

Correspondence – Democratic Planning Group

Folder Citation: Collection: Records of the 1976 Campaign Committee to Elect Jimmy Carter;
Series: Noel Sterrett Subject File; Folder: Correspondence – Democratic Planning Group;
Container 77

To See Complete Finding Aid:

http://www.jimmycarterlibrary.gov/library/findingaids/Carter-Mondale%20Campaign_1976.pdf

DPG 11/1/74

"Advice to Democrats" from Lawrence F. O'Brien NY Times, 10/19/74

"Although party reform has not been a bed of roses for the Democrats, the Republican party has failed to engage in a comparable effort to achieve openness and to democratize its procedures. To date, there is no discernible element of reform within the Republican party and, in the political climate of Watergate, to maintain an attitude of politics-as-usual is to court disaster...

"As a result of the (Democratic) party's new nominating procedures, we are now reasonably assured that our national convention will be truly democratic. I am inclined to believe that its very openness will be extremely helpful in achieving the unity vital to success in 1976."

"The Parties May Be Over" by David Broder Washington Post, 10/74

"...a series of studies by Jack Dennis, a political science professor at the University of Wisconsin, indicates...the erosion of popular support for the two-party system...

"...three-fourths or more of the Wisconsin residents agreed that 'the parties do more to confuse the issues than to provide a clear choice on the issues'... four out of five Wisconsin voters agreed that 'more often than not, the political parties create conflicts where none really exist'...

"...When asked in 1964 if they believed 'it would be better if, in all elections, we put no party labels on the ballot,' 67% of Wisconsin voters disagreed...this year only 38% favor keeping party labels on the ballot.

" (Dennis concludes:) "A mighty effort will be required to reestablish the parties to the modicum of confidence and commitment they enjoyed even a decade ago..."

Anne Armstrong, Counselor to the President --- July 16, 1974:

"Right now, they (the Democrats) have a great big Band-Aid holding them together --- Watergate. When it gets ripped off, watch out."

10/9/74

Democrats' Dilemma

IN THE NATION

By Tom Wicker

Representatives of the more liberal elements in the Democratic party made a show of strength last week in Washington, just as the party goes into a period of crunch as to what its new Charter ought to say about "affirmative action" and "proportional representation" in delegate selection.

As numerous participants in the meetings have described them, they were important not least for giving the liberals themselves a new sense of identity and cohesiveness. Those present, for example, fell roughly into four groups which have not always been in close touch:

¶Substantial contributors and money-raisers—men like Harold Wilens, Stanley Sheinbaum, Miles Rubin and Stewart Mott, who in the past have found millions of dollars for liberal and reform candidates.

¶Relatively youthful party activists and organizers, many of whom came into politics with Eugene McCarthy or Robert Kennedy in 1968, or George McGovern in 1972—numerous young Democrats like Representative Yvonne Burke of California, Alan Baron of the Democratic Planning Group, and Gene Pokorny, who managed Mr. McGovern's breakthrough victory in the 1972 Wisconsin primary.

¶A somewhat older group of liberal veterans—Joseph Rauh and Leon Shull of Americans for Democratic Action, Basil Paterson of New York, a vice chairman of the Democratic National Committee, and former Gov. Terry Sanford of North Carolina.

¶Representatives of an important group of "non-Barkan" labor unions (Al Barkan is director of the political action arm of the A.F.L.-C.I.O. and both he and that organization are powerful forces among "regular" Democrats). Among the "non-Barkan" unions present were the Machinists, the Auto Workers, the State, County and Municipal Workers, the Communications Workers and the Graphic Arts Union.

One immediate result of the liberal gathering was the undertaking of an organizational effort in all fifty states to win maximum support for liberal positions at the "mid-term" Democratic convention in Kansas City in December. Mr. Baron, who is managing that effort, hopes to line up "one or two" people in each state to provide a central pool of information on that state's delegates to the Kansas City convention, so that the "non-Barkan" unions and other liberal groups—women's organizations, black

and Chicano activists, and the like—can follow up with an "educational" effort.

A major presentation of the liberal point of view on party issues also is planned for the Democratic Governors' Conference at Hilton Head, S. C., on Nov. 16. Mr. Baron, for one, thinks the governors can have a major impact on the Kansas City convention.

There are two major issues toward which this activity is directed. Probably the most important and the one with the greatest emotional and symbolic content is Article Ten of the proposed Democratic Party Charter. Article Ten would put into the Charter—a sort of party constitution—language reflecting compromise rules worked out by the so-called Mikulski Commission for "affirmative action" in delegate selection. These rules, later approved for the 1976 convention by the National Committee, require a positive showing that affirmative action has been taken to "increase participation" of women, young people and minority groups. Regulars balked at including the Mikulski language in the continuing Charter of the party; as a result, two regular and two liberal alternatives to Article Ten have been proposed, the regulars trying to soften the requirement and the liberals to stiffen it.

The other major issue is whether to include in the Charter the mandate of the 1972 convention eliminating the unit rule at all levels and insuring proportional representation. Instead, Mr. Barkan and other regulars want to put this language in the party by-laws, where it could be more easily changed.

These are not minor or hair-splitting issues, although the actual differences in proposed language and procedures may be less than the real emotions they have aroused on both sides. "Black leaders of the Democratic National Committee" have already issued a statement threatening a boycott of the mid-term conference if they are forced to compromise further on affirmative action. Mr. Baron and other liberals have said that, for them, the Mikulski rules are "the bottom line."

Ostensibly, these disputes are about the continuing rules of the party and have nothing to do with 1976, when the Mikulski rules and the 1972 convention mandate will prevail. But unless some position satisfactory to all sides can be worked out, there is little hope for the kind of party unity required for a Democratic victory in 1976. Which is the reason Chairman Robert Strauss has scheduled a meeting Nov. 7 to try to avoid what one Democrat called an "either-or choice between Barkan and the blacks."

DEMOCRATIC PLANNING GROUP

An information/communications center for progressive Democrats.

Suite 1109, 1025 Vermont Ave. NW, Washington, D. C. 20005 (202)347-3413

#25 November 1, 1974

KANSAS CITY: Building Consensus

Conversations with political leaders across the country indicate a growing consensus in support of the Sanford Charter - plus rejection of the four alternatives in Article 10 (Full Participation) and inclusion instead of the Mikulski Commission rule on affirmative action (or the very similar Article 10 from the March Draft Charter).

