

September 30, 1968

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

S 11663

applies to all non-network business, both programs and announcements, both "plans" and frequency discount structures, both radio and television. Additionally, it was announced that all Storer stations have been instructed to intensify their efforts in arranging interview panels and other meaningful appearances of candidates for major offices within the permissible limits of Section 315 restrictions and sound programming. (The law currently provides that political rates can be no higher than comparable commercial rates. The thrust of this policy would make them 25% less than commercial rates.) The decision and announcement are in direct response to the recent recommendation of Chairman Rosel Hyde of the Federal Communications Commission and other similar comments from government officials commenting on the high cost of campaigning and the need of the campaigners to reach more people.

"In all honesty we do not know what the results of this discount will be as far as the candidates themselves are concerned," stated Michaels, "but under the circumstances we felt that it was in order to make a simple, concise and meaningful concession in the direction requested. We do know that it will reflect direct out-of-pocket loss of revenue to the stations, for during the closing weeks of the campaign the television stations in particular, operate on virtually a complete sold-out basis, with or without the discount, and this will simply mean less revenue per spot or program used.

"We feel that in many respects television is being incorrectly blamed for creating high costs of campaigning, whereas the truth of the matter is that the increased amounts spent are the result of the known efficiency of radio and television in reaching the public. These expenditures are larger because the candidates are using the medium in larger quantities than ever before by choice. The candidates with the most serious problem, of course, are those for the local or regional offices, and we hope that this move will in some degree facilitate their use of local radio and television, even though it is at a net financial cost to the station.

"We are not looking for old medals or halos. Business is good, and our stations as a whole are doing well. Our move is made as a gesture of cooperation, not of charity or rate-cutting. We hope that it will be productive for the candidates and the public, and if the results so indicate, we will give serious consideration to the application of the principle on a permanent basis."

The Storer Broadcasting Company stations are: WJBK and WJBK-TV, Detroit; WJW, WCJW and WJW-TV, Cleveland; WSPD and WSPD-TV, Toledo; WAGA-TV, Atlanta; WITI-TV, Milwaukee; WSBK-TV, Boston; WHN, New York; WIBG, Philadelphia; WGBS, Miami; and KGBS, Los Angeles.

#### WILL HUBERT HUMPHREY REPUDIATE L. B. J.?

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, many of Vice President HUMPHREY's "fair weather friends" are proposing that he turn his back on his great benefactor, L. B. J., and repudiate both him and his conduct of the war. I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD a news release on this subject issued by me yesterday.

There being no objection, the news release was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

#### NEWS RELEASE BY SENATOR MUNDT

WASHINGTON, D.C.—In a statement issued from his office here Sunday afternoon, Senator Karl Mundt (R. S.D.), a member of the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations, ex-

pressed disappointment over the fact that UN Ambassador George Ball "resigned from his urgent responsibilities at the United Nations almost on the very day of his confirmation by the Senate and thus placed his interest in partisan politics above his sense of service to the high office to which he was so recently appointed."

Mundt said, "In seeking a valid reason for this quick switch from diplomacy to partisan politics, I presume it must be that President Johnson has been viewing with steadily increasing dismay the series of vacillating and contradictory statements of his auditors along the campaign trail. Consequently it appears the President has arranged for a switch of American Ambassadors to the UN so that Mr. Ball can travel with Mr. Humphrey in an effort to hold the Vice President to the Administration's position on Vietnam and to eliminate the sly criticisms which have been creeping into Mr. Humphrey's statements. Both in the State Department and more especially at the United Nations, Mr. Ball has been an ardent advocate and a vigorous spokesman in defense of the Johnson-Humphrey Administration of our Vietnam policies and the conduct of the war in Vietnam. So it seems his assignment as advisor to Hubert Humphrey is designed to make sure the Vice President does not waver from the war policies he has helped to evolve and which both he and Mr. Ball have so vigorously supported."

"As a long time associate and friend of Mr. Humphrey," however, Mundt added, "I believe the President and our Secretary of State are unduly alarmed over the possibility that Mr. Humphrey will yield to the siren call of the peace-nicks, the doves, the hippies, the appeasers in Americans for Democratic Action and others urging him to 'come home, Hubert, come home to your former lovers'. Hubert is a native son of South Dakota and a man who has spent his life in the Great Middle West and our people have certain characteristics which I feel confident Vice President Humphrey shares.

