, Caroline Tolbert & Daniel A. Smith, <i>Priming Presidential Votes by Direct Democracy</i> , 70 J. POL. 1217 (2008).....	10
Todd Donovan, Christopher Z. Mooney & Daniel Smith, STATE AND LOCAL POLITICS: INSTITUTIONS AND REFORM (Cengage 2013).....	12
Todd Donovan & Daniel Smith, <i>Identifying and Preventing Signature Fraud on Ballot Measure Petitions</i> , in ELECTION FRAUD: DETECTING AND DETERRING ELECTORAL MANIPULATION (Brookings 2008) .....	10
Todd Donovan, <i>N. Am. &amp; the Caribbean</i> , in REFERENDUMS AROUND THE WORLD: THE CONTINUED GROWTH OF DIRECT DEMOCRACY (M. Qvortup ed., 2014).....	7, 8
Todd Donovan, Shaun Bowler, David McCuan & Ken Fernandez, <i>Contending Players and Strategies, Opposition Advantages Initiative Campaigns</i> , in CITIZENS AS LEGISLATORS: DIRECT DEMOCRACY IN THE UNITED STATES (Ohio State Univ. Press 1998).....	12
Todd Donovan, Shaun Bowler & David McCuan, <i>Political Consultants and the Initiative Industrial Complex</i> , in DANGEROUS DEMOCRACY? THE BATTLE OVER BALLOT INITIATIVES IN AMERICA (Rowman and Littlefield 2002) .....	12

**TABLE OF AUTHORITIES**

	<b>Page</b>
UTAH EXEC. ORDER, 2020-12 (Apr. 1, 2020) .....	15
Wyoming Secretary of State, “Initiative & Referendum,” <i>available at</i> <a href="https://sos.wyo.gov/Elections/InitiativeReferendumInfo.aspx">https://sos.wyo.gov/Elections/InitiativeReferendumInfo.aspx</a> ..	11
Zoltan L. Hajnal & Paul G. Lewis, <i>Municipal Insts. &amp; Voter Turnout in Local Elections</i> , 38 URB. AFF. REV. 645 (2003) .....	9



**INTEREST OF *AMICI CURIAE*<sup>1</sup>**

*Amici* Direct Democracy Scholars are political science and law professors who have written extensively on direct democracy issues in the United States, *viz.*:

Richard Briffault is the Joseph P. Chamberlain Professor of Legislation at Columbia Law School;

Todd Donovan is a Professor of Political Science at Western Washington University;

Richard D. Parker is the Paul W. Williams Professor of Criminal Justice at Harvard Law School;

Janine Parry is a Professor of Political Science at the University of Arkansas and Director of the University of Arkansas Poll;

Daniel A. Smith is the Chair of the Department of Political Science at University of Florida; and

Caroline J. Tolbert is a Professor of Political Science at the University of Iowa.

Among *Amici's* areas of expertise is the democratic process for initiating and qualifying for ballot referenda. *Amici* regularly teach, research and pub-

---

<sup>1</sup> No counsel for a party authored this brief in whole or in part; no such counsel nor any party made a monetary contribution intended to fund the preparation or submission of the brief; and no person or entity, other than the *amici curiae*, their members, or their counsel made such a monetary contribution. See SUP. CT. R. 37.6. All parties have consented in writing to the filing of this brief.

lish about direct democracy issues, including the citizens' initiative campaigns process and the effect the citizens' initiative process has on civic engagement.

*Amici* also include the Initiative and Referendum Institute (IRI) at the University of Southern California. IRI is a nonprofit, nonpartisan research and educational organization. IRI's mission is to study the mechanisms of direct democracy, to develop analyses of the rules and regulations used to regulate the referendum process, and to disseminate that information. IRI's research on the initiative process has been cited by Justices of this Court. E.g., *Hollingsworth v. Perry*, 570 U.S. 693, 717 (2013) (Kennedy, J., dissenting); *John Doe No. 1 v. Reed*, 561 U.S. 186, 210 (2010) (Alito, J., concurring); *id.* at 234 (Thomas, J., dissenting).

Finally, *Amici* include Citizens in Charge, a nonprofit advocacy organization that works with state and local legislators, petitioners, media, and voters to protect and expand the initiative and referendum process.

*Amici* submit this brief to highlight the importance of the citizens' initiatives, their widespread use, and the public interest in protecting this important and traditional form of political speech. *Amici* believe that the Court should resolve the Circuit split as to whether First Amendment protections apply to the ballot initiative process, and if so, what level of scrutiny governs.