The Mikulski rule represents a negotiated settlement of the controversial quota question. It passed the Mikulski Commission unanimously and has been ratified by the full Democratic National Committee for 1976. The rule bans quotas, requires affirmative action in delegate selection and all party affairs, with the goal of encouraging participation as indicated by presence in the Democratic electorate.

DPG's delegate analysis points to these same results. Our projection is that a minimum of 34% of the delegates to Kansas City do not identify themselves with either the "new politics" or "old guard" wing of the party, and are likely to shift back and forth, depending on the issue at stake.

Right now, most of these delegates appear likely to vote with the "regulars" to reject "liberal" minority reports on structural/organizational issues, such as mandatory midterm conferences...and to vote with the "reformers" to reject "conservative" minority reports to gut affirmative action and roll back delegate selection guarantees. With the remaining 66% of the delegates about evenly divided, a shifting majority of 2:1 seems likely to reject most minority reports and adopt the Sanford + Mikulski Charter.

The key figures in this "center" group, among others:

Governors (or potential Governors) Anderson of Minnesota, Carey of New York, Gilligan of Ohio, Askew of Florida, Carter of Georgia, Shapp of Pa. State Chairmen Dugan of New Jersey, Vance of Alabama, Flaherty of Massachusetts

Union leaders Leonard Woodcock and Douglas Fraser of the United Auto Workers (dominant in Michigan); Arnold Miller of the United Mineworkers (key to West Virginia), as well as those from other progressive unions, such as Communications Workers; Machinists; State, County, Municipal Employees; Oil, Chemical, Atomic Workers; Graphic Arts.

Of course, no one knows for certain exactly what form charter issues will take. With many delegates still undecided, a Strauss-called meeting of Charter commissioners set for November 7th, and the Democratic Governors Conference scheduled to discuss the Charter on 11/17, much remains to be seen.

DELEGATES: "The Count"

It is nearly impossible to take a hard count of Kansas City delegates.

First, labels are misleading:

A regular in Iowa or Wisconsin would be a reformer in Kansas or Oklahoma; a moderate in Minnesota or California would be a liberal in Texas or Nevada.

Second, labels are a poor guide to Charter issues:

Some of the delegates perceived as most "liberal" oppose midterm conferences and a strong party structure; some "conservatives" vigorously fight winner-take-all.

Nevertheless, there are "counts." Strauss aide Mark Segal projects that a "good majority" of the delegates will be "loyal to the Chairman." And just where is the Chairman? On the same day, he told a Black leader that "I'm with you 100%" and a Meany labor man "not to worry."

The Coalition for a Democratic Majority (CDM) has also prepared and publicized delegate counts. CDM was organized during the '72 campaign by Meany labor operatives, Democrats for Nixon, Jackson supporters. Its chief staffers (Penn Kemble, Josh Muravchik) are from the part of the Socialist movement which contends that liberal/reform Democrats are dominated by agents of the "Communist conspiracy." Of course, many CDM members do not hold this view. And a number of members, such as Pat Harris, resigned in response to CDM's leadership.

CDM identifies 39% of the delegates as New Politics, a group including New York's Bella Abzug and Shirley Chisholm, Maine's (Gubernatorial nominee and former Muskie Campaign Manager) George Mitchell, North Carolina's (former Governor and Charter Commission Chairman) Terry Sanford, Alabama's (State Chairman and President of the Association of Democratic State Chairmen) Robert Vance.

CDM places all of the above outside of the party's Mainstream, 48%, which includes Texas Gov. Dolph Briscoe (who favors having no charter at all) and New York's Hugh Carey (who supports midterm conferences).

That leaves 11% "swing" delegates and 2% Wallace backers.

As noted on page 1, DPG's own analysis is that at least 34% of the delegates will be in the middle --- not self-identifying with either the "new politics" or the "old guard." The other two-thirds are about equally divided between (1) liberal, minority, women, activists perceived to be to the "left" of the "establishment" and (2) the pre-1968 party establishment: Meany labor, urban organizations, conservatives.

DELEGATES (continued)

The following is a rough regional breakdown of this pattern:

SOUTH: Wallace backers won only about 10% - 2/3 of Alabama, 1/4 of Louisiana, 5% of Texas, and little elsewhere. Conservatives, including South Carolina's Don Fowler, Texas' Briscoe, Mississippi's Waller, are about 35%. Another 35% are identified with more moderate leaders, such as Georgia's Carter, Florida's Askew, North Carolina's Sanford. The remaining 20% are identified as liberals, with a major share of these black.

CENTRAL: About 35% are identified with Meany-labor or old-line organizations; most of these delegates are from Illinois, Indiana, Missouri, Kansas, Ohio. Another 30% are liberals responsive to such officeholders as Minnesota's Anderson, Ohio's Gilligan, Missouri's Eagleton, Indiana's Bayh, and the progressive unions. Some 35% are identified as liberal activists; this group is particularly strong in the upper plains, Iowa, Minnesota, Wisconsin.

EAST: 25%, Meany-labor or old line; many from city organizations in New York, Pennsylvania, New Jersey. 35% likely to follow the lead of such officeholders as New York's Carey, Pennsylvania's Shapp, New Jersey's Byrne. Another 40% includes "reformers" from New York, New Jersey, Massachusetts, Pennsylvania, and independent-liberals, many from New England.

WEST: California (with half region's delegates) has not yet selected. Of the other half, about 35% are conservative/regular (including the Jackson 2/3 of Washington, and Hawaii); 25% centrist/liberal (scattered); and some 40% liberal/activist (particularly strong in Utah, New Mexico, Colorado, Oregon).

It should be reiterated that the above is only a general guide; that the various "labels" are only a rough indication of where individuals stand.

CREDENTIALS: The Illinois Challenge

When Illinois' Congressional Districts caucused to elect Delegates to Kansas City, 70 men - and only 7 women - were selected. So it was expected that the party leadership would act to provide some balance in the 17 to be chosen at large.

Not on your life. The State Chairman prepared, presented, and distributed a slate of 15 men and 2 women. Naturally, it passed the state "convention," composed of delegates appointed by the State Committee (legal for 74, but not for 76). Asked if it would not have been "easier" to name five or six "Daley women" to the slate, and avoid controversy, the State Chairman, John Toohey, replied that "I've been in politics 20 years, and I've never done things the easy way."