"For example, from my knowledge of Hubert, I do not believe that he is a hypocrite. He speaks fast and often but I do not believe he speaks for the purpose of being deceitful. For four years he has been perhaps an even more ardent, devoted, determined and frequent advocate of this Administration's position and policies on Vietnam than has the President himself. I just can not believe he would now repudiate his past speeches, admit he was guilty of hypocrisy, and indict himself as having repeatedly supported a point of view to which he was individually opposed.

"And I have never known Hubert Humphrey to manifest cowardice. Having so often and for so long given complete and courageous support to the foreign policies and the war time decisions of this Administration and having participated in their formulation, I can not believe he would now run out on his own convictions because of some political fear that to remain consistent might jeopardize his personal political fortunes.

"Finally, Hubert Humphrey in my opinion is no ingrate. He knows better than anyone else the tremendous help the devoted friendship of Johnson has meant to the success of Humphrey. It was LBJ who selected Hubert as his assistant leader in the Senate and it was LBJ who personally chose Hubert as his running mate at the Atlantic City Democratic Convention. Without these great encouragements and boosts by LBJ, HHH knows he would today not even be running for the Presidency and I for one just do not believe that in the closing weeks of the political campaign Hubert would drive the dagger of ingratitude into the back of his illustrious and faithful benefactor.

"I speak as a Republican and as a long time friend of Dick Nixon's, and as one who is actively supporting Nixon in his great

campaign for the Presidency. But I do feel that those who do not know Hubert Humphrey well or who do not realize the qualities of citizenship and the personal characteristics which mark the vast majority of people in the Middle West do our Vice President a gross injustice in continuing to suggest that he now divorce himself from Johnson and turn his back on everything for which he has consistently stood for so long. I feel they underestimate Hubert Humphrey when they expect him to do a gross disservice both to his faithful friend, in the White House, his political party, and the power and prestige of the United States in these dangerous times by repudiating the Administration of which he is a part and the policies which he helped President Johnson, formulate and implement. Thus, I doubt the need for George Ball to suddenly quit his post at the United Nations where experienced leadership is now so necessary in order to make certain that Hubert Humphrey 'stay hitched' as a member of the Johnson-Humphrey Administrative team."

#### CZACH KENNAN CALLS UNITED STATES- SOVIET DETENTE PURE MADNESS

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, since August 20, 1968, the policymakers in the White House have seen their hopes for a detente between the United States and the Soviet Union dim in the continuing dusk of detention in Central Europe. The small ray of light of emerging freedom in Czechoslovakia was absorbed in the omnivorous twilight of fear as Soviet-bloc troops occupied that land.

Twice before during this term of Congress I have argued in this Chamber that the Communist threat to the free world had become greater and not less; that the increased threat was not just military, or political, or economic, but all of these—a strategic threat.

The deliberate subjugation of Czechoslovakia points up this strategic threat. On September 5 of this year, I reviewed the six major assumptions underlying the recent attempts of the United States at detente with the Soviet Union. In the sobering aftermath of Czechoslovakia we can see how illusory these tenets of detente are.

It was under the delusion of detente that the United States allowed NATO to deteriorate, that we redeployed military forces in Europe, and that we considered substantial troop reductions in Europe. We ignored the precepts for a sound NATO strategy.

I urged in my statement on September 5 a thoughtful and serious review of U.S. policy in two critical areas:

First, a full-scale conference of North Atlantic Treaty Organization foreign ministers and defense ministers should be convened to review mutual defense arrangements in Europe.

Second, concurrently, the United States must review, in depth, its current policy of "bridge building" to the Soviets.

I take heart that Secretary of State Dean Rusk has recently proposed to hold a group meeting with the foreign ministers of the U.S. NATO allies sometime soon in New York. This is a first step. The administration has taken no such preliminary moves, however, to begin a review of the policy of "bridge building" to the Soviets. In fact, President Johnson

September 30, 1968

still seems to be pursuing the contrary intent of seeking a summit conference with the Soviet leaders.

