



TEACHING AMERICAN HISTORY

READING PACKET FOR JANUARY 6TH, 2023 | CONTESTED ELECTIONS & ELECTORAL REFORM

CORE READING 1: From Thomas Jefferson to Aaron Burr | December 15, 1800

SOURCE: <https://founders.archives.gov/documents/Jefferson/01-32-02-0208>

Dear Sir

Although we have not official information of the votes for President & Vice President and cannot have until the first week in Feb. yet the state of the votes is given on such evidence as satisfies both parties that the two Republican candidates stand highest. from S. Carolina we have not even heard of the actual vote; but we have learnt who were appointed electors, and with sufficient certainty how they would vote. it is said they would withdraw from yourself one vote. it has also been said that a General Smith of Tennessee had declared he would give his 2d. vote to mr Gallatin; not from any indisposition towards you, but extreme reverence to the character of mr G. it is also surmised that the vote of Georgia will not be entire. yet nobody pretends to know these things of a certainty, and we know enough to be certain that what it is surmised to be withheld will still leave you 4. Or 5. votes at least above mr A. however it was badly managed not to have arranged with certainty what seems to have been left to hazard. it was the more material because I understand several of the highflying federalists have expressed their hope that the two republican tickets may be equal, & their determination in that case to prevent a choice by the H. of R. (which they are strong enough to do) and let the government devolve on a President of the Senate. decency required that I should be so entirely passive during the late contest that I never once asked whether arrangements had been made to prevent so many from dropping votes intentionally as might frustrate half the republican wish; nor did I doubt till lately that such had been made.

While I must congratulate you, my dear Sir, on the issue of this contest, because it is more honourable and doubtless more grateful to you than any station within the competence of the chief magistrate, yet for myself, and for the substantial service of the public, I feel most sensibly the loss we sustain of your aid in our new administration. it leaves a chasm in my arrangements, which cannot be adequately filled up. I had endeavored to compose an administration whose talents, integrity, names & dispositions should at once inspire unbounded confidence in the public mind, and ensure a perfect harmony in the conduct of the public business. I lose you from the list, & am not sure of all the others. should the gentlemen who possess the public confidence decline taking a part in their affairs, and force us to take up persons unknown to the people, the [evil genius](#) of this country may realize his avowal that 'he will beat down the administration.'— the return of mr Van Benthuyzen, one of your electors, furnishes me a confidential opportunity of writing



TEACHING AMERICAN HISTORY

this much to you, which I should not have ventured through the post office, at this prying season. we shall of course see you before the 4th. of March. accept my respectful & affectionate salutations.



TEACHING AMERICAN HISTORY

CORE READING 2: Alexander Hamilton to Harrison Gray Otis | December 23, 1800

SOURCE: <https://www.gilderlehrman.org/collection/glc00496028>

. . . My opinion is, after mature reflection, that if Jefferson and Burr come with equal votes to the House of Representatives, the former ought to be preferred by the Federalists. Mr. Jefferson is respectably known in Europe – Mr. Burr little and that little not advantageously for a President of the U States – Mr. Jefferson is a man of easy fortune – Mr. Burr, as I believe, a bankrupt beyond redemption, unless by some coup at the expence of the public, and his habits of expence are such that Wealth he must have at any rate – Mr. Jefferson is a man of fair character for probity – Very different ideas are entertained of Mr. Burr by his enemies and what his friends think. . . . Mr. Jefferson, though too revolutionary in his notions, is yet a lover of liberty and will be desirous of something like orderly Government – Mr. Burr loves nothing but himself – thinks of nothing but his own aggrandizement – and will be content with nothing short of permanent power in his own hands – No compact, that he should make with any passion in his breast except Ambition, could be relied upon by himself – How then should we be able to rely upon any agreement with him? Mr. Jefferson, I suspect will not dare much Mr. Burr will dare every thing in the sanguine hope of effecting every thing –

By no means, my Dear Sir, let the Federalists be responsible for his Elevation – In a choice of Evils let them take the least – Jefferson is in every view less dangerous than Burr.



