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CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION TO THE STUDY

I. THE PROBLEM

Statement of the problem. The problem of this study was to develop a resource unit on reapportionment to be used at the high school level. The unit will be of value in situations involving flexibility of content and teaching procedures. Specifically, the unit will be of value for those teachers interested in American or Modern Problems and the phases of these courses related to political concepts and their application in modern democratic action. The unit will be of value also for those teachers interested in piloting an elective course delving into the history of democracy at work as exemplified by a decision and opinions of the justices of the United States Supreme Court and how these opinions have application to a state such as Iowa.

Importance of the study. An intelligent citizen understands the procedures of democratic government. He is aware of both desirable and undesirable practices in politics and government and works to make desirable practices prevail. The high school graduate must be prepared to assume a responsible position in his country. His responsibility to himself, his country and mankind calls for a growing
understanding of his world. He needs the realization that others in responsible positions are also making decisions affecting his democratic government. The student must attempt to understand such sweeping decisions as Reynolds v. Sims, a case applying the "one person, one vote" concept as a requirement in the districting of states for the election of state legislatures.

Educators are often painfully aware of the many adverse conditions with which the secondary school teacher must contend and over which he has no control. Overcrowded classes, subject overload, lack of equipment and facilities are but a few of the many causes of poor learning situations in the secondary school. Even the average teaching load does not allow time to seek out and synthesize the materials necessary to supplement or supplant parts of the limited textbook. Thus the need is created which can in part be supplied by the resource unit.

II. DEFINITION OF TERMS USED

Apportionment. Apportionment was used to denote a distribution of legislative seats among already established

---

political units, such as counties, towns or other political subdivisions or parts thereof.

Reapportionment. Reapportionment was interpreted as the reassigning of seats in the legislature to various counties, cities, or towns or parts thereof.

Redistricting. Redistricting shall be interpreted as the drawing of new lines for districts. Any change in legislative representation may involve both reapportionment or redistricting.

III. LIMITATIONS OF THE STUDY

This study was limited to presenting extensive information concerning the problems of reapportionment in Iowa for use at the secondary school level.

IV. THE RESOURCE UNIT DEFINED

A resource unit is a systematic and comprehensive survey, analysis, and organization of the possible problems, issues, activities, teaching aids, and the like that a teacher might utilize in planning, developing, and evaluating a learning unit.¹

Krug defined the resource unit as "a collection of suggested activities and materials organized around a given topic to be used as a basis for teacher preplanning."¹

The full significance of the resource unit according to Alberty lay in the functions which it fulfilled. In a list of such functions he included:

1. To furnish suggestions for materials, methods, procedures, activities, teaching aids, and evaluative procedures to be used in the development of a learning unit.
2. To provide a means for helping the teacher organize materials so he can depart from traditional methods such as the use of the text as the sole guide.
3. To provide a means by which the teacher can effectively translate modern educational philosophy into practices.
4. To serve as a guide in helping the teacher to include in the learning unit certain important values basic to education in a democratic society.
5. To aid the teacher in becoming aware of the significant problems and issues that have a bearing on an area of living.
6. To promote flexibility and democratic group planning in the curriculum.
7. To conserve the time of the teacher.
8. To make provision for having instructional materials available when needed.²

Resource unit versus the teaching unit. Whenever the subject of "units" is brought up in the field of education, many persons are likely to believe that "units" carries the

²Alberty, op. cit., p. 272.
same connotation in every usage. They might think that a "resource unit" and a "teaching unit" are one and the same thing.

It should be emphasized that a resource unit and a teaching unit are quite different. Quillen and Hanna stated that the resource unit has the following characteristics to distinguish it from a teaching unit:

1. It is made for teacher rather than student use;
2. it contains many more suggestions than can be used by any one class; 3. it covers a broad area from which materials can be drawn for the study of specific topics or problems; 4. it gives a number of possibilities for achieving the same objectives; and 5. it is not organized as a classroom teaching guide.\(^1\)

A teaching unit is a classroom guide for teaching an organized body of material. It contains only the materials and activities which the teacher expects to use with a particular class, arranged in the order in which they are to be used.

Therefore, suggestions may be drawn for several teaching units from a single resource unit. The resource unit is extensive rather than specific, suggestive rather than definitive, and flexible rather than rigid. It encourages creative

adaptation by the teacher to meet individual needs and democratic planning in the classroom. The teacher is in no sense obligated to use all the suggestions that are made in the resource unit, but merely those which seem to him most pertinent to his particular situation.

In summary, it should be noted that when considering the use of a resource unit, it should be understood that:

1. it is prepared for teachers for teacher use.
2. it contains more material than any one teacher can use.
3. it is a teacher enrichment document, not a teaching unit.

Considerations in building a resource unit. In constructing a resource unit the philosophy of the school must be considered. All of the learning activities included or afforded by the unit should retain the basic philosophy of the school. The following categories by Albery are useful in organizing an educational philosophy:

(1) the nature of cultural ideals
(2) the nature of the individual
(3) the nature of learning, and
(4) the purposes of the school in the light of the foregoing.¹

The interests and abilities of the students should be recognized and the resource unit should be planned in such a

¹ Albery, op. cit., p. 450.
way that each student should be able to have the opportunity
to participate in the learning situation to the extent of his
ability.

**General philosophy and purpose.** More and more the
resource unit is becoming a major tool in curriculum develop-
ment. It performs the task of giving the classroom teacher
aid, support, and inspiration while at the same time encourag-
ing him to fully develop his own approach.¹

The philosophy and purpose underlying the resource unit
are basically to afford all the learning activities possible.
The interests and abilities of the students should be recog-
nized and the planning of the unit should allow the student
the opportunity to participate in the learning situation to
the extent of his ability. In so doing, the student may be
exposed to learning and undiscovered talent may be found.²

If citizens are to meet their responsibilities and
duties, they must be educated up to them. For this reason
every pupil needs to learn how to think. He must learn to
analyze and interpret data and to make decisions on the

---

¹Leonard H. Clark, Raymond L. Klein, and John B.
Burks, *The American Secondary School Curriculum* (New York:

²Alberty, (1953), *loc. cit.*
merits of evidence. He should be taught to question and test pronouncements by authorities and pseudo authorities. He needs to learn how to separate fact from rumor, opinion, prejudice, sentiment and wish.¹

One of the jobs of the school is to take democracy into the classroom where teachers and students may plan and solve problems cooperatively. The individual must be stimulated intellectually to understand and acknowledge problems of the past, and this can be provided for, at least the opportunity, through the use of resource units in the classroom.²

Education authors have noted that the most useful resource units are ones prepared by a group of teachers rather than one teacher. Those teaching the courses concerned know first hand the problems and possibilities of the courses. If teachers have a share in the preparation, they tend to be more willing to utilize the unit. Resource units are best used by those who prepare them. The unit should be organized and indexed for effective use, and published in a form that facilitates frequent and easy revision.³

¹Clark, Klein, and Burks, op. cit., p. 129.
³Clark, Klein, Burks, op. cit., p. 441.
V. ORGANIZATION AND CONTENT

Resource units vary in organization and content. The following plan is one which is commonly used and which was used in this study.¹

I. Introduction.

II. Philosophy and objectives.

III. Scope.

IV. Suggested Activities
   Following the scope are given activities and bibliography relating to the given area.

V. Bibliography and teaching aids
   This consists of lists of books, periodicals, and films helpful in developing the unit.

VI. Evaluation
   Procedures are provided for testing the success of the learning unit.

VII. Leads to other units.

VIII. Use of the unit.

VI. PROCEDURE

The procedure followed was to review literature concerning resource units, state and define the problem. After establishing the reasons for the study, the need of teaching materials in the area of reapportionment, and the general principles of a resource unit, the writer proceeded to research

and report the historical background of reapportionment in Iowa.

The development of the unit included institutional objectives, specific objectives of the unit, a detailed outline of apportionment and its relationship to Iowa following the history of apportionment-reapportionment in Iowa. Activities included initiatory, developmental, and culminating procedures for the unit. A general bibliography containing available books, periodicals, and films on apportionment with emphasis placed on learning of apportionment and its history in Iowa was included.

Chapter two concludes with methods of evaluating the unit, suggestions how the unit could lead to other units, and suggested steps in using the unit.

Since this was a resource unit, major emphasis was placed on the development of the unit. Once the terms were identified, the problem stated, and the history written, the writer concentrated on the essential points which are contained in the third chapter. A study must be validated and summarized, it is true, but usually a teacher is more interested in sections of a unit that can benefit him most.

The reader will find in chapter two the history of apportionment and the problems of apportionment-reapportionment that have grown out of the political and legislative history of Iowa.
CHAPTER II

EVOLUTION OF REPRESENTATION AND THE HISTORY OF REPRESENTATIVE GOVERNMENT AS APPLIED TO THE IOWA STATE LEGISLATURE

In order to understand the present structure of the Iowa state legislature—as expressed both in constitutional provisions and in the often avoidance or ineffective implementation of those provisions—it is necessary to understand the theory of representative government, and to view its application at different times in history. As with any theory of government, the theory of representative government has been subject to constant change and modification in order to meet changing times and circumstances.¹

The path of representative government has followed the changing interests of the community. Its history, for the purpose of application to state legislatures, began with the struggle between the European kings and their subjects. The kings, in order to raise revenues and armies, had to have the assistance of the feudal lords. To obtain this assistance, various councils to the King were created. In England the council soon became the Parliament. Once established, the

council or Parliament, began to appreciate its power with respect to the king. Slowly, the leverage gained by these lords developed into representative government.\footnote{Robert Luce, Legislative Principles (Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1930), pp. 58-65.} As Beard has said:

\ldots representative government began its career as an instrument of political power, in a given complex of social and economic circumstances, to serve the purposes of the ruling monarchs; and it has played a bewildering role, in form, spirit and authority for more than five hundred years. Flexibility has been its prime characteristic.\footnote{Charles A. Beard and John D. Lewis, "Representative Government in Evolution," American Political Science Review, XXVI (1932), 223.}

During the colonial period in America great changes were taking place in the structure of government in England.

The American colonies were founded in a century in which England developed highly significant ideas of representation. At the beginning of the 17th century, the power of the Throne in England was great. By the middle of the century, the Crown had been temporarily banished, and by the end of the century, Parliament had become supreme and modern "representative government" had begun.\footnote{Alfred de Grazia, Public and Republic (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1961), p. 13.}

These developments had a strong impact on colonial America. The English development during the seventeenth century was concerned largely with the respective roles of the King and Parliament. It was not until this issue was resolved, or its conclusion clear, that attention was turned to the constitution and operation of the representative

\ldots
Representative government in England was begun at a time when nearly all wealth was measured by land. It was natural, therefore, for all the first representatives to the King's Council or Parliament to be selected on the basis of land holdings, since it was from such land that the King hoped to obtain royal revenues. As commerce grew, the King found it opportune to grant charters to cities and towns. Such charters, in addition to dealing with taxing powers of the King, usually granted the town representation in the Parliament. Representation at this time was not based on population or any other criterion that might be related to population. It was based on town or feudal units.