An Associated Press story, printed in many leading newspapers on September 22, 1968, reported on an extensive interview with George F. Kennan in which he discussed our strategic needs in Europe today. This story points up the folly of the detente mentality. Mr. Kennan is an eminent authority on U.S. foreign policy and on the Soviet Union. He is generally considered the chief architect of foreign policy during the Truman administration, and served the United States for more than a quarter of a century at various top-level posts in the U.S. Foreign Service.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that this excellent article as published in the St. Louis Post-Dispatch be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

IDEA OF JOHNSON-KREMLIN TALKS DESCRIBED  
BY AMBASSADOR KENNAN AS MADNESS  
(By Endre Marton)

PRINCETON, N.J., September 21.—The United States should dispatch 100,000 troops to West Germany and then tell the Soviet Union: "We will not take them out until you leave Czechoslovakia," scholar-diplomat George F. Kennan suggests.

He describes as "pure madness" any idea of President Lyndon B. Johnson meeting with Russian leaders under present circumstances.

"What respect would the Russians pay to the word of a lame duck president? What has Mr. Johnson to offer them? It is a bad policy to go and plead with people when you have no cards in your hands, no carrot and no stick," Kennan said in an interview.

Kennan, regarded by many as the top American authority on Communism, strongly questioned that there would be a detente or relaxation of tensions between East and West.

"I have never understood this talk about detente," Kennan said. "I have not seen any evidence of detente and I wouldn't trust any so-called detente if it is not supported by free contacts between governments and peoples."

An atmosphere of co-operation with the Soviet Union, he explained, "simply doesn't exist. Their conspiratorial method of diplomatic action cannot create such an atmosphere."

#### NUCLEAR WEAPONRY

There has been some progress in the field of nuclear weaponry and the nonproliferation issue, Kennan said. But he went on: "This is not detente. This is simply the dictate of obvious and bitter situation, presenting danger for both. An agreement on nonproliferation can be concluded without affecting our general political relations. The real test of relations would be if the Soviets permitted normal contacts between peoples."

"Any real detente," he said, "would have to begin with agreement on the future of Eastern and Central Europe. But I don't see that anything has changed in this respect, or that we would be any closer to the solution of the German problem."

Kennan said, in reference to published reports that Mr. Johnson still wanted to meet with Russian leaders:

"The suggestion of such a meeting at this time smacks of one of the worst phenomena of American diplomacy in earlier years, namely: the abuse of external relations of our people as a whole for the domestic-political advantage of a single faction or party. The idea of the President's going to Russia at this time strikes me as pure madness."

#### WHAT TOPIC?

What would Mr. Johnson discuss with the Russians? Kennan asked.

"Germany? There has been no preparation with our allies. The President has nothing new to offer and nothing to suggest. Vietnam? The Russians have warned us a hundred times that Vietnam is a burden on our relations. Is Mr. Johnson in a position to fold up the Vietnam war? I do not think so. And the Russians really cannot undertake to speak for Ho Chi Minh. Perhaps they could use their influence with him but not when they are put on the spot by all the publicity of a summit meeting."

Although talking in scholarly terms, Kennan did not conceal his emotions when he discussed the Czech invasion. In 1938, after the Munich conference where Britain and France sacrificed Czechoslovakia to appease Hitler, Kennan was assigned to the Prague legation and six months later he witnessed the Nazi occupation of that country.

"The Russians did not intervene in Czechoslovakia to re-establish a military balance. They intervened because of their internal weakness," he said.

#### NO CHALLENGE TO PACT

"It is against the rules of the game for them to intervene when a Communist regime evolves as the Czech Communist regime was evolved. There was no challenge to the Warsaw pact. There was no attempt to overthrow the Communist regime in Czechoslovakia. There was no Western interference. Just because another Communist regime evolves slightly, under the pressure of its own public opinion, in the direction of greater freedom, that is no reason for upsetting the military balance of Europe."

"What should we do now?" Kennan asked. "Perhaps move 100,000 men into Germany and tell the Russians: 'We will not take them out until you leave Czechoslovakia.'"

"The trouble is," he continued, "that we don't put any cards in the hands of those elements in the Soviet Union who never liked the idea of sending 300,000 or 400,000 men into Czechoslovakia in the first place and who might like to reverse this policy now."