TEACHING AMERICAN HISTORY

CORE READING 3: Letter from Thomas Jefferson to Judge Spencer Roane | 1819

SOURCE: <https://teachingamericanhistory.org/document/letter-to-judge-spencer-roane/>

Dear Sir

I had read in the Enquirer, and with great approbation the pieces signed Hampden, and have read them again with redoubled approbation in the copies you have been so kind as to send me. I subscribe to every tittle of them. they contain the true principles of the revolution of 1800. for that was as real a revolution in the principles of our government as that of 76. was in it's form; not effected indeed by the sword, as that, but by the rational and peaceable instrument of reform, the suffrage of the people. the nation declared it's will by dismissing functionaries of one principle, and electing those of another, in the two branches, executive and legislative, submitted to their election. over the judiciary department, the constitution had deprived them of their controul. that therefore has continued the reprobated system: and altho' new matter has been occasionally incorporated into the old yet the leaven of the old mass seems to assimilate to itself the new; and after 20 years confirmation of the federated system by the voice of the nation, declared thro the medium of elections, we find the judiciary on every occasion still driving us into consolidation. in denying the right they usurp of exclusively explaining the constitution. I go further than you do, if I understand rightly your quotation from the Federalist of an opinion that the judiciary is the last resort in relation to the other departments of the government, but not in relation to the rights of the parties to the compact under which the judiciary is derived. if this opinion be sound, then indeed is our constitution a compleat felo de se for intending to establish three. . .



CORE READING 4: Letter from Martin van Buren to Thomas Ritchie | January 13, 1827
SOURCE: <https://teachingamericanhistory.org/document/letter-to-thomas-ritchie/>

Thomas Ritchie was the editor of the Richmond Enquirer, which was one of the most influential newspapers in the South. Van Buren contacted Ritchie as part of Van Buren's effort to build the first true party organization in America (see [Autobiography](#)). Part of Van Buren's motivation was to prevent a repeat of the disastrous results of the 1824 election when multiple candidates necessitated a runoff election in the House of Representatives. Van Buren believed that a strong party organization would produce a clear winner in the Electoral College.

Building on the remnants of the old Democratic-Republican Party, Van Buren imagined a new party that would be more faithful to Jeffersonian principles. The Democratic-Republicans had become too nationalist in their orientation and threatened a return to Federalist principles. Van Buren tapped Andrew Jackson, a military hero from the War of 1812, to be the standard-bearer for the new Democratic Party, in hopes that his popularity would provide the necessary momentum the party needed to secure victory.

The Democrats engaged in grassroots campaigning and began the process of developing a national party organization. As part of that process, Van Buren and the Democrats introduced the party convention to replace the party caucus as a means of nominating presidential candidates. The conventions were far more democratic and participatory than the caucus that had derisively become known as "King Caucus."

Van Buren's efforts were rewarded when Jackson was elected president in 1828 and Van Buren was appointed secretary of state. Four years later, Van Buren was selected as Jackson's running mate; in 1832, he was chosen to be Jackson's successor to the presidency.

—Eric C. Sands

Dear Sir,

You will have observed an article in the Argus upon the subject of a national convention. That matter will soon be brought under discussion here and I sincerely wish you would bestow upon it some portion of your attention... The following may, I think, justly be ranked among its probable advantages.

First, It is the best and probably the only practicable mode of concentrating the entire vote of the opposition and of effecting what is of still greater importance, the substantial re-organization of the Old Republican Party.

2nd Its first result cannot be doubtful. Mr. [John Quincy] Adams occupying the seat and being determined not to surrender it except in extremis will not submit his pretensions to the convention. Noah's real or affected apprehensions upon that subject are idle. I have long been satisfied that we can only get rid of the present, and restore a better state of things, by combining General Jackson's personal popularity with the portion of old party



TEACHING AMERICAN HISTORY

feeling yet remaining. This sentiment is spreading, and would of itself be sufficient to nominate him at the Convention.