As the power of Parliament grew and as it turned its attention to matters other than revenue and taxes, stirrings began to be heard. Should land and political subdivisions be considered the appropriate criteria for determining representation in Parliament? It was not until the Reform Act of 1832 that England finally resolved the question of Parliamentary representation in favor of population. The struggle had lasted for nearly two centuries, and it was during this struggle that colonial America was settled.

---

1Ibid., p. 15.  
2Luce, op. cit., pp. 31-33.  
3Ibid., p. 336.
American colonial legislatures were greatly affected by the matters at issue in England, but the heirs of English history were quicker to accept population as a basis of representation than was the mother country. As early as 1635 Massachusetts gave recognition to population in towns by establishing the following formula.¹

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Freeholders</th>
<th>Number of Representatives</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0-10</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10-20</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20-40</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>over 40</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Rhode Island gave similar recognition to population, but Connecticut provided for equal representations for each town.² In view of this checkerboard pattern, Luce said, "Nowhere did representation bear any uniform relation to the number of electors. Here and there the factor of size had been crudely recognized."³

During the period from 1776 to 1790, the States of the emerging nation grappled with the problem of organizing their respective governments. The problem of legislative representation based on population (or one of its equivalents—

² Ibid., p. 6. ³Luce, op. cit., p. 337.
qualified electors, taxable inhabitants, or taxes paid) or political subdivision was one of many dealt with at great length. The question of the basis of representation at the State level was intertwined with numerous other issues (particularly qualifications for voting and qualifications for holding office).^{1}

It is at this stage in American government Beard said:

...the modern conception of representative government may be summarized in the following fashion. Speaking politically, all adult heads are equal and alike, each having an equal share of governing power (whatever that is). The sovereign power of government is exercised either by constitution convention or parliament composed of deputies elected by the voters. Logically applied, this principle means that the representative shall be distributed among districts containing substantially the same number of inhabitants, and shall be chosen by a majority or plurality vote. Duly assembled, the delegates shall organize themselves and proceed to the exercise of their authority by majority rule. In other words, the political assembly no longer represents estates, classes, or orders as such, but free and equal heads—abstract political persons.^{2}

Luce gave to the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, under its constitution of 1776, the distinction of being the first to adopt population—in this case taxable inhabitants—as the basis for legislative representation. The Pennsylvania constitution of 1776 also provided for a unicameral legislature. When a new constitution, adopted in 1790, established

---

^{1}Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations, *op. cit.*, p. 6.

a bicameral legislature, Pennsylvania retained population as the basis of representation in both houses of its legislature. Following the lead of Pennsylvania, the States of Georgia (unicameral), New York, and South Carolina adopted population as the basis of representation. Massachusetts and New Hampshire modified population somewhat as the basis of representation in one of the houses of their bicameral legislature. The tradition of representation from the town was to be retained, but both states required a minimum number of "rateable polls" (qualified voters) for representation and provided for additional representation for the larger towns.\(^1\) In Massachusetts, the ratios were: 150-175, one representative; 176-600, two representatives, 601, three representatives; and an additional representative for each 250 "rateable polls." New Hampshire adopted a similar formula.\(^2\)

Representation based on political subdivisions—counties—of the State developed in the middle Atlantic States. Delaware and New Jersey based representation in both houses of their legislatures on the county. Maryland, North

\(^1\)Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations, op. cit., p. 7.

\(^2\)Luce, op. cit., pp. 350-55.
Carolina and Virginia did the same but provided additional representation for certain specified cities.\(^1\)

Connecticut, Vermont, and Rhode Island used the town for the basis of representation in one house of their bicameral legislatures; though in both states, size of towns was crudely recognized. Unfortunately, the 1790 census did not list town populations for Connecticut. The thirty towns of Rhode Island contained populations ranging from a low of 507 to a high of 6,715 and twenty-four of them had populations between 1,100 and 4,200. As with the States using the county as the basis of representation, the population difference between towns was relatively small in Rhode Island.\(^2\)

The next significant event was the passage of the Northwest Ordinance by Congress under the Articles of Confederation on July 13, 1787. This ordinance provided the guide to the development of the West. It is significant that this ordinance was enacted in the same year that the Constitutional Convention completed the final draft of the new Constitution of the United States for submission to the States for ratification.\(^3\) It should be recalled that while

\(^1\)Ibid., pp. 351-2. \(^2\)Ibid., pp. 341, and 348.

the United States Constitution called for apportionment of votes on a population basis the Northwest Ordinance was adopted by Congress under the Articles of Confederation. Representation under the Congress of the Articles of Confederation was without regard to population and each state had but one vote. With respect to representation in territorial legislatures the Ordinance said in Section 9:

So soon as there shall be 5,000 free male inhabitants, of full age, in the district, upon giving proof thereof to the governor, they shall receive authority, with time and place, to elect representatives from their counties or townships, to represent them in the general assembly. Provided, that for every 500 free male inhabitants there shall be one representative, and so on, progressively with the number of free male inhabitants, shall the right of representation increase, until the number of representatives shall amount to 25; after which the number and proportion of representatives shall be regulated by the legislature.

With respect to reapportionment the United States Constitution in Article I, Section three directs:

Representatives shall be apportioned among the several states which may be included within this union, according to their respective numbers, . . . . The actual enumeration shall be made within three years after the first meeting of the Congress of the United States, and within every subsequent term of ten years, in such manner as they shall by law direct.


2Ibid., pp. 69-73.

3United States Constitution, Article I, Section III.
The Constitution of the State of Iowa as adopted in 1846, Section 33, Article III required an enumeration (census) in the state as follows:

The General Assembly shall, in the years One thousand eight hundred and fifty nine, One thousand eight hundred and sixty three, One thousand eight hundred and sixty five, One thousand eight hundred and sixty seven, One thousand eight hundred and sixty nine, and One thousand eight hundred and seventy five, and every ten years thereafter, cause an enumeration to be made of all white inhabitants of the State. ("White" was stricken from the section in 1868, the complete section was repealed by an amendment adopted in 1936.)

Iowa began as an agricultural state. For most of its years it has been an agricultural state. Agriculture consistently dominated its economy; the rural population has dominated its official legislative and political acts. For a long time, that is exactly as it should have been.

Iowa went into the Union in 1846. For six years after its organization as a territory in 1838, nothing was done about statehood. Then, in 1844, efforts were begun to write a constitution to replace the territorial constitution. The first product was rejected by the people twice because of dissatisfactions with the boundaries of the state. Two years

1Constitution of the State of Iowa, Article III, Section 33.


later, in 1846, a second constitutional convention's constitution was ratified and Iowa was received as a state of the union on December 28 of that year.  

Iowa entered the union with a population of only 166,454. It had only thirty counties, only two congressional districts, and, as of 1850, Dubuque was its principal city with a population of 3,108.  

Within a single decade all the counties had been established and the state's population had passed the half-million mark. The million mark was passed in the census of 1870; Davenport was the principal city with Des Moines gaining fast, showing the new spread of population toward the west.  

Ten years later, in 1880, Iowa boasted a population of more than one and one-half million and had eleven congressmen. Des Moines, Davenport and Dubuque were rivals for "principal city" honors, each with a population in the low 20,000s.  

Population gains after 1880 were never so great in numbers as they were between 1850 and 1880. Even so, by the time the century turned in 1900 the state had a population of

---

1Ibid.


3Ibid.  

4Ibid.
more than two and one-quarter million people. Des Moines was the largest city of Iowa with 62,139. Dubuque was second with 36,397. Davenport held third place with 35,254. Sioux City, which had ranked sixth in 1870 with 3,401 and second in 1880, with 37,806, had dropped to fourth place with 33,111.¹

In fact, Iowa's urban population was evident well before 1900. Back in 1896 the Iowa Official Register, using the 1895 state census figures, estimated the urban population as 42.34 per cent.²

Many eyes it seemed were on those figures and it was even then definite that the urban people were beginning to constitute an increasingly high percentage of the total population. That could have had profound influence on what happened in 1888, and again six years later in 1904.

As a territory and state, Iowa has operated under only three constitutions. The first was the territorial constitution which went into effect in June, 1838, when Iowa became a territory. The second went into effect on the day Iowa became a state in 1846.³

---

¹Iowa Official Register, 1900, pp. 411-17.
²Iowa Official Register, 1896, pp. 410-12.
³Ross, op. cit., pp. 14-16.
But some of the theory in this constitution did not work out in practice; according to the Iowa Official Register, one of the principal theories that did not work out was the prohibition of banking institutions. So still another constitutional convention was called. It wrote a new constitution early in 1857, which was accepted by the people in the fall of that year, and which became official by the governor's proclamation on September 3, 1857.¹

It is still the state's basic constitution, although it has been amended twenty-one times. A number of those amendments pertained to apportionment of the state legislature.²

It may be surprising to some to discover that all three of Iowa's constitutions originally apportioned both houses of the state legislature on population. This was a fact resulting from the model of the Northwest Ordinance, which was adopted in 1787, and provided for the apportionment of seats in the territorial legislatures solely on the basis of population.³

The house was to have one hundred members in the original version of the constitution of 1857, members being assigned to seats on a population formula laid down

¹Shambaugh, op. cit., pp. 213-69.
³Shambaugh, op. cit., pp. 74-87.
in the constitution but with one area provision: No repre-
representative district could contain more than four organized counties,
and every representative district was entitled to at least
one representative. Also, a part of this original constitution
was the stipulation that the number of senators was not to be
less than a third or more than half that of the representa-
tives. The number of senators was flexible therefore, but a
maximum number was set at fifty members. After each census
the number of senators was to be fixed by law and apportioned
among the several counties.¹

Reapportionment was to be undertaken by the state
legislature every two years, according to the state census,
and this provision was faithfully followed during the life of
the territorial and the 1846 constitutions and for the first
thirty years of the 1857 constitution, or up to 1887. From
1888 until 190⁴—the other date of significance with respect
to population—the legislature merely re-adopted the apportion-
ment of 1886. In 190⁴ came a complete revision of the
apportionment procedure.²

The amendments of 190⁴ first established the senate
at fifty members, the upper limit under the old provision, and

¹Constitution of the State of Iowa, Article III,
Sections 6 and 35.

²Shambaugh, op. cit., pp. 269-81.
decreed senators were to be apportioned among the various counties or districts of the state. Next, the amendments provided that each county should constitute one representative district and be entitled to one representative. Thus, just over sixty years ago, the Iowa "area house" was born.\textsuperscript{1}

It was not entirely an area house, for the provision stated that after the ratio number was determined (by dividing the total population by the number of organized counties, then and still ninety-nine) "each county having a population in excess of the ratio number as herein provided, of three-fifths or more of such ratio number, shall be entitled to one additional representative. . . ." But then came the provision: "...But said addition shall extend only to the nine counties having the greatest population."\textsuperscript{2}

Therefore, no matter how many counties might grow large enough to have the ratio number plus three-fifths, only the nine largest counties could actually have an additional representative.