A challenge to the slate filed by the Women's Caucus failed, but even Bob Strauss and Caroline Wilkins voted to censure the Illinois party leadership for their lack of sensitivity. That, of course, was no victory. But the resulting political awareness of Illinois women certainly was.

THE RULES

After much negotiation, the DNC adopted rules for Kansas City which center power on a 52-member Rules Committee, consisting of the Executive Committees of the Charter Commission and DNC. A number of DNC members objected to the unelected body (on which some 19 states are not represented), but the concept won approval because the body does fairly reflect the various constituencies within the party and the members are experienced on charter issues and negotiations. To get on the floor, minority reports will need 40% of the Rules Committee or 200 delegates from 5+ states, with no more than 50 per state.

NOTICE...

On FRIDAY, NOVEMBER 15th, a group of Charter Commission members will host a discussion of the issues...for Kansas City delegates/alternates and other interested Democrats...at WASHINGTON, D.C.'s SHERATON PARK HOTEL from 9:30 a.m. until 5:00 p.m. There is no fee; there will be a lunch break.

HOSTS include: Rep. Don Fraser (Minn.), Rep. Yvonne Brathwaite Burke (Calif), Sen. Robert Garcia (NY), Jean Westwood (Utah), Joe Farmer (Nebr), Mildred Jeffrey (Mich.), Ann Wexler (Conn.), Matt Reese (DC), Barbara Morgan (DC), Bill Welsh (DC), Neal Staebler (Mich), Pat Derian (Miss)

Participants will be briefed by spokesmen for various viewpoints, including, in addition to the above, DNC Executive Director Bob Keefe, AFL-CIO staffer Jake Clayman, Congressman Tom Foley, South Carolina Chairman Don Fowler.

THE DEMOCRATIC PLANNING GROUP provides information and coordinates planning for liberal Democrats involved in party affairs. DPG's Board includes, among others,

- Rep. William Clay of Missouri, Secretary of the Congressional Black Caucus
- Joe Bernal of Texas, Chairman of the DNC Latino Caucus
- Joe Rauh of Washington, D. C., former Nat'l. Chmn. of ADA
- Angela Cabrera of New York, Puerto Rican community leader
- Al Gropiron of Colorado, President of the Oil, Chemical, Atomic Workers Union and Vice-President, AFL-CIO
- Madeleine Russell of California, Democratic National Com'woman

DEMOCRATIC PLANNING GROUP
Alan Baron, Director
Labor Donated

YOUR CONTRIBUTIONS make this newsletter possible: Subscription, \$10 or more

DEMOCRATIC PLANNING GROUP

An information/communications center for progressive Democrats.

Suite 1109, 1025 Vermont Ave. NW, Washington, D. C. 20005 (202) 347-3413

#26 December 1, 1974

AFFIRMATIVE ACTION: Governors Back Mikulski

The Democratic Governors Conference - meeting at Hilton Head, South Carolina, on November 18th - endorsed adoption of the Mikulski Commission Rule 18, instead of any of the four Charter alternatives, as Article 10 of the Charter.

This decision to join with minority, women, liberal, and moderate activists in support of Mikulski was somewhat of a surprise.

It had been expected that the Governors would either adopt no recommendation on specific language - or would endorse a draft prepared by Robert Strauss and already agreed upon by George Meany.

The Strauss/Meany language geared affirmative action to "all Democrats," while Mikulski aims at "all Democrats, with particular concern for minorities, women, young people, and Native Americans."

The Strauss/Meany language bans "the imposition of quotas." Mikulski bans "the party's imposition of mandatory quotas."

Ohio Governor John Gilligan, a Mikulski drafter, led the battle. Gilligan argued that there is a "tremendous sensitivity to nuances" of the Mikulski language and that "changing even a semi-colon" could "open a Pandora's box," causing the Kansas City Conference to "tear ourselves to shreds."

Gilligan was supported by Idaho's Cecil Andrus, who urged the Governors to rely on "18 months of careful work" by commissioners; Georgia Governor Jimmy Carter, who expressed the conviction that Mikulski represented a negotiated settlement to which all sides should adhere; Florida's Reuben Askew; Wisconsin's Pat Lucey; and Massachusetts' Gov-elect Michael Dukakis, who made the motion for endorsement.

A key figure in the discussion was DNC Vice-Chairman Basil Paterson. Paterson made clear that minorities and women would not accept further dilution of the reforms.

Also key in the decision was the Chairman of the Democratic Governors: Wendell Anderson of Minnesota. Anderson acted to guarantee that Governors received various viewpoints - not just one, as has been the case in some past issues.

In the DPG's November letter, it was predicted that moderates and liberals would enact Mikulski at Kansas City with a 2:1 majority. The Hilton Head decision raises that estimate to 3:1.

Nevertheless, tough issues - including the basic delegate selection reforms in Charter Article 2 and the role of the Judicial Council - remain undetermined.

LABOR: Meany Steps In

During the past two years, AFL-CIO policy concerning Democratic Party rules has, most usually, been made by COPE Director Al Barkan, a committed, adamant ideologue determined to purge the "kooks," "crazies," and "McGovernites" from the party.

Last month, however, several liberal labor leaders took the subject of the Charter Conference directly to George Meany --- and urged him to review Barkan's strategy. Meany has no love for the left; but he is more of a politician - and less committed to "reforming" the Democrats - than Barkan.

Meany ordered a review of labor's policy...which eventually led to acceptance of the Strauss draft noted on page 1. Meany hoped to sell this position to all of labor at a meeting called for Monday, November 18. Simultaneously, Strauss was to win the Governors' approval of the draft. The rest of the party would then be presented with a *fait accompli*.

As noted, the Governor did not go along. And neither did the progressive unions. Six union leaders (of 14) argued that labor could not develop a "union compromise" without the participation of minorities, women, and other elements of the party. These AFL-CIO unions took the same position in the following letter to the Washington Post (11/19), written in response to a Strauss-emanated Evans and Novak column asserting that progressive unions were going to reunite with Barkan and desert their liberal allies.

Labor Unity

Evans and Novak are dead wrong in their assessment of the disagreement we have with some other individuals in the AFL-CIO over the charter for the Democratic Party going into its December convention in Kansas City.

As political representatives of our respective unions, we all want a unified labor movement. That kind of unity pays off for our members and makes it easier for us to work within the party for programs that serve the needs of working families.

