Republican Rules Roulette

Closing the Door after the Party

The nine-day battle over the rules to govern the Republican Party through the 1976 Convention provided the only break from the carefully programmed and wrapped-in-plastic 1972 Convention.

In the end, after a spirited floor fight, the Convention adopted a delegate allocation formula containing similar defects in the opinion of lawyers to those in the formula ruled unconstitutional in April for the Ripon Society and the Republican National Committee (RNC).

The Convention also adopted DO Committee recommendation 8, which provides that, "Each state shall endeavor to have equal representation of men and women in its delegation to the Republican National Convention;" but ignored DO recommendations designed to increase the participation of young people and minority group members.

But the only really serious controversy involved delegate allocation. It began with testimony before the RNC Rules Committee on Monday, August 14. The open hearings, which had been agreed to by Rules Chairman William C. Cramer of Florida only a few days before, included statements from, among others, Senators Packwood, Javits, Buckley and Percy; Congressmen Railsback, Crane and Wiggins; Governor Francis Sargent and gubernatorial candidate Christopher "Kit" Bond of Missouri; John Gardner of Common Cause; Dan Swilling of Ripon, Mrs. Jesse Sargent and Christine Topping of the Women's Political Caucus.

After the testimony was completed in early evening, Cramer asked for a motion to make all subcommittee and committee sessions closed. The motion was made, and then to Cramer's surprise, was defeated, with Rhode Island National Committeeman Fred Lippitt and Missouri Committeewoman Rosemary Ginn, who chaired the DO Committee, making the most convincing arguments. Now faced with open meetings, Cramer acutely stated that while anyone could attend, "the meetings will be orderly and any disruptions would be dealt with appropriately."

The four Rules subcommittees convened in makeshift quarters in the Eden Roc Hotel Tuesday morning, with television cameras covering the meetings on Rule 30 and Rules 31-34. Rule 30 on delegate allocation, chaired with unflagging fairness and good humor by William S. Powers of Colorado, suffered its first "disruption" not long after it had begun wading through the 17 proposed formulas before it.

Cramer walked in and announced that Sen. John Tower of Texas had an important statement to make and had been unable to be present the day before. Tower arrived following a press conference to announce the "Tower-Kemp" (Rep. Jack Kemp of New York) Plan, dubbed the "Miami Compromise," which was the basis for the formula finally adopted by the Convention. The Tower Plan was accompanied by a chart showing how the plan would work if Nixon carried every state in November. When reduced to the basis of all other plans - 1968-70 voting statistics — the plan would have generated 1321 delegates, 27 fewer than at this Convention.

By the end of the day, the subcommittee was down to three plans: Sen. Percy's, modeled on the Ripon plan; the Tower plan; and a formula worked out by Fred Lippitt and New York Chairman Charles Lanigan, which allocated delegates based on carrying congressional districts as well as presidential vote. The Lippitt-Lanigan plan carried 6-5 over Tower, after the Percy formula had been eliminated by consensus.

The subcommittee plan was presented to the full RNC Rules Committee the next day, along with reports from the other three subcommittees. Tom Stagg of Louisiana offered as a substitute a modified Tower plan, which would have enlarged the convention to 1979 delegates. The modified plan provided that each state would receive delegates equal to three times its electoral vote, plus 4½ delegates and 60% of its electoral vote if the state carried for the GOP presidential candidate. After substantial debate, during which opponents of Tower called it a form of "Russian Roulette" and pointed out its constitutional defects, the substitute, as amended, passed 31-16.

The full RNC met the next day to receive the report of the Rules Committee. A minority report, signed by nine of the 16 who voted nay in the Rules Committee, was presented by Bernard Shanley of New Jersey, who had been a vocal opponent of Ripon's lawsuit, but was convinced that, since the court had spoken, the Tower plan was unconstitutional as the old Rule 30. The minority report (the original plan approved by the subcommittee) was defeated on a voice vote, and the decision was made by its principal advocates, State Chairmen William McLaughlin of Michigan, Dave Kroogsmen of Minnesota, Charles Lanigan of New York, and Lippitt that a record vote would not be requested. Two amendments later offered to the Tower plan — one to extend the victory
bonus to senatorial and gubernatorial contests, and the
other to include a congressional district victory bonus —
were both defeated, the first on a 50-71 vote, the other
by voice vote.

Attention then turned to the Convention Rules Com-
mittee, also chaired by Cramer, which was to meet for
the first time on Sunday, August 20. Its 105 members con-
tained only 15 who had served on the RNC Rules Com-
mittee, and included effective advocates of reform like
Congressman William Steiger of Wisconsin, Senators Math-
ilof Pennsylvania and Packard, Minnesota Chairman
Krogness and New York Assembly Speaker Perry Duryee.

The group, which had been in the minority all week,
also set about to develop a true compromise formula,
which included elements from both the Tower plan and
the subcommittee plan. Originally conceived by Lanigan
in the lobby of the Eden Roc Hotel and refined in a two-
room suite in the Deauville which had become the opera-
tions center, the plan was put in final form on Sunday.
Congressman Steiger agreed to offer it when the Conven-
tion Rules Committee met to consider Rule 30 on Monday.

Also on Sunday, Governor Robert Ray of Iowa held
a press conference to announce his opposition to the Tower
plan, particularly lobbying among fellow governors, many
of whom arrived that weekend.