3rd. The call of such a convention, its exclusive Republican character, and the refusal of Mr. Adams and his friends to become parties to it, would draw anew the old Party lines and the subsequent contest would re-establish them; state nomination alone would fall far short of that object.

4th It would greatly improve the condition of the Republicans of the North & Middle States by substituting party principle for personal preference as one of the leading points in the contest. The location of the candidates would in a great degree be merged in its consideration. Instead of the question being between a Northern and Southern man, it would be whether or not the ties, which have heretofore bound together a great political party should be severed. The difference between the two questions would be found to be immense in the elective field. Altho' this is a mere party consideration it is not on that account less likely to be effectual. Considerations of this character not infrequently operate as efficiently as those which bear upon the most important questions of constitutional doctrine.

5thly It would place our Republican friends in New England on new and strong grounds. They would have to decide between an indulgence in sectional and personal feeling with an entire separation from their old political friends, on the one hand, or acquiescence in the fairly expressed will of the party, on the other. In all the states the divisions between Republicans and Federalists is still kept up and cannot be laid aside whatever the leaders of the two parties may desire. Such a question would greatly disturb the democracy of the east.

6th. Its effects would be highly salutary on your section of the union by the revival of old party distinctions. We must always have party distinctions and the old ones are the best of which the nature of the case admits. Political combinations between the inhabitants of the different states are unavoidable and the most natural and beneficial to the country is that between the planters of the South and the plain Republicans of the north. The country has once flourished under a party thus constituted and may again. It would take longer than our lives (even if it were practicable) to create new party feelings to keep those masses together. If the old ones are suppressed, geographical divisions founded on local interests or, what is worse prejudices between free and slaveholding states will inevitably take their place. Party attachment in former times furnished a complete antidote for sectional prejudices by producing counteracting feelings. It was not until that defense had been broken down that the clamor against Southern influence and African Slavery could be made effectual in the North. Those in the South who assisted in producing the change are, I am satisfied, now deeply sensible of their error. Formerly, attacks upon Southern Republicans were regarded by those of the north as assaults upon their political brethren and resented accordingly. This all powerful sympathy has been much weakened, if not, destroyed by the amalgamating policy of Mr. Monroe. It can and ought to be revived and the proposed convention would be eminently serviceable in effecting that object.



TEACHING AMERICAN HISTORY

Lastly, the effect of such a nomination on General Jackson could not fail to be considerable. His election, as the result of his military services without reference to party and so far as he alone is concerned scarcely to principle would be one thing. His election as the result of a combined and concerted effort of a political party, holding in the main, to certain tenets and opposed to certain prevailing principles, might be another and a far different thing.



CORE READING 5: Popular Government, William Howard Taft | 1913

SOURCE: <https://teachingamericanhistory.org/document/popular-government/>

Taft and Roosevelt drifted apart while Roosevelt was out of the country; when Roosevelt returned, the two men could not make amends. Roosevelt first began expressing disappointment in Taft, and disappointment soon became outright criticism. Yet Roosevelt gave no hint he would challenge Taft for the Republican nomination until Wisconsin senator La Follette announced a presidential run as a Republican. Roosevelt then moved to position himself for a run as well. When Taft won the nomination at the Republican National Convention, Roosevelt bolted the party and joined the Progressive Party. With the Republican Party now split, Taft realized he had little hope of winning the election. Taft spent as much time on the golf course as he did campaigning, and the race quickly came down to Wilson versus Roosevelt. After losing reelection, Taft accepted an offer to become Kent Professor of Law and Legal History at Yale Law School. There he wrote extensively and gave several notable lectures. He continued his tenure at Yale until President Harding made him Chief Justice of the United States, a position he held until just before his death in 1930.

