



The Democratic Party's Presidential Nominating Process

Fourth Edition ★ 2000 Convention

by Terry Michael

(Version Number 4, March 2000)

The Democratic Party's Presidential Nominating Process

Fourth Edition ☆ 2000 Convention

by Terry Michael

*Executive Director, Washington Center for Politics & Journalism
and former Press Secretary, Democratic National Committee*

Contents

I. **2000 Rules Lite**

A brief guide to Democratic Convention delegate selection rules

II. **Notes on the History of the Democratic Party's Presidential Nominating Process**

*An overview of the Party's nominating process from "King Caucus"
and "brokered conventions" to the "Reform Era"*

III. **Background and Explanation: Delegate Selection Rules/2000 Democratic Convention**

*A discussion of the genesis and development of the "Reform Era"
delegate selection process, and a detailed explanation
of the 2000 rules*

IV. **Pledged Delegate Allocation Calendars, 1984-2000**

*Calendars of delegate selection primaries and first-stage caucuses
determining allocation of delegates to presidential candidates*

☆☆☆☆☆

Editor's Note:

This is the fourth edition of a document first produced for the 1988 Convention by Terry Michael, who served as Director of Convention Communications for the 1984 Democratic Convention and was Democratic National Committee Press Secretary from 1985-87. It is published by the Washington Center for Politics & Journalism, a non-profit, non-partisan educational foundation, and is offered as an unofficial supplement to the official "Delegate Selection Rules for the 2000 Democratic National Convention" and the "Call for the 2000 Democratic National Convention" published by the DNC.

*Future revisions of this document can be obtained from the
Washington Center for Politics & Journalism
P.O. Box 15201, Washington, DC 20003
Telephone: 202/296-8455 Internet E-Mail: pol-jrn@wcpj.org*

Updated, March 31, 2016:
P.O. Box 15603, Washington, DC
20003, 202/210-8455
terrymichael@wcpj.org

The 2000 allocation calendar in this document is based on information provided by the DNC Rules and Bylaws Committee, which should be consulted for frequent updates. The calendar is revised throughout the year preceding the convention, as state parties revise their delegate selection rules.

Dedicated to the memory of Anne Campbell and Paul Tully, ultimate rules junkies.

2000 Rules Lite

A brief guide to Democratic Convention delegate selection rules

By Terry Michael
former DNC Press Secretary

I. “Reform Era” (post-1968) principles guiding selection

“Full participation.” Reacting to dominance of delegate selection from 1832 to 1968 by party elites, modern rules promote “full participation” by grassroots Democrats, including minorities and women.

“Fair reflection of presidential preferences.” Reform rules make sure that most delegates are allocated to presidential candidates in proportion to their percentage of primary and caucus popular support.

II. Two varieties of delegates: pledged and unpledged

Pledged delegates (about 81.5% of the 2000 Convention). There will be 3,537 Convention delegate seats allocated in 2000 to presidential candidates on the basis of primary and caucus results, including 3,016 “base” delegate votes divided among the 51 state parties (including DC) and 59 additional seats assigned to the five territorial parties, as provided by the 2000 Convention Call (adopted 9/26/98). The “base” votes are allotted to the 51 parties by a population-and-Democratic-support formula in the Call. The 3,537 total also includes a 15 percent add-on to the 56 parties’ base delegate shares for pledged party leaders and elected officials (“PLEO’s”). Three-quarters of a state’s base delegates must be allocated to presidential candidates in primaries or caucuses at the district level (usually congressional districts); the remaining quarter are selected state-wide (allocated to presidential candidates by preferences expressed in district-level voting, as are the add-on PLEO seats.) All persons seeking to fill the 3,537 slots must sign advance pledges of presidential preference, to assure they are bona fide supporters of candidates to whom their seats are allocated.

Unpledged delegates (about 18.5% of the 2000 Convention). All delegates from 1972 to 1980 were “pledged.” Concerned that many party leaders and elected officials weren’t participating in reform era conventions, the 1984 rules created a new class of

“unpledged” delegates—party leaders and elected officials who don’t have to sign advance pledges of support for candidates. For 2000, unpledged delegates total 801 (as of March 2000, subject to change by intervening election results and other circumstances), and include: all Democratic National Committee members; all Democratic Governors; all Democrats in the U.S. House and Senate; current and former Democratic Presidents and Vice Presidents; former Democratic U.S. Senate Majority and Minority Leaders, U.S. House Speakers and Minority Leaders, and DNC Chairs; and a number of “add-on” seats, to equal one-for-every-four of the 56 parties’ DNC member convention votes, for assignment to other elected and party officials.

III. Two systems for pledged delegate allocation: primaries and caucuses

Primary election system. Most of the 56 state and territorial Democratic parties (39 for 2000, including 3 to be “party-run”) hold primary elections to allocate their pledged delegates to presidential candidates.

Caucus/convention system. Some states, mostly smaller, allocate pledged delegates with a process that usually begins with party members assembling in precincts, wards or townships to elect representatives to a county or some other intermediate convention, which in turn sends representatives to a district convention for final selection of district delegates; the process often ends with a state convention. Preferences expressed in lowest level caucuses, reflected upward, determine the percentage allocation of all pledged delegate slots to presidential candidates.

IV. Proportional method for pledged delegate allocation

Allocation determined by vote percentages. All pledged delegate seats must be allotted to presidential candidates by the proportion of votes or preferences they receive in primaries and caucuses.

15% Threshold. Before a candidate is entitled to a share of delegate slots, he must demonstrate a threshold level of support—at least 15 percent of votes cast in a primary or preferences expressed in a caucus.

V. Calendar window for selection of delegates

First Tuesday in March to second Tuesday in June. All primaries and lowest level caucus meetings for delegate selection must take place in 2000 between the first Tuesday in March and the second Tuesday in June. Three states are formally exempted by the rules for earlier dates—Iowa, New Hampshire, and Maine.

Notes on the history of....

The Democratic Party's Presidential Nominating Process

By Terry Michael

The Constitution and the selection of a President

The U.S. Constitution says nothing about partisan nomination of presidential candidates or even political parties, which developed—despite the low esteem in which they were held by many of the founding fathers—from the constitutional philosophy, issue, personality, and geography-based factions that materialized in Congress and in state legislatures during the country's first decades.

The Constitution did not provide for popular voting for presidential candidates of any sort, let alone political party nominees. Rather, it called for presidential “electors” to be selected from the states—allowing each state legislature to decide how to choose them.

Page 4

Initially, most states chose electors by votes of their legislatures, with only a few using popular votes for statewide or district selection. But by 1824, the popular vote of a state's general electorate had become the common method for selection of slates of electors identified with presidential candidates.

For the first half-century of presidential elections, there was no fixed date for selection of electors. In 1845, Congress adopted legislation requiring that all states choose them on the same day—the Tuesday after the first Monday in November.

The meaning of a party's presidential nomination

In American political tradition, a presidential nomination has been a recommendation by a more-or-less representative group of individuals gathered in the name of a political party—a method for organizing the choice of a president, by reducing the electoral chaos that would result if there were no process for narrowing the potential field.

A nomination cues a party member that the nominee is someone who shares his general philosophy and views—an easier choice than the burden a voter would face if he had to determine independently whether the beliefs of many unknown candidates squared with his own.

As noted above, early nominees were not presented directly to general election voters; rather, they were informally considered by state legislatures or by voters choosing electors identified with particular candidates.

Now, party presidential nominees are placed before voters through provisions in the laws of each state, which recognize the two major political parties, accept their presidential nominating processes, and record their nominees on the official ballots issued by a state's election jurisdictions. Of course, a vote for a nominee is in reality a vote for a slate of electors chosen by his party through some mechanism in state law.

Early nominations by King Caucus, 1790's to 1820's

Because American political parties developed from factions that emerged in Congress, the identities of the early parties were largely functions of their caucuses in Congress. Consequently, early party presidential nominations were made by the congressional party caucuses, theoretically mirroring the desires of party adherents throughout the land.

Caucuses of Federalists, associated with Presidents Washington and Adams and Alexander Hamilton, and the Jeffersonian Republicans, predecessors of the modern Democratic Party associated with Thomas Jefferson, had formed in Congress and begun making presidential nominations in the 1790's.

The party caucuses of state legislative bodies noted the recommendations of their congressional counterparts in selecting electors who would vote for the "party choice" for president. As the popular vote came into use, voters who identified with a party also considered the nominees of their congressional caucuses.

As the identities of political parties broadened to encompass state and local elected officials, party clubs and organizations, and grassroots members, dissatisfaction developed with what critics dubbed "King Caucus." Rank-and-file party members questioned whether the choice of the congressional party caucus reflected the wishes of other elements of the party. For example, party members in congressional districts not represented by one of their number had no direct representation when the caucus met to choose a nominee.

The convention system emerges, 1832

The response to King Caucus was the

emergence of the convention system for nominating the party's presidential candidate. The first Democratic Party convention was held in 1832 in Baltimore, after the congressional caucus of the Party in Congress refused to nominate the popular Senator and war hero Andrew Jackson in 1824, and Jackson went on to win the election of 1828 without caucus support.

A first national political party convention was actually held by the short-lived Anti-Masonic Party in 1831, creating the model that was emulated by the Jacksonian Democrats a year later.

With no national party organization or committee, the 1832 Democratic Convention was arranged for and called by supporters of Jackson, who wanted to use it to nominate him for re-election. Specifically, Jackson supporters in the New Hampshire state legislature issued a call to Democrats in other states to send delegations to Baltimore in May, 1832, according to the Congressional Quarterly book, *Presidential Elections Since 1789*.

The 1832 convention and other early conventions were small affairs, with no more than several hundred delegates. The number of votes assigned to state delegations was based on the number of electoral votes of each state. But in early conventions, the number of persons casting those votes was haphazard. For example, at the 1835 convention (which nominated the 1836 ticket), 188 delegates from Maryland cast the state's 10 votes in balloting in Baltimore. In sharp contrast, CQ notes, a traveling businessman from Tennessee, who happened to be in Baltimore at the time, cast his state's 15 votes.

Creation of the Democratic National Committee, 1848

The first several Democratic Conventions were called by ad hoc methods. As noted above, the New Hampshire legislature called the first meeting in 1832. President Jackson set the date for the 1835 convention (for the 1836 nomination) and the New Hampshire legislature again called the 1840 session.

To conduct planning for each subsequent convention and to provide a structure for coordinating the campaign of the Party's nominee in an era when national travel and communication were limited, the 1848 Democratic Convention created a "Democratic National Committee."

The DNC was structured as an organization of state Democratic parties, with each state entitled to one Democratic National Committeeman. That structure continued until universal suffrage was adopted with the 19th Amendment to the Constitution in 1920, at which time the DNC was expanded to include one committeeman and one committeewoman from each state. The National Committee kept that structure until the Democratic Party's reform era began after the 1968 Convention. The national committee was then expanded to give proportional representation to state parties based on population and Democratic voting strength. The DNC now has over 400 members.

Selection of early convention delegations

For the first 136 years of Democratic convention history, state parties were given tremendous autonomy in determining how their convention delegations were chosen. There were only very limited national party delegate selection criteria stated in the "calls" to conventions. (The "call" is the document adopted by the National Committee every four years setting the time, place, allocation of delegate positions to the states, and preliminary rules of procedure for the quadrennial meeting.)

Throughout the 19th Century and into the 20th, delegates were generally selected by various party groups and leaders within each state, including state legislative caucuses and local and state party committees, caucuses and conventions. Many delegations were effectively handpicked by powerful party leaders and elected officials.

Dominated by party leaders and elected officials, these early delegate selection procedures limited grassroots or rank-and-file

participation.

The forces that began to change the process of convention delegate selection were the same that led to reform of government corruption associated with urban machine politics in the late 19th Century.

Presidential primaries emerge in the Progressive Era

The "Progressive Era" (roughly the two decades after the mid-1890's) brought with it the institution of party primary elections for selection of candidates for public office. Though primaries were used in some local jurisdictions as far back as the 1840's, they did not gain widespread use until the late 1890's and the first years of the 20th Century, when their implementation was at the top of the Progressive movement's agenda.

Party primaries—because they are elections run by independent public authorities—shifted access to the general election ballot from privately-operated party committees, caucuses and conventions to a quasi-government process. Nominations took on the character of "pre-elections" involving many voters, rather than recommendations of elite groups. Allowed to participate in the process of naming a political party's candidates were many voters who had little interest in or appreciation for the role of formal party organizations in the political process. Thus, primary elections dealt a blow to the power and position of institutional party organizations in the American political system.