## SUMMARY OF ARGUMENT

The citizens' initiative is an important form of direct democracy. The use of citizens' initiatives is widespread and frequent. Ballot measures promote political speech and citizen engagement, and mobilize voters to participate in elections. Petitioning is a major part of ballot measure campaigns. Current restrictions and regulations on ballot qualifications—*e.g.*, requiring petitioners to collect thousands of original ink signatures through face-to-face interactions within a set timeframe—are demanding.

Already an arduous task, gathering signatures to qualify an initiative to appear on the ballot is now further burdened by public health mandates in response to the COVID-19 pandemic. The State of Ohio's Emergency Order—prohibiting large-scale events and directing social distancing—makes collecting voters' ink signatures extremely difficult. As a result, initiative proposals that could have qualified in non-pandemic times may not reach the ballot today. The Court's guidance to state and local governments on how to balance and protect First Amendment rights is needed.

The question the Petition presents is an important and recurring one and should be granted by the Court.

## ARGUMENT

### I. The Citizens' Initiative Has Become An Important Feature Of The American Political Process.

“Direct democracy” describes processes through which citizens directly participate in lawmaking. During Colonial America, for more than 150 years during the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, citizens regularly gathered at town meetings to propose and veto laws passed by elected representatives. Henry Noyes, *Direct Democracy as a Legislative Act*, 19 CHAPMAN L. REV. 199, 200 (2016). Three of the earliest state constitutions—New Hampshire (1776), Pennsylvania (1776), and Massachusetts (1780)—contained features of direct democracy. See *ibid.* It was an exercise of the people’s inherent legislative power, as later reflected in the Declaration of Independence. *Id.* at 201. Direct democracy—the right of initiative and the right to petition the government—is an exercise expressed in manifold ways in the First Amendment to the United States Constitution. See *City of Cuyahoga Falls Ohio v. Buckeye Cmty. Hope Found.*, 538 U.S. 188, 196 (2003).

The Tenth Amendment of the United States Constitution also allows states to employ techniques of direct democracy: “One of federalism’s chief virtues, of course, is that it promotes innovation by allowing for the possibility that ‘a single courageous State may, if its citizens choose, serve as a laboratory; and try novel social and economic experiments

without risk to the rest of the country.” *Gonzales v. Raich*, 545 U.S. 1, 42 (2005) (O’Connor, J., dissenting). The laboratory of democracy, see *New State Ice Co. v. Liebmann*, 285 U.S. 262, 310 (1932) (Brandeis, J., dissenting), often operates at the ballot box.

“Direct democracy is the most direct expression of the people’s power to govern themselves.” Noyes, *Direct Democracy as a Legislative Act*, *supra*, at 201 (citing *Ariz. State Legislature v. Ariz. Indep. Redistricting Comm’n*, 135 S. Ct. 2652, 2671 (2015)). Through citizens’ initiatives, often referred to as “ballot measures” or “propositions,” voters have a direct say in defining policies subject to a popular vote. Citizens propose policy themselves, and if enough of their fellow citizens concur (by providing their signatures on petitions), the initiative is placed on the ballot; then, the initiative is accepted or rejected by popular vote.

In the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, as the result of populist political movements, states returned to the country’s pre-Revolution roots and began statutorily or constitutionally to empower their citizens to legislate directly. In 1898, South Dakota became the first state to adopt the direct democracy techniques of initiative or referendum. David B. Magleby, *DIRECT LEGISLATION: VOTING ON BALLOT PROPOSITIONS IN THE U.S.*, at 39 (1984). In 1902, Oregon followed suit. *Ibid.* Most of the states that now have these processes adopted them between 1898 and 1918. *Id.* at 38–39. Additional states

adopted such procedures later in the twentieth century: Alaska in 1959 (upon attaining statehood), Florida and Wyoming in 1968, Illinois in 1970, and Mississippi in 1992. Daniel A. Smith & Dustin Fridkin, *Delegating Direct Democracy: Interparty Legislative Competition and the Adoption of the Initiative in the American States*, 102 AM. POL. SCI. REV. 333, 333–350 (2008). Direct democracy now exists in 24 states. No state has repealed its provisions for initiative or referenda after adoption.

Many eligible local governments also separately grant their residents the right to participate in the referendum process and ballot initiatives. See, e.g., *City of Tucson v. Arizona*, 273 P.3d 624, 626 (Ariz. 2012). When new cities are incorporated, residents typically seek greater local control by retaining the right to enact or prohibit laws through popular referendum. See John Allswang, *The Origins of Direct Democracy in Los Angeles & Cal.*, 78 S. CAL. Q. 175, 179 (1996).