The United States, Kennan said, was paralyzed during the 1956 Hungarian uprising and is paralyzed now in the Czech crisis because "unfortunately our attention was and is diverted by crises in other parts of the world."

"What could we have done in these situations, if we had not been tied up with these other situations?" he asked, and replied:

"We might, it seems to me, have at least proposed some modification of our military position in Germany as quid pro quo for Soviet forbearance in Hungary or in Czechoslovakia, as the case might be."

#### U.S. WITHDRAWAL

"We could have proposed, for example, a withdrawal of American forces Bavaria or some other area in return for Russian withdrawal from Czechoslovakia. This might not have been accepted, but it would have given the Czechs a talking point in their dealings with the Russians and exposed the hollowness of the Russian claim that they need for military reasons to station troops along the western border of Czechoslovakia. And there might have been people in the Soviet high command to whom such an offer would have had a serious appeal."

But, Kennan continued, "for this we would have had to have prepared the ground long since in discussions with our European allies—we would have had to clarify Western thinking generally on the question of the function of our forces in Europe and the conditions for their eventual withdrawal. But this—preoccupied with Vietnam and, in general, uninterested in Europe—our government has never done."

And now, he continued, "we are apparently not even reinforcing our troops there,

though there are now about half a million more Russians in the area. Moreover, had this thing not come along, we were well on the way to withdrawing our troops unilaterally and the Russians knew it."

"Our forces in Germany were apparently regarded as an expendable asset since we were gradually withdrawing them, yet we were unwilling to use this withdrawal as a pawn in 1956 and again now."

#### WORLD CHANGE

Neither the United States nor the Soviet Union has recognized that the world has changed since the end of World War II "when the Russian empire was established as a result of our deplorable weakness in 1939," Kennan said.

The Russians, he said, "do not recognize that they cannot get away from such aggression any more before world opinion, and our government does not recognize that, whereas it was obliged to tolerate such aggression in 1956, it cannot and should not pass it over in the same way in 1968."

Kennan was asked whether there was a danger that the Russians, encouraged by a passive attitude, might threaten Western Europe. He replied.

"A year ago I would have said: definitely not. Now I don't know. Recent Russian behavior has not been rational. What happened in Czechoslovakia must be the reflection of some curious internal struggle within Russia. After all the Soviets gained nothing. Surely no one who had primarily Russia's external relations at heart could have made such a decision."

"I cannot believe it was a properly prepared decision of the Soviet hierarchy. It must have been the work of some faction which happened momentarily to be in a position to enforce its will on the others. There is evidence of rivalry between factions in Russia. I strongly suspect the influence of the secret police, supported by a portion of the officer corps and a portion of the party."

#### NO RUSSIAN GAIN

The Russians did not gain, he continued, because all four areas of Soviet foreign relations suffered.

"In the capitalist world their interest suffered great damage," Kennan said. "The same is true in the nonaligned world, including Tito's Yugoslavia. For Russian relations with Communist parties in the non-Communist world, the Czech invasion was disastrous—in the long run, probably irreparable—the greatest blow since the Hitler-Stalin pact. In the Communist bloc, they secured one satellite precariously and for the moment, but at the cost of largely losing another, namely Romania. In addition to that, the invasion ruined the mild elements of rapprochement with Yugoslavia."

Stalin, Kennan said, was "more prudent in 1948 and wise enough to recognize that force was not enough. He knew that there was no alternative Communist leadership in Yugoslavia to replace Tito and he was too wise to try to overthrow a regime when he had no alternative, just as the Russians have no alternative in Czechoslovakia."

The new Soviet leaders, he said, "did not study their Stalin." There has been a "strange streak of adventurism" in Moscow since Stalin's death which led to the 1962 Cuban missile crisis and, since then, to Soviet penetration in the Middle East and the Mediterranean, he added.

It is regrettable, he said, that the West Germans were late in abandoning the rigid doctrine which barred diplomatic contacts with Communist countries recognizing East Germany.

#### BRANDT'S POLICY

"Things might have been different if we had more flexibility in past years and if the West Germans had adopted earlier Willy Brandt's policy of *let (East German Communist chief Walter) Ulbricht hang himself*," Kennan said.