Taft had a visceral distaste for campaigning and politics. Although the party bosses handed him the nomination in 1912, he detested the world of parties and party politics. Nevertheless, Taft spoke out about Progressive Party reforms and considered them to be worse than the disease. In particular, he took issue with the direct primary and believed it to be a counterfeit way of securing a successful party nomination. Primaries attracted voters who were not really wedded to particular candidates and gave advantage to men of wealth and power over those actually qualified for office. In some states, members of the opposition party could vote in a party's primary, thus undermining the results by opposition party members voting for poorly qualified candidates. None of this, according to Taft, represented a substantial improvement over the existing convention system.

—Eric C. Sands

There is one other proposed reform that has been associated with the new methods of initiative, referendum and recall, though not necessarily involving them or involved in them. I mean the direct primary. That is a method of selecting the party candidates to be voted for in the election by a preliminary election of the members of the party. It is also usual and necessary to have a declaration of party principles so that the whole electorate may know what may be expected if the party succeeds in electing its candidates and controls the legislature and the executive. The direct primary itself cannot furnish this, and it is usually accompanied by some plan for securing such a declaration either from a party committee or from a conference of candidates. The same evils which have prompted a resort to such radical methods as the initiative, the referendum and the recall, have also stimulated a wish to change the old methods of party government, of the selection of party candidates, and the declaration of party principles.

... But to return to the party primary. A party is a voluntary organization, and originally the natural theory was that the members of the party should be left to themselves to determine how their party representatives were to be selected and their party principles were to be formulated; but the abuses to which completely voluntary



TEACHING AMERICAN HISTORY

organizations of this kind led, brought about a change of view as to the function of the government with reference to such party procedure.

... The reports leave no doubt whatever, indeed the statistics of the elections frequently conclusively confirm the conclusion, that in State and other primaries, thousands and tens of thousands of Democrats vote at Republican primaries, and vice versa. It often happens that in one party, a primary issue, like the selection of a candidate, is settled in advance by general agreement as to who the candidate shall be or what the principle shall be. In such a case the voters of that party feel entirely free to go into the primaries of the other party, and sometimes, with malice aforethought, to vote for the candidate in that party whom it will be most easy for the candidate of their own party to defeat at the general election.

Of course, this is all wrong. This is not taking the voice of the party. It is taking the voice of men who are not interested that the party should succeed, and who do not intend to be genuine supporters of the men whom they put upon the party ticket.

... It seems to have been the opinion in the Courts of some States that in carrying on an election of this sort, no citizen, whatever his party, could be deprived of the right to vote in either primary. Such a construction may turn upon peculiar language in a state constitution, but the result is so absurd in the provision for a party primary that it cannot for a moment be sustained on general principles and is utterly at war with fairness and honesty in party control.

Until some method has been devised successfully to prevent this fraud I have been describing, we cannot be said to have a successfully primary law. Of course, it is helpful to have party primaries of all parties on the same day. In this way, if there is a real controversy in all parties, the voters are likely to divide themselves according to their real and sincere party affiliations, because one can only vote in one primary; but the case of a lively fight in one party and none in another is so frequent that the difficulty I have suggested is often a real one.

The first impulse, and a proper one, of the honest legislator, in dealing with this subject, is to give all the members of the party an equal voice in the selection of candidates and in the declaration of party principles. Therefore all the rules which limit the caucus to the active few, or which exclude regular members of the party, have been properly abolished under such primary statutes, and provision is made for every such member to cast his ballot.

The question upon which opinions differ vitally is whether these electors of the party shall cast their ballots directly for their candidates to be run at the general election, or whether they shall select delegates to local conventions, the candidates to be selected in the local conventions. The modern tendency is toward the direct selection of candidates by the party electors themselves, without the intervention of a convention. I am inclined to think that for a time at least this elimination of the party convention in local politics is a good thing.