The job still was not quite finished. In 1928 the legislature returned to make still another restrictive change. To the section that provided for the fifty members of the

\textsuperscript{1} Ross, \textit{op. cit.}, p. 23.

\textsuperscript{2} \textit{Amendment to the Constitution of Iowa}, 1904, Article XII, Section 35.
senate, "to be apportioned among the several counties or districts of the state according to population as shown by the preceding census," there was added this sentence: "No county shall be entitled to more than one (1) senator."¹

With the amendments of 1904 and 1928 a part of the state constitution no longer could the population provision of the Constitution of 1857 be followed. Only nine counties could get a second representative; no county, no matter how big it became, could have more than one senator.

The practice of adopting previous legislative apportionment instead of reapportioning after every census, begun in 1888, was continued. Senate seats were not reapportioned following the federal census of 1910, 1920, or 1930. Attempts to alter the 1904 and 1928 amendments by constitutional convention were rejected by the voters in 1930, 1940 and 1950. (The people voted for a convention in 1920 but it was never called.) Even so, occasional changes were made. Lee and Wapello counties changed positions a few times as the ninth largest "population representative" county, but both lost out to Johnson county in 1960.²

In 1941 the legislature reapportioned four senate

¹Amendment to the Constitution of Iowa, 1928, Article III, Section 34.

seats, to even out some imbalance. These seats affected the following counties: Jackson, Cedar, Jones, Lyon, Osceola, Sioux, O'Brien, Dickenson, Clay, Emmet, and Palo Alto. In 1953 the legislature reapportioned four more seats affecting Black Hawk, Grundy, Cerro Gordo, Hancock, Franklin, Benton, Tama, Brewer, and Butler counties. These changes bring the legislature to 1964 almost exactly as it had been since 1904 and 1926.¹ (The amendment to the state constitution in 1928 did not change the representation from that of 1926.)

The post World War II period brought still more population to the cities as veterans returned, got jobs, married and established homes. The 1950 census was the catalyst. When cities were shown to have 46.9 per cent of the state's population under the old definition and 47.7 per cent of it under the new, the urban people began giving voice to their dissatisfaction. (The old and new definitions are not complicated. Under the new, people living in densely populated urban-fringe areas are now regarded by the Federal Census Bureau as being "urban," even though they may not live within a city's corporate limits.)²

One of the first voices raised was that of the late Arch W. McFarlane of Waterloo whose speech in the Iowa Senate

¹Iowa Official Register, 1965-1966, pp. 113, 518.
²Ibid., p. 337.
in 1953 opened the gates of protest. All through the 1950s many people drew many different reapportionment plans, and none was accepted. Even plans originating among the legislators, as they tried to unscramble the problems presented by the amendments of 1904 and 1928 were unsuccessful. But when the 1960 census came along, showing the urban areas held 53 per cent of the state's population, the legislature began to act.¹

The Shaff, Stuart, and Shroeder plans, the three most talked of and best known reapportionment plans, were products of legislators. The Shaff plan, something of a compromise, had the most supporters and having passed the test of three readings in successive legislature was submitted to the voters of Iowa December 3, 1963. The voters turned down the plan.² (Maps and discussions of these plans appear in the appendix.)³

Following the defeat of the Shaff plan, the federal district court in the case of Davis vs. Synhorst, 225 F. Supp. 689 (1964) decreed that the legislature should meet in special session to reapportion itself in time for the 1964 elections to choose members for the 1965 session. The Sixtieth General

¹Ibid., p. 113. ²Ibid., pp. 114-15. ³Appendix.
Assembly was called into extraordinary session February 24, 1964. The Sixtieth Extra Session instructed by the court that one house was to be apportioned on a population basis and the other on a rational basis if not by population decided upon a temporary plan providing fifty-nine senators and 124 representatives. Control of the senate could be gained by 38.9 of the population; control of the house by 44.02 per cent. The court indicated this acceptable since no further direction had come from the United States Supreme Court. The session proposed a permanent plan as well as the temporary one. This permanent plan called for a fifty member senate a majority of which should be elected by no less than 36 per cent of the population. The house would have 114 members 50 per cent of whom would be elected from counties containing 50 per cent of the population.

The definition for reapportionment came on June 15, 1964, when the United States Supreme Court in Reynolds v. Sims, 377 U. S. 533 (1964) ruled that "the equal protection clause requires that the seats in both houses of a bicameral legislature must be apportioned on a population basis." This became known as the one-man, one-vote principle.

---

The Sixty-first General Assembly convened January 11, 1965, with the members elected on November 3, 1964, as called for by the temporary plan of the special session in attendance. It received notice of the one-man, one-vote principle when a three-man Federal court panel ruled on February 12, 1965, that the Iowa Legislature must be reapportioned on a population basis only. This made the temporary plan invalid. This session devised a new temporary reapportionment leaving the 124 member house as it was with a 44.02 per cent population control but raising the population control in the senate to 45.1 by adding two senators, bringing the total to sixty-one and reducing the number of districts to forty-nine. This plan will be used for elections in 1966 and seating of the Sixty-second General Assembly in 1967.\(^1\)

The Sixty-first General Assembly also proposed a new constitutional amendment for a permanent plan. The plan calls for a senate of not more than fifty and a house of no more than one hundred members apportioned on a population basis by the 1971 General Assembly and each Assembly thereafter the decennial census. Subdistricting is permitted.\(^2\)

As further addition to the reapportionment dilemma, the Iowa Supreme Court ruled in *Kruidenier v. McCulloch*, 142 N.W.2d

\(^1\) *Iowa Official Register*, loc. cit.

that large-population Iowa counties must be split into subdistricts with each subdistrict electing its own state representative or state senator. The Iowa Supreme Court decision outlawed one voter casting votes for eleven candidates for office as was the case in Polk county in 1964. Instead, Polk county must be divided into subdistricts. The resident of a subdistrict would vote only for one state representative or state senator. 1

The Iowa Supreme Court allowed the legislature until 1967 to complete the districting process to be put into effect for 1968 elections.2 Pending an appeal to the Federal Supreme Court which might reverse this decision, county subdivisions, and the proposed constitutional amendment on permanent apportionment first approved by the 1965 session will be before the 1967 legislative session in Iowa.

1Kruidenier v. McCulloch, 142 N.W. 2d 355.
2Ibid.
Specific objectives. To think seriously about the United States and Iowa at a time when America's constitutional history approaches a decisive turning point as dramatized in the famous trio of cases, Baker v. Carr, Wesberry v. Sanders, Reynolds v. Sims, and the "one man, one vote" reapportionment evolving from them is the aim of this unit. The storm of controversy over those cases has had repercussions in the Congress and the politics of all the states; yet the precise details of its effects are hard to pinpoint, involving as they do what are perhaps the most cloudy areas of Constitutional law--the concepts of justiciability and equal protection--and the complex workings of apportionment systems.¹

This study aims to present the study of reapportionment in Iowa as a story, but a very important one in the growth of the United States and the State of Iowa. Therefore the institutional and specific objectives to be achieved by this study are:

I. Institutional Objectives

A. All youth need to understand the rights and duties of the citizens of a democratic society, and to be diligent and competent in the performance of their obligations as members of the community and citizens of the state and the nation, and to have an understanding of the nations and peoples of the world.

B. All youth need to develop respect for other persons—to be able to live and work co-operatively with others, and to grow in the moral and spiritual values of life.

C. All youth need to grow in their ability to think rationally, to express their thoughts clearly, and to read and listen with understanding.

D. All youth need to develop saleable skills and those understandings and attitudes that make the worker an intelligent and productive participant in economic life.¹

II. Attitudes and Appreciations

A. Appreciating the nature of apportionment and its relation to representative government.

B. The influence of apportionment on the voter and his relation to the state.

C. Realize the contributions of legislators to one's democratic freedoms.

D. Significance and importance of apportionment and mal-apportionment play in people's lives and history.

E. The part the courts play in the United States in relation to apportionment.

F. The leadership of men in politics and law.

G. The quality and values of American culture today.


I. The courage and stamina needed to cope with modern problems of law.

III. Understandings

A. The colonial significance of state legislatures as the fountain head of representative government.

B. The judicial protection of Constitutional rights that a minority does not rule the majority.

C. The value of a citizen's vote must not be debased no matter where he lives, this is illegitimate overweighting or diluting the efficacy of his vote.

D. A citizen, a qualified voter, is no more or less so because he lives in the city or on the farm.

E. The recognition of unconstitutional concepts, such as legislative inaction even when political or judicial remedies are unavailable, and related understandings in dealing with these schemes.

F. An understanding that no model or pattern of apportionment was intended by the founding fathers when the federal Congress was adopted.
G. The concept and an understanding of apportioning seats in the territorial legislature solely on a population basis.

H. The understanding of separate and distinct governmental entities being yet at the heart of the constitutional system even though many of their formerly held powers have been delegated elsewhere.

I. An understanding of what may be considered separate and sovereign entities, and whether counties, or cities are within this definition.

J. Understanding the problems in reapportionment presented by the Iowa Constitution, Section 37, Article III.

K. A basic knowledge and understanding of the outstanding proposals for reapportionment presented to the Iowa Legislature in past years.

L. An understanding of the Shaff plan and reasons for voter rejection of it.

M. Understanding the implications of the permanent apportionment plan of 1964 and implications for the legislative session of 1967, and future sessions.

Study skills. As a result of the experience presented in the unit the pupil will enhance his reading skills in the ability to read and understand more clearly, gain a wider
vocabulary and use it through oral recitation, take notes, discover and trace historical continuity, parallels and comparisons. The student use of primary and secondary source materials secured in the library will give him experience in using charts, graphs, pictures, and time lines and by applying these skills to writing, organizing, and summarizing within historical methods of research and material use, many skills will be enhanced through the experiences gained.

The experience resulting from the unit will develop critical thinking and problem solving instances for the student. The developing and recognizing of these problems, their evaluation, the evolution of conclusions, and testing, paralleling and comparing of these conclusions present a skillful learning task for the student.

Group activities in preparing term papers, participating in co-operative group discussions, interviewing, and formal-informal meetings are experiences to be gained from the unit. All these skills are necessary for the well oriented student.

**Scope.** This section contains an outline of the general topic areas considered of importance in understanding the problems of reapportionment in Iowa. The outline is not expected to cover all phases of reapportionment but briefly touch on many significant ones. No outline can do the job
for all teachers nor can all teachers use the entire outline, but the material can be used as the individual teacher decides.

In an outline of this type, too many headings, subheadings, et cetera, merely become confusing, therefore, it was the purpose of this resource unit to make as detailed yet clear an outline as possible. The scope represents an accumulation from which the individual teacher, working with students, may draw helpful suggestions for developing a unit of classroom work.

Once the teacher has developed a unit of this nature, then it becomes his responsibility to present this material in an interesting way and make sure the subject is covered thoroughly. The design of the unit is not always clear until the instructor has carefully organized and employed it in a classroom situation.