Concurrent with the institution of primary elections for selecting nominees for public office was the use of this quasi-government mechanism for allowing voters to select some of the delegates to the national nominating conventions and to express preferences for potential party presidential nominees.

The first state to pass a law allowing parties to select convention delegates in primary elections was Florida in 1901, but with no provision for listing presidential candidates

on the ballot. Wisconsin, where factions of the dominant Republican Party had selected two delegations to the 1904 GOP convention, in 1905 mandated selection of delegates in primaries—but with no provision for indicating delegate preferences for presidential candidates. Pennsylvania and South Dakota followed with delegate selection primaries in 1906 and 1909, and Oregon took the next big step in 1910, when it adopted a primary system that allowed expression of presidential candidate preference, as well as election of delegates.

The enthusiasm for presidential primaries had peaked by 1916, when 26 states held primaries for election of delegates, expression of presidential preference, or both (according to CQ's *Presidential Elections Since 1789*.) After that, the number dropped to the mid or high teens, where it stayed until the Democratic Party's post-1968 reform era began with the 1972 delegate selection process.

The brokered convention era, 1832 to 1968

From 1832, through the Progressive Era, and up to 1968, Democratic nominations were brokered by elite groups of leaders. Even after 1912, when primaries were first used widely for selection of delegates, up until 1968, the number of delegates chosen in primaries ranged from only about one-third to two-fifths of total convention votes. And few of those chosen in primaries were bound to vote for particular candidates for the nomination. In fact, many of the delegates selected in the primaries were fielded by party leaders, who commanded their loyalty and could deliver them in blocks to favored presidential contenders.

Even though candidates for the Democratic Party's presidential nomination occasionally used primaries to demonstrate their popular appeal to voters and to win some delegates, they concentrated most of their efforts on courting party leaders who had the

ability to broker the selection of a nominee.

The brokering process sometimes concluded before a convention, but at other times it wasn't settled for numerous convention ballots. Of course, there was usually no brokering when an incumbent president sought re-nomination. He usually was not challenged and was accepted as the de facto nominee for re-election.

The last multi-ballot brokered Democratic Convention took place in 1952, when Adlai Stevenson was nominated on the third ballot.

It wasn't until the 1960's that the stage was set for a drastic change in the nominating system. The political polarization caused by a demand for minority participation in the electoral process and grassroots disaffection with party leaders over the Vietnam War led to a demand for a major overhaul of the nominating process and a stronger role for the national party in setting rules for selection of delegates to the Democratic Party's convention.

The Democratic Party's reform era, 1972 to present

The Mississippi Freedom Democratic Party's demand to be seated at the 1964 Democratic Convention, instead of the white male-dominated delegation fielded by the state party, represented the vanguard of a grassroots-activist and liberal reform movement that led to drastic changes in the process for selection of delegates to Democratic conventions.

The fate of the old system of delegate selection, dominated by party and elected officials, was sealed at the 1968 Democratic Convention. Civil rights and anti-war activists who came to Chicago argued that the old method of selecting delegates did not allow for full and timely participation by the full range of Party members, nor did it produce delegations that necessarily reflected the presidential candidate preferences of the rank-and-file.

As a result, the convention approved creation of the first of a series of commissions

on the nominating process, which wrote national party delegate selection rules that each state and territorial party had to follow in designing their delegate selection plans.

Special commissions were formed to write and refine nominating rules for each convention from 1972 to 1988, including: the McGovern-Fraser Commission, for 1972; the Mikulski Commission, 1976; the Winograd Commission, 1980; the Hunt Commission, 1984; and the Fowler Commission, 1988. After two decades of revising and refining rules through special commissions, the Democratic National Committee began using its own Rules & By-Laws Committee to draft delegate selection rules for 1992, a practice continued for 1996.

Two basic principles have guided formulation of national party delegate selection rules: (1) a commitment to opening-up the nominating process to *full participation* by the party's many constituencies; and (2) a belief that the process should assure the *fair reflection of presidential preferences* of those who participate in selecting delegates.

Delegate selection in the reform era

The 1972 rules implementing the *full participation* principle ultimately resulted in a de facto quota system at the 1972 Convention in Miami. The "affirmative action" requirements in the rules were interpreted by the convention to allow delegations to be challenged if they didn't contain precise numerical percentages of minorities and other groups of party members.

Quotas were specifically outlawed in the 1976 and subsequent rules; however, strong language was included requiring state parties to adopt and implement affirmative action plans. But if such plans were put in place, delegations couldn't be challenged solely on the basis of composition.

The 1976 rules allowed state parties to institute equal division of their delegations by gender without violating the ban on quotas, and the Call to the 1980 convention made equal division a formal requirement

for all delegations—mirroring the tradition that began with universal suffrage in equally dividing the Democratic National Committee by gender. Beginning in 1984, the rules went an additional step by naming five groups—Blacks, Hispanics, Native Americans, Asian/Pacific Americans and women—for which "specific (affirmative action) goals and timetables" had to be adopted (but again banning quotas as a vehicle for implementation.)

The *fair reflection* principle was instituted in the rules by: (1) establishing a system that allocated delegate slots to presidential candidates based on the percentage of support each received in votes cast in primaries or preferences stated by participants in caucuses; and (2) requiring that individuals seeking to fill delegate slots sign an advance "pledge" of presidential preference (allowance was made for a pledge of "uncommitted") so that slots would be filled with bona fide supporters of a candidate.

The national rules allowed pledged delegates to be chosen either through primary elections or multi-tiered caucus and convention systems that would begin with local level meetings to encourage full participation. In either case, the bulk of delegates had to be chosen at the congressional district level or lower to keep the selection process as close as possible to the rank-and-file. Any pledged delegates chosen state-wide also had to be allocated to presidential candidates on the basis of the percentage of preferences expressed in primaries and caucuses.

The reform era delegate selection rules have resulted in heavy reliance on primaries for delegate selection. Even though many state parties use the modern caucus/convention method, most larger states use primaries. Of the 56 state and territorial Democratic parties, 34 will hold primaries in 1996, selecting 62.6% of all delegates, pledged and unpledged, with the remaining 22 parties using caucuses. Primaries accounted for 38% of all delegate votes in the last pre-reform convention of 1968. Use of primaries for delegate selection increased dramatically in 1972, when they were used to select 61% of delegates, followed by 73% in 1976, 72% in 1980, and then dropping to a little less than 55% in 1984, when 31 parties used the caucus/convention system and "unpledged" delegates were added, reducing the number

of delegates selected in either primaries or caucuses. They quickly rebounded, however, with about 68% of all delegates chosen in primaries in 1988 and 67% in 1992.

It should be noted that post-1968 Democratic Party reformers, in applying the *full participation* and *fair reflection* principles, did not attempt to go so far as to replace the convention system with a snapshot-in-time, one-day national primary. They left some possibility for brokering of interests within the party and for deliberation at the convention, should no single candidate emerge from the process with a majority of pledged delegates. In addition, the rules allowed for a process that took place over a period of months, subjecting would-be candidates for the nation's highest office to a series of tests.

The resulting mixed system reflected in part the thinking of strong-party advocates, who argued that a nominee should represent the institution of party, as well as the collection of individual participants in the process—some of whom have commitments to single-issue interests stronger than their commitment to the philosophically broader-based institution of party.

Renewing a role for party leaders and elected officials

A consequence of early delegate selection reforms was the significant reduction in convention participation and influence by party leaders and elected officials.

The reform rules, beginning with 1972, specifically banned *ex officio* service by party and elected officials as delegates. They had to seek election as delegates and were required to sign the same advance pledges as any other delegate candidates. Many such officials—particularly those representing broad constituencies, such as members of Congress and governors—were reluctant to make early commitments to candidates and declined to run for delegate seats against their constituents and supporters.

Critics argued that a system which discouraged involvement of party and elected officials unwisely weakened the party organization, with its broader-based agenda, in favor of narrower competing interests represented by activists with weaker allegiance to, or appreciation for, the institution of party.

In partial response, the 1976 rules urged the National Committee to give Democratic Governors and Members of Congress not elected as delegates non-voting floor privileges at the convention. The 1980 rules went farther, giving each state an additional number of delegates, equal to 10% of its base delegation, to be specifically set aside for party leaders and elected officials—but they still had to run with formal advance pledges.

Reacting to increasing criticism of the diminished role for party leaders and elected officials at conventions, the 1984 rules created a category of “unpledged” party leader and elected official delegates, including all state party chairs and vice chairs, 60% of the U.S. House and Senate Democratic caucus and conference, and other party leaders and elected officials, with special preference given to governors and big city mayors. Comprising about 14% of total convention delegates, these unpledged delegates didn't have to sign the formal advance pledges in support of candidates (though they weren't precluded from making informal endorsements of, or commitments to, candidates at any time in the process they saw fit.)

In the rules for 1988, the category of “unpledged delegates” was modified to include: (1) all Democratic National Committee members, (2) 80% of the U.S. House and Senate Democratic caucus and conference, (3) all Democratic governors, and (4) former Democratic Presidents, Vice Presidents, House Speakers and Senate Majority Leaders. Those categories were retained for 1992, and a new category of “add-on” unpledged delegates—equal to one-for-every-four DNC member delegate votes—was added in the 1992 Convention Call to accommodate other elected and party officials. Unpledged delegates were about 18% of all 1992 delegates. The 1996 rules retained all of the previous categories of unpledged delegates and added more unpledged seats, giving delegate status to *all* Democrats in the House and Senate,

plus the Democratic President and Vice President and former Chairs of the DNC. Unpledged delegates will now account for about 18% of all 1996 delegates.

Conclusion

The Democratic Party's nominating system has evolved, in broad outline form, from congressional party caucuses (1790's to 1820's), to conventions managed and brokered by party elites (from 1832 to 1968), to grassroots-participation primaries and caucuses as the major route for nomination (since 1972.)

The present-day convention represents a mixture of old and new methods for nominating the Democratic Party's standard-bearer. Rejecting use of a single national primary for choosing a candidate, the present nominating method has purposefully retained some vestiges of the old systems. The modern convention encourages participation, but not dominance, by the congressional Democratic Party and other elected Democratic officials in the selection of a presidential candidate. And it allows for the possibility of healthy, deliberative brokering that keeps the interests of the institutional party in mind should the grassroots-participation primaries and caucuses produce no majority for a candidate prior to the convention.

It allows the voices of rank-and-file Democrats to be heard, without inhibiting the productive role which the broad-based institutional party can play in organizing electoral choices and in promoting the coalitions and consensus necessary for effective governance.



Contents☆☆☆☆☆☆☆☆☆☆

Background and Explanation

Delegate Selection Rules 2000 Democratic Convention

By Terry Michael
*Executive Director of the
Washington Center for Politics & Journalism
and former DNC Press Secretary*

(Version Number 4: March 2000)

- I. Genesis of the 2000 rules
- II. Roles of the national and state parties
- III. Reform era principles:
participation and fair reflection
- IV. Outreach, non-discrimination,
affirmative action provisions
- V. Two delegate categories:
pledged and unpledged
- VI. Apportionment of delegates
to states and within states
- VII. *Primary* and *caucus/convention*
systems for allocating pledged delegates
- VIII. Proportional method
for allocating pledged delegates
- IX. Party leader and elected official (PLEO)
and at-large pledged delegate allocation
- X. The calendar “window”
for primaries and caucuses
- XI. The “threshold” for pledged delegate
allocation to candidates
- XII. Presidential candidate rights and restrictions
- XIII. Restriction of primaries and caucuses
to Democrats
- XIV. Alternate delegates
- XV. Qualifications for pledged delegate
candidacy and obligations of pledged
delegates to presidential candidates
- XVI. Enforcement by the DNC Rules and
Bylaws Committee and sanctions
- XVII. Relationship of state plans to state law
- XVIII. The “Call” to the Convention
and delegate selection rules
- XIX. Contrasts between 2000 and 1996 rules
- XX. Contrasts between 1996 and 1992 rules
- XXI. Contrasts between 1992 and 1988 rules
- XXII. Contrasts between 1988 and 1984 rules

I. Genesis of the 2000 rules

A. Eighth set of “reform” rules. The Delegate Selection Rules for the 2000 Democratic National Convention comprise the eighth set of detailed national Democratic Party presidential nominating process regulations adopted since the beginning of the Party’s “reform era” following the 1968 Convention. Prior to that time (from 1832 to 1968), only very limited national rules governed selection of delegates by state and territorial Democratic parties.