A significant majority, *i.e.*, more than seventy percent of the country's citizens, resides in a state or city where citizens enjoy the right to enact or challenge laws by referendum. John G. Matsusaka, *Direct Democracy Works*, 19 J. ECON. PERSP. 185, 186 (2005). This percentage is increasing with population growth in states that statutorily or constitutionally empower direct democracy, such as Arizona, California and Florida.

As the number of state and local governments that adopt initiative or referendum has grown, so too has the prevalence of citizen-driven propositions. Between 1990 and 2019, more than 1,000 statewide initiatives reached the ballot. See Initiative and Referendum Institute, “Initiative Use,” Dec. 2019, *available at* [http://www.iandrinstitute.org/docs/IRI-Initiative-Use-\(2019-2\).pdf](http://www.iandrinstitute.org/docs/IRI-Initiative-Use-(2019-2).pdf); Todd Donovan, *N. Am. & the Caribbean*, in REFERENDUMS AROUND THE WORLD: THE CONTINUED GROWTH OF DIRECT DEMOCRACY, at 138 (M. Qvortup ed., 2014). Hundreds more citizen initiatives have been on ballots at the local level.

## **II. The Citizens’ Initiative Is And Promotes Political Speech.**

The Supreme Court has long recognized that the circulation of a ballot initiative involves core political speech. *Meyer v. Grant*, 486 U.S. 414, 421–422 (1988). “The people in our democracy are entrusted with the responsibility for judging and evaluating the relative merits of conflicting arguments.” *First Nat’l Bank v. Bellotti*, 435 U.S. 765, 791–792 (1978). Those arguments are often presented to the electorate through television and radio, pamphlets, social and digital media, and town hall debates. “The First Amendment protects [such] political speech.” *Citizens United v. F.E.C.*, 558 U.S. 310, 371 (2010).

*Amici’s* academic research confirms that ballot initiatives stimulate political dialogue. Campaign spending on advertisements generally provides “a

vehicle of information and opinion.” *Lovell v. City of Griffin*, 303 U.S. 444, 452 (1938). The volume of political speech in the arena of citizen initiatives is substantial and consequential. Thomas Stratmann, *Is Spending More Potent for or Against a Proposition? Evidence From Ballot Measures*, 50 AM. J. POL. SCI. 788, 792 (2006).

For example, in the 2008 and 2012 general election cycles, more money was spent on communicating with voters about state-level ballot measures than was spent on all 7,382 state legislative races in the country combined. Donovan, *N. Am. & the Caribbean*, *supra*, at 141–144. And, in the 2008 general election cycle, more money was spent on state-level ballot measures than the winning 2008 U.S. presidential campaign. *Ibid.* Such spending for initiatives is not new. In the early twentieth century, when the current form of direct democracy was in its infancy, initiative campaigns routinely had significant spending on both sides of an issue. Daniel A. Smith & Joseph Lubinski, *Direct Democracy During the Progressive Era: A Crack in the Populist Veneer?*, 14 J. POL’Y HIST. 349, 368 (2002). The First Amendment promotes this political discourse. And, the robust exercise of the First Amendment reflected in the significant amount of spending on initiative campaigns is indicative of the importance of this political discourse to voters and citizens generally.



### III. The Citizens' Initiative Drives Voter Engagement.

Citizens are attentive and responsive to political communication in the arena of direct democracy. The presence of initiatives on ballots often corresponds with increased voter turnout at both the state and local level. See, e.g., Caroline J. Tolbert, Ramona S. McNeal & Daniel A. Smith, *Enhancing Civic Engagement: The Effect of Direct Democracy on Political Participation & Knowledge*, 3 ST. POL. & POL'Y Q. 23, 29 (2003); Zoltan L. Hajnal & Paul G. Lewis, *Municipal Insts. & Voter Turnout in Local Elections*, 38 URB. AFF. REV. 645, 657–658 (2003).

Ballot measures drive political engagement and voter turnout. Informed citizens are more likely to turn out to vote in midterm and presidential elections. Todd Donovan, Caroline J. Tolbert & Daniel A. Smith, *Political Engagement, Mobilization, and Direct Democracy*, 73 PUB. OP. Q., 98, 114 (2009); Jantine A. Parry, Daniel A. Smith & Shayne Henry, *The Impact of Petition Signing on Voter Turnout*, 34 POL. BEHAV. 117, 132 (2012). Relatedly, campaign spending for ballot measures, particularly political communication and advertising, corresponds with increased voter turnout. Caroline J. Tolbert, Daniel C. Bowen & Todd Donovan, *Initiative Campaigns: Direct Democracy & Voter Mobilization*, 37 AM. POL. RES. 155, 160–162 (2009).