The resource unit outline that follows has been carefully prepared and does, to the best of the writer's knowledge, develop the history and problems of reapportionment in Iowa.

RESOURCE UNIT OUTLINE OF THE HISTORY AND PROBLEMS OF REAPPORTIONMENT IN IOWA

I. History of Iowa apportionment

A. Originally two-house legislature apportioned on population basis
1. Constitution of 1846 when Iowa entered the United States

2. One hundred representatives

3. Flexible number of senators to fifty

B. Reapportionment of each chamber every two years to 1904

1. Faithfully followed for thirty years

C. Re-adoption of Reapportionment Act of 1886

1. From 1888 legislatures re-adopted previous apportionment thereby failing to adapt the representation to population shifts

D. Amendment proposed in 1902

1. Readopted in 1904 by General Assembly, ratified by voters November 8, 1904.
2. Fifty member senate, each county a representative district, no more than 108 representatives.

E. Amendment of 1928

1. No county could have more than one senator

F. Beginning in 1911 reapportionment required every ten years.


1. Legislative seats reapportioned in 1941, 1953 to even out some representation imbalance, as far as constitution allowed on population basis.
II. Equal Votes for Equal Citizens
   A. Political equality and the American tradition, one vote for each voter
   B. The Constitution: Framers and Ratifiers
      1. Ways of ascertaining their attitudes
         a. Read the Constitution
         b. Debates of Philadelphia Convention
         c. The Federalist
         d. Debates at state ratifying conventions
   C. The Democratic impulse
      1. Each man politically equal to any other

III. Representative Democracy and Apportionment Theory
   A. Apportionment defined
   B. Historical and comparative theory

IV. Doctrines and Ideologies
   A. Democratic belief-systems
      1. Complications of representative government
   B. The majority principle
      1. Majority vote rules over minority vote

V. Apportionment Practices and Reapportionment
   A. The Single-Member District
   B. Varieties of Gerrymandering
   C. Gerrymandering at Work: The 1962 Elections
   D. Motives and Melioration
   E. Ease of Change
   F. Recent Change
VI. The Effects of Apportionment
   A. Effects on Political Parties
   B. The Roles of Legislators
   C. Racial Discrimination in Apportionment
   D. Effects on City and County
   E. Relation to the Majority Principle
   F. Proportional Representation

VII. The Reform of Apportionment
   A. Public Interest in Apportionment
   B. Organizational Activity
   C. Support of Existing Apportionments
   D. Congressional Districts in the 1950's
   E. District Characteristics

VIII. The States and the Judiciary
   A. Colegrove's Cases
   B. The State of the States
   C. Baker v. Carr
   D. Westbury v. Sanders
   E. Davis and Lewis v. Cameron
   F. Kruidenier v. McCulloch
   G. Rhetoric and Reality

IX. The Prospect of the Sixties
   A. Action and Inaction
   B. Two Americas, Rural and Suburban
   C. Possible Alternatives--Past Plans in Iowa
1. Stuart Bill
2. Shaff Bill
3. Governor's Committee Bill
4. Miller Bill

X. Future Apportionment

A. Apportionment in the Next Generation.

Activities. The following list of activities can be used to further enrich the unit on reapportionment. Other activities may supplement as the teacher and group find fitting or necessary to meet particular problems. The list could be, by working it over with each group under careful supervision, expanded and adapted for the individual teacher's taste.

Education for citizenship is a whole-school responsibility although this responsibility should be spread throughout the curriculum and extracurriculum, ordinarily the brunt of the burden of formal citizenship education falls on two courses, civics and problems of democracy, whose content most directly concerns political science and government.¹

A democratically conducted classroom can be one of the most effective instruments for citizenship education.

¹Clark, Klein, Burks, *op. cit.*, p. 183.
Students in planning a unit must be made to feel that their opinions count regardless of what they are or how ineptly they are stated. Teacher-student planning creates a democratic classroom and practical application of shared power as in a democratically legislated society. The activities in this resource unit are a means of helping the student acquire knowledge as proposed in the scope and gain an understanding of actions within a democratic society.

The list of activities to enrich the teaching of the problems of reapportionment in Iowa are divided into initiatory, developmental, and culminating activities, and are arranged to provide as much assistance to teachers as possible.

ACTIVITIES

Initiatory

1. Play a record of The Collected Poems of Oliver Goldsmith to illustrate a need for a developing sense of social conscience in regard to constitutional legislation.

2. Obtain a taped interview from one of the state's national congressmen stressing his views of reapportionment.

3. Display some suggested books and pamphlets concerning reapportionment such as publications of the League of Women Voters, the Farm Bureau or the State Historical Society of Iowa publication The Palimpsest. (See the resource unit bibliography.)
4. Use the opaque projector to reproduce reference maps showing possible remap plans.

5. Plan a field trip to see the statehouse in Des Moines.

6. Use a newspaper from the library, or museum splashing a headline concerning reapportionment and containing an appropriate story.

7. Ask a state legislator to appear before the class to present a talk and answer questions about reapportionment.

8. Encourage students to draw up their own program for reapportionment.

9. Construct charts and graphs showing the number of people represented by single legislators in the last ten years in Iowa.

10. Have the students draw maps of Iowa showing congressional districts, districts that might be set up by different proposals for reapportionment.

11. Have the class compare the form of the national Senate and House of Representatives and that of the State of Iowa.

12. Encourage students to write to state and national congressman for information on reapportionment.

13. Make a time line showing the important events and dates characterizing apportionment action in Iowa throughout history.

14. Have a committee plan a bulletin board display concerning reapportionment in Iowa.

15. The teacher might begin the unit with some broad introductory questions to stimulate interest such as: 1. What is the matter with having the state legislature "Just like Congress?" 2. Why study about Iowa reapportionment issues? 3. What is meant by the down-trodden majority? 4. Who has more political power in Iowa the rural or the urban voter? 5. Is the next election already rigged? These questions will bring out others to provide an initial curiosity and interest in the unit.
Developmental

1. Prepare a questionnaire to poll students' parents' opinions on reapportionment.

2. Trace the history of reapportionment-reapportionment in the state of Iowa.

3. Divide the class into mythical senate and house of representative units. Have them draw up their own reapportionment measures.

4. Have two students, possibly the mythical speaker of the House and majority leader of the Senate, carry on a conversation concerning their opposing party views of reapportionment.

5. Volunteers from the class who would like to express themselves through original drawings and cartoons should be encouraged to do so.

6. Write a theme on gerrymandering.

7. Review from history studies the background and formation of apportionment in relation to the federal legislature.

8. Look up Article VI, paragraph 2 of the Constitution and explain in class what is meant by the "supreme law of the land." Why is this necessary?

9. Differentiate between "division" and "separation" of powers. How does this relate to apportionment?

10. Draw a map of Iowa outlining in heavy lines the Congressional districts of Iowa. Find out the population of each. Do you see any evidence of gerrymandering?

11. Write a theme on the role of lobbyists in the legislature. What is their purpose? Their effect? What role did they play in the defeat of the Shaff plan? (use newspaper accounts and pamphlets for resource materials)

12. Prepare a list of arguments for and against the present method of apportioning the membership of the United States House of Representatives, the Iowa House of Representatives, the United States Senate and the Iowa Senate.
13. Prepare reports on each of the present members of the Supreme Court, explaining their stand on the recent apportionment decisions. (See Congressional Directory, Who's Who in America, and Law Review.)

14. After learning the stand taken by particular members of the Supreme Court other members of the class can act as justices and attorneys arguing the case. Draw up majority and minority opinions.

15. Find out the names of the federal district judges in Iowa. Prepare reports on the reapportionment cases and decisions that have come before these district courts in the last five years.

16. Write a theme on any of the following topics.

a. On what do the proponents of reapportionment in accordance with the one person, one vote concept base their arguments?

b. What is meant by equal representation?

c. Is democracy possible without equal representation?

d. Why would State Legislatures resort to devices such as gerrymandering, the county unit system, or weighting in deciding Congressional Districting?

e. Does the one person, one vote concept guarantee that one party cannot dominate the other by districting along equal population lines?

f. In Colegrove v. Green, back in 1946, Justice Frankfurter said that "Courts should not enter this political thicket (districting and apportionment)." What did he mean? Would the court have been correct in not reversing the philosophy as it did in Wesberry v. Sanders?

g. Are the rights of states violated by the Wesberry decision?
h. Was the Supreme Court "legislating" in its Wesberry decision?

i. What possible political and legislative effects do you see if the House of Representatives is elected fully on a "one person, one vote" basis?

j. How will our way of life in Iowa be affected by the Wesberry decision? To what extent will it be affected?

17. Prepare a radio or television newscast as if you were reporting events before and after the voting on the Shaff Plan of reapportionment.

18. Assign books and articles pertaining to reapportionment and have each student make a short summary of his readings.

19. Prepare a series of newspaper editorials or articles representing opinions and facts to the people of Iowa about impending reapportionment legislation.

20. Do research to prepare a report on how various groups, such as the League of Women Voters, view reapportionment.

21. Interview persons connected with the Iowa legislature, such as the head of the Legislative Research Bureau, or State officials about their ideas and feelings concerning reapportionment and report to the class your findings.

22. Have someone do exploratory research on reapportionment proceedings in state legislatures of adjacent states.

Culminating

1. Make an apportionment plan you feel would stand the test of the United States Supreme Court and Iowa legislative and Court scrutiny.

2. Collect at least ten newspaper articles pertaining to reapportionment in the Nation and in the next Iowa legislative session.
3. Write an article called Then and Now. Explain the original apportionment of Iowa and present apportionment problems.

4. Write an article called Then and Now. Explain the reason why state legislative bodies have not followed the lead set by the Northwest Ordinance in 1787 for apportioning legislative seats.

5. Write a short paper explaining the differences between any two Iowa Legislative reapportionment proposals studied.

6. Ask a speaker to come and talk to the class on the topic of reapportionment.

7. Prepare a series of debates concerning such problems in the apportionment process as: Gerrymandering, lobbies, equal representation, the county unit system, and weighting.

8. Discuss the role of the state and federal legislator in a democratic society.

9. Have students write an essay summarizing important points they have gained from their study.

10. Draw cartoons representing types of reapportionment.

11. Visit a session of the state legislature and see in legislative action.

12. Have students prepare questions to form part of a unit examination.

13. Have the class write letters to their congressman regarding some proposed legislation concerning reapportionment. (such as the Dirksen Amendment)

14. Prepare a reapportionment proposal, submit it to the model student legislature from the classroom, and take it through the legislative process until it has been voted upon, accepted or rejected.
Books. This particular section of the unit lists books and articles available on reapportionment as it pertains to Iowa. It should be noted that because of the nature of this study and in fact that reapportionment has become a great issue again since the Supreme Court decisions of 1962 and 1964, few books pertinent to the study are available. The greatest source of reference the reader will find is in periodicals. Newspaper articles needed by the teacher for instructional purposes can often be obtained by writing to that newspaper.