B. Special commissions, 1972 to 1988. The first five set of rules were drafted by: the McGovern-Fraser Commission for 1972; the Mikulski Commission for 1976; the Winograd Commission for 1980; the Hunt Commission for 1984; and the Fowler Commission for 1988. All of the drafts were subject to approval by the Democratic National Committee, which has final authority over the presidential delegate selection process.

C. 2000, 1996 and 1992 rules drafted in-house. The 2000 rules, like those for 1996 and 1992, were drafted in-house by the Democratic National Committee’s own Rules and Bylaws Committee, making only modest changes in previous rules. The full Democratic National Committee adopted the 2000 rules at its May 9, 1988 meeting.

The 2000 rules represent a continued refinement of the regulations developed in the reform era—which was triggered by civil rights and anti-war activists at the 1964 and 1968 conventions, who urged creation of a more open nominating process with greater participation by rank-and-file members of the Party.

II. Roles of the national and state parties in the process

A. National rules govern. The national Party rules represent basic regulations which the 56 state and territorial Democratic parties comprising the Democratic National Committee must follow in writing their own delegate selection plans.

B. States must submit written plans. Each of the 56 parties, in a process open to rank-and-file members, must draft a plan and submit it to the DNC Rules & Bylaws Committee, designated by the rules to assist state parties in complying with the national rules. The national party rules attempt to give state parties some flexibility in choosing their methods for selecting

delegates, taking into account their histories and traditions.

III. Reform era principles: *participation and fair reflection*

A. Two basic concerns. The reform era in the Democratic convention delegate selection process began with two basic concerns:

(1) *Full participation.* Reformers believed that the relatively closed processes used by most state parties in selection of their delegations did not provide for full participation by rank-and-file or grassroots Democrats, particularly ethnic and other minorities and women.

(2) *Fair reflection of presidential preferences.* They also believed that the delegations selected under those processes did not always fairly represent or reflect the presidential preferences of rank-and-file members of the Party. They were especially concerned that minority views about who should be nominated—sometimes differing from those of party elites—were provided little opportunity for expression in convention balloting.

B. Past abuses. The first reform commission, chaired initially by U.S. Sen. George McGovern of South Dakota and later by U.S. Rep. Donald Fraser of Minnesota, researched the processes used for delegate selection by the various state parties in 1968.

They found that they were dominated by party insiders; that many processes lacked written rules; that existing rules, including dates and locations for delegate selection meetings, were not adequately communicated to rank-and-file Democrats by party officials; that delegate selection was often underway before the year in which the convention was held, preceding the emergence of candidates and issues that would dominate the process; that party committees charged with selecting delegates were often themselves selected in ways that failed to represent the interests of many Democrats within their jurisdictions; that party committees involved in delegate selection often acted without a reasonable quorum of members present; that delegates were often forced to support presidential candidates against their wishes, through such devices as “unit rules”, which mandated unanimous support for candidates obtaining pluralities; and that excessive costs and fees inhibited participation in contests for delegate positions and delegate service.

It was in that context that many of the rules still in force for the 2000 process were first adopted by the McGovern-Fraser Commission.

IV. Outreach, non-discrimination, affirmative action provisions

Rules 1-6 of the 2000 rules are aimed at implementing the reform era's "full participation" principle. These rules mandate:

A. Written plans. Written delegate selection plans [Rule 1.] must be prepared by each state party, and they must be readily accessible to rank-and-file Democrats and adopted with ample opportunity for grassroots input.

B. Restriction to Democrats. In 2000, the processes must be "open to all voters who wish to participate as Democrats" [Rule 2.A.], the same test first imposed for the 1988 process, which was a broader allowance than in 1984 (see Part "XIII" below). The current restriction also continues the 1984 and previous rules prohibition against participation by persons who vote in another party's nominating process.

C. No mandatory fees. Participants in the delegate selection process can be charged no mandatory fees [Rule 2.D.].

D. Publicized meetings. All meetings and events related to delegate selection must be held at convenient times that are uniform throughout the state and must be well-publicized with clear statements of the purposes of the events [Rule 3.].

E. Open party, non-discrimination. Recognizing that delegate selection rules cannot be fairly devised or implemented by a state party unless the party offers full, non-discriminatory participation in all its affairs, the 2000 rules continue to reiterate the "Six Basic Elements" of an open party [Rule 4.] first adopted in 1966 by the Special Equal Rights Committee created by the 1964 Convention. The 2000 rules also require state parties to develop and submit outreach plans for inclusion of groups "under-represented in the Democratic Party's affairs" as part of their delegate selection plans. The 2000 rule [Rule 5.C.] alters the outreach requirement to specifically cite "race/ethnicity, age, sexual orientation and disability" as examples of under-represented groups and adds "diversity" to full participation as a second purpose for requiring outreach efforts. The 1996 and 1992 rules had dropped references to eight groups named in the 1988 rules, in favor of more general language covering any "under-represented" groups.

F. Affirmative action. The 2000 rules require adoption and implementation of affirmative action plans [Rule 6.] "with specific goals and timetables" for five groups, first specifically designated for this purpose in the 1984 rules: Blacks, Hispanics, Native Americans, Asian/Pacific Americans and women. Quotas are banned as a means for implementation, as they specifically have

been, beginning with the 1976 rules. The rules make clear that delegations can't be challenged simply on the basis of composition if affirmative action plans have been adopted and implemented. The 2000 rules retain a section added in 1992 [Rule 6.I.] requiring presidential candidates to use their "best efforts" to ensure that the group of delegates pledged to them within a state is composed to achieve the affirmative action goals established by the state's selection plan for its entire delegation, and it requires that a candidate's delegation from a state be equally divided between men and women. The 2000 rules add a requirement (in Rule 6.A.3.) that, in selecting at-large delegates, state parties must give priority of consideration to the four groups specified in Rule 5.C. as "under-represented", in addition to the five groups designated for "affirmative action" since 1984.

G. Equal division by gender. The 2000 rules continue a requirement first instituted for the 1980 Convention that each state's delegation be equally divided between men and women [Rule 6.C.]. The equal division requirement is not considered a quota for purposes of applying the ban on quotas. It mirrors eight decades of equal division of the Democratic National Committee, initiated with adoption of the 19th Amendment to the U.S. Constitution. The rules make clear that, for equal division purposes, a state's delegation includes unpledged as well as pledged delegates. And the rules require equal division at the district level and equal division of both the total of a state's delegates and the total of its alternates (so that alternate slots can't be used to balance an unequally divided group of full delegates.)

V. Two delegate categories: *pledged and unpledged*

A. Pledged delegates. Candidates for (a) a state's "base" delegation (see Part "VI" below) to the convention, and (b) the fifteen (15) percent add-on to the base delegation set aside for party leader and elected officials must all sign advance pledges of their presidential preferences, either for a specific candidate or a pledge of "uncommitted" [Rule 11.B.].

Public statements of preference, provided for beginning with the 1972 rules, along with a selection system that allocates delegate slots to presidential candidates according to percentage of votes and preferences received in primaries and caucuses, comprise the manner in which the "fair reflection" principle of the reform era is achieved—by giving a rank-and-file participant in the process assurance that his or her vote will translate to election of delegates with allegiance to the participant's preference for the nomination.

Pledged delegate categories:

(1) *District level (75% of base)*. The rules require that 75% of a state's base delegation be elected at levels no higher than the congressional district [Rule 7.C.]. These positions must be fairly apportioned to districts on the basis of population and Democratic voting strength (see Part "VI." below.)

(2) *At-large (25% of base)*. The remaining 25% of a state's base delegates are to be selected at-large (state-wide) [Rule 7.C.]. This division allows use of the at-large slots for affirmative action balancing of a delegation when selection at the district level has not given adequate representation to various broad groups within the Party. The allocation to presidential candidates of these at-large positions must reflect candidate preferences expressed in district level voting. At-large delegates are to be selected after all others are chosen (to allow balancing.)

(3) *Party leader & elected officials (a number equal to 15% of base)*. Beginning with the 1980 rules, each state delegation was given an additional number of slots to be set aside for party leader and elected officials [Rule 8.]. This category of pledged delegates was created in reaction to concern that the reform era rules were discouraging participation in Democratic Conventions by party leaders and elected officials.

The number of "PLEO's", an acronym sometimes used to designate this category, was equal to 10% of base delegates for 1980 and 1984 and was increased to 15% in 1988, the percentage still in effect for 2000 (the percentage was increased in 1988 when certain classes of officials were removed from consideration for unpledged delegate slots.)

Provision for pledged party leader and elected official delegate positions was designed to encourage participation in the convention by such officials, but without giving them the automatic delegate status banned beginning with the 1972 rules. These delegate positions, selected state-wide in a manner similar to that used for choosing "at-large" delegates, must also be allocated to presidential candidates by percentages reflecting the preferences expressed in the selection of district level delegates.

B. Unpledged delegates. Despite the creation of special pledged delegate positions for party leaders and elected officials, the number of such officials—particularly Members of Congress—declined at the 1980 Convention. The Hunt Commission, which wrote the 1984 rules, addressed the problem by creating a category of "unpledged" delegates [Rules 8.A. and 8.B.], believing that officials would be more likely to attend the convention if they didn't have to make early, formal, advance pledges of support for presidential candidates and they didn't have to run against their own constituents and supporters to win delegate seats. The Hunt Commission also felt that a non-formally-pledged group of public officials, more likely to represent the broad-based philosophy of the party rather than narrower interests, could help restore some of the deliberative nature of the convention process lost under reform rules.

Because they didn't have to take advance pledges, the

unpledged delegates were informally dubbed "super delegates" by journalists. "Unpledged" does not mean that these party and elected leaders are restrained from endorsing or expressing personal commitments to presidential candidates at any time during the process; the status simply gives them a way to go to the convention without being subjected to a required, formal statement of preference.

The 1984 rules configured the unpledged category of delegates by giving delegate status to all state chairs and vice chairs and by apportioning 400 unpledged slots to the state parties, plus additional slots to each state, if needed, to bring their unpledged apportionment to a number equalling the sum of Democrats in the state holding the offices of Governor, U.S. Representative, U.S. Senator and big-city mayor (cities of 250,000 population or more.) The rules also allowed the U.S. House Democratic Caucus and U.S. Senate Democratic Conference each to select up to 60% of their members to fill some of the 400-plus unpledged slots noted above. The unpledged delegate seats not filled by House and Senate members selected in Washington were filled by state parties, giving priority first to governors and big city mayors and then to state-wide elected officials, state legislators, DNC members and Members of Congress not selected in Washington. The total unpledged positions created for 1984 was 568, which equalled about 14% of the total (3,933) convention delegate votes.

The 1988 rules changed and simplified unpledged delegate selection, creating the first four of the five following categories of unpledged delegates, retained in the 1992, 1996 and 2000 rules. The fifth category was added when the DNC adopted the "Call" [see Part "XVIII" below] to the 1992 Convention.

Unpledged delegate categories:

(1) *DNC members*. All members of the Democratic National Committee, capable of casting about 425 convention votes (some territorial DNC members have only partial votes in National Committee deliberations, so the number isn't equal to the actual number of nearly 450 DNC members), are placed in their respective state delegations.

(2) *House & Senate Democrats*. All Democrats in the House and Senate, as in 1996, can attend the 2000 Convention as unpledged delegates from their states. (The 1992 and 1988 rules had allowed the House Democratic Caucus and the Senate Democratic Conference to select up to 80% of their members, an increase of one-fifth over the 1984 allotment.) [Any House or Senate member who also serves on the Democratic National Committee is seated in his or her capacity as a DNC member.]

(3) *Democratic Governors*. All Democratic Governors of the states and territories can serve with their respective delegations. [Governors who are members of the DNC vote as DNC members, and the mayor of the District of Columbia is treated as a governor.]

(4) *Distinguished leaders*. Former Democratic Presidents, Vice Presidents, Speakers of the House and Senate Majority Leaders were given unpledged delegate status in 1988 and 1992. Any sitting Demo

cratic President and Vice President and former DNC Chairs were added for 1996, all to serve with their respective state delegations. The 2000 rules add former Senate and House Democratic Minority Leaders to the category of distinguished former leaders eligible for unpledged delegate seats.