"The mere fact that Ulbricht got so frightened when one began to talk seriously of East-West contacts, shows that Brandt's policy was correct."

Thirty years ago Kennan, then a young Foreign Service officer, wrote in an analysis about the "jealous uncertainty which seemed to make Russian rulers so suspicious, so bureaucratic, so Oriental." Those views did not change, he said, and he added:

"I cannot trust any government which controls closely and jealously the contacts of its own officials and citizens with foreigners and permits them no leeway. Such relationship is precarious: it rests on no cushion of mutual confidence, it can be upset any moment and should not be trusted."

Noting the "almost psychotic fear in the Soviet Union of contacts with foreigners," Kennan spoke about U.S. relations with Britain:

"Take our relations with them. There are a thousand ways we can satisfy ourselves that nothing seriously adverse to our interests is going on there that we wouldn't know about. If we are in doubt, there is always someone to whom we can say: 'Come over, have a drink and let's talk about it.'"

#### OUR NATIONAL ANTHEM: "OH SAY, CAN YOU—ULP"

Mr. MCINTYRE. Mr. President, Members of the U.S. Senate are blessed with many more opportunities than most citizens to attend public gatherings at which our national anthem is sung. For those of us who have any sort of ear for music, the experience can, at times, become quite unnerving.

A distinguished American musician, Mr. George London, formerly with the Metropolitan Opera Company and now musical administrator of the John F. Kennedy Center for the Performing Arts, has recently written a music review of the "Star Spangled Banner." Mr. London and the publishers of Life magazine deserve the thanks of the American people for so clearly presenting the basic musical difficulties which our national anthem poses to singers.

I believe that Mr. London's review will come as welcome expert confirmation of the feelings which many Senators, I am certain, share with me in regarding the difficulty of adequately singing our national anthem. I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD following my remarks.

There is another reason, Mr. President, why I bring this matter to the attention of the Senate. Our national anthem, it is true, does have a strong historic place in American history, although it has been our official anthem only since 1931. It does have a certain nobility, and it will always remain close to the hearts of our citizens. Nevertheless, it lacks a certain emotional feeling which the anthems of other nations seem to have.

For example, those of us who have seen the moving picture "Casablanca" may remember the stirring scene which takes place in Rick's American Cafe when Victor Laslow, as a leader of the French resistance, stood up before German military officers to lead his companions in the singing of the "Marseillaise." The Republic of France has truly been blessed with an anthem which, when sung at times of great national stress, can bring tears to the eyes and hope to the heart. So too, the national anthems of Ger-

many, Great Britain, and the Netherlands are outstanding in the deep feelings of patriotism which they are able to generate in the feelings of the citizens of those nations.

On the other hand, the unofficial national anthem of Australia, "Waltzing Matilda" is an example of a song which is popular in its own right as a musical composition.

I would be interested in hearing from Senators who hear or read my words today about their views on our national anthem. Perhaps the time has come to consider some alternative.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from New Hampshire?

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

"OH SAY, CAN YOU—ULP"—OUR WORRISOME NATIONAL ANTHEM

(By George London)

(NOTE.—Mr. London, a leading bass-baritone of the Metropolitan Opera Company, was recently appointed musical administrator of Washington's John F. Kennedy Center for the Performing Arts.)

One hundred and fifty-four years ago Sept. 13, Francis Scott Key wrote a poem titled The Star-Spangled Banner. He set his words to the tune of a popular English drinking song, To Anacreon in Heaven. It is likely that the lads who sang the original version, in a state of bacchic bliss, were unaware of the song's vocal difficulties. Unfortunately, most of us today who sing The Star-Spangled Banner are cold sober. Congress, in 1931, decreed that this song was to be our national anthem; we've been struggling with it ever since.

The difficulties of our national anthem awe me. I prepare for it as I would for a major operatic role. When required to sing it in public I warm up long in advance and do a lot of worrying and pacing back and forth. And yet I am rarely satisfied with my performance. If you want to know the truth, most singers try to avoid singing it in public. It's just too hard.