TEACHING AMERICAN HISTORY

Theoretically the convention would be better for reasons which can be very shortly stated. If all the electors, divided into wards and precincts, could select honest and intelligent delegates to represent them in a convention, and these delegates were to give their best thought and disinterested effort to the selection of candidates, I have no doubt that the candidates selected would be better for the party and better for the people than the candidates selected directly at a primary. And this is because the delegates can better inform themselves as to the qualifications of the party candidates than can the people at large. And, secondly, the delegates of a party have a sense of responsibility in selecting the party candidates to secure the support of the people at the general election which is utterly absent in the votes which are cast by the electors of the party at the direct primary polls. There the party electors vote for the men who have been brought favorably to their attention by the newspapers and other means of publicity which the candidates themselves are able to adopt and use. They cast their votes very much as the electors at a general election cast their votes, for the men whom they like, or the men whom they know, and frequently without much knowledge or preference at all. Whereas, in a convention, the leaders and the delegates have the keenest care with respect to what is going to happen at the general election.

In the selection of State and national candidates, this becomes a very important matter. One tendency in a direct election of candidates in a national party will be to select a popular partisan, while that of a convention system will be to take a more moderate man whose name will appeal to the independent voter. Thus a primary election in 1860 would certainly have nominated Seward, not Lincoln; in 1876 would have nominated Blaine, not Hayes.

A third objection to the direct election of candidates by the people is the obvious advantage which the men with wealth and of activity and of little modesty, but of great ambition to be candidates, without real qualification for office, have over the men who, having qualifications for office, are either without means or refuse to spend money for such a purpose, and are indisposed to press their own fitness upon the voters. In other words, the direct election of candidates very much reduces the probability that the office will seek the man.

... The direct primary puts a premium on self-seeking of an office. After men are nominated as party candidates, the party is behind them, and can elect them even though they modestly refrain from exploiting themselves. But in the stage previous to this, when the candidates are to be selected at a direct primary for a party, modest but qualified men are never selected. This substantially lessens the number of available candidates capable by reason of their intelligence and experience of filling the offices well.

I have thus stated three serious objections to the direct election of candidates by the people for local offices and for representatives in Congress and the legislature, and yet I do not think that they are sufficient to overcome the present necessity of avoiding the evils that have arisen from the delegate and convention systems so far as these local and district officers are concerned. The delegates selected for the local convention are many of them usually not of a character to resist the blandishments and the corrupt means which will in such cases be used by bosses



TEACHING AMERICAN HISTORY

and the principals of bosses. The local convention of local delegates offers such a rich opportunity for manipulation of those who are corruptible,—things are done so quickly by committees of credentials, and on resolutions,—that the opportunity of the unscrupulous boss in such a convention is very great. I sympathize, therefore, with the movement to abolish the local convention, at least until the exercise of the direct primary shall have broken up the local machines and shall have given an opportunity to the electors of the party, even with the disadvantage of inadequate information, to express their will.



SUPPLEMENTARY READING 1: Alexander Hamilton to John Jay | May 7, 1800

SOURCE: <https://founders.archives.gov/documents/Hamilton/01-24-02-0378>

Dear Sir

You have been informed of the loss of our Election in this City. It is also known that we have been unfortunate throughout Long Island & in West Chester. According to the Returns hitherto, it is too probable that we lose our Senators for this District.

The moral certainty therefore is that there will be an Anti-foederal Majority in the Ensuing Legislature, and this very high probability is that this will bring Jefferson into the Chief Magistracy; unless it be prevented by the measure which I shall now submit to your consideration, namely the immediate calling together of the existing Legislature.

I am aware that there are weighty objections to the measure; but the reasons for it appear to me to outweigh the objections. And in times like these in which we live, it will not do to be overscrupulous. It is easy to sacrifice the substantial interests of society by a strict adherence to ordinary rules.