(5) *Other elected and party officials.* A number of additional unpledged delegate seats, equal to one-for-every-four DNC Member delegate votes in a state's delegation, were added in a provision included in the "Call" to the 1992 Convention, retained for 1996 and 2000. These extra seats (totalling 81 nationally for 2000) were intended for other elected and party officials not covered in the above groups.

Number of 2000 pledged and unpledged delegates: *The "Call" to the 2000 Convention established the same number of "base" pledged delegates for 2000 as for the 1988-96 conventions—3,000—to be apportioned to the 50 states and the District of Columbia. The Call assigned three "at-large" pledged delegate votes each for American Samoa, Guam and the Virgin Islands; six "at-large" pledged delegate votes for Democrats Abroad; and 44 "base" delegate votes for Puerto Rico. With the 15% add-on for PLEO's (apportioned to the 50 states, DC, Democrats Abroad and Puerto Rico), the total number of pledged delegates for 2000 will be 3,537. (Note: Numerical rounding in application of the allocation formula resulted in a total of 3,016 base delegates allocated to the 50 states and the District of Columbia.) As of this writing (March 2000), unpledged delegate votes at the 2000 convention total 801 (subject to slight change by intervening election results and other factors.) With delegate votes expected to total very close to 4,338, approximately 81.5% will be pledged delegates and 18.5% unpledged.*

VI. Apportionment of delegates to states and within states

A. "Call" apportions to states. The "Call" to a Democratic Convention sets a total number of pledged "base" delegates to be selected from the 51 state parties (including the District of Columbia), and then apportions those base delegates to the parties through a formula giving equal weight to population and state Democratic voting strength reflected in the past three presidential elections. The Call also specifies a number of delegates for the 5 territorial parties.

B. States apportion to districts. "Rule 7" of the 2000 rules outlines various options state parties can then use to apportion district-level base delegates (75 percent of a state's total base delegates) to districts within the state (usually congressional districts, but no larger than congressional districts). The options are various formulas or combinations of formulas that take into account population of districts and Democratic voting strength of districts reflected in recent presiden-

tial and gubernatorial general election results and recent Democratic voter registration figures. In states with only one congressional district, district level and at-large delegates (the remaining 25 percent of a state's total base delegates) can be selected at the same time.

VII. Primary and caucus/convention systems for allocating pledged delegates

All pledged delegate seats (district level, at-large and pledged party leaders and elected officials) must be allocated to presidential candidates or an "uncommitted" status, and persons to fill these seats must be selected through one of the two following basic systems:

A. Primary election system. In this system, voters at the district level cast ballots for presidential candidates. The results determine what proportion of the delegate seats to be elected in the district will go to each presidential candidate; persons to fill these positions can be chosen either on the ballot in the same election or at pre- or post-primary meetings of supporters of presidential candidates, from a list of persons who have filed their candidacies for delegate and have taken the formal written pledge of support for a presidential candidate (or uncommitted status.)

B. Caucus/convention system. In the typical caucus/convention system, party members assemble in their precincts, wards or townships to elect representatives to a county or some other intermediate convention, which in turn sends representatives to a district convention for final selection of district delegates; the process often ends with a state-wide convention. It is the date of the lowest level meeting in a state's caucus/convention process that is listed on the calendar (compiled by the Democratic National Committee) of state delegate selection events, along with the dates for delegate selection primaries. The district level allocation of delegate seats to presidential candidates can be extrapolated from the division of preferences expressed at the lowest level caucus meetings, but the actual allocation doesn't take place until the district level conventions held sometime later, at which point individuals are also chosen to fill the allocated slots.

Percentages chosen in primaries and caucuses. *The reform era delegate selection rules have resulted in heavy reliance on primaries for delegate selection. Even though many state parties use the modern caucus/convention method, most larger states use primaries. Of the 56 state and territorial Democratic parties, 39 were to hold primaries (several party-run) in 2000, in which about 68.5% of all delegates (and 84% of pledged delegates) were to be allocated, with the remaining parties using caucuses to determine about 13.1% of all 2000 delegates (and about*

16% of the pledged delegates.) For contrast: primaries accounted for 38% of delegate votes in the last pre-reform convention in 1968 and jumped to 61% in 1972, 73% in 1976, and 72% in 1980. The numbers dropped to a little less than 55% in 1984, when 31 state parties used the caucus/convention system and “unpledged” delegates were added, reducing the number of delegates selected in either primaries or caucuses. The percentage for primaries then rebounded in 1988, when primary voters selected about 68% of the total convention delegates, close to the 67% selected in primaries in 1992 and 63% in primaries in 1996.

With the exception noted for 1984, the trend of the Reform Era in delegate selection has been an increase in the use of primaries for delegate allocation to candidates, with the portion of pledged delegates selected in primaries increasing from two-fifths in 1972 to over three-fifths in 1996.

Note: Some states selecting delegates with the caucus/convention system have held non-binding primary elections that allow voters to designate their favorite presidential candidates. Such “beauty contests”, as they are sometimes called, have nothing to do with delegate selection.

VIII. Proportional method for allocating pledged delegates

A. Proportional allocation only. In addition to requiring preference pledges of those who seek delegate seats, the 2000 rules, continuing a change first made in 1992, further implement the “fair reflection of presidential preferences” principle of the reform era by limiting the pledged delegate selection process to a proportional allocation method [Rule 12.], eliminating the “bonus delegate” and “direct election of delegates” options permitted in the 1984 and 1988 rules.

(1) *Old “bonus” method.* The 1984/1988 bonus method gave the presidential candidate winning a plurality of votes in district level primaries, or preferences stated by participants in the caucus/convention method, one of the delegate positions to be selected in the district; the remaining delegate slots were then allocated in proportion to the candidates’ percentages of votes or preferences. First allowed in the 1984 rules, the bonus system was sometimes referred to as “winner take more.” Eight primary states (FL, GA, MA, MO, MT, NY, NC and OH) and two caucus state parties (AK and CO) used the method in 1988.

(2) *Old “direct election” method.* The direct election of delegates method (officially permitted during the reform era in 1972, 1976, 1984 and 1988) was applicable only to primary election systems. Candidates for delegate in a district were directly elected by plurality in a primary, with no direct voting for presidential candidates (unless a state simultaneously held

a “beauty contest” preference primary, the results of which did not affect delegate selection.) A candidate for delegate under this system appeared on the ballot with the name of his or her presidential preference or “uncommitted” status noted clearly for voters. The delegate candidates receiving the highest number of votes were elected. Because voters in this method of delegate selection frequently didn’t cross-vote between presidential “slates” (though they had to be allowed to do so), one presidential candidate often ended up winning all of the delegates to be selected in a particular district, which resulted in informal (but inaccurate) reference to this method as “winner-take-all.” Allowed in the 1972 and 1976 rules, this method was banned for 1980, when a few states were able to use it under a loophole in the rules; thus, it was sometimes referred to as a “loophole primary.” The 1984 and 1988 rules once again made it a permissible method, along with proportional and bonus. Seven parties (IL, MD, NJ, PA, WV, PR and Democrats Abroad) used the direct election method in 1988.

B. Description of proportional method. The 1988 Democratic Convention adopted a change in the Party’s Charter requiring use of only the proportional method for allocation of delegates to presidential candidates. Under this method, a presidential candidate gets a proportion of a district’s delegate seats equal to the percentage of vote he or she receives in a primary election or to the percentage of support he or she receives when the preferences of participants in a district convention are tallied (reflecting preferences of the lowest level, first-stage caucuses.)

In both primary and caucus/convention states, presidential preferences stated at the district level must reach at least 15% of those participating before a presidential candidate can qualify for award of delegate seats. The proportion of seats a candidate receives is determined by first dropping the votes received by candidates falling below the 15% threshold and then re-calculating to determine percentage allocation. (More discussion of the threshold follows in Part “XI” below.)

IX. Party leader and elected official (PLEO) and at-large pledged delegate allocation

A. Allocation to reflect district level results. Allocation to presidential candidates of “at-large” and “party leader and elected official” pledged delegate seats must reflect presidential preferences expressed at the district level [Rules 7.8., and 9.]. (Therefore,

it is possible to extrapolate the allocation of all three categories of pledged delegates from primaries and first-stage caucus results.)

B. “PLEO’s” selected before “at-large” for affirmative action. The pledged “PLEO’s” must be selected before the at-large pledged delegates, so that the at-large slots can be used, if necessary, for meeting affirmative action goals and required gender balancing of the state delegation.

C. Allocation methods. Allocation of all state-wide slots, at-large and PLEO, can take place by one of the following methods [Rule 9.C.]:

(1) *State-wide primary vote.* If the state uses a presidential preference primary system to proportionally allocate district delegates, the cumulative state-wide votes received by presidential candidates will determine their allocation of available at-large and pledged party leader and elected official delegate slots.

(2) *State-wide convention preference division.* In a state with a caucus/convention system culminating in a state-wide convention, allocation is based on the division of preferences among convention participants (as reflected up from the lowest level caucuses.)

(3) *Percentage of district level delegates.* In a state using a caucus/convention system not culminating in a state-wide convention, allocation of at-large delegates and pledged PLEO delegates is based on the percentages of district level delegates received by each presidential candidate at the time of district-level selection.

Note: If a presidential candidate entitled to an allocation under any of the above three methods is no longer a candidate at the time of at-large and PLEO delegate selection, his or her allocation is proportionately divided among those others entitled to allocations.

D. Bodies permitted to select “at-large” and “PLEO” pledged delegates. The 2000 rules permit three types of representative bodies [Rule 8.D.] to select *individuals* to fill the at-large and pledged party leader and elected official delegate slots once they are allocated:

(1) *a state convention;*

(2) *a committee consisting of a quorum of all pledged delegates chosen at the district level; or*

(3) *a state Democratic committee, provided that the state committee is properly apportioned on the basis of its constituent units’ population and Democratic voting strength; it is selected in an open and timely manner; and, as required by new language added to the 1996 rules, it complies with the equal division by gender requirement of the Charter of the Democratic Party of the United States.*

X. The calendar “window” for primaries and caucuses

A. Initial limitation was “calendar year of convention.” The first reform era rules adopted for 1972 required that the delegate selection process be confined to the calendar year of the convention, so that rank-and-file voters could express their preferences in a timely fashion and not before all or most presidential candidates had entered the race or before the issues that would dominate the race were fully engaged. The same timing provision governed the 1976 process.

B. First “window” for 1980. But for 1980, the rules created a calendar “window” in which all binding primaries and first-stage caucuses had to be held—between the second Tuesday in March and the second Tuesday in June. The purpose was to keep the process from extending over too long a period of time, draining candidate and party resources.

C. Exemptions granted starting in 1984. The 1984 rules kept the window, but granted specific exemptions for two states—Iowa and New Hampshire—which had traditions of holding their events before the second Tuesday in March. Iowa was allowed to go no more than 15 days before the second Tuesday in March, and New Hampshire no more than seven days prior. A provision allowed appeals for exemption from the window if a state party made an honest effort to alter conflicting state law, and two states eventually received exemptions—Maine and Wyoming.

The 1988 rules kept the same window, but gave exemptions to the four states which held their primaries and caucuses before the window in 1984: Iowa, no more than 22 days before; New Hampshire, no more than 14 days; Maine, no more than 9; and Wyoming, no more than 4.

D. Window, changed in 1992, retained for 2000. The 1992 rules changed the window [Rule 10.], defining it as the first (instead of second) Tuesday in March to the second Tuesday in June. The same window was retained for 1996 and will also apply to 2000. The 2000 rules continue to give exemptions to Iowa, no more than 15 days before the first Tuesday in March, for its early caucus; to New Hampshire, no more than 7 days before the first Tuesday in March, for its early primary; and to Maine, no earlier than 2 days before the first Tuesday in March, for its early caucus the weekend after New Hampshire’s primary. (Wyoming no longer needed the exemption it was granted prior to 1992, since its traditional caucus date fell within the new window.) [Iowa and New Hampshire received additional exemptions for 2000 after the rules were adopted to allow them to hold their events even earlier.]

XI. The "threshold" for pledged delegate allocation to candidates

A. Threshold broached in 1976 rules. The threshold concept was first broached in the 1976 rules, which allowed state delegate selection plans to restrict awarding of district level delegate slots to presidential candidates who failed to receive support from at least 15% of binding primary or caucus/convention participants.

B. Purpose of threshold. Allowance of a threshold was based on the view that the purpose of the Party's nominating process is to select a standard-bearer who has demonstrated the ability to amass popular support through a winnowing process—not to allow candidates with very small levels of support to use a handful of delegates to play a brokering role at the convention.