BOOKS
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"Congress Goes to Court," Economist, CCXII (September 26, 1964), 1237-38.


"Congressional Reapportionment--A Case Study," Social Education, XXIX (December, 1965), 541-554.


McKay, Robert B. "Don't Amend the Constitution," State Government (Spring, 1965).


"One Man-One Vote," Twentieth Century Fund, Conference of Research Scholars and Political Scientists (June 15, 1962).
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Annals of Iowa. (Des Moines: State Department of History and Archives).

Iowa Journal of History and Politics, to 1948.
NEWSPAPERS

Burlington Hawkeye

"Reapportionment Case To Provoke Interest in Iowa" July 20, 1962

Stuart Awbry

"Iowa Dems Rake The Shaff Plan" 29,
"Suit Will Settle State's Rights" August 13,
"Turning To Federal Courts" 15,
"Election Orators To Skip Shaff Mention" 15,
"Area Men In Remap Suit" 24,
"Shift Remap Suit Target" October 12,
"Unions Plea Still Alive" 21,
"Democracy At Home" 22,
"Forget the Shaff Plan" November 9,
"Shaff Shenanigans" February 11, 1963
"The Shaff Opposition" 15,
"Issues and Rules For Remap Hearing Set" 19,
"Remap Case Brief Filed" March 18,
"The Small Towns Have It" April 19,
"The Fight on Shaff" June 19,
"Schmidhauser Calls For Defeat of Shaff Plan" July 3,
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&quot;A Rural Protest&quot;</td>
<td>July 8, 1963</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Sees Shaff Plan Threat for Future Rural Areas&quot;</td>
<td>22,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Shaff Contends His Plan Has Urban-Rural Balance&quot;</td>
<td>23,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Throw 'Em A Bone&quot;</td>
<td>24,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Shaff Foe Calls on F. B. To 'Tell Truth'&quot;</td>
<td>August 8,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Shaff Plan Stand of Hughes Hit&quot;</td>
<td>October 11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Snow Job' Is Charged By Anti-Shaff Leader&quot;</td>
<td>22,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Shaff Vote Rules Listed By Hultman&quot;</td>
<td>25,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Poll Shows Farmers in Favor of Shaff Plan 2-1&quot;</td>
<td>30,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Area and Population&quot;</td>
<td>November 1, 1963</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Gov. Hughes Is No Help&quot;</td>
<td>7,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Court To Tackle Remap Hassles&quot;</td>
<td>12,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;No Time For An Election&quot;</td>
<td>December 3,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;S. E. Iowans Vote Down Shaff Plan&quot;</td>
<td>4,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;They Said No&quot;</td>
<td>4,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;How Each County Voted&quot;</td>
<td>4,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Mandate To Legislature&quot;</td>
<td>5,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Hultman To Offer Remap Plan of His Own Dec. 20&quot;</td>
<td>11,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Hughes In Favor of Bigger House&quot;</td>
<td>15,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Breaking the Deadlock&quot;</td>
<td>16,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Hultman Seeking Remap By June 1&quot;</td>
<td>18,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Iowa Starts Reshaping Its Laws&quot;</td>
<td>31,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Title</td>
<td>Date</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Local Legislator Has Remap Idea&quot;</td>
<td>January 19, 1964</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;And Court Costs Too&quot;</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Dodds To Introduce Plan For Remapping&quot;</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Republicans Discuss 3 Reapportionment Plans, Hultman Says&quot;</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Temporary Remap Possible&quot;</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Popular Control May Hamper Remapping Plans&quot;</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Demos Push Remap Plan&quot;</td>
<td>February 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Legislature May Refuse To Remap&quot;</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Legislators Giving Up Remap Concepts&quot;</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Air of Uncertainty On Remapping&quot;</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Congressional District Status In Iowa Unclear&quot;</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Don't Want Court Remap&quot;</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Remap Moves Studied By Both Sides&quot;</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;The Iowa Majority&quot;</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Legislators Are Split Over Appeal on Remap Ruling&quot;</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Iowa Labor Is Against Ray's Plan&quot;</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Iowa Legislators Tackle Reapportionment Problem&quot;</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Legislature Begins Special Session&quot;</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;14 Remap Proposals Studied By Senators&quot;</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Iowa G. O. P. Facing Big Challenge&quot;</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Percentages Play Large Remap Role&quot;</td>
<td>March 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Ask More Advice From Court&quot;</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
"Court Rules Legislature Must Guide" March 10, 1964

"Guilty" 15,

"Legislators Action Fought By Labor Men" 17,

"Hultman Seeking Court Advice" 19,

"Hughes Backs Splitting of Districts In Iowa" 20,

"Wise Action Says Hughes" 20,

"Reapportionment Race Is Entering Home Stretch" 22,

"The Week's Wash" 22,

"Redistricting Plan Upheld" April 8,

"Newest Plan Not Good, Hughes, Hultman Agree" 9,

"Reapportionment Session Cost State $337,500" 12,

"The Special Session" 12,

"Curiouser and Curiouser" 13,

"Reapportionment Is Issue In Campaigns" 16,

"Remap Plan Popularizes Unicameral Legislatures" June 18,

"Colorado Remaps On Population Factor" July 9,

"One Way to Reapportion" September 2,

"The States Can Act" October 10,

"See New Proposal On Reorganization" December 2,

"Senate Remap Attitude" January 27, 1965

"Law by Computer" February 2,
"1967, And All That" February 19, 1965

Bill Eberline

"Miller Sees Subdistricting In Reapportionment"

"Redistricting In Kansas Invalid" March 1,

"At Least A Start"

"'Other Than Population'"

"Reapportionment Good"

"To Expedite Remap Case"

Bill Eberline

"High Court Orders Iowa Subdistricts" April 17, 1966

The Cedar Rapids Gazette


Frank Nye

"Platform of 'Vigor' Hits Shaff Plan" July 29,

"Iowa Reapportionment Suit" August 19,

"Remap Will Not Solve Everything, Iowa Cities Told" Sept. 15,

"State Asks Dismissal of Remap Suit" 18,

"Colton Is Opposed to Shaff Remap Plan" 25,

"No Equity Here" 25,

"Shaff and Gilmour To Debate Remap Plan" 26,

"Riley Outlines Revolutionary Remapping Plan" 27,

"Shaff Says Remap Plan 'Practical' Not Perfect" 28,

"Court to Hear Remap Suit in Iowa Oct. 20" Oct. 1,

"A 'Think Ahead' Plan" 7,

"Labor Asks Remap Relief Delay to '65" 12,
"Reapportionment Suit" October 15, 1962

"Throw Out Iowa's Bid to Dismiss" 20,

"Unequal Supervisory Districts" December 28,


"Shaff Plan Clouds" February 4,
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"U. S. Gives Views on Reapportioning of State Legislatures"  14,

"The Judicial Thicket of Reapportionment"  18,

"Shaff Plan Doubts Unavoidable"  18,

"In Polk County and City Shaff Plan Loses by 5 to 1"  December 4,

"Polk County's Vote on the Shaff Plan"  5,

"Lines Drawn for Apportionment Case"  10,

"U. N. Reapportionment"  17,

Drake Mabry

"Let Legislature Do It"  18,

"Says Apportion Plan Top Issue"  19,

Drake Mabry

"Offer Plan for Population-- Basis Reapportionment"  20,
"Redistrict Sales Job By G. O. P." December 31, 1963

"Fural Group Yielding" January 1, 1964

"Court Orders Reapportion and Sets Out Guidelines" 15,

"Court Guidelines on Reapportionment" 17,

"Hultman Works on Apportion" 21,

"Apportion Parley By Rural Group" 24,

"Our Reapportionment Idea" 24,

"Apportion Plan Is Studied" 28,

"Court: Equal Population Is Rule for U. S. House" February 17,

"Two Districting Plans" 18,

"No Apportion Appeal Now" 19,

"Segregation Issue In Redistricting" 20,

"Reapportionment Plans Ready for Special Session" 21,

"Legislature Can't Detour Governor" March 4,

"Senator Main's Idea" 5,

"A Border Dispute" 7,

"Appeal Apportion Step by Auditors" 9,

"Leaders vs. Rural Forces" 10,

"Importance of Rural Vote In Iowa" 18,

"Michigan Reapportionment" 19,

"Polk's Extra Seats" 20,

"Deny New Apportion Guidelines" 27,
"Apportion Plea Set for High Court" March 30, 1964

"Legislature OKayed An Interior Plan" 30,

"County Home Rule" April 11,

"The State's Revised Representation" 14,

"Apportion Plans Upset!" June 15,

"Rules 'Fifth' Applies in State Cases" 15,

"Sees Apportion Upheaval for 32 Legislatures" 16,

"Fifth Amendment Applied to States" 18

"Hughes: Two House Plan Better" 22,

"Ask Reapportionment for Supervisors Too" 23,

"Legislators Ask Curb on Courts" 23,

"Iowa Legislative Apportionment" 24,

"Sub-County Districts In Iowa House" July 1,

"Rocky Blow at Frantic Reapportion" August 10,

"Weighted Voting In Legislature" 12,

"County Reapportionment" September 16,

"Ask Court To Order New '67 Apportionment Plan" November 11,

"Apportion Job Left to State Court" 16,

"A New Court Plan to Force Apportionment" 25,

"Politics and Apportionment" December 9,

"Permanent Apportion Plan to Die?" 28,

"Court Rules For County Apportion" January 6, 1965

"Asks Court Delay on Apportioning" 8,
"Path Left Open to Bring Sub-districting to Court" January 20, 1965

"One-Man, One-Vote Rule Cited" February 12, 1965

"Apportionment" March 19, 1965

Drake Mabry

"Apportionment Plan Vote by Senate" 26, 1965

"Reapportionment For Counties" 31, 1965

"Make Districting Mandatory" April 1, 1965

"Two Vital Bills on Apportionment" 9, 1965

"Only Chance for Subdistricts" June 2, 1965

"Missouri Reapportionment" August 25, 1965

"Reapportionment to District Court" 24, 1965

"The Fourteenth Is Here To Stay" November 2, 1965

"Proportional Representation" 16, 1965

"Apportionment Guidelines" 30, 1965

"Remap Voted in Connecticut" December 15, 1965

"Rules Nebraska Apportion Valid" January 25, 1966

"Ohio's New Subdistrict Plan Upheld" February 21, 1966

"Single Districts For Legislators" 23, 1966

"Apportion Plan Affirmed" 28, 1966

"Florida Apportionment" March 1, 1966

"One-House Legislature" 19, 1966

"Court Opinion Won't Affect City Council" 19, 1966

"U. S. Ruling On Districting" April 2, 1966
Omaha World-Herald

"Most Feel Legislature Okay As Is" March 23, 1963
"High Court Ruling Shakes States" November 12, 14,
"Southwest to Approve Shaff Plan" 15,
"Attorney's Defending Redistricting Effort" December 6,
"Hughes: Let Panel Decide" 13,
"Assembly Can Start Action" January 1, 1964
"Redistricting Plan Pushed" 16,
"Naden Says Iowa Should File Appeal" February 11,
"Population Basis Gains" 26,
"All Apportioning Bills Cost Southwest Iowa" June 24,
"Iowa Unions Warn 1965 Legislature" July 8,
"Cases May Flood Court" June 5, 1965
"Reapportion Delay Urged" December 7,
"Reapportion Hearing Set"