In observing this, I shall not be supposed to mean that any thing ought to be done which integrity will forbid—but merely that the scruples of delicacy and propriety, as relative to a common course of things, ought to yield to the extraordinary nature of the crisis. They ought not to hinder the taking of a legal and constitutional step, to prevent an Atheist in Religion and a Fanatic in politics from getting possession of the helm of the State.

You Sir know in a great degree the Antifoederal party, but I fear that you do not know them as well as I do. Tis a composition indeed of very incongruous materials but all tending to mischief—some of them to the overthrow of the Government by stripping it of its due energies others of them to a Revolution after the manner of Buonaparte. I speak from indubitable facts, not from conjectures & inferences.

In proportion as the true character of this party is understood is the force of the considerations which urge to every effort to disappoint it. And it seems to me that there is a very solemn obligation to employ the means in our power.

The calling of the Legislature will have for object the choosing of Electors by the people in Districts. This (as Pennsylvania will do nothing) will insure a Majority of votes in the U States for Foederal Candidates.

The measure will not fail to be approved by all the Foederal Party; while it will no doubt be condemned by the opposite. As to its intrinsic nature it is justified by unequivocal reasons for public safety



TEACHING AMERICAN HISTORY

If done the motive ought to be frankly avowed. In your communication to the Legislature they ought to be told that Temporary circumstances had rendered it probable that without their interposition the executive authority of the General Government would be transferred to hands hostile to the system heretofore pursued with so much success and dangerous to the peace happiness and order of the Country—that under this impression from facts convincing to your own mind you had thought it your duty to give the existing Legislature an opportunity of deliberating whether it would not be proper to interpose and endeavour to prevent so great an evil by referring the choice of Electors to the People distributed into Districts.

In weighing this suggestion you will doubtless bear in mind that Popular Governments must certainly be overturned & while they endure prove engines of mischief—if one party will call to its aid all the resources which Vice can give and if the other, however pressing the emergency, confines itself within all the ordinary forms of delicacy and decorum.

The legislature can be brought together in three weeks. So that there will be full time for the objects; but none ought to be lost.

Think well my Dear Sir of this proposition. Appreciate the extreme danger of the Crisis; and I am unusually mistaken in my view of the matter, if you do not see it right and expedient to adopt the measure.

Respectfully & Affecty Yours, Alexander Hamilton



SUPPLEMENTARY READING 2: Mandate for Reform on Party Structure and Delegate Selection | September 22, 1971

SOURCE: <https://teachingamericanhistory.org/document/mandate-for-reform-on-party-structure-and-delegate-selection/>

The 1968 presidential election was a disaster for the Democrats, largely as a result of their nomination process. In an unusual turn of events, Senator Hubert H. Humphrey won the nomination without having entered any of the primaries. At the convention, Humphrey garnered all his support from unpledged delegates (delegates who were not directed to vote for a particular candidate through the primary process). The result of this disregard for the party's popular choice was a convention that ended in disarray and a badly divided Democratic Party. Student groups protested the convention, resulting in violent clashes in the streets with police.

To prevent the events of 1968 from happening again, the Democrats established the Commission on Party Structure and Delegate Selection, which came to be known informally as the McGovern-Fraser Commission. The purpose of the commission was to design rules intended to broaden participation in the Democratic primary process. In particular, the new rules emphasized the need for broader representation of traditionally minority groups and other groups that had been shut out of the convention process. The commission eventually met seventeen times between 1969 and 1972 and ultimately produced a report called "Mandate for Reform." The rules set by the commission would go into effect for the 1972 primary season.

—Eric C. Sands

Part II—The Guidelines

A–1 Discrimination on the basis of race, color, creed, or national origin

The 1964 Democratic National Convention adopted a resolution which conditioned the seating of delegations at future conventions on the assurance that discrimination in any State Party affairs on the grounds of race, color, creed or national origin did not occur.... In 1966, the Special Equal Rights Committee, which had been created in 1964, adopted six...antidiscrimination standards—designated as the “six basic elements”—for the State Parties to meet....