But the labor movement does not own the Democratic Party. The party draws its strength from its ability to command the loyalty of organized and unorganized workers, minority groups, farmers, consumers and dozens of other interest groups. A unified labor

position that is in conflict with these other groups, particularly the black community, can only be counterproductive for the party and the country.

Far from being hung up on quotas, we insist that there are several ways to insure maximum participation in party affairs by Americans from all walks of life. But decisions of such importance have to be made with the involvement of all the affected groups, and not merely by the leadership of the AFL-CIO.

What Evans and Novak kiss off as conflict of personalities is much, much more than that. The equation we're searching for is one that will bring a winning combination together in Kansas City, to begin the march toward regaining the White House for the Democratic Party in 1976. We think the other AFL-CIO leaders want that, too.

William B. Welsh,

Assistant to the President for Legislation
and Political Education, American
Federation of State, County
and Municipal Employees.

Edward V. Donahue,

Vice President, Graphic Arts
International Union, AFL-CIO.

Mikel K. Miller,

Assistant to the President, Communications
Workers of America, AFL-CIO.

William J. Holater,

Director, Machinist Non-Partisan League,
International Association of Machinists
and Aerospace Workers, AFL-CIO.

Anthony Mazzocchi,

Citizenship/Legislative Director, Oil,
Chemical and Atomic Workers
International Union, AFL-CIO

William S. Gary,

Assistant to the President for Legislation,
International Union of Electrical, Radio
and Machine Workers, AFL-CIO.

Washington.

FROM THE STATES:

California: This year, no one can claim to have been caught off guard. The nation's largest (156) delegation, was also nearly its latest (selected 11/9) and certainly the most hotly contested.

COPE and allies made their greatest effort here: staffers from DC and California were shifted from get-out-the-vote work to the Charter battle; the million plus circulation union newspapers warned of takeovers by "McGovernites" and "environmentalists." Direct mail was utilized in key districts, as were chartered busses and phone banks. Liberals, on the other hand, relied on one full time staffer, a budget of under \$4,500.

Results: liberals won 60% of delegates; conservatives/COPE, 20%. Remaining 20% is in the middle, includes delegates from progressive unions.

At-large selections broke same way. Controversy developed when Sigmund Arywitz, head of the LA County Federation of Labor, was defeated by Felicia Bragg, a young black woman supported by the powerful Hotel/Restaurarnt Employees union and others. Key issue: Arywitz' taping of Radio commercials endorsing the GOP candidate for Attorney General and blasting the Democratic nominee.

New York: State Chairman Joe Crangle will, reportedly, be replaced by Bronx Democratic leader Patrick Cunningham, a close ally of Gov. Carey and friend of Bob Strauss. Cunningham prepared the at-large delegate slate of 8 women and 18 men which drew the fire of Lt. Gov. elect Mary Anne Krupsak, Rep. Abzug, and others.

Pennsylvania: The State Committee selected 34 delegates (with 1/2 vote each) to fill 17 at-large positions. When it was clear the Compliance Committee would not approve the scheme, State Chair Harvey Theiman and Robert Strauss "persuaded" half the group to resign.

Texas: A challenge to the state's at-large slate (nominations from the floor were not recognized at the state convention) was sustained by the Compliance Committee. A committee (2 liberals, 1 conservative) will select alternates to replace absent delegates - giving preference to minority group members.

Arizona, Montana joined most other western states in electing progressive delegations to Kansas City.

Wisconsin: Liberal activist Midge Miller, a State Representative from Madison, will serve as Co-Chairperson of the state's KC delegation - with Gov. Pat Lucey.

Missouri: New state Chair, Jim Spain, was one of three delegates to vote for McCarthy in 1968. Spain represents shift in party leadership from former Gov. Warren Hearnes to Sen. Eagleton.

Georgia: Gov.-elect Busbee calls for state party reform; advocated staggering party officers and Governor terms to increase party permanence.

QUOTAS?

Labor leader Jake Clayman spent 45 minutes voicing to Democratic Governors the AFL-CIO's firm opposition to "quotas." In response, Gov. Gilligan told Clayman that, of course, the Gobs were all against quotas. But Gilligan further noted what had happened in Ohio this year: after the state committee's initial selection of at-large delegates was made, the UAW had won three positions, and the AFL-CIO, none. Naturally, the AFL-CIO was not happy about that - so there was some negotiating and some consulting and some dealing. The final slate included 3 UAW and 3 AFL-CIO. Precisely. But no quotas.

THE PARTIES

Evidence of the weakening...even disintegration...of political parties is abundant. Fear of a strong charter is common not only among coservatives and states-righters, but also many liberals. In the November 14th Wall Street Journal, respected columnist Alan L. Otten noted some of the "minuses" of this trend:

"A few candidates may be elected on program, but many more will likely win on looks, TV style, or catchy sloganeering. Efforts to develop coherent party programs will be even less useful than they are now. Having run and won at a distance from party, candidates will keep that distance in office. ignoring party postures and demands. Relying on their ability to manipulate the mass media, many won't try to deliver even on their own campaign commitments.

"Pressure groups will have more influence than ever. Narrow splinter parties, concentrating on one or two highly emotional issues, will complicate legislative efforts. Presidents and legislative leaders will find it almost impossible to enact their programs...the result can only be the continuing disillusionment of the electorate, as it encounters even greater difficulty in fixing responsibility..."

KANSAS CITY

The DEMOCRATIC PLANNING GROUP offices at The President Hotel will open noon Monday, December 2nd. AMERICANS FOR DEMOCRATIC ACTION and "THE FRASER CAUCUS" of the Charter Commission will be located with DPG. A direct line telephone number should be available from information.

The WOMEN'S CAUCUS is at the Alladin Hotel; the Black Caucus, at the Muelbach Hotel.

DEMOCRATIC PLANNING GROUP
Alan Baron, Director
Labor Donated.

Subscription contributions:
\$10 (or more) per year

"I recognize when power moves..."

Richard J. Daley, 12/7/74

In 1964, when Fannie Lou Hamer, Aaron Henry, and Mississippi's "Freedom Democrats" challenged that state's regular Democrats at Atlantic City, New Jersey, there were no national rules for delegate selection. Joe Rauh presented the case to Gov. David Lawrence's Credential Committee, consisting of two members per state, regardless of size.