Sioux City Journal

"State Reapportionment Problem" August 14, 1962
"Point of Law" 18,
"Iowa's Population Ranges" September 5,
"Quash Apportionment Suit, Hultman Asks U. S. Court" 8,
"Demands Supervisors Redistrict Woodbury" 11,
"Reapportionment of Counties Too?" 13,
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Asks Court to Enjoin Supervisors&quot;</td>
<td>October 18, 1962</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Reapportionment Suit Dismissed Here; Court States It Lacks Power&quot;</td>
<td>December 20,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;County Reapportionment Suit&quot;</td>
<td>24,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;County Reapportionment Decision&quot;</td>
<td>January 2, 1963</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Lawmaker Reduction Plan Fails&quot;</td>
<td>February 16,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Court Says 'One-Person, One-Vote'&quot;</td>
<td>March 21,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Say Iowans Are Satisfied With State Representation&quot;</td>
<td>23,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Those State Aid Expenditures&quot;</td>
<td>28,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Iowa Reapportionment Ruling&quot;</td>
<td>May 11,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Alternative to Shaff Plan Needed&quot;</td>
<td>June 18,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;League of Women Voters in Anti-Shaff Plan Move&quot;</td>
<td>19,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Gov. Hughes and the Shaff Plan&quot;</td>
<td>September 30,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Shaff Plan Could Lead to Farm-Labor Coalition&quot;</td>
<td>November 6,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Sioux City Legislator Raps Leaders on Shaff&quot;</td>
<td>7,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;The History of Iowa Reapportionment&quot;</td>
<td>27,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;The Strange Attitude of Urban People&quot;</td>
<td>December 3,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Next Step in Reapportionment Is Pondered by Iowas Leaders&quot;</td>
<td>5,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;A Surprising Vote on the Shaff Plan&quot;</td>
<td>5,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Urges G. O. P. Push Reapportionment&quot;</td>
<td>7,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Iowa's New Reapportionment Plan&quot;</td>
<td>10,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Issues in Court Hearing on Reapportionment Continued&quot;</td>
<td>11,</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
"List Issues in Districting Suit" December 11, 1963
"Changes in the Iowa Political Scene" 12,
"Iowa Attorney General to Propose Reapportionment System" 12,
"The Vote by Areas" 14,
"Same Old Trail" 17,
"Excerpts From Both Briefs in Suit Over Apportionment" 26,
"Reapportionment Argument Continues" 26,
"A Challenge for Iowa Republicans" January 6, 1964
"The Court Rules on Reapportionment" 17,
"Hughes Veto Among Constitutional Issues" 17,
"Reapportionment Is Major Business on Agenda Owing Federal Court Ruling" 18,
"Iowa Rural Solons Lean Toward Population House, Little Change in Senate" 29,
"That Famous Section 37" 29,
"Iowa G. O. P. Asks Bipartisan Backing on Reapportionment" February 8,
"Population May Be Basis For Representation In Both Houses" 12,
"Iowa's Setup Might Get Judicial Okay: Hultman" 18,
"Solons Oppose Federal Court Reapportioning Legislature" 20,
"Would Get High U. S. Court Aid If Necessary for Iowa" 26,
"Area and Legislative Apportionment" March 6,
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Publication Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Extremes in Reapportionment--Other States Show&quot;</td>
<td>March 7, 1964</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;G. O. P. Leader Says Tears Unfounded&quot;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Winterset Solon Takes Senate Maverick Role&quot;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Will Wait for Guidelines from U. S. Supreme Court&quot;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;The Split Over Reapportionment&quot;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Seek Hultman Aid in Asking Intervention&quot;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Rural Forces Seek Petition for a Stay of Reapportionment&quot;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;The Next Reapportionment Problem&quot;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Permanent Districts&quot;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Some Legislators Want to Institute Amendment to Allow Subdistrict&quot;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Reason for a Smaller Legislature&quot;</td>
<td>April 2,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;A Sorry Reapportionment Plan&quot;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;They Wrote Bills and Drew Maps: Reyhons, Faupel, Unsung Heroes&quot;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;More Reorganization&quot;</td>
<td>June 15,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Reapportionment Guidelines Are Here&quot;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Woodbury Legislators Comment on Remap Rule&quot;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;N.D. Legislature Very Much in Air on Reapportionment&quot;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Editors Say Many States May Take Long Look at One-House Legislature&quot;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;New Legislative Building Opportunity&quot;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Title</td>
<td>Date</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Ruling Asked on Validity of Iowa Remap Plan&quot;</td>
<td>June 29, 1964</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Rural Control of Iowa Legislature Theoretically Possible in Population Reapportionment&quot;</td>
<td>July 6, 1964</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Nebraska Lets Court Order to Reapportion&quot;</td>
<td>18, 1964</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;That Second Legislative House&quot;</td>
<td>September 12, 1964</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;S.D. Redistricting Optional Plans Submitted&quot;</td>
<td>29, 1964</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Solon Boosts Constitutional Apportionment Amendment&quot;</td>
<td>October 6, 1964</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Reapportionment Roadblock Killed&quot;</td>
<td>8, 1964</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Reapportionment Seen as Key Issue&quot;</td>
<td>December 5, 1964</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;U. S. Court Ruling May Shake Local Government in Dakota&quot;</td>
<td>14, 1964</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Set Pretrial Reapportion Conference&quot;</td>
<td>January 7, 1965</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;May Map Redistricting at Pierre on Thursday&quot;</td>
<td>23, 1965</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Unicameral Legislative History&quot;</td>
<td>February 9, 1965</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;A Chance to Try the Unicameral Plan&quot;</td>
<td>24, 1965</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;If a Unicameral, How Big?&quot;</td>
<td>March 9, 1965</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Play-Acting and Reapportionment&quot;</td>
<td>13, 1965</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Case for Redistricting&quot;</td>
<td>29, 1965</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Long Apportionment Road&quot;</td>
<td>31, 1965</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Reapportionment the Hottest Issue&quot;</td>
<td>April 2, 1965</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Go All the Way on Districts&quot;</td>
<td>5, 1965</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;One Reason for Two Houses&quot;</td>
<td>May 3, 1965</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Seek Subdistrict Legislative Plan&quot;</td>
<td>11, 1965</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Chance for Comparison&quot;</td>
<td>17, 1965</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
"Where We Are Now in Reapportionment" September 9, 1965
"The Question of Subdivision" November 15,
"Upholds Rolvaag's Reapportion Veto" 27,
"Challenge Legality of Nebraska's 2nd Reapportion Bill" December 3,
"Reapportioning Suit Appealed Before Iowa Supreme Court" January 7, 1966
"The Case for Subdistricting: 1" 24,
"The Case for Subdistricting: 2" 25,
"Iowa Court Under Pressure in Reapportionment Problem" February 22,
"Should Cities Be Subdistricted?" April 20,
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"See Iowa Group Taking Remap Issue to Court" July 19, 1962
"Calls Iowa County Government 'Outmoded'" August 15,
"Do Districting Suits Violate State Rights?" 15,
"Labor Ready to Take Remap Suit to U. S. Supreme Court" 17,
"Is Malapportionment Local Problem in Iowa" November 6,
"State Rights Advocates Have Hurt Own Cause" January 25, 1963
"Question Shaff Plan's Realism" February 10,
"Allocate Legislative Costs to Counties?" March 5,
"Image of State Hurt by Bickering Over Patronage" 15,
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Rational Basis' to Shaff Plan?&quot;</td>
<td>March 18, 1963</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Is One-Person, One-Vote Basic?&quot;</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;State Contends Iowans 'Perfectly Content' with the Present Apportionment&quot;</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Is This Taxation without Representation?&quot;</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Invites Shaff Plan Foes To Meeting at Des Moines&quot;</td>
<td>May 29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Lively Shaff Plan Debate Assured&quot;</td>
<td>June 21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Is Shaff Plan Better Than Nothing?&quot;</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Shaff Plan Violates Historical Precedents&quot;</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Are Iowa Counties Like States in Union?&quot;</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Conservatives Beat Themselves&quot;</td>
<td>August 13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Stanley Clings to Sinking Ship&quot;</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Editors Continue Shaff Plan Debate&quot;</td>
<td>Sept. 15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Is 'Federal Analogy' Valid in Shaff Plan?&quot;</td>
<td>October 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Shaff Debate Continues&quot;</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Doctor's Group Uses Fright Tactics&quot;</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Decide 3 Issues: Is Shaff Plan Better Plan&quot;</td>
<td>November 14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Editors Lash Hughes&quot;</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Polk Suit Asks $6,000 of Reapportionment Group&quot;</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Now We Can Get Good Assembly Plan&quot;</td>
<td>December 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Rural Areas Clinched Shaff Loss&quot;</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
"Hughes Gives His Remap View" December 13, 1963

"Let's Not Repeat Shaff Plan Fight" 13,

"Settle One Single Assembly Issue" 20

"G.O.P. Can Lead Way to Good Apportionment" 23,

"G.O.P. Tries Another Remap Plan" 31,

"Legislative Districts Compared" January 6, 1964

"Apportionment Order Bars Sub-Districting" 16,

"Iowa Leaders Hunting Ways Around Booby Trap to Remap Drive" 17,

"Veto Power on Interim Remap Plan Illogical" 17,

"Governor Sees 'Fair' Remap Plan" 19,

"Iowa Legislators Won't Be Negative" 19,

"Resolve Rural-Urban Split on Apportionment" 21,

"Hultman Says G.O.P. Chiefs Are Drafting Remap Plans" 22,

"Pre-Session Remap Talks Suggested" 23,

"Weber Thinks Governor Can Veto Interim Remap" 23,

"Proposed G.O.P. Interim Remap Plan Acceptable" 24,

"G.O.P. Chiefs Plan Solon Meetings on Remap Plans" 26,

"Present Solons Should Like G.O.P. Remap Plan" 28,

"May Delay Permanent Remap Until After U.S. Supreme Court Acts" 30,
"Hultman: Solons Must Adopt Remap Amendment After Interior Plan Is Set" January 31, 1964