The weekend also saw the first attempts at media-
tion of the dispute, RNC Chairman Bob Dole asked for-
ter National Chairman Ray C. Bliss of Ohio to meet with
both sides, which he did on Saturday, but no head-
way was made. Dole made it clear again Sunday on na-
tional TV that he wanted a compromise that would avoid
the almost inevitable floor fight, but neither Dole nor Co-
chairman Tom Evans personally pushed hard for a com-
promise, due in part to the press of other duties.

The White House and the Committee to Re-elect the
President, which during the RNC Rules proceedings through
its agents Charles McWhorter and Harry Fleming had been
not-so-quietly supporting the Tower plan, also fin-
ally began looking for a compromise. John Ehrlichman
had been designated as the contact, but beyond some sound-
ings, nothing was done until the Convention Rules Com-
mittee had made its decision.

When Rule 30 was reached on Monday, Steiger gain-
ed recognition and offered his compromise formula. After
very brief debate, the Steiger substitute was tabled on a
motion by Mississippi's Claude Reed, effectively ending
debate on it. Immediately thereafter, a 22-year-old state
representative from South Carolina, Sherry Shealy, severe-
lly munching on a Wisconsin apple, moved that the Tower
plan be adopted without amendment. This provoked the
longest debate in the committee, with the supporters
who should make its own decision, and that
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had been designated as the contact, but beyond some sound-
ings, nothing was done until the Convention Rules Com-
mittee had made its decision.

When Rule 30 was reached on Monday, Steiger gain-
ed recognition and offered his compromise formula. After
very brief debate, the Steiger substitute was tabled on a
motion by Mississippi's Claude Reed, effectively ending
debate on it. Immediately thereafter, a 22-year-old state
representative from South Carolina, Sherry Shealy, severe-
lly munching on a Wisconsin apple, moved that the Tower
plan be adopted without amendment. This provoked the
longest debate in the committee, with the supporters
arguing that the issue had been fully debated over the past
week, and the opponents arguing that this was a new
body which should make its own decision, and that
debate should not be cut off until everyone who wished to
speak had been heard.

The motion was finally defeated on a 38-61 roll call vote,
which one Washington political writer dubbed "a narrow victory for the First Amendment." One amendment was
finally adopted, granting one bonus delegate for each
GOP governor, governor or congressional majority elected
in a state.

When the Rules Committee finally ended its work
early Tuesday morning, Rule 30, though very different and
providing for a larger convention, still unfairly discrimi-
nated against the larger states. Aside from the provision
on women delegates, and the inclusion of a provision
creating a committee with no enforcement power to as-
sist the states to implement the new rules (which contain
very little new), the report going to the floor contained
little to cheer advocates of an open party.

The adoption of the Tower plan made a floor
fight inevitable, even though prospects for winning were slim.
In an attempt to keep it from the floor, the White House
arranged a meeting on Monday between Sen. Tower and
Sen. Hugh Scott, accompanied by McLaughlin, Lanigan
and Pennsylvania Chairman Clifford Jones, with Bliss again
the mediator. A compromise was discussed and it was
agreed that each side would discuss it, with the group to
reconvene on Tuesday at 11 a.m., only two hours before
the Convention would meet to hear committee reports,
including Rules. Tower failed to show up, encouraging Bliss
and Scott to go back to their delegations to convince them
to vote for the Steiger plan, which would be offered on the
floor.

While a floor fight had been tactically discussed for
a week, the decision to proceed was not actually made until
Tuesday evening. The New York delegation-caucused and
voted unanimously for a floor fight, providing the fight's
impetus as well as much of its logistical support.

The convention managers asked that the two sides
meet before debate began to work out ground rules. At the
Brown Headquarters it was agreed that Steiger would
speak first in support of his amendment, to be followed
by 24-year-old Brigid Shanley of New Jersey, New York
Assembly Speaker Duryea (both members of the Rules
Committee) and finally Michigan Chairman McLaughlin,
who had been effective in debate all week.

Steiger led off, followed by Cramer in opposition.
The speakers then alternated, with other opponents in-
cluding Rex Duwe of Kansas, Mayor Richard Lugar of
Indianapolis and finally Gov. Ronald Reagan. The roll
vote was 434-910 against the Steiger substitute, with the
bulk of Steiger's support coming from the large states:
(Ohio 89, Ohio 52, Pennsylvania 60, New Jersey 34, Michigan 48, Massachusetts 34). Substantial support
was also received from Minnesota, Connecticut, Wisconsin,
Iowa, Missouri, Oregon and the Virgin Islands (all of its
three votes).

Ripon reaffirmed its determination to challenge the
new formula, as part of the current proceedings. Senators
Scott and Schweiker announced that they would file suit
to challenge the constitutionality of new Rule 30.

So the battle, fought so well for nine days in Miami
Beach, returned to the courtroom. And moderate Repub-
licans, beaten once again in convention, returned home
with a renewed appreciation of how well the conserva-
tives control the party.
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Conservative Coalition
The coalition which pushed the unfair and probably illegal Tower plan through the Convention was made up of two distinct groups, which came together out of necessity.

One part first met in June in Salt Lake City, to discuss the Ripon lawsuit and convention strategies. The meeting was called by Wyoming State Chairman David Kennedy to seek ways to protect small state interests. (See June 15 FORUM newsletter for details.) Though from generally conservative mountain states, they were not moved by ideology but by the need to keep the over-sized chunk of delegates awarded by the old, unconstitutional Rule 30.