During the decade following, the Democratic Party became one of few institutions to reform itself. Virtually every aspect of party procedure was changed. But while blacks and other emerging constituencies raised the issues, traditional spokesmen for the regular and reform wings of the party (such as Rauh, Lawrence, Richard Hughes, Lawrence O'Brien, Joe Califano, James O'Hara, Harold Hughes, and George McGovern) wrote the rules.

1974 was different. This year, reform became reality; not so much because the reformers were generally successful (although they were) but rather because of the process by which they achieved success. No longer were decisions made for women and minorities...they were made by them. No longer did Governors and State Chairs watch Washington write rules...they became involved. And no longer did progressive trade unionists allow George Meany to speak for all of labor...they played a crucial role in the process.

Blacks provide nearly 1/4 of the Democratic Presidential vote. Scores of officeholders (such as Gov's. Brown & Briscoe, Sen's. Bayh, Chiles, & Huddleston) have lost a majority of the white vote. Black leadership knows this "new math." And that leadership now includes some of the nation's most powerful Mayors, members of Congress, & state officials. Thus, blacks not only did their own negotiating in KC, they negotiated from strength.

Women also exercised unprecedented clout. Those who have been the backbone of the reform effort (such as Utah's Jean Westwood, Maine's Nancy Chandler, Mississippi's Patt Derian, Colorado's Doris Banks, Michigan's Millie Jeffrey) were joined by elected officials, movement-oriented activists, & moderates, in developing a system of savvy floor leaders and opening communication with minorities and progressive labor.

Latinos also acted with greater unity and central focus than ever before. They joined blacks and women on affirmative action; also succeeded in winning increased representation for Puerto Rico at conventions.

At the focal point of every negotiation was labor. Meany forces were the hard core of opposition to reform; progressive unions were the central force in support of the moderate-reform charter. It was, in fact, 3 int'l. Presidents who convinced the Governors to renegotiate with women and minorities: Leonard Woodcock (UAW); Jerry Wurf (AFSCME), and Glenn Watts (CWA). A key reason for the progressive unions' effectiveness was their political directors: Bill Welsh (AFSCME), Bill Dodds (UAW), Bill Holayter (IAM), Mike Miller (CWA), and Ed Donahue (Graphic Arts). All five are experienced in Democratic Party politics and adept at coalition-building.

No doubt Meany's neutral-for-Nixon stance in '72 led to labor's new role. But equally important were the winds of change within labor: Arnold Miller & the

Mineworkers; the victory of an independent Steelworker in that union's largest district; the new Coalitions of Black and Women unionists.

Two years ago, much of the New South was aligned with Meany-labor in opposition/ reaction to "new politics." This year, these southerners took a more independent and moderate role. Gov. Askew (Fla.) was key to the affirmative action compromise & his state led the fight for open meetings. State Chair Bob Vance (Ala.) won full votes for State Chairs and Vice-Chairs on the DNC; secured passage of a provision allowing equal division of committee and delegate posts between men and women. Thomas Carroll (Ky.), a leading "regular" on the Charter Commission, was highly respected by the "reformers" for his integrity and independence in negotiations.

Indeed, the distinction between "regular" and "reform" Democrats was beginning to fade. Virtually all the delegates to KC were regulars; there were no major insurgencies in 1974. And a majority of those regulars were committed to the basic delegate selection reforms.

After all, Tom Whitney, the tough, savvy Iowa Chair, had been in Chicago in November, 1967, to begin battle with an incumbent President. Jim Spain, Missouri's Chair, was one of 3 delegates from Mo. to back McCarthy in '68. Rudy Ortiz, Nat'l. Com'man. and a powerful figure in New Mexico's party, was an organizer for Kennedy-McCarthy-McGovern. State Rep. Midge Miller, Wisconsin's Delegation Co-Chair, was an early anti-war activist. Phil Hoff is Chairman of Vermont; John Burton, California.

As David Broder wrote (Washington Post, 12/11/74): "The McGovern 'crazies' of two years ago are the county chairmen - or United State Senators - of today."

If many of the "reformers" are regulars, many of the "regulars" led the battle for reform. The fight for mid-term conferences & issue-orientation was led by Doris Banks and Monte Pascoe, Colorado Humphrey backers. The strongest proponents of proportional representation were John White and Carrin Patman, Texas regulars. Such reform supporters as former State Chairs Joe Crangle (NY), Chuck Manatt (Calif.), and Neil Staebler (Mich.), and former DNC executives Bill Welsh, Matt Reese, & Mark Shields can hardly be classified as "new politics."

Of course there were other regulars too. City leaders (such as Chicago's Daley, Philadelphia's Camiel, New York's Cunningham), more conservative elected officials (such as Nebr. Gov. Exon, Md. Gov. Mandel), and party leaders opposed to "national" interference (such as South Carolina State Chair Don Fowler) were hardly enthusiastic about the reforms. Nevertheless, they are politicians. Many had only to look into their own delegations to see that, as Daley said, power moves. And, like Bob Strauss. they can count.

That fact, in the end, divided them from their allies in Meany-labor. Al Barkan and his operatives remained convinced that '68 & '72 were flukes, that the old order must be restored, that the future lies in the past. In this unwillingness to face reality they were joined only by their lifetime enemies: the few remaining Dixiecrats.

DEMOCRATIC PLANNING GROUP

An information/communications center for progressive Democrats.

Suite 1109, 1025 Vermont Ave. NW, Washington, D.C. 20005 (202) 347-3413

No. 27 January, 1975

THE CHARTER

On December 7th, Democrats in Kansas City adopted a Charter which

- (1) incorporates the basic delegate selection reforms,
- (2) provides a more responsive party structure, and
- (3) sets a framework for creating an effective party organization.

Scores of individuals participated in the drafting process. But two were key: Rep. Don Fraser, whose creative leadership was essential to the reform movement; Terry Sanford, who insured that the process was both democratic and open to dissent.

The highlights:

Delegate Selection

The Charter incorporates the key reforms of McGovern/Mikulski. It bans unit rule; prohibits mandatory fees; restricts participation to Democrats; requires proportional representation; and requires delegates be selected during the calendar year of the convention. These requirements, in effect, ban ex-officio delegates. The only vocal opposition to these provisions came from Meany spokesmen, who wanted reforms relegated to the by-laws until they are "tested."

The Charter apportions delegates based 50% on population & 50% on Demo. Presidential vote. Conservatives attempted to substitute other measures of Demo. strength, but failed.