C. Threshold established for 1980. The 1980 rules formally established a threshold requirement. For primary states, the threshold was a percentage obtained by dividing the number of district level delegates to be selected into 100, but with a 25% limit. For caucus/convention states, the percentage was a minimum of 15% and a maximum of 20%.

D. Changes, 1984-92. The 1984 rules set the threshold for primaries the same as in 1980, but required the threshold in caucus states to be 20%. The 1988 rules reduced the threshold to 15% across-the-board, with application required at the district and state levels. The 1992 rules further clarified the 15% threshold by establishing it as a minimum as well as maximum for all states [Rule 12.]. No changes were made for 1996 or 2000.

XII. Presidential candidate rights and restrictions

A. Rights. To assure that a presidential candidate's support is not diluted in the process of selecting pledged delegates, the rules allow candidates certain rights [Rule 11.]. A presidential candidate has authority, with limitations, to exercise a veto over individuals who may want to seek delegate seats in his name and over how many candidates can run for the maximum number of slots for which he is potentially eligible. These provisions serve to assure that an individual who claims a pledge for a candidate is indeed a bona fide supporter.

The 2000 rules continue the rights of presidential candidates to reduce the number of candidates seeking delegate slots allocated to them at the district level, as long as the remaining number isn't fewer than three for each possible delegate slot. And the 2000 rules continue the 1996 change allowing presidential candidates to reduce the list of candidates for at-large pledged delegates to one for each potential slot to be awarded to the candidate.

The 2000 rules retain language added in 1996 assuring candidates for the party's nomination that they will get to fill, in post-primary caucuses, any delegate slots they win in primaries, even if they failed to slate a sufficient number of candidates before the primary election. And language added in 1996 prohibits state parties from requiring presidential candidates to slate delegate candidates as a prerequisite for access to the primary ballot.

B. Restrictions. The 2000 rules [Rule 11.K.] set new qualifications for candidates for the party nomination, "for purposes of these rules." A candidate must be registered to vote, as in 1996, but he or she must also have been registered for the last presidential election; and a candidate must "have demonstrated a commitment to the goals and objectives of the Democratic Party as determined by the National Chair" and must "participate in the Convention in good faith."

Dropped, from 1996, was language requiring a candidate to be "a declared Democrat" and a requirement that a presidential candidate "have established a bona fide record of public service, accomplishment, public writings and/or public statements affirmatively demonstrating that he or she has the interests, welfare and success of the Democratic Party of the United States at heart."

The 2000 rules retain language added in 1996 limiting petition signatures to 5,000 and filing fees to \$2,500 in states making such requirements for ballot access.

XIII. Restriction of primaries and caucuses to Democrats

A. Limited primary and caucus participation restriction begun in 1988 continues for 2000. The 2000 rules state that the delegate selection process is "open to all voters who wish to participate as Democrats", continuing the same restriction first required in the 1988 rules [Rule 2.].

B. 1980 and 1984 restrictions were greater. The 1988 provision was a modification of the 1980 and 1984 standard, which limited participation to Democratic voters "who publicly declare their party preference and have that preference publicly recorded." The

1980-84 provision precluded the use of “open primaries” for delegate selection, in which voters are not required either to be registered as Democrats or to make a public choice of a Democratic Party ballot or state their Democratic Party preference when going to a polling place or caucus site.

C. “Open primary” use possible. The 1988 change was meant to allow states, like Wisconsin, with open primary traditions the possibility of using the system for delegate selection, but was not meant to encourage other states to adopt such a method.

D. Earlier restrictions. In contrast, the 1972 rules required the process to be open to “all persons who wish to be Democrats” and the 1976 rules said that state parties “must take all feasible steps to restrict participation in the delegate selection process to Democratic voters only.”

XIV. Alternate delegates

A. Same selection process as for delegates. To assure that alternates who may eventually replace elected delegates fairly reflect the presidential preferences represented by pledged delegates, the process for selecting alternates is the same as that for selecting pledged delegates [Rule 17.].

B. Must be same presidential preference, gender. Permanent alternates must be of the same presidential preference and gender, and, to the extent possible, from the same political subdivision as the delegates they replace.

C. Methods for designating alternates to replace delegates. An alternate can be designated to replace a delegate by one of the following methods: (1) the delegate designates the alternate; (2) the delegation designates the alternate; (3) an alternate is designated who received the highest number of votes; or (4) another process that protects the interests of presidential candidates, delegates and alternates.

D. Alternates only for “pledged” delegates, except for deceased “unpledged”. Alternates are selected for the purpose of replacing, if necessary, pledged delegates who may resign, be unable to attend the convention, become ill or die before the convention, or are eliminated from delegate service for some other reason. Only in case of the death of an unpledged delegate shall a state have the right to fill such a position with another person. Unpledged delegates who don’t participate in the convention for any other reason are not entitled to replacements.

Number of alternates: The Call to the 2000 Convention sets the number of alternates at one-for-every-six base delegates, the same since 1992, when the number of alternates was reduced by one-half from the 1988 level. The Call requires a minimum of four alternates for each of the 50 states, the District of Columbia and Puerto Rico; two for Democrats Abroad; and one each for American Samoa, Guam and the Virgin Islands. (The number of alternates for recent conventions has been reduced as the number of delegates has increased. The number of delegates has almost tripled since 1960.)

XV. Qualifications for pledged delegate candidacy and obligations of pledged delegates to presidential candidates

A. Qualifications for delegates. The 2000 rules continue a 1996 change setting new qualification requirements for candidates for pledged delegate slots, restricting their candidacies to districts in which they are registered to vote and requiring that they be “bona fide Democrats”, as defined in Rule 11.H. of the rules.

B. “All good conscience” standard continues for convention voting. The 2000 rules continue the same requirement of pledged delegates first adopted for 1984: “Delegates elected to the national convention pledged to a presidential candidate shall in all good conscience reflect the sentiments of those who elected them.” [Rule 11.J.] The “all good conscience” language allows delegates to vote other than their pledges if, in good conscience, they feel that those who selected them would approve of the change. The language first adopted for 1984 represented a significant change from that adopted for the 1980 convention, which required that pledged delegates “be bound to vote for the presidential candidate whom they were elected to support for at least the first Convention ballot.” The 1972 and 1976 rules contained no requirements with regard to first ballot votes by pledged delegates.

XVI. Enforcement by the DNC Rules and Bylaws Committee and sanctions

A. Enforcement by the DNC Rules and Bylaws Committee. The 2000 rules again specify, as they have since 1992, that the Democratic National Committee’s Rules and Bylaws Committee will assist state parties in writing their delegate selection plans and review and supervise their compliance with the national rules. [Rule 18.]

Use of the “in-house” Rules and Bylaws Committee was a 1992 departure from the 1976-88 delegate selection processes, when special commissions were established for compliance. The 1988 commission was called the “Compliance Assistance Commission.” The commission was called the Compliance Review Commission from 1976 to 1984. The 1972 rules were supervised by the same commission which wrote them, the Commission on Party Structure and Delegate Selection (informally called the McGovern-Fraser Commission.)

Under the 2000 national rules, state party delegate selection plans were due to the Rules and Bylaws Committee by May 1, 1999. State party plans were to be acted upon by the Rules and Bylaws Committee no later than September 16, 1999.

B. Sanctions for non-compliance. Reacting to non-compliance with national party delegate selection rules by some state parties for recent conventions (particularly with regard to the “window” for delegate selection events), the 1992 rules for the first time incorporated a number of specific sanctions that are to be imposed on violators [Rule 19.], sanctions continued for 2000.

The rules require a 25% reduction in the number of district level delegates and a 25% reduction in district level alternates in a state’s delegation, and elimination of delegate voting status for DNC members from the state if the DNC Rules and Bylaws Committee finds a state has violated any of three rules categories:

(1) *Provisions requiring delegate selection primaries and first stage caucuses within the permissible “window”* (first Tuesday in March to second Tuesday in June, with specific exemptions for Iowa, New Hampshire and Maine) [see Part “X.” above];

(2) *Provisions limiting allocation of pledged delegates to the proportional method* [see Part “VIII.” above];

(3) *Provisions requiring a threshold of not less or more than 15 percent for allocation of pledged delegates* [see Part “XI.” above].

The rules further permit reduction of state delegations for other rules violations and suggest the following additional sanctions that could be levied for any violations: (a) establishment of a special committee in a state to run a delegate selection process alternative to the one in violation; (b) reduction of the number of Convention standing committee seats to which a state would otherwise be entitled; (c) limitations on the number of Convention guest, VIP and other passes to which the state would be entitled; and (d) penalties with regard to the assignment of a state delegation’s seating position on the Convention hall floor and its hotel rooms and function space.

The rules give the Rules and Bylaws Committee authority to waive penalties in circumstances where it finds that a state party has tried to reverse state law that causes the state party’s delegate selection plan to be in non-compliance.

XVII. Relationship of state plans to state law

Supreme Court decisions have established that political parties generally have the right to control their own national convention delegate selection processes, unencumbered by state law.

But the processes used by many state parties have been written into state law. When a state law conflicts with the Democratic Party’s national delegate selection rules, the rules require state parties to “take provable positive steps to achieve legislative changes to bring the state law into compliance” with the national rules.

The national rules reserve the right of the national Party to require state parties to operate alternative party-run delegate selection processes apart from the requirements of state law. [Rule 20.]

XVIII. The “Call” to the Convention and delegate selection rules

A. Pre-Reform Era rules were in “Call”. Before the Party began to adopt detailed national rules for delegate selection in 1972, most rules were encompassed in the “Call” to the Convention—the historically used device for calling together delegations from the various states for the quadrennial meeting.

B. Timetable for Call. The Call to a convention usually is adopted by the Democratic National Committee a year-or-more before the quadrennial meeting. A “Final Call” is sometimes preceded by adoption of a “Preliminary Call.” The preliminary stage was skipped for 2000, when the DNC adopted the Call at its September 26, 1998 meeting.

C. Call provisions. The Call normally sets the convention location and dates; reaffirms any delegate selection rules previously adopted by the DNC; sets the number of delegates and alternates and provides a formula for apportioning them to the states; establishes a certification process for delegates and alternates; gives the Democratic National Chairman the right to determine bona fide presidential candidates for purposes of the rules (such as non-voting representation on Convention committees); establishes procedures for selection of the Standing Committees of the Convention—Rules, Credentials and Platform; and outlines preliminary procedural rules for the Convention, including an order of business.

XIX. Contrasts between the 2000 and 1996 rules

Following is a brief account of key differences between the 2000 and 1996 rules, many of which are covered in more detail above:

A. "Under-represented" groups specified for outreach. The 2000 rules categorize "race/ethnicity, age, sexual orientation or disability" as "historically" (the 1996 rules used "significantly") under-represented groups for which state parties must develop special "outreach" efforts. And the new language adds "diversity" to "full participation" as another goal for conducting the outreach. In 1996 and 1992, the outreach requirement used "under-represented" without naming specific groups, a change from the 1988 rules when a list of groups was also cited. [Rule 5.C.]

B. Preference for the four new groups in at-large delegate selection. The four groups cited in Rule 5.C. must now be given "priority of consideration" when state parties select at-large delegates, in addition to the priority given to African Americans, Hispanics, Native Americans, Asian/Pacific Americans and women for affirmative action purposes. [Rule 6.A.3.]

C. Former Congressional Minority Leaders added as unpledged delegates. The 2000 rules add former U.S. House and Senate "Minority Leaders" to the short list of distinguished former leaders allowed to attend the convention as unpledged delegates (the previous list had included former Democratic Presidents, Vice Presidents, Senate Majority Leaders, House Speakers and DNC Chairs.) [Rule 8.A.5.]

D. New eligibility requirements for presidential candidates. The 2000 rules revise the eligibility requirements for presidential candidates. A candidate must be registered to vote, as in 1996, but he or she must also have been registered for the last presidential election; and a candidate must "have demonstrated a commitment to the goals and objectives of the Democratic Party as determined by the National Chair" and must "participate in the Convention in good faith." Dropped from 1996 was language requiring a candidate to be "a declared Democrat" and a requirement that a presidential candidate "have established a bona fide record of public service, accomplishment, public writings and/or public statements affirmatively demonstrating that he or she has the interests, welfare and success of the Democratic Party of the United States at heart." [Rule 11.K.]