At Miami this group was joined, and later dominated, by southern conservatives, led by Mississippi Chairman Clarke Reed and Louisiana's Tom Stagg, who operated by proxy on both Rules Committees. This group portrayed the rules fight as "a liberal takeover of the party," claiming after the fight in Reed's words, "This assures that the nominee in 1976 will not be to the left of Richard Nixon."

The old YR syndicate was put into action, and a committee was formed to pump out attacks on such people as RNC General Counsel Fred Scribner and Rules subcommittee chairman William Powers. The handouts carried Clarke Reed's phone number, but he disavowed any knowledge of them. The sheet attacking Powers was in such bad taste that even Tom Stagg was moved to call it "scurrilous garbage."

The conservative nature of the coalition was best illustrated by the support of California, Texas and Florida for the Tower plan, even though those states fared better under almost any of the other seriously considered, but apparently constitutional, formulas.

Responsible Leadership
Republicans have every reason at this point to be euphoric about their convention and their national ticket. As the Democrats continue to bumble and stumble through the campaign, the Republican ticket continues to rise in the polls. The carefully orchestrated performance in Miami proved every bit the media event its planners had hoped.

Still, Republicans ought to be concerned about the lack of candor on the part of the President and party officials about the future direction of a second Nixon Administration. Neither the platform nor the President's acceptance speech presented any kind of consistent theme or set of principles on which to build that vaunted congressional majority. Time and again, Republicans attacked McGovern or one of his policies without advancing concrete goals for future Republican leadership.

On the sole major controversy before the convention, delegate allocation, the White House totally abdicated responsible leadership. Instead of working openly and forthrightly with the Rules Committee over the six months it studied the problem, a few White House operatives went straight to the last minute behind a conservative-backed allocation formula which helped polarize the entire convention and ensure further court action. The fight may not have seriously damaged Richard Nixon's electoral prospects, but his party was hardly strengthened by the outcome.

So far, John Mitchell's dictum, "You can't beat somebody with nobody" seems to have held up. Ultimately, however, the voters will measure Richard Nixon not just against George McGovern but against the responsibilities of the presidential office. If the President projects no greater sense of responsible leadership and direction for the nation and party than he did in Miami Beach, we may find this election much closer than it now is or ought to be.

Party Platform

Miami Beach — The near flawless orchestration of the 1972 Republican Platform must have been viewed with some satisfaction by Maestro Richard Nixon and his White House Ensemble.

Just about everything was in tune, as everyone knew it would be, and a few discordant notes heard now and then throughout the performance must have been more a source of amusement than irritation.

The language of the platform was designed by and for conservatives, although the programs and proposals it outlined were relatively moderate. It stands in contrast to the Democratic platform which was unabashedly liberal in both language and content.

But while the 1968 Platform Preamble stressed positive Republican leadership "in time of crisis" the 1972 preamble relies heavily on a narrow attack on McGovernism, criticizing in particular "the convulsive, leftward lurch of nation the national Democratic Party." The 1972 preamble, like 1968, takes note of people's frustration's with government, especially among youth. In 1968, the preamble stressed solutions, saying in part:

- We must bring about a national commitment to rebuild our urban and rural slum areas;
- We must attack the root causes of poverty and eradicate racial hatred and violence;
- We must give all citizens the opportunity to influence and shape the events of our time.

The 1972 preamble in contrast, gives one line's credit to social progress under President Nixon and then proceeds to set up some false choices:

- Between negotiating and begging with adversary nations;
- Between an expanding economy in which workers prosper and an handout economy in which the idle live in ease;
- Between running our own lives and letting others in a distant bureaucracy run them.

And so the tone of the Nixon campaign is set — a tone which carves a rhetorical distinction between the goals and outlook of the two parties, knowing full well that, in reality, the broad policy positions of each are largely similar.

The President used the platform to call upon the Democratic Congress to take action on many of his domestic legislative proposals, including the five-point foundation of New American Revolution: welfare reform, revenue-sharing, government reorganization, national health insurance, and environmental initiatives. Few Democrats quarrel with the basic thrust of these proposals. Nevertheless, the platforms of the two parties do diverge on several highly emotional, potent political issues.

- The Republicans opposed busing children to achieve racial balance in schools; the Democrats called it "another tool" to bring about desegregation;
- The Republicans opposed gun control laws; the Democrats endorsed the ban on the sale of handguns;
- The Democrats endorsed amnesty for war resisters; the Republicans opposed it;
- The Republicans supported voluntary school prayer; the Democrats did not mention it;
- The Democrats did not mention the use of marijuana; the Republicans opposed liberalization of existing laws;
- The Democrats called for a repeal of section 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley Act (the 'right to work' section); the Republicans did not mention it.

It is difficult to escape the judgement that on most of these issues, the party of Richard Nixon has successfully tapped the troubled thinking of middle America, and that by so doing, it has won for itself a sizable number of votes.
CONVENTION SIDELIGHTS

- Led by Governors William Milliken (Mich.), Robert Ray (Iowa), and Francis Sargeant (Mass.), Republican governors pushed forcefully for rules reform, and were instrumental in restoring the original language of Rule 32 encouraging minority delegate representation.

- Several governors personally attended the Monday night meeting to support delegate-allocation reform.

- If Sen. Edward Brooke's keynote address seemed a letdown, it was because the last two paragraphs were left off the teleprompter.