Party Structure

The new DNC will have 350 members, representing state party organizations and various constituencies. It is a far cry from the pre-72 DNC, with 110 members, 2 per State, who were often "contributors" or "friends of the Governor."

The Charter requires DNC members be chosen through processes providing "full, timely, and equal" opportunities to participate — and by standards in the by-laws. This is the first time the national party has exerted authority of DNC member selection.

The new Executive Committee must have 50% of its membership elected directly from regional caucuses of DNC members (presently the figure is 8 of 25). As "regional members" are generally the most independent members of the ExCom, this is a key reform.

The new Education and Training Council & Finance Council will, of course, be only as meaningful as the DNC makes them. But they provide a framework for real progress.

The Conference adopted a mandatory, rather than optional, Judicial Council. Although its authority is limited, its creation is an important first step toward establishing the "rule of law" in party affairs.

There were a number of other reforms, including a "sunshine law," requiring all party meetings be open and no secret ballots in party elections.

Affirmative Action

Prior to KC, debate centered on two opposing concepts of affirmative action. To conservatives, AA meant little more than open meetings and public notice; to liberals, it meant concerted action to involve traditionally-under-represented groups.

This basic difference was reflected in four disputes over language:

- (1) AA should be geared to "all Democrats" (conservative) or "all Demos, with particular concern for minorities, women, young people, Native Americans" (lib)
- (2) the goal should be "participation" (cons.) or "participation...as indicated by presence in the Democratic electorate (lib)
- (3) AA should apply to "delegate selection" only (cons) or also to "all party affairs" (lib)
- (4) there should be a ban on quotas (cons) or "mandatory quotas" (lib)

At Hilton Head, the Governors endorsed Mikulski language, which included the "liberal" position on all 4 questions. The Rules Committee did the same, by a vote of 41 to 6.

The 6 conservatives: Rep. Jim O'Hara; Pastora Cafferty of Mayor Daley's organization; Betty Drumheller, a Jackson designee from Washington State; Hall Timanus, Wallace's Texas leader; and two Meany operatives: Jake Clayman and Evy Dubrow of the AFL-CIO.

Mikulski rules also provide that "composition (of a delegation) alone shall not constitute prima facie evidence of discrimination, nor shall it shift the burden of proof to the challenged party..."

This provision was accepted for 1976, as part of an overall compromise, by liberals on Mikulski. But minority, women, and many liberal leaders opposed including it in the Charter, as the Governors' proposal suggested.

The reason was that this language is far weaker than civil rights laws enacted by Democratic Congresses. These laws require that, if General Motors builds a plant in Gary and hires no blacks, there is a prima facie case of discrimination, and the burden of proof is on GM to show it took affirmative action. Along the same lines, the Federal Voting Rights Act presumes discrimination in counties with registration under 50%.

Black, latino, women, and many reform leaders were adamant in their determination to remove the weak language from the charter (although they acknowledged it would stay in the by-laws for 1976). At first, however, there was no "give" from the other side. When a black leader told DNC Chair Strauss that he could not stay in the hall if the language stayed in the Charter, Strauss told him he didn't need to walk; he said he (Strauss) would provide a bicycle. The Governors remained equally firm.

But not the delegates. In Missouri, Massachusetts, North Carolina, Minnesota, New York, Texas...almost all over...moderates and regulars began swinging to the "Delete 6" (minority) position. Particularly effective in winning support for this position was the Women's Caucus.

These shifts convinced union leaders Woodcock, Watts, and Wurf to call on the Governors to reconsider their opposition to deletion. They did, and when they switched, Strauss - who had held firm for the original language - followed.

Issues/Conferences

Prior to KC, a groundswell of support developed for a statement on the economy – and a policy resolution was passed. Although there was no real debate in the drafting process, the acceptance of at least that much “issue orientation” was a far cry from the paranoia which circled Strauss & his allies when the question was raised last year.

The delegates defeated a proposal for mandatory mid-term conferences, but it received 45%, considerably higher than DPG’s pre-conference estimate. In fact, it appears that a majority of elected delegates supported the proposal.

That should lay the groundwork for action – at the 76 convention and/or the DNC in 77 – to bring about a conference in 78.

QUOTES

“He (Strauss) has excluded labor from the Democratic Party. His policy is suicide for the Democratic Party.”

John Henning – California AFL-CIO

“To hell with the Democratic Party. I’m going back to being a labor leader. I’m a labor leader, not a political leader.”

Bill Marshall – Michigan AFL-CIO

“The dream of a decade came true this weekend for liberal labor...Meany’s forces didn’t have the votes...This led to speculation that Barkan could not put together a majority in his own labor caucus...”

Detroit Free Press

“Do what you want...You’re all free, white and twenty-one...”

George Hardy, Pres. of Service Employees, to AFL-CIO Caucus

“We negotiate things like this every day.”

Douglas Fraser, VP, UAW, on affirmative action compromise

“I’m unhappy with some of it, but I can live with all of it.”

Donald Fowler, So. Carolina Democratic Chairman

“I’d do almost anything to go out of here unified and beat those water-walking Republicans.”

Mayor Richard Daley

“The lead on your story should have been that Dick Daley announced for another term as Mayor.”

Senator-elect John C. Culver

“When we got to the caucus, we found we were the Uncle Toms.”

California Assemblyman Willie Brown

“Where’s the Irish caucus, where’s the Jewish caucus, where’s the Italian caucus? Let them walk out. Cut the bullshit.”

Rep. Frank Annunzio, shouting to Strauss

"There's nothing in there that guarantees anything. It just guarantees you have the right to work for something."

Hannah Atkins, Okla. State Rep. & Black caucus leader

"So they did what the women and the blacks wanted — knocked the offending language out — and in the tradition of the battles between reformers and regulars, called it a compromise. It was like saying that Russia compromised its differences with Luthuania."

James Flansburg, Des Moines Register

"The forces of privilege will oppose reform — as they always have. The voices of timidity will caution against the effort — as they always do. And the hard-eyed cynics will again call down distortion and ridicule. But to avoid issues is to invite disaster. Our survival as a party is at stake...the people will no longer accept a politics whose only purpose is power. When they ask: 'What is the Democratic program?' we cannot simply answer: 'To not be Republicans.'"

Senator George McGovern

During 1974, the Democratic Planning Group concentrated its efforts on the issues of reform and structure which faced the National Committee, Commissions, and mid-term Conference.