The presence of citizen-driven ballot initiatives spurs media coverage and increases citizen awareness of ballot measures. Todd Donovan, Caroline Tolbert & Daniel A. Smith, *Priming Presidential Votes by Direct Democracy*, 70 J. POL. 1217, 1227 (2008). The initiative process provides more opportunities for political discourse and promotes a more engaged and informed electorate. Frederick J. Boehmke & Daniel C. Bowen, *Direct Democracy & Individual Interest Grp. Membership*, 72 J. POL. 659, 660 (2010).

#### **IV. States Have Various Signature Thresholds And Rules For Qualifying Citizen-Driven Initiative Petitions.**

*Amici* agree that states set qualification rules for ballot petitions. Otherwise, various interest groups would overwhelm voters with lengthy and crowded ballots; voters would be unable to comprehend all the issues and propositions. Jay Barth, Craig M. Burnett & Janine A. Parry, *Direct Democracy, Educative Effects, and the (Mis)Measurement of Ballot Measure Awareness*, POL. BEHAV. (Jan. 28, 2019).

During the early twentieth century, the proponents of direct democracy recognized that an initiative proposal should garner a threshold level of public support before it appears on the ballot. Todd Donovan & Daniel Smith, *Identifying and Preventing Signature Fraud on Ballot Measure Petitions*, in ELECTION FRAUD: DETECTING AND DETERRING ELECTORAL MANIPULATION, at 130 (Brookings 2008). Each

direct democracy state now sets threshold requirements to qualify initiative petitions for the ballot. Caroline J. Tolbert, Daniel H. Lowenstein & Todd Donovan, *Election Law and Rules for Initiatives*, in *CITIZENS AS LEGISLATORS: DIRECT DEMOCRACY IN THE UNITED STATES*, at 28 (Ohio State Univ. Press 1998).

Some ballot qualification rules include obtaining a certain percentage of voters' ink signatures, collecting these signatures within a set timeframe, requiring geographic distribution of signatures (*i.e.*, signatures need to come from all regions of a state), setting standards for "valid" signatures, and requiring petitioners to witness voters' signing of the petition. *Ibid.* Some states, like Wyoming, currently have stringent signature qualification rules, requiring proponents to collect signatures from 15% of those who voted in the prior general election *and* who represent at least two-thirds of the counties in the state. Wyoming Secretary of State, "Initiative & Referendum," *available at* <https://sos.wyo.gov/Elections/InitiativeReferendumInfo.aspx>. Other states, like California and Oregon, have less demanding thresholds. Shaun Bowler & Todd Donovan, *Measuring the Effect of Direct Democracy on State Policy: Not All Initiatives Are Created Equal*, 4 *ST. POL. & POL'Y Q.* 345, 350 (2004).

Regardless of the state's specific referendum requirements, qualifying initiative petitions is an ex-

pensive and difficult task. Signature gathering is often the largest expense for direct democracy campaigns. Todd Donovan, Shaun Bowler, David McCuan & Ken Fernandez, *Contending Players and Strategies, Opposition Advantages Initiative Campaigns*, in *CITIZENS AS LEGISLATORS: DIRECT DEMOCRACY IN THE UNITED STATES*, at 97 (Ohio State Univ. Press 1998). Initiative proponents often spend as much or more on petitioning as on communicating with voters during the actual campaign season. Todd Donovan, Shaun Bowler & David McCuan, *Political Consultants and the Initiative Industrial Complex*, in *DANGEROUS DEMOCRACY? THE BATTLE OVER BALLOT INITIATIVES IN AMERICA*, at 118 (Rowman and Littlefield 2002). Due to generally high qualification thresholds, only a handful of statewide initiatives normally clear existing petitioning hurdles and reach the ballot in every two-year general election cycle. Todd Donovan, Christopher Z. Mooney & Daniel Smith, *STATE AND LOCAL POLITICS: INSTITUTIONS AND REFORM*, at 128 (Cengage 2013).

**V. The Court's Guidance On The First Amendment's Application To Ballot Initiatives Is Needed, Especially Given COVID-19 Public Health Restrictions.**

In light of the growing and more frequent use of direct democracy techniques nationwide, the Court's clarification on the First Amendment implications on ballot initiatives is needed. The Circuits' split on whether the First Amendment applies to the ballot

initiative process, and the split within that split of what level of scrutiny governs, should be resolved. The Petition presents the Court with an excellent opportunity to determine the First Amendment implications of the restrictions on the initiative process.