Contrasts between the 1996 and 1992 rules

Following is a brief account of key differences between the 1996 and 1992 rules, many of which are covered in more detail above:

A. Stronger equal division by gender requirements. The 1996 rules strengthened previous equal division by gender provisions by requiring that a state's entire group of delegates be equally divided and its entire group of alternates be equally divided separately (so that alternates can't be used to balance an unequally divided group of full delegates.) The 1996 rules also provided that district level delegates and district level alternates be equally divided as groups, insofar as is mathematically possible [Rule 6.C.] The 1996 rules clarified previous rules applying to equal division by stating that unpledged delegates are part of a state's full delegation (not just pledged delegates.) [Rule 9.A.]

B. New unpledged delegates and selection provisions. The 1996 rules expanded the number of Democratic U.S. House and U.S. Senate members eligible for service as unpledged delegates from 80% to 100%, eliminating the procedures (made unnecessary by the change) for selection of Representatives and Senators by the House Caucus and Senate Conference. The 1996 rules also added any sitting Democratic President and Vice President and former Democratic National Committee Chairs to the list of distinguished party leaders and elected officials who can serve as unpledged delegates. The 1996 rules also defined procedures for selecting any unpledged "add-ons" provided in the Call (as was done in both the 1992 and 1996 Calls, allowing one such "add-on" unpledged delegate for every four DNC votes.) [Rules 8.A. and 8.B.]

C. "At-large" and "PLEO" selection changes. A presidential candidate was given the right in the 1996 rules to limit the list of his at-large and party leader and elected official (PLEO) supporters from which his allocated slots are filled to just one candidate per slot (though state parties were given the right to require presidential candidates to remove fewer names, so that at least two candidates remain for every slot.) The no-fewer-than-three-names requirement was continued for the list of supporters to fill slots chosen at the district level. [Rule 11.D.] Previous rules required that at least three at-large and PLEO candidates remain for each fillable slot.

D. Delegate and alternate residency, party allegiance requirements. The 1996 rules added residency requirements for district level delegate and alternate candidates and required, "for purposes of these rules", that all delegates and alternates be "bona fide Democrats" who have the "interests, welfare and success of the Democratic Party of the United States at

XX.

heart"; who subscribe to the Party's charter; and who will participate in the Convention "in good faith." [Rule 11.H.]

E. Presidential candidate party allegiance requirement. For "purposes of these (1996) rules", a Democratic presidential candidate "must be registered to vote, must be a declared Democrat, and must, as determined by the Chairman of the Democratic National Committee, have established a bona fide record of public service, accomplishment, public writings and/or public statements affirmatively demonstrating that he or she has the interests, welfare and success of the Democratic Party of the United States at heart and will participate in the Convention in good faith." [Rule 11.K.]

F. Petition, fee requirements. The 1996 rules set a 5,000 limit on signatures for placing a presidential candidate's name on a primary ballot and a maximum of 1,000 signatures for candidates for delegate or alternate. If a filing fee is charged for presidential primary candidates, it cannot exceed \$2,500. [Rule 13.]

G. New delegate and ballot access rights for presidential candidates. A presidential candidate who wins delegate slots was given the right to fill those slots under the 1996 rules, even if he or she doesn't slate enough delegate or alternate candidates prior to a primary. [Rule 12.C.] And state parties were prohibited from requiring filing of district level delegate or alternate candidates as a condition for placement of a presidential candidate's name on the preference ballot. [Rule 13.H.]

XXI. Contrasts between the 1992 and 1988 rules

Following is a brief account of key differences between the 1992 and 1988 rules, many of which are covered in more detail above:

A. "Proportional" method only for delegate selection. The 1992 rules, incorporating a provision adopted by the 1988 Democratic Convention, restricted allocation of pledged delegate slots decided in primaries and caucuses to the "proportional" method, prohibiting use of the "bonus" and "direct election" methods.

B. "Window" changed. The 1992 rules moved the beginning of the calendar "window" for primaries and caucuses to the first Tuesday in March (from the second Tuesday.) Exemptions remained for Iowa, New Hampshire and Maine, with an exemption no longer necessary for Wyoming. After adoption of the 1992 rules, the South Dakota Democratic Party, after trying and failing to change state law, was allowed by the DNC to hold its primary before the first Tuesday in March; New Hampshire and Iowa, with "first-in-the-nation"

primary and caucus laws, were then allowed to hold their events an additional week earlier than provided by their 1992 exemptions.

C. Sanctions for rules violations. The 1992 rules required a reduction in a state's delegation size if the state violated rules governing the calendar "window", the restriction of delegate selection to the "proportional" method, or the requirement of a 15 percent threshold with regard to awarding of pledged delegates to presidential candidates. The new provisions also suggested other possible sanctions that might be applied to violators, including: requiring that a state hold an alternative delegate selection process, reducing a state's number of Convention standing committee members, and penalizing the state with respect to its Convention guest passes, floor and other hall space, and hotel assignment.

D. New category of unpledged delegates. Following adoption of the 1992 rules in March of 1990, the DNC, in the Call to the 1992 Convention adopted September 15, 1990, added an additional category of unpledged delegates. The Call granted each state one additional unpledged delegate for every four of its DNC Members.

E. Affirmative action and participation requirements. The 1992 rules added those with "physical disability" to groups protected against discrimination in party affairs, listed those groups only once in the rules instead of repeatedly, and made subsequent reference to them with restrictions against discrimination on the basis of "status"; dropped a specific list of groups for which state parties have to develop outreach plans in favor of a general reference to requiring outreach plans for those groups "significantly under-represented in our Party's affairs"; and tightened requirements in state party delegate selection plans on affirmative action by presidential candidates in forming their slates of individuals to fill delegate slots won by them in primaries and caucuses.

F. Threshold clarified. The 1992 rules clarified the 15 percent threshold of votes and preferences in primaries and caucuses required for allocation of delegate slots to presidential candidates by specifically stating that state delegate selection plans couldn't establish threshold's above or below 15 percent.

G. House & Senate delegate selection timing. The 1992 rules required only that House and Senate unpledged delegates be selected by May 1, 1992; the 1988 rules mandated their selection between April 19 and May 7 so they wouldn't be chosen before the primaries and caucuses began.

H. Alternate replacement of delegates. The 1992 rules clarified requirements and methods for alternate replacement of delegates.

I. DNC "in-house" enforcement of rules. The 1992 rules, instead of creating a special Compliance Assistance (or Review) Commission, as did the 1976-88 rules, gave responsibility for enforcement of the national Party delegate selection rules to its own Rules and Bylaws Committee.

J. Miscellaneous. The following were miscellaneous

significant changes made in the 1992 rules:

(1) *District of Columbia mayor treated as governor.* For the purpose of assigning Democratic Governors to state delegations as unpledged delegates, the District of Columbia mayor was considered a governor.

(2) *Big city mayors/state-wide elected officials treated equally.* For the purpose of choosing a state's "15%-add-on" pledged party leader and elected official delegates, big city mayors and state-wide elected officials were given equal first priority of consideration.

(3) *Presidential candidate ballot access.* The 1992 rules prohibited a state delegate selection plan from requiring that a presidential candidate first have candidates pledged to him listed on a ballot before his own name can be on the ballot.

(4) *State-wide figures used for at-large delegate allocation.* If a state held a primary for district level allocation of delegate slots to presidential candidates, the 1992 rules required that the "at-large" and "party leader and elected official" pledged delegate slots be awarded to presidential candidates on the basis of the proportion of the state-wide vote won by the candidate. This prohibited the potential for a lesser number of state-wide pledged slots for a candidate that could occur if the number of delegates were calculated as a function of the percentage of district level delegates won by the candidate.

XXII. Contrasts between the 1988 and 1984 rules

Following is a brief account of key differences between the 1988 and 1984 rules, many of which are covered in more detail above:

A. Pledged "PLEO" delegates increased. The 1984 10% add-on for pledged party leader and elected official delegates was increased to 15% in 1988 to give officials excluded from competition for unpledged slots a greater alternative opportunity to be selected as delegates.

B. Unpledged delegate categories changed. The configuration of unpledged delegates was changed from 1984 to 1988 to include: (1) all DNC members; (2) 80% of the House and Senate Democratic caucus and conference; (3) all Democratic governors; and (4) former Democratic Presidents, Vice Presidents, Speakers of the House, and Senate Majority Leaders. The 1984 unpledged delegates were state chairs and

vice chairs (114 total), plus 454 seats apportioned to the states and chosen in a manner that included acceptance of 60% of the House and Senate Democratic caucus and conference members selected by those bodies and election of the remainder by a priority system that required state parties to give first consideration to governors and big city (250,000 population) mayors.

C. Window exemptions granted. The 1988 rules added Maine and Wyoming to 1984 exemptions for Iowa and New Hampshire, allowing all four to precede the second Tuesday in March by a specified number of days.

D. Threshold modified. The 20% threshold of 1984 was reduced to 15% in 1988 for allocation of pledged delegate seats to presidential candidates.

E. House and Senate delegate selection timing. The selection of delegates by the House and Senate was restricted to the period between April 19 and May 7, 1988, so that these actions wouldn't become the first delegate selection events of the year, as they were in 1984.

F. Direct election slate voting permitted. States using the direct primary election of pledged delegates method were for the first time in 1988 allowed to permit single votes for slates of candidates committed to a presidential candidate, but votes for individual candidates still had to be permitted.

G. "Compliance Assistance Commission" name change. The name of the former Compliance Review Commission was changed to "Compliance Assistance Commission" and its membership structure was changed.

H. Open primary allowance. The rule limiting participation in the process to openly declared Democrats was altered to allow states with open primary traditions to once again use the method, which was banned in the 1980 and 1984 rules.

☆☆☆

(Version Number 4: March 2000)

1984 Democratic Convention

Pledged Delegate Allocation* Calendar

Summary Figures:

26 Primaries, allocating 2,141 delegates, equalling 63.6% of the 3,365 pledged delegates and 54.5% of the total 3,931 delegates

(13 Primary/Proportional = 563)
(5 Primary/Bonus = 599)
(8 Primary/Direct = 979)

31 Caucuses, allocating 1,224 delegates, equalling 36.4% of the 3,365 pledged delegates and 31.1% of the total 3,931 delegates

(26 Caucus/Proportional = 1,080)
(5 Caucus/Bonus = 144)

Unpledged Delegates

totalled 566, equalling 14.4% of the total 3,931 delegates to the convention

* Allocation to presidential candidates of all pledged delegate slots can be tracked to results of primaries and first-stage caucuses held on dates on this calendar