- Tom Stagg, the Louisiana National Committee man who was a leader in the conservative effort in the Rules Committee, didn't belong there. Stagg was an elected member of the Resolutions Committee but when things heated up in Rules and South Dakota's Jack Gibson proved an inadequate spokesman, Stagg took over that slot to which Ross Perot of Louisiana had been elected. When a challenge to Stagg was made on the opening day of the convention by Inkster, Michigan Mayor Edward Bivens, Jr., former Congressman William Cramer of Indiana, jumped out of his seat when it was pointed out to him that Stagg had been elected. When a challenge to Stagg was made on the opening day of the convention by Inkster, Michigan Mayor Edward Bivens, Jr., former Congressman William Cramer of Indiana, jumped out of his seat when it was pointed out to him that Stagg had been elected.

- A reporter literally bumped into Presidential assistant John Erlichman coming out of an elevator in the Fontainebleu. "What's happening?" Erlichmann asked in his big, friendly way. "Just sat through a press conference with George Romney," said the correspondent. "What'd he say?" asked Erlichmann, beaming broadly. "He said he was quitting the administration to go into business with Wally Hickel," the reporter replied, trying a small attempt at humor. Erlichmann, no longer smiling, grunted and marched away.

- Congressman Peter Frelinghuysen (R-N.J.), chairman of the subcommittee on human rights and responsibilities, reported that no proposals would be considered "appropriate" until such time as the war had ended. The White House insisted on language rejected "here and now" all amnesty proposals. Supporters of that language emphasized that if Frelinghuysen promised Stagg the previous night that he would not allow the Stagg's credentials to be challenged in committee session. Some observers felt Cramer might have made a mistake when he said "Tower-Kemp would be known as the Louisiana Compromise not the Louisiana Purchase."

- The subtle and not-so-subtle manipulation of the platform was illustrated by the pass issued supporting voluntary school prayer. Congressman Frelinghuysen, chairman of the subcommittee which dealt with the school prayer issue, had been one of the only 26 House Republicans who had voted against a constitutional amendment on the subject in November, 1971. School prayer advocates made unsuccessful efforts to have Frelinghuysen removed as chairman. Meanwhile, however, House Speaker Carl Albert and Senator Strom Thurmond both joined together in a primary challenge to the proposed American Education Amendment. The Indian delegates caucused Sunday night for a constitutional amendment on the subject in November, 1971. School prayer advocates made unsuccessful efforts to have Frelinghuysen removed as chairman. Meanwhile, however, House Speaker Carl Albert and Senator Strom Thurmond both joined together in a primary challenge to the proposed American Education Amendment.

- By comparison, the Indian delegates, though far fewer, had impressive success with their platform proposals. "Of such witnesses was a key to the final platform. The only major changes on the White House-written document were, in fact, the planks on day care and women's rights spearheaded by Congresswoman Margaret M. Heckler.

- Indianapolis Mayor Richard Lugar ran an impressive press blitz for his presidential ambitions at the Miami Convention but some of his maneuvers were ineffective and petulant when confronted with questions at meetings of the black caucus. The only effective black leaders were Carol Ann Taylor (New York) and Gen. Hassan Jereh-Abd (D.C.), but even they failed to generate any concerted action. Hassan and fellow D.C. Republican Wilber Colom filed a challenge with the Credentials Committee on the make-up of the D.C. delegation (which was 83 percent black though D.C. itself is 71 percent black) but dropped the challenge in exchange for floor passes — a deal on which the D.C. delegation chairman later reneged. The D.C. credentials fight was the sole effort on which the black caucus really united. At best, the caucuses were debating sessions. At worst, Sexton and Jones became involved in a argument over Jones' position — which Sexton would like. On the convention floor, however, these same black leaders were scattered. The feeling is growing that the black voter effort, that Jones and Sexton are supposed to be coordinating, is being written off. Apparently, "nobody is listening" to these staffers on CRP, and as a result, the votes of black voters may go Democratic by default this fall.

- Ohio former Gov. James Rhodes (R) testified with characteristic enthusiasm before a platform subcommittee on the party issue nearest his heart, vocational education. Looking slimmer and more relaxed than he has in years, Rhodes gave every impression of a man ready and willing to offer himself to the voters.

- Congratulations to the convention security forces who devised a deftly clever scheme to exclude hooky-looking young people from the Platform Committee. The Dick Tracy-like illustrators for the "open" sessions in the large LaRonda Room of the Fontainebleu were available to the public at the opposite end of the cavernous hotel in a tiny room surrounded by curtains. During the convention, Rhodes agreed to support a minority report supporting economic development and "self-determination without termination" if planks on urban Indians and surplus land were dropped. Peter MacDonald presented the minority report, which fell on deaf ears, to the Credentials Committee, and the amendment was overwhelmingly adopted.

- Congressional member of the Resolutions Committee but when Ross Perot of Louisiana had been elected. When a challenge to Stagg was made on the opening day of the convention by Inkster, Michigan Mayor Edward Bivens, Jr., former Congressman William Cramer of Indiana, jumped out of his seat when it was pointed out to him that Stagg had been elected.

- By comparison, the Indian delegates, though far fewer, had impressive success with their platform proposals. "Of such witnesses was a key to the final platform. The only major changes on the White House-written document were, in fact, the planks on day care and women's rights spearheaded by Congresswoman Margaret M. Heckler. Five-foot-tall blowlamps of Lugar in various poses, impressive brochures, and a souvenir china ashtray connecting Lugar with the All-American City, Indianapolis. Titled "There is Hope," the last section of the Lugar brochure read: "Of Lugar's future, nothing is certain except that it will never be mediocre. Some would-be seers, of course, go further, entertaining national visions. In bar stools whispers and barbershop speculation, the name Lugar often elicits the fervently-held conviction that the Unigov merger may not have been Indy's last miracle."