"Sees Chance Legislature Will Reject Redistricting" February 5

"Rep. Grossley Says District Order 'Stinks'" 7

"Most Legislators in A.P. Poll Abandon 'Area' Concept" 11

"Will Ruling on Georgia Affect Iowa?" 18

"Legislators Divided on Remap Appeal" 20

"Hughes Hits Cornstalk Curtain" 21

"New G.O.P. Chairman Says Party Must Act" 21

"Remap Plan Based on Present Setup" 22

"Here Are Major Events Leading to Remap Session" 23

"Iowa Remap Battle Starts Tomorrow" 23

"G.O.P. Solons Should Back G.O.P. Chairman" 24

"Senate Committee Plan Excellent. Why Quibble!" 28

"Assembly Tries to Pay $100 Debt with $25" March 4

"Is One-Per-County Solon Idea Dead?" 9

"Present Senate Shows Error of 51 Seat Senate" 13

"Iowa Counties Won't Be Merged" 15

"House Hails Action on Remap" 18

"Hultman, Hughes Take Same Stand on Remap" 18

"At Least Temporary Remap Averts Disaster" 19

"Can Assembly Remap Without Veto Threat?" 20
Bill Severin

"Shaff Calls for Tight Remap Guidelines" March 20, 1964

"Subdistricting Desirable for Permanent Remap" 23,

"When Is Permanent Remap to Take Effect?" 24,

"Gentlemen, Don't Fight Over Remap Details" 25,

"Permanent Plan Will Not Endure" April 1,

"Subdistrict Bill Is Gamble" 2,

"Fights for Fair Reapportionment" 3,

"Assembly Offers Base for New Remap" 10,

"Reapportionment Posed Mechanical Problems" 13,

"Illinois Teaches Remap Lesson" 14,

"Supreme Court Division Needed" 15,

"Reorganization Record Impressive" May 14,

"Court Declare Most Legislatures Are Illegal" June 16,

"Court May Accept Remap on County Lines" 17,

"We Deny Value of Unicameral Assembly" 19,

"Will Iowa Temporary Plan Stay Until 1970?" 22,

"We Doubt Reversal of Court Remap Verdicts" 26,

"Eye Computers for Remap Plan" 28,

"Supervisors Council Under Remap Verdict?" 28,
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Legislator Sherle Must Be Joking&quot;</td>
<td>July 1, 1964</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Congress Studies Curb on Court Jurisdiction&quot;</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Iowans Ask Move for One House Not on Population&quot;</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Can State Courts Enforce Remap?&quot;</td>
<td>August 21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Beware of Tricks on Remap Issue&quot;</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;House Unit Okays Move to Bar One-Man, One-Vote Rule for State Assemblies&quot;</td>
<td>Sept. 17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Attempt to Reverse High Court Foils&quot;</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;New 'Temporary' Plan Needed?&quot;</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Dixie Chiefs Rap Remap Ruling&quot;</td>
<td>October 15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Would You Want 25 Men to Vote Legislation?&quot;</td>
<td>November 30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Postpone Court Remap Action Request&quot;</td>
<td>December 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;G.O.P. Bares New York Remap Plan&quot;</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Hughes: Splig Big Counties Into Legislative Districts&quot;</td>
<td>January 5, 1965</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Keep Remap Plans Simple&quot;</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Exact Population Districts Unwise&quot;</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Iowa Remap Argued in Court&quot;</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Could G.O.P. Overturn Ban on Subdistricting?&quot;</td>
<td>February 14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Cross County Lines for Legislative Districts?&quot;</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Gerrymander Districts for Equal Population?&quot;</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Iowa Did Good Redistricting Job&quot;</td>
<td>March 23</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
"Pending Apportionment Amendment Defective" March 24, 1965

"Will Remap Bill Be Killed in 1967?" 29,

"Democrat Remap Plan Abandons High Principles" April 23,

"Postpone Painful Districting Issue?" 29,

"Iowa Assembly Backs Area Factor In Senate" May 11,

"Prove Need for Subdistricting" 13,

"Legislator-Per-County Concept on Way Back?" 18,

"Urban's Plan Too Good To Pass?" 24,

"Iowa Judge Throws Out Remap Suit" June 18,

"Does No Subdistricting Mean Unequal Citizens?" August 25,

"Remap Issue Left with Iowa Courts" September 3,

"Resist Remap Plan Attack" 17,

"Professor Calls for Iowa Subdistricting" Oct. 1,

"Some Reapportionment Action in 45 of 50 States" 8,

"Dismisses Appeal on Local Remap" 11,

"Local Inequality No Federal Issue?" 13,

"Remap Reverse Now Is Failure" 26,

"Remap Plan Upheld by Polk Judge" November 5,

"Subdistricting No Matter of Taste" 8,

"Core Cities Won't Rule State Legislatures" 12,

"Backs Count Reorganization Plan" April 13, 1966
"1967 Iowa Legislature Faces Subdistricting Task" April 17, 1966
"Reapportionment Ruling" 17,
"New Legal Concept on Subdistricting" 18,
"Plans Remap Appeal" 22

In the preceding newspaper articulated bibliography citations with authorship given are indicated by the authors' names. All other entries had no specific author and those articles are editorials or staff written articles.

Audio-visual aids and techniques. The social studies teacher has endless opportunities to enrich his teaching by the appropriate use of visual and auditory materials. Most of them can be used to aid teaching and facilitate learning. According to an old Chinese proverb, "one seeing is worth a hundred telling." Whether this is literally correct or not, it embodies a sound truth which has come to be recognized in education.¹

Besides books, the teacher needs as standard equipment: maps, globes, films, and filmstrips. Not only do these aids clarify concepts and bring the world into the classroom, but they also have the following psychological implications: (1) provide motivation; (2) extend the range of experience; (3) aid the poor reader and slow learner especially; (4) are highly valuable for introducing new

¹Wesley and Wronski, op. cit., p. 268.
materials; (5) can clarify processes and procedures;
(6) increase the amount learned within a specified time;
(7) strengthen retention; (8) clarify perceptions, con-
cepts, and understandings; (9) encourage further reading
and study; (10) produce more and better group discussions;
(11) reinforce other methods of learning; (12) create a
feeling of reality about unknown persons or places;
(13) encourage desirable attitudes and behavior patterns.¹

Audio-visual materials. The following are examples
of the films and filmstrips that are available to the
teacher and pertinent to the instruction of reapportion-
ment in Iowa. Most of the films listed are available
through the State University of Iowa and Iowa State Uni-
versity film services on a loan basis, with addresses as
follows:

Bureau of Audio-Visual Instruction
Extension Division
State University of Iowa
Iowa City, Iowa

Visual Instruction Service
Iowa State University
Ames, Iowa 50010

The filmstrips are available as addressed for each individual
series.

¹Ibid., p. 271.
The Congress. (Revised Edition). (20 minutes). Presents a dramatic demonstration of the powers and duties of the Congress. The making of law begins with citizens at home concerned with a vital issue. This issue, a community's need for a flood control program, is traced from the action of the local committee to the campaign of the congressman through debate in a congressional committee, to final action on the Senate floor.

The Constitution And The Right To Vote. (30 minutes). Two cases--Grove v. Townsend and Smith v. Allwright--which challenged the "white primary" are documented in this program as it traces the growth of the electorate from the time of the founding fathers and examines the constitutional issues involved in the steady broadening of the basis of our democracy.

The Constitution: Whose Interpretation. (30 minutes). Draws on historic film from the National Archives and other sources to illustrate the conflict among the various components of the government in the interpretation of their respective powers under the Constitution. It traces the "court packing fight" of the 1930's when the legislature, executive and judicial branches were sharply at odds over the constitutionality of New Deal measures, with particular attention to Helvering v. Davis which tested the constitutionality of the Social Security Act.

Iowa's General Assembly. (25 minutes). Shows the steps of how a bill becomes a law in the state of Iowa. Students are shown visiting during the sessions of the Legislature. The daily procedures of the House and Senate, the duties of the Governor, Lieutenant Governor, Speaker of the House, Chief Clerk of the House, and Secretary of the Senate are shown. This is a picture of democracy in action.

Majority Vote. (7 minutes). A film designed to provoke discussion on the question of whether the elected representative of a group may legitimately support a measure which is
disliked by a majority of those who elected her. A situation is presented in which a class of high school students voice their disapproval of the support given by their student council representative to a measure curtailing their extracurricular activities. In defending her action the representative gives adequate reason for her support of the measure. The audience is invited to express their opinion.

The Meaning of Election. (10 minutes). In a presentation of the meaning of elections in our democracy, this film shows the concept of equality, the relationship of the elected official to his constituency, the importance of citizens voting, the operation of election machinery, and the necessity for people to strive continually to improve their election system.

Meet Your Federal Government. (20 minutes). A schoolboy tells his class about his visit to his congressman in Washington, and how he saw various departments of government in action.

Our Living Constitution. (11 minutes). Shows how the Constitution greater in problems which are close to us guarantees our rights and freedoms and protects the interests of the people as a whole.

Our National Government. (11 minutes). A dramatization of the historical background and operation of our national government with a discussion of its basic philosophy and the devices by which our forefathers sought to maintain order in government while preserving personal liberty.

Politics and Civil Service. (6 minutes). Shows the spoils system at work in an American city and the efforts of the National Civil Service Reform League to reform it.

Presidential Elections. (15 minutes). Describes the process of electing a President of the United States, emphasizing it as the most significant event in American political life. Animated drawings and a wealth of photographic material record recent campaigns. The film describes the structure
and strategy of Presidential campaign organization and the major political moves involved in the nomination and election of a president.

**Pressure Groups.** (22 minutes). Clearly explains what pressure groups are and reveals that, when democratically used, they are a necessary instrument for making decisions in democracy. Illustrates methods used by representative democratic pressure groups to bring about legislation for a desirable civic project. Contrasts these methods with the underhanded and behind-the-scenes manipulation employed by a group attempting to prevent the passage of a bill.

**The Supreme Court.** (7 minutes). How the United States Supreme Court works, how a case gets to and through the court and the extent of the Court's authority are given major emphasis. The role of a court in preserving our political institutions and its effect upon our national life is examined.

**The Supreme Court.** (11 minutes). This story about the Supreme Court of the United States begins in a city a thousand miles from Washington. As we follow a case from inception, through the lower courts to final hearing before the Supreme Court, we learn the relationship of the court to the "Plain Citizen." We see the Supreme Court as the guardian of Constitutional rights, learn its functions, powers and jurisdiction—a candid film lesson of the Highest Court in our Federal Judicial System.

**Voting Procedures.** (14 minutes). A step-by-step presentation of procedures necessary for the alert citizen to follow in qualifying for the casting of his vote, this film contains scenes of activities in government buildings, and polling places which deal with voting procedures. Specific information on voter registration, marking of ballots, and operation of the voting machine are portrayed. Scenes are included which show a voter casting his vote in a primary and in a general election using both types of voting.
FILMSTRIPS


1. Citizen And His Courts
2. How Foreigners Become Citizens
3. How We Elect Our President.

Nature of Democracy. (Series of seven filmstrips).
Curriculum Materials Corporation, 1319 Vine Street, Philadelphia.

1. By And For the People
2. Democracy At Work
3. Education
4. Equality Before The Law
5. Freedom of Expression
6. Freedom of Religion

Evaluation. Appraisal of pupil growth is one of the most important processes of the unit. Students vary greatly in ability, talent, interest and maturity and the teacher must be vitally concerned with what can be done with individual student talent. Since it is recognized that some pupils gain little or no skill or knowledge from certain
activities but only enrichment, evaluation must take many forms.