Date	State	System/Method+	# of Pledged Delgates	State's % of 3365 Total Plgd	Cumulative % of All 3365 Pldged Delgats Allocated As Of...	Day Total % of 3365 Pledged	Day Total # of 3365 Pledged
Feb 20	IA	Cauc/P	50	1.486%	1.486%	Feb 20	50
Feb 28	NH	Prim/P	18	0.535%	2.021%	Feb 28	18
Mar 04	ME	Cauc/P	22	0.654%	2.675%	Mar 04	22
Mar 10	WY	Cauc/P	12	0.357%	3.031%	Mar 10	12
Mar 13	AL	Prim/P	52	1.545%			
	ASmoa	Cauc/P	3	0.089%			
	DAbrd	Prim/D	3	0.089%			
	FL	Prim/D	123	3.655%			
	GA	Prim/B	70	2.080%			
	HI	Cauc/B	19	0.565%			
	MA	Prim/P	100	2.972%			
	NV	Cauc/P	15	0.446%			
	OK	Cauc/P	43	1.278%			
	RI	Prim/P	22	0.654%			
	WA	Cauc/P	61	1.813%	18.217%	Mar 13	511
Mar 14	DE	Cauc/P	14	0.416%	18.633%	Mar 14	14
Mar 15	AK	Cauc/P	11	0.327%	18.960%	Mar 15	11
Mar 17	AR	Cauc/B	35	1.040%			
	KY	Cauc/B	53	1.575%			
	LAmer	Cauc/P	3	0.089%			
	MI	Cauc/P	136	4.042%			
	MS	Cauc/P	36	1.070%			
	SC	Cauc/P	41	1.218%	27.994%	Mar 17	304
Mar 18	PRico	Prim/B	48	1.426%	29.421%	Mar 18	48
Mar 20	IL	Prim/D	171	5.082%			
	MN	Cauc/P	75	2.229%	36.731%	Mar 20	246
Mar 24	KS	Cauc/P	37	1.100%	37.831%	Mar 24	37
Mar 25	MT	Cauc/B	19	0.565%	38.395%	Mar 25	19
Mar 24/26	VA	Cauc/P#	68	2.021%	40.416%	Mar 24/26	68
Mar 27	CT	Prim/P	52	1.545%	41.961%	Mar 27	52
Mar 14-28	ND	Cauc/P#	14	0.416%	42.377%	Mar 14-28	14
Mar 31	VIsl	Cauc/P	3	0.089%	42.467%	Mar 31	3
Apr 03	NY	Prim/B	252	7.489%	49.956%	Apr 03	252
Apr 07	WI	Cauc/P	78	2.318%	52.274%	Apr 07	78
Apr 10	PA	Prim/D	172	5.111%	57.385%	Apr 10	172
Apr 14	AZ	Cauc/P	33	0.981%	58.366%	Apr 14	33
Apr 18	MO	Cauc/P	75	2.229%	60.594%	Apr 18	75
Apr 24	VT	Cauc/P	13	0.386%	60.981%	Apr 24	13
Apr 25	UT	Cauc/P	22	0.654%	61.635%	Apr 25	22
Apr 28	GUam	Cauc/P	3	0.089%	61.724%	Apr 28	3
May 01	DC	Prim/P	15	0.446%			
	TN	Prim/P	65	1.932%	64.101%	May 01	80
May 05	TX	Cauc/P	169	5.022%			
	LA	Prim/P	57	1.694%	70.817%	May 05	226
May 07	CO	Cauc/P	43	1.278%	72.095%	May 07	43
May 08	IN	Prim/P	77	2.288%			
	NC	Prim/B	75	2.229%			
	MD	Prim/D	62	1.842%			
	OH	Prim/B	154	4.577%	83.031%	May 08	368
May 15	NE	Prim/P	24	0.713%			
	OR	Prim/P	43	1.278%	85.022%	May 15	67
May 24	ID	Cauc/B	18	0.535%	85.557%	May 24	18
Jun 05	CA	Prim/D	306	9.094%			
	NJ	Prim/D	107	3.180%			
	NM	Prim/P	23	0.684%			
	SD	Prim/P	15	0.446%			
	WV	Prim/D	35	1.040%	100.000%	Jun 05	486
TOTALS			57 Prim & Cauc	3365	100.000%		

Note: Total delegate votes in 1984 = **3,931**, including **566 Unpledged Delegates** not selected in either primaries or caucuses

+ Three methods of allocation were permitted in 1984

P=Proportional method B=Bonus method D=Direct method

VA allowed to hold first-stage caucuses on two dates, ND over 15 days

(Calendar compiled by Terry Michael, former DNC Press Secretary)

1988 Democratic Convention

Pledged Delegate Allocation* Calendar

Summary Figures:

35 Primaries, allocating 2,842 delegates, equalling 80.8% of the 3,517 pledged delegates and 68.3% of the total 4,161 delegates

(20 Primary/Proportional = 1,317)
(8 Primary/Bonus = 903)
(7 Primary/Direct = 622)

21 Caucuses, allocating 675 delegates, equalling 19.2% of the 3,517 pledged delegates and 16.2% of the total 4,161 delegates

(19 Caucus/Proportional = 618)
(2 Caucus/Bonus = 57)

Unpledged Delegates

totalled 644, equalling 15.5% of the total 4,161 delegates to the convention

* Allocation to presidential candidates of all pledged delegate slots can be tracked to results of primaries and first-stage caucuses held on dates on this calendar

Date	State	System/Method+	# of Pledged Delgates	State's % of 3517 Total Plgd	Cumulative % of All 3517 Plgd Delgats Allocated As Of...	Day Total % of 3517 Pledged	Day Total # of 3517 Pledged
Feb 08	IA	Cauc/P	52	1.479%	1.479%	Feb 08	52
Feb 16	NH	Prim/P	18	0.512%	1.990%	Feb 16	18
Feb 23	MN	Cauc/P	78	2.218%	4.208%		
	SD	Prim/P	15	0.426%	4.635%	Feb 23	93
Feb 28	ME	Cauc/P	23	0.654%	5.289%	Feb 28	23
Mar 05	WY	Cauc/P	13	0.370%	5.658%	Mar 05	13
Mar 08	AL	Prim/P	56	1.592%			
	ASmoa	Cauc/P	3	0.085%			
	AR	Prim/P	38	1.080%			
	FL	Prim/B	136	3.867%			
	GA	Prim/B	77	2.189%			
	HI	Cauc/P	20	0.569%			
	ID	Cauc/P	18	0.512%			
	KY	Prim/P	55	1.564%			
	LA	Prim/P	63	1.791%			
	MD	Prim/D^	67	1.905%			
	MA	Prim/B	98	2.786%			
	MS	Prim/P	40	1.137%			
	MO	Prim/B	77	2.189%			
	NV	Cauc/P	16	0.455%			
	NC	Prim/B	82	2.332%			
	OK	Prim/P	46	1.308%			
	RI	Prim/P	22	0.626%			
	TN	Prim/P	70	1.990%			
	TX	Prim/P^	183	5.203%			
	VA	Prim/P	75	2.132%			
	WA	Cauc/P	65	1.848%	42.821%	Mar 08	1307
Mar 10	AK	Cauc/B	12	0.341%	43.162%	Mar 10	12
Mar 12	SC	Cauc/P	44	1.251%	44.413%	Mar 12	44
Mar 15	IL	Prim/D	173	4.919%	49.332%	Mar 15	173
Mar 19	KS	Cauc/P	39	1.109%	50.441%	Mar 19	39
Mar 20	PRico	Prim/D	51	1.450%	51.891%	Mar 20	51
Mar 22	DAbrd	Prim/D	7	0.199%	52.090%	Mar 22	7
Mar 26	MI	Cauc/P	138	3.924%	56.014%	Mar 26	138
Mar 13-27	ND	Cauc/P#	15	0.426%	56.440%	Mar 13-27	15
Mar 29	CT	Prim/P	52	1.479%	57.919%	Mar 29	52
Apr 02	VIsl	Cauc/P	3	0.085%	58.004%	Apr 02	3
Apr 04	CO	Cauc/B	45	1.279%	59.283%	Apr 04	45
Apr 05	WI	Prim/P	81	2.303%	61.587%	Apr 05	81
Apr 16	AZ	Cauc/P	36	1.024%	62.610%	Apr 16	36
Apr 18	DE	Cauc/P	15	0.426%	63.037%	Apr 18	15
Apr 19	NY	Prim/B	255	7.250%	70.287%		
	VT	Cauc/P	14	0.398%	70.685%	Apr 19	269
Apr 24	GUam	Cauc/P	3	0.085%	70.771%	Apr 24	3
Apr 25	UT	Cauc/P	23	0.654%	71.425%	Apr 25	23
Apr 26	PA	Prim/D	178	5.061%	76.486%	Apr 26	178
May 03	DC	Prim/P	16	0.455%			
	IN	Prim/P	79	2.246%			
	OH	Prim/B	159	4.521%	83.708%	May 03	254
May 10	NE	Prim/P	25	0.711%	85.471%	May 10	62
	WV	Prim/D	37	1.052%	86.750%	May 10	62
May 17	OR	Prim/P	45	1.279%		May 17	45
Jun 07	CA	Prim/P	314	8.928%			
	MT	Prim/B	19	0.540%			
	NJ	Prim/D	109	3.099%			
	NM	Prim/P	24	0.682%	100.000%	Jun 07	466
TOTALS			56 Prim & Cauc	3517	100.000%		

Note: Total delegate votes in 1988 = **4,161**, including **644 Unpledged Delegates** not selected in either primaries or caucuses)

+ Three methods of allocation were permitted in 1988

P=Proportional method B=Bonus method D=Direct method

North Dakota was allowed to hold its first-stage caucuses over a 15-day period

^ **Maryland** used mixed methods for selection of pledged delegates, selecting district level delegates by the direct election method and statewide delegates by the proportional method based on statewide vote totals for presidential candidates. **Texas** used a hybrid system for selection of pledged delegates, selecting district level delegates by primary and statewide delegates by caucus-convention, with participation limited to primary voters; summary figures in this chart treat all Texas pledged delegates as chosen by primary system

(Calendar compiled by Terry Michael, former DNC Press Secretary)

Date	State	System	# of Pledged Delegates	State's % of 3516 Total Plgd	Cumulative % of All 3516 Plgd Delgates Determined As Of...	Day Total % of 3516 Pledged	Day Total # of 3516 Pledged
02 10	IA	Caucus	49	1.394%	1.394%	Feb 10	49
02 18	NH	Primary	18	0.512%	1.906%	Feb 18	18
02 23	ME	Caucus	23	0.654%	2.560%	Feb 23	23
02 25	SD	Primary	15	0.427%	2.986%	Feb 25	15
03 03	ASmoa	Caucus	3	0.085%	3.072%		
03 03	CO	Primary	47	1.337%	4.408%		
03 03	GA	Primary	76	2.162%	6.570%		
03 03	ID	Caucus	18	0.512%	7.082%		
03 03	MD	Primary	67	1.906%	8.987%		
03 03	MN	Caucus	78	2.218%	11.206%		
03 03	UT	Caucus	23	0.654%	11.860%		
03 03	WA	Caucus	71	2.019%	13.879%	Mar 03	383
03 07	AZ	Caucus	41	1.166%	15.046%		
03 07	SC	Primary	43	1.223%	16.268%		
03 07	WY	Caucus	13	0.370%	16.638%	Mar 07	97
03 08	NV	Caucus	17	0.484%	17.122%	Mar 08	17
03 07-09	DAbdr+	Caucus	7	0.199%	17.321%	Mar 09	7
03 10	DE	Caucus	14	0.398%	17.719%		
03 10	FL	Primary	148	4.209%	21.928%		
03 10	HI	Caucus	20	0.569%	22.497%		
03 10	LA	Primary	60	1.706%	24.204%		
03 10	MA	Primary	94	2.673%	26.877%		
03 10	MO	Caucus	77	2.190%	29.067%		
03 10	MS	Primary	39	1.109%	30.176%		
03 10	OK	Primary	45	1.280%	31.456%		
03 10	RI	Primary	22	0.626%	32.082%		
03 10	TN	Primary	68	1.934%	34.016%		
03 10	TX@	Prim/Cauc	196	5.575%	39.590%	Mar 10	783
03 17	IL	Primary	164	4.664%	44.255%		
03 17	MI	Primary	131	3.726%	47.981%	Mar 17	295
03 05-19	ND+	Caucus	14	0.398%	48.379%	Mar 19	14
03 24	CT	Primary	53	1.507%	49.886%	Mar 24	53
03 28	VIsld	Caucus	3	0.085%	49.972%	Mar 28	3
03 31	VT	Caucus	14	0.398%	50.370%	Mar 31	14
04 02	AK	Caucus	13	0.370%	50.739%	Apr 02	13
04 05	PRico	Primary	51	1.451%	52.190%	Apr 05	51
04 07	KS	Primary	36	1.024%	53.214%		
04 07	NY	Primary	244	6.940%	60.154%		
04 07	WI	Primary	82	2.332%	62.486%	Apr 07	362
04 11/13	VA+	Caucus	78	2.218%	64.704%	Apr 13	78
04 28	PA	Primary	169	4.807%	69.511%	Apr 28	169
05 03	GUam	Caucus	3	0.085%	69.596%	May 03	3
05 05	DC	Primary	17	0.484%	70.080%		
05 05	IN	Primary	77	2.190%	72.270%		
05 05	NC	Primary	84	2.389%	74.659%	May 05	178
05 12	NE	Primary	25	0.711%	75.370%		
05 12	WV	Primary	31	0.882%	76.251%	May 12	56
05 19	OR	Primary	47	1.337%	77.588%	May 19	47
05 26	AR	Primary	36	1.024%	78.612%		
05 26	KY	Primary	52	1.479%	80.091%	May 26	88
06 02	AL	Primary	55	1.564%	81.655%		
06 02	CA	Primary	348	9.898%	91.553%		
06 02	MT	Primary	16	0.455%	92.008%		
06 02	NJ	Primary	105	2.986%	94.994%		
06 02	NM	Primary	25	0.711%	95.705%		
06 02	OH	Primary	151	4.295%	100.000%	Jun 02	700
<hr/>							
TOTALS	56 Prim & Cauc		3516	100.000%			

1992 Democratic Convention

Pledged Delegate Allocation* Calendar

Summary Figures:

36 Primaries, allocating 2,868 delegates, equalling 81.6% of the 3,516 pledged delegates and 66.9% of the total 4,288# delegates

20 Caucuses, allocating 648 delegates, equalling 18.4% of the 3,516 pledged delegates and 15.1% of the total 4,288# delegates

Unpledged Delegates total 772#, equalling 18.0% of the total 4,288# delegates to the convention

* Allocation to presidential candidates of all pledged delegate slots can be tracked to results of primaries and first-stage caucuses held on dates on this calendar

Total as of May 28, 1992. Subject to slight change before Convention, as circumstances may alter the number of Unpledged Delegates.