*Amici* do not question the need for States to impose public health orders restricting social contact during a pandemic or other public health or similar crises. But the pandemic and resulting health-related measures (which will certainly continue for months, if not years) has made the initiative and referendum process severely burdensome. To qualify an initiative on the ballot, campaigns depend heavily on face-to-face interactions between petitioners and registered voters: petitioners usually discuss and explain the initiative proposal before convincing voters to sign on. Historically, to obtain the necessary number of signatures and gain support for the ballot initiatives, canvassers often approach bystanders at large-scale or community events—*e.g.*, parades—or have a dialogue with citizens on public streets. Public health orders in Ohio and other states during the pandemic, however, prohibit most large and public gatherings, direct a six-foot social distance between individuals from different households, and instruct residents to stay home. These measures—well-intentioned, important, and necessary—nonetheless severely restrict initiative proponents’ ability to satisfy ballot qualification rules.

A pandemic halts or hinders petitioning activities. In 1918, the influenza pandemic almost halted the women's suffrage movement. Ellen Carol DuBois, *A Pandemic Nearly Derailed the Women's Suffrage Movement*, NAT'L GEOGRAPHIC (Apr. 20, 2020), available at <https://www.nationalgeographic.com/history/2020/04/pandemic-nearly-derailed-womens-suffrage-movement/>. Gatherings of suffragists aimed to collect petition signatures to amend state constitutions to allow women the right to vote were cancelled. E.g., *Influenza Mars Suffrage Plans*, NEW ORLEANS TIMES-PICAYUNE, at 15 (Oct. 10, 1918) ("Everything conspires against women's suffrage. Now it is the influenza which is trying to prevent a spread of the suffrage doctrine, but obedient to the demands of the health authorities the suffragists will refrain from public gatherings.").

Without modification to the current ballot qualification rules, initiative petitions will likely fail to reach the ballot. Sarah Holder, *How Coronavirus Is Killing Off Ballot Measures*, BLOOMBERG CITYLAB (Apr. 9, 2020), available at <https://www.bloomberg.com/news/articles/2020-04-09/coronavirus-is-killing-off-2020-ballot-measures>. Prohibitions on large gatherings, and fears associated with such gatherings, have removed the most historically important forum for the exercise of direct democracy. Moreover, the pandemic has reduced the number of available paid and volunteer signature gatherers who may have at-home obligations (e.g., childcare) or who worry about exposure to coronavirus. Thus,

initiative proposals will likely fail—not because of the lack of public support—but rather from fear of contracting coronavirus as well as violating public health orders.

On the other hand, the pandemic has demonstrated that businesses, governments and citizens can adapt to a world without large gatherings, or person-to-person contact. If the Court recognizes that the ballot and initiative process implicate First Amendment rights, then States, like Ohio, should tailor their ballot qualifying requirements to the current public health and real world realities of conducting business, governmental and other activities, which will certainly continue as the pandemic eases. Nationwide, many states have temporarily modified or made such modest changes to ballot qualification rules to accommodate public health orders stemming from the coronavirus. E.g., MONT. DECLARATORY ORDER, No. SOS-2020-DR-0001 (May 8, 2020) (in Montana, permitting citizens to download initiative materials, sign, and mail in the petition); UTAH EXEC. ORDER, 2020-12 (Apr. 1, 2020) (in Utah, suspending the witness requirement and allowing initiative campaigns to distribute petitions electronically, by fax or email, and requiring voters to sign and return the petitions by mail); N.J. EXEC. ORDER 132 (Apr. 29, 2020) (in New Jersey, allowing petitioners to collect signatures online because “[n]ow is not the time for anyone to be going door-to-door or collect signatures for any purpose”).

Elections are “of the most fundamental significance under our constitutional structure.” See *Illinois Bd. of Elections v. Socialist Workers Party*, 440 U.S. 173, 184 (1979). Elections in 24 states include citizens’ initiatives—the right of direct self-governance. Yet, despite its importance, the Courts of Appeals and state high courts are deeply divided as to whether the First Amendment applies at all, and if it does, the applicable standard of scrutiny to review certain government restrictions that make exercise of such speech particularly burdensome. See Pet. Br., at 9–25. The Petition presents the right case to resolve “an important issue of election administration.” See *Little v. Reclaim Idaho*, 140 S. Ct. 2616, 2616 (2020) (Roberts, C. J., concurring).

### CONCLUSION

The Court should grant the Petition for a writ of certiorari.

Respectfully submitted,

March 8, 2021

PAUL A. ZEVNIK  
*Counsel of Record*  
JASON Y. SIU  
MORGAN, LEWIS &  
BOCKIUS LLP  
1111 Pennsylvania  
Avenue, N.W.  
Washington, D.C. 20004  
paul.zevnik@morganlewis.com

Counsel for *Amici Curiae*