These actions demonstrate the intention of the Democratic Party to ensure a full opportunity for all minority group members to participate in the delegate selection process....

A–2 Discrimination on the basis of age or sex

The Commission believes that discrimination on the grounds of age or sex is inconsistent with full and meaningful opportunity to participate in the delegate selection process. Therefore, the Commission requires State Parties to eliminate all vestiges of discrimination on these grounds. Furthermore, the Commission requires State Parties to overcome the effects of past discrimination by affirmative steps to encourage representation on the national



delegation of young people ... and women in reasonable relationship to their presence in the population of the State....

A-5 Existence of party rules

In order for rank-and-file Democrats to have a full and meaningful opportunity to participate in the delegate selection process, they must have access to the substantive and procedural rules which govern the process. In some States the process is not regulated by law or rule, but by resolution of the State Committee and by tradition. In other States, the rules exist, but generally are inaccessible. In still others, rules and laws regulate only the formal aspects of the selection process (e.g., date and place of the State convention) and leave to Party resolution or tradition the more substantive matters (e.g., intrastate apportionment of votes; rotation of alternates; nomination of delegates). The Commission believes that any of these arrangements is inconsistent with the spirit of the Call in that they permit excessive discretion on the part of Party officials, which may be used to deny or limit full and meaningful opportunity to participate. Therefore, the Commission requires State Parties to adopt and make available readily accessible statewide Party rules and statutes which prescribe the State's delegate selection process with sufficient details and clarity....

B-2 Clarity of purpose

An opportunity for full participation in the delegate selection process is not meaningful unless each Party member can clearly express his preference for candidates for delegates to the National Convention, or for those who will select such delegates. In many States, a Party member who wishes to affect the selection of the delegates must do so by voting for delegates or Party officials who will engage in many activities unrelated to the delegate selection process. Whenever other Party business is mixed, without differentiation, with the delegate selection process, the Commission requires State Parties to make it clear to voters how they are participating in a process that will nominate their Party's candidate for President. Furthermore, in States which employ a convention or committee system; the Commission requires State Parties to clearly designate the delegate selection procedures as distinct from other Party business.

B-6 Adequate representation of minority views on presidential candidates at each stage in the delegate selection process

The Commission believes that a full and meaningful opportunity to participate in the delegate selection process is precluded unless the presidential preference of each Democrat is fairly represented at all levels of the process. Therefore, the Commission urges each State Party to adopt procedures which will provide fair representation of minority views on presidential candidates and recommends that the 1972 Convention adopt a rule requiring State Parties to provide for the representation of minority views to the highest level of the nominating process. The Commission believes that there are at least two different methods by which a State Party can provide for such representation. First, in at-large elections it can divide delegate votes among presidential candidates in proportion



TEACHING AMERICAN HISTORY

to their demonstrated strength. Second, it can choose delegates from fairly apportioned districts no larger than congressional districts.

C-4 Premature delegate selection (timeliness)

The 1968 Convention adopted language adding to the Call to the 1972 Convention the requirement that the delegate selection process much begin within the calendar year of the Convention. In many States, Governors, State Chairmen, State, district and county committees who are chosen before the calendar year of the Convention, select—or choose agents to select—the delegates. These practices are inconsistent with the Call. The Commission believes that the 1968 Convention intended to prohibit any untimely procedures which have any direct bearing on the process by which National Convention delegates are selected. The process by which delegates are nominated is such a procedure. Therefore, the Commission requires State Parties to prohibit any practices by which official elected or appointed before the calendar year choose nominating committees or propose or endorse a slate of delegates— even when the possibility for a challenge to such slate or committee is provided. When State law controls, the Commission requires State Parties to make all feasible efforts to repeal, amend, or modify such laws to accomplish the stated purposes.