The national anthem is sung at ball games, at prizefights, political rallies and the like. As often as not, the soloist is somebody's friend or relative who has recently started to study voice. With the announcement, "Ladies and gentlemen, our national anthem," any other singers in the audience start to sweat for the poor devil. His electronically projected nervousness becomes palpable. It obliterates the music, the words and the patriotic fervor. The performance is greeted with perfunctory applause by perhaps 30 pairs of hands.

What is wrong with The Star-Spangled Banner? First of all, it covers a range of an octave and five tones, far too great for the average untrained voice. In terms of phrasing—where one breathes—it is awkwardly constructed. The words do not automatically (a test in good lyric writing) communicate their message. Many Americans, hazy about the meaning, merely parrot the lyrics and often sing them wrong. There is a popular misconception that the song concerns a battle of the Revolutionary War rather than the attack by the British on Baltimore's Fort McHenry during the War of 1812.

Consider a hypothetical performance of The Star-Spangled Banner on, let us say, Columbus Day. The festivities begin with the national anthem. Our troubles start almost immediately. The first two tones are fine: "Oh-oh" emerges with confidence. But the word "say," down on a low B-flat, is, for the sopranos and tenors, just hot air. (All are singing in unison, of course, not in four-part harmony.) Things improve until we get

to "twilight's last gleaming." "----ming" is down on another low B-flat, kind of a grunt. Between this and "whose bright stars" there is no chance for a proper breath. Soon everyone is out of rhythm. The same occurs after the low B-flat of "streaming." Then, with no time to grab a desperately needed breath, one is confronted by the wicked high F of "the rockets' red glare." The baritones and the basses have by now capitulated and are singing an octave lower. The sound of the congregation has become hesitant and thin, and so it remains through the high F of "land of the free," normally attempted only by the sopranos and the tenors. Finally, all the voices join in confidently on "and the home of the brave!" which only partially dissipates the general malaise. Everybody sits down with a thud.

Over the years a number of songs have been proposed as replacement for the national anthem. Least controversial is *America the Beautiful*; it has dignity but is not exciting. *America* ("My Country 'tis of Thee") has the same melody as *God Save the Queen*. There is occasional activity on behalf of Irving Berlin's *God Bless America*. It's a catchy tune, but it lacks nobility. Then there's *Dixie*. It's one hell of a song, but it is the property of the South.

The finest of all, in my opinion, is the well-loved song, *The Battle Hymn of the Republic*. It was Winston Churchill's favorite hymn, and he asked that it be sung at his funeral. Originally *John Brown's Body*, it was reset, during the Civil War, to a poem by Julia Ward Howe ("Mine eyes have seen the glory of the coming of the Lord"). This version made people aware of its inspiring force. It has, moreover, a range of only one octave, so practically everybody can sing it.

I propose that Congress commission one of our leading poets to write a new set of words to this great hymn, contemporary and divorced from any reference to the Civil War. In this time of stress and division a great new, and *singable*, national anthem would give all Americans a spiritual rallying point independent of party, policy or region.

#### WHAT TO DO ABOUT THE ELECTORAL COLLEGE?

Mr. MUNDT. As the election of 1968 draws near, more and more citizens are understandably expressing concern about the antiquated procedures by which our electoral college operates. Increasingly serious-minded citizens are asking what is the best and most effective type of reform which should be considered for removing the uncertainties and the inequities of our present procedures.

For many years, the American Good Government Society, headquartered in Washington and directed by Mr. J. Harvie Williams, has been conducting careful studies about the electoral college procedures and the optimum methods for improving them. After long years of analysis and examination, the American Good Government Society has decided that among all the suggestions before Congress dealing with the electoral college, Senate Joint Resolution 12 presents the most effective remedy with the least disruption of our established constitutional concepts.

Mr. J. Harvie Williams testified before the platform committees of both the Republican and the Democratic National Conventions. Both conventions approved platform language which in general encompasses the suggestions made by Mr. Williams in his testimony.

September 30, 1968

Mr. William has also been active in the recent legal effort before a district Federal court in Virginia to have the existing methods by which the electoral college votes are evaluated and counted declared unconstitutional.

The platforms of both of our major parties contain planks favoring "reform" of the electoral college. Neither party wishes to abolish this institution, which many of us believe to be of supreme importance in our constitutional structure, and essential to effect the separation of executive and legislative powers and to place them on the same foundation in the electorate—the States as such and the people of the United States.