In 1975, DPG's newsletter will continue to focus on the politics of the National Committee...as delegate selection plans and affirmative action plans are prepared and submitted...and as the Call for the 1976 Convention is issued.

In addition, various authors will report on issues and personalities affecting Democratic politics.

DPG will publish eight or more issues, depending on events, during the year. Subscriptions will be \$10.00, or more. Please send in your check (in the enclosed reply envelope) today, as we are no longer mailing complimentary subscriptions. (If you subscribed in mid-year 1974, still return the envelope for our records.)

Democratic Planning Group
Alan Baron, Director

Labor Donated

ADDRESS MAIL CONCERNING SUBSCRIPTIONS (PAYMENTS) AND ADDRESS CHANGE
TO: DPG. POB 7062, ARLINGTON, VA. 22207

DEMOCRATIC PLANNING GROUP

An information/communications center for progressive Democrats.

POB 7062, Arlington Virginia 22207 (202) 488-4972

No. 29 March 1, 1975

LABOR: The Meany Decision

Meeting in Bal Harbour, Florida, in mid-February, the AFL-CIO Executive Council voted to withdraw from direct participation in the internal affairs of the Democratic Party - including the delegate selection process for the 1976 convention. President Meany indicated that the Federation would follow the Samuel Gompers tradition of allowing the parties to nominate their candidates - and then selecting which to support.

The only vocal opposition to the Meany policy came from Jerry Wurf, President of the American Federation of State, County and Municipal Employees (AFSCME) - the nation's fastest growing union. Wurf said labor should become involved, to avert a choice between two unacceptable candidates, such as Wallace and Ford, in November.

Meany reiterated support for his 1972 statement that "both parties can go to hell." He also said he, personally, had no preference between the parties.

Privately, key labor leaders viewed the Meany decision as one based on (1) a desire to reduce divisiveness within the labor federation based on political differences; (2) a distrust of Democratic Party leaders, including his former friend, Henry Jackson, whom he charged with "deceit;" and (3) a return to more traditional AFL policies.

But the impact of Meany's decision may be more apparent than real. More and more, the greatest labor clout in party affairs has been coming from individual unions - particularly the Auto-workers, Steelworkers, Machinists, Communications Workers, AFSCME, etc. In a major effort last November, the 1.7 million member California AFL-CIO was able to turn out less than 4,000 persons, statewide, to Kansas City Conference delegate selection caucuses. And many of these came from the "progressive" unions.

In the past couple of years, the AFL-CIO's greatest "clout" was in direct pressure on State Chairmen and Vice-Chairmen and National Committee members. But this was reduced by (1) over-usage and (2) counter pressure, from the progressive unions.

No doubt, individual unions and trade unionists will continue to play a major role in delegate selection and Democratic Party affairs; indeed, their participation is essential to the future of the party.

Also, it should be noted that the Meany position is hardly new: in 1974, George Meany personally campaigned for only three candidates: Javits of New York, Mathias of Maryland, Schweiker of Pennsylvania. All are Republicans.

THE ASHLAND OIL CASE: continued

In the February DPG bulletin, it was reported that the Watergate Special Prosecutor's office is conducting an investigation of a total of \$50,000 in cash contributions from Ashland Oil Company, Inc., of Kentucky to the Democratic National Committee. The contributions, made in 1970 and 1971, were given to Chairman Robert Strauss, then DNC Treasurer.

The statute of limitations on corporate contributions has now expired, so Ashland Oil is not believed to be vulnerable to prosecution. Nevertheless, Strauss has reportedly told several individuals that he will ask the National Committee - at its March 21st meeting in Washington - to vote on whether the \$50,000 should be returned.

The statute of limitations has not expired on another aspect of the case: the DNC's failure to report the \$50,000, except as the funds were included under a general, "miscellaneous" heading.

Chairman Strauss originally termed this failure to report only a "technical" violation of the law. Later, he told the press that Ashland Oil did not want the contributions reported, fearing Nixon Administration reprisal (Ashland denies this). Still later, Strauss told reporters that he had assumed the \$50,000 came from hundreds of small contributors, each donating \$100 or less (such contributions did not need be reported under the law).

The DNC's financial reports for the period are now sealed (the Clerk of the House is required to keep them open for only two years). At the request of Federal District Judge Hart, the House of Representatives voted to turn them over to the Special Prosecutor.

But the records are still not open to members of the Democratic National Committee, the press, and the public. Which is why Massachusetts Democratic National Committeeman Jerry Grossman, who authored the DNC's open meeting rule, will move at the March meeting to require that all past financial records be

The first two words on the minds of most Presidential candidates these days are "direct mail." Sen. McGovern's 72 success convinced most Democrats that this fundraising method is the wave of the future. And the new federal limitations convinced the rest.

A few candidates should have no trouble with mail. George Wallace's emotional appeal to a highly issue-oriented constituency is already working. Henry Jackson will probably not have a problem, either. Jackson is gearing his mail to a particular constituency concerned about a particular issue; he has established himself as the foremost advocate of Israeli policy in the Senate and his emotional appeals to Jewish mailing lists (which need not even mention Israel) should work. Incidentally, Jackson may use one of direct mail's greatest tools: the ethnic dictionary, which sorts out members of a particular group from a general list.

It is possible that one candidate on the party's "left" may also do well with mail. But, right now, with Kennedy, Mondale, and McGovern not running, this may not happen.

The fact is that candidates not clearly identified with a specific interest group or issue constituency have real trouble with direct mail. They usually seek to convince supporters that they have a good record, can unite the party, and will win in November. These are just the arguments which used to work with big givers. But big givers are a thing of the past. And these arguments hardly motivate mail contributors.

This brings us to the basic problem: if the Democrats are to win, they need a candidate who can raise money with mail. But, instead of starting with the candidate and then planning a mail campaign, perhaps the party will need to start with a direct mail program...and then find a candidate to run on it.

In checking with direct mail experts, one finds that - with rightwingers and Jewish-Americans spoken for - the best remaining groups are Civil Servants and Book Club Members. But Civil Servants are often fearful of the Hatch Act (barring political activity) and are also "poor mail responders." So that leaves the Book Club Members.