- The efforts of the Black Caucus at the Republican Convention were a study in disorganization. Each of the three top GOP strategists, RNC's Edwin Sexton, CRP's Paul Jones and the White House's Bob Brown, threw elaborate parties for the black delegates but they were ineffective and petulant when confronted with questions at meetings of the black caucus. The only effective black leaders were Carol Ann Taylor (New York) and Gen. Hassan Jereh-Abd (D.C.), but even they failed to generate any concerted action. Hassan and fellow D.C. Republican Wilber Colom filed a challenge with the Credentials Committee on the make-up of the D.C. delegation (which was 83 percent black though D.C. itself is 71 percent black) but dropped the challenge in exchange for floor passes — a deal on which the D.C. delegation chairman later reneged. The D.C. credentials fight was the sole effort on which the black caucus really united. At best, the caucuses were debating sessions. At worst, Sexton and Jones became involved in a argument over Jones' position — which Sexton would like. On the convention floor, however, these same black leaders were scattered. The feeling is growing that the black voter effort, that Jones and Sexton are supposed to be coordinating, is being written off. Apparently, "nobody is listening" to these staffers on CRP, and as a result, the votes of black voters may go Democratic by default this fall.

- Ohio former Gov. James Rhodes (R) testified with characteristic enthusiasm before a platform subcommittee on the party issue nearest his heart, vocational education. Looking slimmer and more relaxed than he has in years, Rhodes gave every impression of a man ready and willing to offer himself to the voters.

- Congratulations to the convention security forces who devised a deftly clever scheme to exclude hooky-looking young people from the Platform Committee. The Dick Tracy-like illustrators for the "open" sessions in the large LaRonda Room of the Fontainebleu were available to the public at the opposite end of the cavernous hotel in a tiny room surrounded by curtains. During the convention, Rhodes agreed to support a minority report supporting economic development and "self-determination without termination" if planks on urban Indians and surplus land were dropped. Peter MacDonald presented the minority report, which fell on deaf ears, to the Credentials Committee, and the amendment was overwhelmingly adopted.
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- Ohio former Gov. James Rhodes (R) testified with characteristic enthusiasm before a platform subcommittee on the party issue nearest his heart, vocational education. Looking slimmer and more relaxed than he has in years, Rhodes gave every impression of a man ready and willing to offer himself to the voters.
I am a 21-year-old registered Republican. Until a year and a half ago, I was involved in Democratic state politics, but became interested in Congressman Paul McCloskey and his Presidential candidacy. He became "my candidate," and in the course of my involvement in both his Presidential and Congressional campaigns, he was successfully in convincing me that the fundamental of the Republican Party were very similar to my basic political beliefs.

I differ with President Nixon on a number of issues. But my priority right now is the Vietnam War. Basically, Nixon's handling of the war is the best evidence that his administration is guilty of such anti-Republican tendencies as the brutal and cynical substitution of impersonal technological warfare for the direct involvement of America's sons. And, any Republican who feels this way—or any other way—should have had the opportunity to express his views. Unfortunately, Miami was not a convention, but a Nixon rally.

A group of former McCloskey workers decided to join me in a trip to Miami for the Convention. We had been denied the right to be represented officially at the convention. Our request for gallery passes from the RNC had been turned down because we were not members of Young Voters for the President, but felt that the trip could be worthwhile if we could find some way to express our views to convention delegates and other young people in Miami. My friends and I spent Monday and Tuesday talking to Congressmen McCloskey and sitting around hotel lobbies discussing issues with the "Nixonettes." We attended convention sessions and committee meetings. Tuesday night, I asked Pete if he and Tom Mayer (the young man from New Jersey who was supposed to be McCloskey's delegate) would like to attend Wednesday night's session, "No," Pete said. "But give the passes to some of the VVAW (Veterans Against the War) guys."

So, the three of us went to Flamingo Park before the Wednesday evening session and brought two young Vets in wheel chairs to Convention Hall. All armed with passes to the VVAW credentials, we ran through the tear gas and into the hall.

We were allowed into the hall and told our seats were on the platform, but because of the wheel chairs we were allowed to stay in the floor guest area.

We sat for a while — Bill Wyman of New Mexico, Bob Mullen, Ron Kovics and I. Armed with poster board and a magic marker, Bob made a sign that read "Stop The Bombing." After about five minutes, a security man jumped in (we had been surrounded by men wearing security credentials), grabbed the sign and ran off, tearing it as he went. I ran after him, asking him his name and what right he had to take the sign. He mumbled something about it not being any of my business. A policeman standing by refused to be of any help.

Another sign was made, this one reading "Stop The Killing." A delegate grabbed the sign and started to tear it. He stopped when a guard told him to return the sign. All along, we were being harassed by Nixon people around us. Finally, we couldn't take it anymore and one of the Vets violated an agreement we had made before we entered the hall — that we would not yell or make trouble that would lead to our expulsion from the hall. He started to yell, "Stop the killing. Please stop killing my brothers." With that, television cameras were on us, and we were shuffled out of the hall by security guards. The young men were let out of a side door and it was then locked. I was not allowed out with them... I was told to leave via a door at the other end of the hall and three young men, crippled for life defending their country, were left to fend for themselves in the tear gas war that was going on outside the hall.