Note: Total 1992 delegate votes = **4,288#**, including **772# Unpledged Delegates** not selected in either primaries or caucuses.

+ Democrats Abroad and North Dakota held their first-stage caucuses over a period of days, and Virginia allowed its local party jurisdictions to hold caucuses on either of two dates.

@ District level pledged delegates were chosen in a Texas primary March 10; At-large and Party Leader and Elected Official pledged delegates were chosen in a caucus/convention process beginning the same day. The "36 Primaries" and "20 Caucuses" counts above assign Texas as a primary; but the 127 pledged district delegates chosen in the primary and the 69 pledged statewide delegates chosen in the caucuses are used to calculate the whole numbers and percentages listed for the Primary and Caucus processes.

(Calendar compiled by Terry Michael, former DNC Press Secretary)

Date	State	System	# of Pledged Delgates	State's % of 3521 TotalPlgd	Cumulative % of All 3521 Pldged Delgats Determined As Of...	DayTotal% of 3521 Pledged	DayTotal# of 3521 Pledged
02 12	IA	Caucus	48	1.363%	1.363% Feb 12	1.363%	48
02 20	NH	Primary	20	0.568%	1.931% Feb 20	0.568%	20
03 05	ASmoa	Caucus	3	0.085%			
03 05	CO	Primary	49	1.392%			
03 05	CT	Primary	53	1.505%			
03 05	GA	Primary	76	2.158%			
03 05	ID	Caucus	18	0.511%			
03 05	ME	Primary	23	0.653%			
03 05	MD	Primary	68	1.931%			
03 05	MA	Primary	93	2.641%			
03 05	MN	Caucus	76	2.158%			
03 05	RI	Primary	22	0.625%			
03 05	SC	Caucus	43	1.221%			
03 05	VT	Primary	15	0.426%			
03 05	WA	Caucus	74	2.102%	19.341% Mar 05	17.410%	613
03 07	MO	Caucus	76	2.158%			
03 07	NY	Primary	244	6.930%	28.429% Mar 07	9.088%	320
03 09	AZ	Caucus	44	1.250%			
03 09	SD	Caucus	15	0.426%	29.679% Mar 09	1.676%	59
03 09-11	DABrd+	Caucus	7	0.199%	30.105% Mar 09-11	0.199%	7
03 10	NV	Caucus	18	0.511%			
03 10	PRico	Primary	51	1.448%	32.264% Mar 10	1.960%	69
03 12	FL	Primary	152	4.317%			
03 12	HI	Caucus	20	0.568%			
03 12	LA	Primary	59	1.676%			
03 12	MS	Primary	38	1.079%			
03 12	OK	Primary	44	1.250%			
03 12	OR	Primary	47	1.335%			
03 12	TN	Primary	68	1.931%			
03 12	TX^	Prim/Cauc	194	5.510%	49.929% Mar 12	17.665%	622
03 15	DE	Caucus	14	0.398%	0.398% Mar 15	0.398%	14
03 16	MI	Caucus	128	3.635%	53.962% Mar 16	3.635%	128
03 19	IL	Primary	164	4.658%			
03 19	OH	Primary	147	4.175%			
03 19	WI	Primary	79	2.244%	65.038% Mar 19	11.076%	390
03 23	WY	Caucus	13	0.369%	65.408% Mar 23	0.369%	13
03 25	UT	Caucus	24	0.682%	66.089% Mar 25	0.682%	24
03 26	CA	Primary	363	10.310%	76.399% Mar 26	10.310%	363
03 29	ND	Caucus	14	0.398%	76.796% Mar 29	0.398%	14
03 30	VIsld	Caucus	3	0.085%	76.882% Mar 30	0.085%	3
04 13	AK	Caucus	13	0.369%	77.251% Apr 13	0.369%	13
04 13&15	VA+	Caucus	79	2.244%	79.494% Apr 13&15	2.244%	79
04 23	PA	Primary	167	4.743%	84.237% Apr 23	4.743%	167
05 04	GUam	Caucus	3	0.085%		0.000%	
05 04	KS	Caucus	36	1.022%	85.345% May 04	1.108%	39
05 07	DC	Primary	17	0.483%			
05 07	IN	Primary	74	2.102%			
05 07	NC	Primary	84	2.386%	90.315% May 07	4.970%	175
05 14	NE	Primary	25	0.710%			
05 14	WV	Primary	30	0.852%	91.877% May 14	1.562%	55
05 21	AR	Primary	36	1.022%	91.536% May 21	1.022%	36
05 28	KY	Primary	51	1.448%	94.348% May 28	1.448%	51
06 04	AL	Primary	54	1.534%			
06 04	MT	Primary	16	0.454%			
06 04	NJ	Primary	104	2.954%			
06 04	NM	Primary	25	0.710%	100.000% Jun 04	5.652%	199
<hr/>							
TOTALS	56 Prim & Cauc		3521	100.000%		100.000%	3521

Note: Total delegate votes in 1996 = 4,289 -- the 3,521 Pledged delegate votes, plus 768 unpledged delegates not selected in either primaries or caucuses.

+ Democrats Abroad and Virginia hold their first-stage caucuses over a period of days.

^ District level pledged delegates are chosen in a Texas primary March 12; at-large and party leader and elected official (PLEO) pledged delegates are chosen in a caucus/convention process beginning the same day. The count of "37 Primaries" and "19 Caucuses" on this chart includes Texas as a primary; but the 127 pledged district delegates allocated in the primary and the 67 at-large and PLEO delegates allocated in the caucus/conventions system are used to calculate the whole number and percentage break-downs listed for all of the Primary and Caucus processes in the "Summary" that follows.

Chart designed and edited by Terry Michael, former DNC Press Secretary (Calendar dates and delegate counts from DNC Rules and Bylaws Committee)

1996 Democratic Convention

Pledged Delegate Allocation* Calendar

Summary:

34 Primaries, allocating 2,685 delegates, equalling 76.3% of the 3,521 pledged delegates and 62.6% of the total 4,289 delegates

22 Caucuses, allocating 836 delegates, equalling 23.7% of the 3,521 pledged delegates and 19.5% of the total 4,289 delegates

Unpledged Delegates total 768, equalling 17.9% of the total 4,289 delegates to the convention

* Allocation to presidential candidates of all pledged delegate slots can be tracked to results of primaries and first-stage caucuses held on calendar dates.

Date	State	System	# of Pledged Delgates	State's % of 3537 TotalPlgd	Cumulative % of All 3537 Pldged Delgats Determined As Of...	DayTotal% of 3537 Pledged	DayTotal# of 3537 Pledged
01 24	IA	Caucus	47	1.329%	1.329% Jan 24	1.329%	47
02 01	NH	Primary	22	0.622%	1.951% Feb 1	0.622%	22
03 07	ASmoa	Caucus/C	3	0.085%			
03 07	CA	Primary	367	10.376%			
03 07	CT	Primary	54	1.527%			
03 07	GA	Primary	77	2.177%			
03 07	HI	Caucus	22	0.622%			
03 07	ID	Caucus	18	0.509%			
03 07	MA	Primary	93	2.629%			
03 07	MD	Primary	68	1.923%			
03 07	ME	Primary	23	0.650%			
03 07	MO	Primary	75	2.120%			
03 07	ND	Caucus	14	0.396%			
03 07	NY	Primary	243	6.870%			
03 07	OH	Primary	146	4.128%			
03 07	RI	Primary	22	0.622%			
03 07	VT	Primary	15	0.424%			
03 07	WA	Caucus	75	2.120%	39.129% Mar 7	37.178%	1315
03 09	SC	Caucus	43	1.216%	40.345% Mar 9	1.216%	43
03 10	CO	Primary	51	1.442%			
03 10	UT	Primary	24	0.679%	42.465% Mar 10	2.120%	75
03 11	AZ	Primary/P	47	1.329%			
03 11	MI	Primary/P	129	3.647%	47.441% Mar 11	4.976%	176
03 12	NV	Caucus	20	0.565%			
03 11/12	MN	Caucus	74	2.092%	50.099% Mar 12	2.658%	94
03 10-14	DABrd	Caucus	7	0.198%			
03 14	FL	Primary	161	4.552%			
03 14	LA	Primary	61	1.725%			
03 14	MS	Primary	37	1.046%			
03 14	OK	Primary	45	1.272%			
03 14	TN	Primary	68	1.923%			
03 14	TX^	Prim/Cauc	194	5.485%	66.299% Mar 14	16.200%	573
03 18	GUam	Caucus/C	3	0.085%	66.384% May 18	0.085%	3
03 21	IL	Primary	161	4.552%	70.936% Mar 21	4.552%	161
03 25	WY	Caucus	13	0.368%	71.303% Mar 25	0.368%	13
03 27	DE	Caucus/C	15	0.424%	71.727% Mar 27	0.424%	15
04 01	Visld	Caucus	3	0.085%	71.812% Apr 1	0.085%	3
04 02	PRico	Caucus	51	1.442%	73.254% Apr 2	1.442%	51
04 04	PA	Primary	160	4.524%			
04 04	WI	Primary	77	2.177%	79.955% Apr 4	6.701%	237
04 15/17	VA	Caucus	79	2.234%	82.188% Apr 17	2.234%	79
04 22	AK	Caucus	13	0.368%	82.556% Apr 22	0.368%	13
04 29	KS	Primary/P	36	1.018%	83.574% Apr 29	1.018%	36
05 02	DC	Primary	17	0.481%			
05 02	IN	Primary	72	2.036%			
05 02	NC	Primary	86	2.431%	88.521% May 2	4.948%	175
05 09	NE	Primary	26	0.735%			
05 09	WV	Primary	30	0.848%	90.105% May 9	1.583%	56
05 16	OR	Primary	47	1.329%	91.433% May 16	1.329%	47
05 23	AR	Primary	37	1.046%			
05 23	KY	Primary	49	1.385%	93.865% May 23	2.431%	86
06 06	AL	Primary	54	1.527%			
06 06	MT	Primary	17	0.481%			
06 06	NJ	Primary	105	2.969%			
06 06	NM	Primary	26	0.735%			
06 06	SD	Primary	15	0.424%	100.000% Jun 6	6.135%	217
TOTALS			56 Prim & Cauc	3537			

Note: Total delegate votes in 2000 = 4,338 -- the 3,537 Pledged delegate votes, plus 801 unpledged delegates not selected in either primaries or caucuses.

Total as of March 2000. Subject to slight change between now and Convention as circumstances may alter the number of Unpledged Delegates.

^ District level pledged delegates are chosen in a Texas primary; at-large and party leader and elected official (PLEO) pledged delegates are chosen in a caucus/convention process beginning the same day. The count of Primaries and Caucuses on this chart includes Texas as a primary; but the 127 pledged district delegates allocated in the primary and the 67 at-large and PLEO delegates allocated in the caucus/conventions system are used to calculate the whole number and percentage break-downs listed for all of the Primary and Caucus processes in the "Summary" that follows.

Chart designed and edited by Terry Michael, former DNC Press Secretary (Calendar dates and delegate counts from DNC Rules and Bylaws Committee)

Information as of March 2000. Contact DNC for further updates. Contact Terry Michael, 202/296-8455, for revisions of this chart.

2000 Democratic Convention

Pledged Delegate Allocation* Calendar (As of March 2000)

Summary:

39 Primaries
(Primary/P = Party-run)

allocating:
2,970 delegates, equalling
84.0% of the 3,537 pledged
delegates and 68.5% of the
total 4,338# delegates

17 Caucuses
(Caucus/C =

Caucus/Convention) allocating:
567 delegates, equalling
16.0% of the 3,537 pledged
delegates and 13.1% of the
total 4,338# delegates

Unpledged Delegates

total 801#, equalling
18.5% of the total 4,338#
delegates to the convention

*Allocation to presidential candidates of all pledged delegate slots can be tracked to results of primaries and first-stage caucuses held on calendar dates.