With these easily-attainable lists in hand, the next step is to select an issue with strong emotional appeal. The answer, of course, is money...Tax Credits for Book Club dues...Or tax rebates for book purchases, up to a limit (no loopholes for rare book collectors). One could even suggest an end to the minimum purchase requirements (isn't that restraint of trade, or something?).

Now, you can't just appeal to people's pocketbooks. You've got to add a moral imperative. But that can vary, according to the mailing list involved.

OVER

To doves, "we must make it possible for every American to learn the limits of power." To hawks: "foreign policy must be formed, not in the streets, but from the vantage point of our leaders." To liberals, "never again must we tax the poor who wish to read their rights." To populists, "the businessman can deduct the cost of a martini, but can we deduct the cost of a 'Guide to Better Hunting'?"

There would, of course, be problems. Where do books end and magazines begin? Where do magazines end and newspapers begin?

But the constituency is waiting. And the need is clear.

So, don't be surprised, one day soon, to find in your mail an appeal from a handsome young man, declaring that "the torch has passed to a new generation of encyclopedias" and "we must get America reading again."

LETTER TO THE EDITOR

The following letter to DPG is from David Selden, former President of the American Federation of Teachers.

I have been thinking recently of a 1972 conversation I had with Donald Slaiman, one of the handful of top AFL-CIO strategists. It was the day after George McGovern had been nominated by the Democratic Convention. My wife and I had gone over to the Americana Hotel, where the AFL-CIO contingent was staying to have lunch.

Slaiman, speaking slowly and heavily, called the McGovern nomination a "disaster." He showed me a copy of a letter supporting the principle of the open shop which McGovern was supposed to have written to Reed Larsen, chairman of the National Right to Work Committee. And then Slaiman said, "The only thing we can do now is cut our losses," and he repeated it for emphasis: cut our losses.

I have thought of Slaiman's remark many times since that day. "Cutting losses" meant not joining the struggle to defeat Richard Nixon, even though 35 international unions refused to stay neutral in that fight.

Maybe defeating Nixon was an impossible task, but "cutting losses" had the effect of maximizing the Nixon landslide and encouraging the arrogance which led to the abuse of governmental power in the Watergate aftermath. More important, "cutting losses" meant fostering disunity in the liberal-labor coalition. That disunity continues to be the greatest obstacle progressive forces face on the road to 1976. "Cutting losses" and insisting on a narrow sectarian approach to public policy questions plays into the hands of conservatives and reactionaries. "Cutting losses" could lead to the bankruptcy of a labor movement which needs all the friends it can find.

opened. Later, as by-laws are prepared, Grossman will propose a permanent requirement along these lines.

Grossman says that "in the wake of Watergate, the Democratic Party cannot afford to keep these records closed." Grossman believes that "full public disclosure - open meetings and open financial records - is essential to our prospects in 1976."

AFFIRMATIVE ACTION: Slow Start

Implementation of the Democratic Party's affirmative action requirements is beginning, but just barely. Few states are expected to meet the March 15th deadline for submission of plans to the Compliance Review Commission. And thirty days of public circulation of the plans is required prior to submission. It is expected that the CRC and the DNC will extend the deadline. Regardless, however, state parties should by now have some plans drafted -- and interested persons should seek information from party officials.

The Compliance Review Commission, or more accurately DNC Chairman Robert Strauss, has hired two staffers: Monica Borkowski, formerly secretary to Bob Keefe, and Scott Lang, previously employed as an organizer for the rightwing Coalition for a Democratic Majority. No persons identified with the moderate or liberal wings of the party -- and no minority group members -- have been hired. The decisions were made while CRC Chairman Robert Wagner was out of the country; members of the CRC were not consulted.

A legal Review Board has also been appointed; this appears to be more in balance. The chief is Walter Pozen, a Washington attorney identified with the Kennedy Administration. Other members are Howard Gamser, chief of staff of the O'Hara Commission; Judith Orian, a professor at Georgetown Law School; George Daley, an aide to Black Caucus Chairman Charles Rangel; Jack Quinn, an aide to Senator Haskell and a former staffer on the Mikulski Commission; and Washington lawyers Julie Gilbert, Richard Cooper, and Kenneth McKinnon.

While these lawyers can be expected to prepare objective reviews of state rules, affirmative action programs will need to be analyzed from the prospective of party workers, grass-roots organizers, and members of traditionally under-represented constituencies. The national committee must provide creative services to state parties if Affirmative Action is to be all meaningful. And, although Chairman Strauss pledged to labor leaders and others in Kansas City that this was his intention, little concrete has happened.

BRIEFS

Texas: Sen. & Pres. candidate Lloyd Bentsen is seeking to abolish the state's caucus/convention system of delegate selection, which includes proportional representation, and replace it with a primary, providing for the election of individual delegates on a CD basis; i.e. a de facto winner-take-all by CD system, like New York's. Bentsen believes that, in head-to-head contests with Wallace, he will win most districts. But former Sen. Ralph Yarborough is now talking of running as a liberal favorite son... and few are willing to predict the outcome of a three way primary.

California: The state legislature is considering a shift from a New York type primary law (passed last year) to a pure PR system, with a cut-off point. At the recent state convention, Paula Higashi Essex, the young organizer for the Democratic Planning Group for Kansas City, led the field of candidates for new DNC posts. Of the five other new members elected, four are liberals; one, a moderate.

Ohio: Bill Lavelle resigned as State Chair; was replaced by Paul Tibbs, Montgomery County Chairman. Tibbs had the support of former Governor John Gilligan but was opposed by US Senator John Glenn; he won decisively. As a County Chairman, the Dayton housing developer had organized a local "issues convention," one of the first in the nation.

State Chairmen: The drive to oust Robert Vance of Alabama as President of the Association of Democratic State Chairmen (and Vice-Chairpersons) continues. As reported in February, Donald Fowler of South Carolina will oppose Vance at the Association's meeting, scheduled for March 20th in Washington.

Fowler supporters are telling conservatives that "Vance can't get along with his own Governor (Wallace) and must be replaced." They tell liberals that "Senators Allen and Sparkman are for Vance and therefore he must be a Wallace man."

The facts: Vance has been on the opposite side of Wallace in Alabama for years; just last year, Wallace made an all-out effort to "purge" him and a Vance defeat in March would set the stage for another move against him at home.

But Sparkman and Allen do support their homestate Chairman for National President. And even Wallace cannot oppose a local Democrat against a South Carolinian...officially.

Labor donated.

Subscriptions: \$10 (or more) per year