And, from that time until I returned home to Boston on Thursday afternoon, I was followed by two men. At one point I went up to them and said, "I know you're following me. Can you tell me who you are and why I'm being tailed?" I was answered with: "we're doing this for your own security."

Well, as a result of my trip to Miami, I've become the Jane Fonda of the Republican Party.

The Republicans don't want me anymore because of my opposition to the President. The Democrats don't want me because I'm a Republican and not about to give that up.

So where does a girl go who loves her country and who has been condemned for having the courage of her convictions?

— SUSAN B. COHEN
Women and the Republican Party

MIAMI has come and gone for the Republicans and Republican women are now in the process of assessing their gains and losses. On the positive side, there is a strong women's plank in the final version of the Republican Party commitment to quality developmental child care — federally-assisted and comprehensive. Party Rule 32 has been expanded to provide for positive action to open up the party and the delegate selection process to women, youth, minorities, ethnic groups and senior citizens. And women "got it together" in Miami in a significant way. Despite some program setbacks, a "consciousness raising" did take place and, because of it, the Republican Party will never be the same.

Arriving in muggy Miami on Sunday evening, August 13, I did not think the two weeks ahead looked very appealing. For those of us from the National Women's Political Caucus who had experienced the Republican Convention of 1968 as a let-me-out-of-here feeling developed almost as soon as we sighted the familiar beach hotels. But with a belief that surprising things could indeed happen, we established ourselves at the Sans Souci Hotel and plunged into the fracas on platform and rules aware that we were at least starting with assigned accommodations that reflected more sensitivity than the Democratic Convention's delegation of women's groups to the Betsy Ross Hotel.

The original draft of the platform, presented to the subcommittee, had not contained any positive reference to child development and day care programs beyond the tax deduction provisions which are already law and the custodial proposals for welfare children in H.R. 1. In addition, there was a let-me-out-of-here opposition to involving the federal government "in the day care business on a massive scale." However, by the time this full Platform Committee reported out its finished product, the plank contained a commitment to: "...the development of public or privately run, voluntary, comprehensive, quality day care services, locally controlled but federally assisted with the requirements that the recipients of these services will pay their fair share of the costs according to their ability." This result, which involved innumerable hours of word by word negotiating with administration and committee staff by Peggy Heckler (R., Mass.), the NWPC, the other Subcommittee, women and the chairman, Peter Frelinghuysen (R., N.J.), represented a significant change in administration and party rhetoric and a recognition of strong feelings on this subject by Republican women, a fact too long and improperly ignored.

The education process on women's rights that accompanied the child care fight was a remarkably healthy one for both the women's movement and the Republican Party. The NWPC held two meetings for all the women delegates on the Platform Committee and innumerable smaller sessions. The change in attitude and awareness which resulted should be an eye opener to politicians, male and female, of both parties. From a group whose initial belief seemed to be that the women's movement was not theirs who couldn't make it on their own, views began to be expressed on a broad range of women's issues and priorities and a sense of common purpose soon developed. These feelings crossed a widely divergent ideological and geographic lines and were not limited to the Eastern, traditionally liberal wing of the party: for example, Anna Chennault made the strongest case in the room for women power and quality child care for all; and the issue of placing women in decision-making positions was addressed most effectively by delegates from Arizona, North Dakota and Nebraska. It should also be noted that the attitudes of many of the male delegates were altered during the course of the Convention and the movement gained quite a few male supporters.

On the matter of abortion: Abortion, both pro and con, was among the topics discussed for three days straight in subcommittee II hearings and twice before the full Committee. In addition, NWPC talked with a large number of delegates about the question of abortion and found a core of between 35 to 40 women, approximately 10% of the female delegates, who were actively and publicly sympathetic and in support of our position. Abortion should be a matter of personal choice for a woman and not a matter that is dictated by society. While agreeing to talk with reporters, these women deliberately chose not to bring the issue to the Convention floor for two reasons: (1) they felt they stood a good chance of being booted off the podium and read out of their state parties for publicly embarrassing the President; and (2) they would give the "right to life" groups the right to reply on nationwide TV (hitting a large and vulnerable daytime audience instead of the 3:30 a.m. newsmag, as was the case with the Democrats) and this could imperil the abortion reform efforts underway in a number of their states.

Thus to say, as some have, that abortion was not discussed at the Republican Convention because it did not make TV time, prime or otherwise, is not a fair statement. The proabortion delegates fought as hard as they could and didn't do any better or worse in the end than their Democratic sisters. They undoubtedly reflected more accurately the 68% of Republicans who, when questioned by Gallup pollsters, supported the belief that abortion should be a decision between a woman and her physician, among others, the wives of famous men and included an inaugural gown display and the latter because it was entitled "See How She Runs." I am getting rather tired of attacks on any form of activity or expression that do not comport with what is viewed as the current popular costume mold. While I, as an individual, would not have chosen either attendance at the brunch or that name for the seminar, there is no reason to chastise women who find either those titles or those statements threatening to their view of themselves. The NWPC attempted to do at Miami and what I believe we successfully accomplished, was to present our conception of what is important in today's political process. The women's movement, after all, is supposed to open up to women the opportunity and chance of choice to determine their own life styles.

The victory on Rule 32 involved a coalition of "progressive" forces of which the women advocates were one part. The Rules debate ran for 9 days and involved approval first by the RNC Rules Committee and then review by the Convention Rules Committee. There were two key sections in the final language accepted by the full Convention on August 22nd, the first of which had been presented by the NWPC:

(a) Each State shall take positive action to achieve the broadest possible participation by everyone in party affairs, including such participation by women, young people, minority and heritage groups, and senior citizens in the delegate selection process.