Achievement of certain educational objectives can be evaluated effectively by paper-and-pencil instruments, others such as operating a microscope, writing a theme, delivering a speech, or preparing food products are kinds of behavior related to other objectives. Ranking and rating methods, check lists and anecdotal records are generally used in evaluating procedures. Product scales, as well as ranking and rating methods, are employed in product evaluation. Sample products, such as themes or notebooks, prepared by the pupil serve well as a means of explaining to him and his parents the degree of his achievement.¹

Participation in class involves getting along with others and playing one's role as a leader and follower. Class observation is the only way in which certain personal-social aspects of the pupil's behavior can be interpreted.²

Some higher intellectual abilities are hard to evaluate with conventional instruments, such objective abilities include problem solving, creative and independent thinking, and the ability to locate and select pertinent information.

²Ibid.
Through the use of projects and reports these can be observed and evaluated. Furthermore, pupil interest can often be determined through the use of projects and reports; perhaps pupil effort, which has often not been forthcoming in more teacher-dominated activities, will be discernible in opportunities allowing greater freedom of action.\(^1\)

In the light of what has been mentioned in the previous paragraphs educators note that factual and interest, attitude and work habit measurement must take place. Therefore, the following suggested methods might be used.\(^2\)

1. Observation. Planned systematic carefully recorded observations of two types, (a) preparation of possible behaviors, observation of a student or group of students and recording of the number of times a given student exhibits the various behaviors listed. (b) 'running account' method, capturing instances of specific student behavior giving the setting and context of this behavior.

2. Anecdotal records of student behavior.

3. Conferences with the student. A distinct advantage that the conference has over such instruments as checklists and inventories, or questionnaires is that the teacher is able to hear how the student responds to certain questions or situations as well as what he says.

4. Case studies. Case studies cannot be done with all students as it is a study in depth and intensity. However, it is of great value in getting beneath the surface manifestations in knowing the student for more comprehensive evaluation.

\(^1\)Ibid. \(^2\)Wesley and Wronski, op. cit., pp. 555-92.
5. Role-playing provides evaluative data for the teacher by what the student says, how he talks and how he acts.

6. Sociometric methods give the teacher an indication of the informal structure of student society.

7. Ratings by students is a way in which students may participate in the total evaluation of themselves or their fellow students.

8. Cumulative records give the teacher a comparison of past school records with his present level of work.

9. Pencil-and-paper tests. These should test for specific objectives and be of both essay and objective types.

Leads to other units. The general learnings, problem solvings, skill in evaluating materials and ability to work as a group which are a part of the learning experience in this unit could well be applied to other areas and units in the social studies. The courses known as civics and American or modern problems should find this study of reapportionment a sound foundation for many similar studies on other phases of historical background dealing with political science.

Depending on local community environment, community resources, interests and abilities of the teacher and students, various units could be formed from this one. Once the teacher has had the opportunity to use the unit,
he can form other units and use these in a similar manner.

Using the unit. It is said that students resist the social studies because: (1) there is far too much repetition in American history offerings in fifth, eighth, and eleventh grades; (2) the world history course tries to cover too much making for a very thin treatment of the subject; (3) history is often treated as a closed body of facts; (4) teachers of the social studies are ill-prepared. All these criticisms are valid, although not equally applicable throughout the country. But granting the validity of these criticisms, does this mean history or the social studies as a subject matter area, has little utility for today's students?\footnote{Mark M. Krug, "History and the Social Sciences: The Narrowing Gap," \textit{Social Education}, XXIX (December, 1965), 522.}

Walter Rundell, Jr. contends the answer is "no."

Said Rundell:

The great majority of students do have an innate interest in the past—whether it be the distant or immediate past. This curiosity about how things were—about how the individual is a product of what went before—is part of the human condition. The teacher's charge, then, is to capitalize on the curiosity, this human condition.\footnote{Walter Rundell, Jr., "History Teaching: A Legitimate Concern," \textit{Social Education}, XXIX (December, 1965), 520.}
The writer of this unit has attempted to focus greater attention on contemporary problems, and to allow for flexibility of content and learning procedures which encompass a great range of individual difference. Through the many definite and specific activities suggested the user of the unit can meet these individual needs. Widening the scope and extending the activities is a desirable aspect as resource units need constant revision to fit the needs of the individual teacher.

The study of reapportionment in Iowa will help the student develop a deeper understanding of his cultural heritage, and a greater respect and concern for the governing and governed within his own nation and throughout the world. If such an outcome is the result, then the study has been of worth to teacher and student alike.
CHAPTER IV

SUMMARY, CONCLUSION, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

I. SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION

The problem of this study was to develop a resource unit on reapportionment to be used at the high school level.

In building the unit the writer reviewed the literature available on reapportionment, then stated and defined the problem. The limitations of this particular unit were stated, and the functions of a resource unit explained. A historical background of apportionment and reapportionment in Iowa was reported. The objectives, outline of reapportionment, as well as an explanation of initiatory, developmental, and culminating activities were stated. A general bibliography containing books, periodicals, films and filmstrips on reapportionment was included for teacher use.

II. RECOMMENDATIONS

The study presents a vast organization of materials for teacher instruction and student study of the history of reapportionment in Iowa. Through teacher selection it
provides a basis for understanding laws validated in the past and the reason each vote is crucial in an election since each vote cast is equal to any other. Teachers need to instruct students in democracy and the workings of democratic government. The use of this unit will present these concepts to the student in Iowa as they concern him and his own state government.

The unit will be best used as a unit in Problems of Democracy, or Civics classes, however it will provide the basis for a one semester course dealing with practical politics in Iowa. The area of reapportionment is not yet nor likely to be in the future a closed book of study. There is a proposed constitutional amendment awaiting the 1967 legislative session, and a possible appeal to the Iowa Supreme Court concerning the subdistricting ruling in Kruidenier v. McCulloch, 142 N.W.2d 355. New problems are certain to arise in the subdistricting of multi-member districts presenting the possibility of gerrymandering, this could present an interesting study. The possible loss of rural power in the legislature might be studied. An area yet not clear and of potential interest for study would be the possible subdistricting in elections of municipal governments, county offices and the election of school boards.
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**B. PERIODICALS**


C. PUBLICATIONS OF THE GOVERNMENT, LEARNED SOCIETIES, AND OTHER ORGANIZATIONS


D. CASES


THE SHAFF PLAN

This plan passed the House of Representatives in three sessions and was referred to as the Steven's Proposal. In the session of the 58th General Assembly, it was known as the Shaff Plan. This plan is easily understood since it follows the general pattern of representation that Iowa has followed since 1928. The House consists of ninety-nine with one representative elected from each county (area house). Counties are combined into sixty senatorial districts with a population equalling approximately one-sixtieth of the state's total population (45,000). Counties that qualify for more than one senator because they have a population unit of 45,000 plus a major fraction of another unit (22,500 plus one) are districted, thus each voter votes for one senator.

State Senator Jack Schroeder (Rep. Davenport) suggested in 1961 that the state be made into three county districts. Each was to have one senator plus one representative for every 22,500 persons.
ADVANTAGES:
1. ORIGINAL INTENT OF PRESENT SYSTEM.
2. EVERY COUNTY REPRESENTED.
3. EASILY UNDERSTOOD.
4. AREA AND POPULATION REPRESENTATION.
5. POPULATED COUNTIES NOT TIED TO SMALL COUNTIES.
6. NO CROSSING OF COUNTY LINES.
7. COUNTIES MORE THAN ONE SENATOR - DISTRICTED.

DISADVANTAGES:
1. SENATORIAL DISTRICTS VARY SOME IN POPULATION.
2. POPULATION HOUSE (SENATE) CONFIRMS APPOINTMENTS.
3. OPPOSITE NATIONAL PATTERN (PRINCIPLE SAME).
4. SOME FOUR-COUNTY SENATORIAL DISTRICTS.
THE STUART PLAN

This plan has been referred to as the Stuart Plan. The state is divided into fifty legislative districts. Forty-nine of these districts are composed of two counties with Polk County being a single district. Each legislative district elects one senator. House members are selected on the basis of population. Each legislative district elects one senator. House members are selected on the basis of population. Each legislative district qualifies for one representative plus one additional for each one one hundred and tenth of the state's population or major fraction thereof.

Since this plan combines large populous counties with small population counties, it has met strong opposition from House members. This plan was passed by the Senate after being amended setting out the seven most populous counties into single senatorial districts, thus resulting in a reapportionment plan that puts the Senate on an area weighted to population and the House on a population basis.
**Plan II**

50 Senators (Area)

The Stuart Plan

110 Representatives (Population)

**Advantages:**
1. Follows national pattern.
2. Area house confirms appointments.
3. No crossing of county lines.
4. Legislative districts more than one representative - districted.

**Disadvantages:**
1. Some counties not represented.
2. 22 two-county districts - one representative.
3. Combines large and small counties.

**Senate**
- 1. 49 two-county districts - one single
- 2. Each district - one senator

**House**
- 1. Each legislative district - one representative
- 2. One additional for each 1/110 of state population (25,000) or major fraction


### PLAN III

#### 54 SENATORS (AREA AND POPULATION)

**COMMITTEE PLAN**

#### 125 REPRESENTATIVES (POPULATION)

---

**SENATE** - (1) COUNTIES WITH 2% OF STATE POPULATION

SINGLE SENATORIAL DISTRICT (9)

(2) 90 COUNTIES PAIRED (45)

**HOUSE** - (1) 125 REPRESENTATIVE DISTRICTS

22,500 POPULATION

(2) MAXIMUM DEVIATION 10%

---

**ADVANTAGES:**

1. SENATE (AREA) CONFIRMS APPOINTMENTS.
2. POPULATED COUNTIES NOT TIED TO SMALL COUNTIES.

**DISADVANTAGES:**

1. HYBRID PLAN CONTINUE CONTROVERSY.
2. CROSSES COUNTY LINES.
3. POPULATION FACTOR IN AREA HOUSE - WILL INCREASE.
4. NO CLEAR-CUT PRINCIPLES ESTABLISHED.
The nine largest counties electing
approximately 40% of the representatives.
(Generally considered a working majority)
Counties to Be Divided Into Single-member Legislative Districts

The number shown in the circle in a county is the number of senatorial districts that must be created. The number without a circle is the number of representative districts that must be created. The Iowa Supreme Court decision leaves uncertain the situation as to Muscatine and Louisa Counties which are now joined in one district electing two state representatives.

Subdistricting

When an Iowa county has had to elect more than one member of the Iowa House or more than one member of the Iowa Senate these legislators have been elected at large, on a county wide basis. Because of the April, 1966, ruling of the Iowa Supreme Court, after 1966 such counties shall be subdivided into single member districts, each district to elect one member of the House or one member of the Senate whichever may be the case.

*Des Moines Register
April 24, 1966