(b) Each State shall endeavor to have equal representation of men and women in its delegation to the Republican National Convention.

When the RNC Rules Committee work was completed on August 16th, the language in Rule 32 had read as it was when it finally passed the full Convention with one major exception: missing were the words from the 1968 anti-discrimination rule that called for "positive action" for participation. In their place were the words "strive to achieve... the opportunity for participation." Thus, while we had gained specific reference and targeting of women, youth, minorities, ethnic groups and senior citizens in the del-
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- The Congressional Action Fund, has announced financial contributions to the campaigns of six selected anti-war liberals: former Congressman George Brown (Calif.), who is running against Congressman Earle Cabell (D), striving for a comeback in Texas' 5th district, and Alan Steelman (R), the sole Republican endorsed, of Gov. Winfield Dunn ever since Dunn's election. Mrs. Bentley was appointed to her post in 1969 and faced a conservative challenge at all costs were many of the small states were represented by House Minority Leader Gerald Ford (R). If Republicans are within range of House control after the November elections, pressure will be brought to bear to arrange a massive political sex change among as many as 33 of the Democrats — representatives of olive branch to both the party's progressive wing and its women; they felt they could live with the reforms of Rule 32 and possibly even control them, if in opening up the party they found people who shared their ideological perspective.

- What does the Rule 32 battle say about women at the 1972 Republican Convention? First, it says that women were prime movers for the expansion of that rule and the broadening of the party's base. Women felt strongly about the issue of delegate representation, both as it applied to women, and as it applied to other underrepresented groups. And, while the forces seemed to shape up primarily along progressive versus conservative lines, many of our supporters called themselves "progressives" on this issue. They point out that the real strategy into the battle on Rule 30 did not want to risk a Convention floor fight which they could lose; and that it was 1:45 a.m. and the exhausting end of an extremely long day with work having been done under very hot, crowded and tense conditions. All these are reasonable assumptions but two factors should be added: (1) that the progressives were stronger in the House, we have the vote on Rule 30 did not turn out to be indicative of the conservatives' real numbers since many of the small states were represented by progressive delegates who voted "conservative" on Rule 30 but "progressive" on Rule 52; and (2) the progressives did not want to lose: and wanted to extend some sort of olive branch to both the party's progressive wing and its women; they took pictures of empty rooms. Ashe's door-to-door campaign must have been effective. He won by more than 3 to 1. His election is considered a big boost to moderate Republicans in East Tennessee.

- The Committee to Re-elect the President has endorsed a candidate. It's now the Committee to Re-elect President Nixon.

- Operation Boll Weevil is being quietly promoted by House Majority Leader Gerald Ford (R). If Republicans are within range of House control after the November elections, pressure will be brought to bear to arrange massive political sex change among as many as 33 of the Democrats — representatives of olive branch to both the party's progressive wing and its women; they felt they could live with the reforms of Rule 32 and possibly even control them, if in opening up the party they found people who shared their ideological perspective.

- What does the Rule 32 battle say about women at the 1972 Republican Convention? First, it says that women were prime movers for the expansion of that rule and the broadening of the party's base. Women felt strongly about the issue of delegate representation, both as it applied to women, and as it applied to other underrepresented groups. And, while the forces seemed to shape up primarily along progressive versus conservative lines, many of our supporters called themselves "progressives" on this issue. They point out that the real strategy into the battle on Rule 30 did not want to risk a Convention floor fight which they could lose; and that it was 1:45 a.m. and the exhausting end of an extremely long day with work having been done under very hot, crowded and tense conditions. All these are reasonable assumptions but two factors should be added: (1) that the progressives were stronger in the House, we have the vote on Rule 30 did not turn out to be indicative of the conservatives' real numbers since many of the small states were represented by progressive delegates who voted "conservative" on Rule 30 but "progressive" on Rule 52; and (2) the progressives did not want to lose: and wanted to extend some sort of olive branch to both the party's progressive wing and its women; they took pictures of empty rooms. Ashe's door-to-door campaign must have been effective. He won by more than 3 to 1. His election is considered a big boost to moderate Republicans in East Tennessee.

- The Committee to Re-elect the President has endorsed a candidate. It's now the Committee to Re-elect President Nixon.

- Operation Boll Weevil is being quietly promoted by House Majority Leader Gerald Ford (R). If Republicans are within range of House control after the November elections, pressure will be brought to bear to arrange massive political sex change among as many as 33 of the Democrats — representatives of olive branch to both the party's progressive wing and its women; they felt they could live with the reforms of Rule 32 and possibly even control them, if in opening up the party they found people who shared their ideological perspective.

The change in wording had occurred rather late on August 16th when Rule 32 had been reyped to reflect the new California's 38th district, and a synonym for "affirmative action"—had a legal and legislative history outside the party framework, "strive to achieve" had none, and that suited the opposition just fine. As one National Committeeman stated bluntly: "If we had to avoid constitutional challenges at all costs in 1976 and the effort mandated by the words 'strive to achieve' would be substantially less likely to support such challenges." This gentleman was also in agreement with a number of witnesses who had earlier testified before the all-white, WASP-dominated WASP Committee and proudly declared that "the Republican Party doesn't need to be reformed."
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Alternative Campaign Strategies

With overflowing coffers, impressive margins in the nation-wide polls, and issues flowing in a positive direction, President Nixon's re-election campaign seems headed for an historic landslide victory. With such a prospect in view, it must be tempting indeed to plan a campaign strategy around the prospects of augmenting the landslide rather than conserving and consolidating a near-certain victory of more modest proportions. Yet there are lurking dangers to the former strategy — in trying to win all, one raises the possibility of losing everything.

The President is ahead in this race not because of a thirty-point lead in the Gallup poll — which arrived overnight and can disappear overnight as it did in 1966 — but he is ahead because the mathematics of the electoral colleges gives him certain strategic advantages which if fully capitalized upon, can almost guarantee a victory. It is easiest to appreciate these strategic advantages which President Nixon enjoys by examining Senator George McGovern's position.

Where can McGovern get the 270 electoral votes he needs? Assuming for the moment that voting patterns for the Democrat resemble the voting patterns of the recent past, his most likely possibilities are in those states which Sen. Hubert Humphrey carried without much fanfare. This is where the Wallace split in the conservative vote — together with those he narrowly missed owing to the same reckoning. Such a list might resemble the following:

- Massachusetts 14
- Rhode Island 4
- Connecticut 8
- New York 41
- New Jersey 17
- Pennsylvania 27
- West Virginia 6
- D. C. 5
- Ohio 25
- Michigan 21
- Illinois 26
- Minnesota 10
- California 45
- Washington 9
- Hawaii 4
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AND Either of the following:

- Wisconsin 11
- Maryland 10
- Maine, South Dakota 11
- Maine, N. Hampshire and South Dakota 12

It is conceivable that the unique national character of McGovern's campaign and its unusual relationship to the traditional Democratic Party might open the possibilities of a departure from a strategy based upon traditional Democratic performances. But what other states could McGovern conceivably carry?

The point is that this election campaign is a contest of resources and ultimately the McGovern forces will have to decide where to place their resources with the highest expected payoff — which would seem to be, at present, the above-mentioned list — and it is certainly possible that they could carry these 16-18 states and win the election.

In this contest of resources, the McGovern forces have one potential advantage: They can write off the entire country except for these 16-18 states and concentrate their whole effort in this area which consists almost entirely of the highly populated Boswash, Chippewas, and Sanans (Boston-Washington, Chicago-Pittsburgh and San Francisco-San Diego) megalopolises with their high concentration of urban poor, Blacks, colleges, suburbs, and traditional Democratic voters. McGovern's farm re-election might be employed exclusively in the Dakotas, Wisconsin, Illinois, and perhaps Ohio where it would reinforce his suburban and urban efforts. He could limit, in effect, his voter registration efforts to these states (which have large and concentrated liberal college populations), and devote much of his personal campaign time to the megalopolises where he could cover large concentrations of population with relatively little travel time. A few token visits to the rest of the country would suffice. The McGovern organization demonstrated last spring that it could squeeze majorities out of minority performances — it is not impossible for it to carve an electoral college majority out of a popular minority this fall by concentrating its entire effort where it has a chance of winning.

If one assumes that McGovern's most efficient use of resources would entail an almost exclusive concentration of his efforts in these 16-18 states, then the strategic advantage which President Nixon enjoys becomes clear. If McGovern, on the one hand, does not focus exclusively in these states, the costs to him of wrestling the other states away from the President are probably considerably greater than the costs to the President of holding them. On the other hand, if McGovern does focus almost exclusively on these states, the President has the opportunity of pursuing a low-cost strategy of simply denying a few of them to the McGovern column. By focusing his efforts on a few key McGovern's weakest states, the President can realize an enormous proportional advantage in his resource allocation. If he tries to augment a landslide everywhere, however, McGovern with a high concentration of effort in his 16-18 states can neutralize whatever resource advantage the President has to begin with — even if that resource advantage is in the order of 2 to 1.

Where, then, should the President allocate his resources? It would seem wasteful to focus on Massachusetts and Rhode Island where McGovern will probably win anyway. The New York — New Jersey — Connecticut media region is also a poor place to concentrate resources. The costs are vast and almost unlimited in nature. Here, it might be advisable for the President to spend only as much effort as is needed to make McGovern spend a lot more. California is a similar case. The President may carry these states anyway, but let McGovern put the vast effort into them as a minimal requirement for victory while the Nixon organization husbonds its areas where the payoffs are probably much higher: vast campaign resources can be sunk in New York — California only to dissolve and almost disappear in the last two weeks before an election after firm resource commitments have been made and they can no longer be shifted.

Nixon's focus therefore, should be rather on Pennsylvania, Ohio, Illinois together with a handful of smaller states where media costs are relatively low and where campaign efforts of a dramatic nature can have a large impact. In fact, a concentration upon just two of these three middle states together with Maine, New Hampshire, Maryland, Wisconsin, North Dakota, and Washington state would create such a strong resource imbalance in favor of the President that McGovern would find victory almost impossible. It is probable that a Nixon victory in any two of these nine states (and he should be able to carry most if not all of them) would be a winning configuration.

There is no such thing as unlimited resources. Intelligent polling, concentrated media efforts (including production costs, direct mail, telephone banks, "volunteer" workers) can absorb vast sums of money. By definition it is more efficient to focus such inherently limited resources as the candidate's time, organizational expertise, etc.

If the President is really "running scared" as Clark McGovern recommends, then he will pursue a strategy which is more conservative than a go-for-broke one. It might be advisable for McGovern to husband his forces in such a way that he could win the all-important contest of efficient resources allocation.

— CLIFFORD BROWN