Only one witness, so far as I have been able to learn, urged "reform" of the electoral college before the platform committees of the Republican and Democrat National Conventions.

At least two witnesses urged both parties to abolish the electoral college. Neither platform committee accepted this truly radical proposal, destructive of our constitutional system.

The Republican plank reads:

We propose to reform the Electoral College system . . .

The Democratic plank reads:

We urge reform of the Electoral College . . .

The one witness favoring reform of the electoral college before both platform Committees was J. Harvie Williams, executive secretary of the American Good Government Society of Washington, D.C. Mr. Williams made the same statement to both platform committees with slightly different introductory paragraphs. He called the statewide election of all presidential electors "gerrymandering pure and simple, gerrymandering without a taint, gerrymandering perfected and glorified." Mr. Williams added that—

On its face, then, the upcoming Presidential election will be as gerrymandered as the wit of man has thought to be possible; and this condition is the clear cause of the perplexities that seem to be overwhelming some politicians and many pundits.

Mr. Williams' statement on the sources of power of the Houses of Congress and the sources of power of the Executive, paraphrased from the Federalist No. 39 by James Madison, bring these fundamental ideas into sharp focus. He says:

Representatives in Congress and representative Electors are apportioned together by the Constitution to the People of America who are the source of power of the House of Representatives and of four-fifths of the Executive Power.

The Presidential Electors of each State allocated by the Constitution with its two United States Senators represent the States as coequal political societies, and these States are the source of the Senate's power and one-fifth of the Executive Power.

These two paragraphs, it seems to me, make the case against "abolishing" the electoral college from our Constitutional structure.

Mr. President, in order that Mr. Williams' statement may be more widely read, I ask unanimous consent that his statement, entitled "Electoral College Reform, a Proposal in Keeping With the Structure of the Constitution," made to the Republican Platform Committee,

and the separate introduction used before the Democratic Platform Committee be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the items were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

#### ELECTORAL COLLEGE REFORM—A PROPOSAL IN KEEPING WITH THE STRUCTURE OF THE CONSTITUTION

(Statement of J. Harvie Williams, before the Republican Platform Committee)

The Republican Platform of 1960 included this plank:

"We favor a change in the Electoral College System to give every voter a fair voice in presidential elections."

That plank was brought forward into the 1964 Platform. If what I say has some weight in your deliberations, the result might include the added thought in this statement.

"We favor a change in the Electoral College to give every voter a fair voice in Presidential elections, both as a citizen of the United States and of his own State."

What we are talking about here is the Constitutional structure of our political society. That is, a limited Constitution of Government, the dual sovereignty of a Federal Union of States, and the separated Legislative and Executive Powers, with both derived partly from the States as coequal political societies and mostly from the People of America in their respective States.

This subject is at par with the Formation of the Union because we seek to reconcile the source and constituency of the Executive Power with the source and constituency of the Legislature power, as the Constitution establishes them.

The Constitution itself reconciles these separated powers by placing them on the same foundation in very nearly the same shapes. But that reconciliation has been distorted by directives of the State legislatures.

That distortion of representation lies solely in the statewide election of the representative members of the Electoral College. An evil distortion, it is the proper target of all valid charges leveled against the Electoral College as an institution. Other charges, by socialists and propagandists, come to nothing under close examination.

The Constitution provides in Article II, Section 1:

" . . . He (the President) shall . . . together with the Vice President . . . be elected, as follows:

"Each State shall appoint, in such Manner as the Legislature thereof may direct, a Number of Electors, equal to the whole Number of Senators and Representatives to which the State may be entitled in the Congress: . . ."

The whole number of Senators of a State is fixed at two by Article I, and the whole number of Representatives apportioned thereunder varies from one to forty-one among the States according to their proportions of the population of all the States.

Exactly like the at-large election of Representatives in Congress, the election of "representative" members of the Electoral College by general ticket, under the directive of State Legislatures, is gerrymandering pure and simple, gerrymandering without a taint, gerrymandering perfected and glorified.

Neither the at-large election of Representatives nor the election by general ticket of all Presidential Electors is representative of people in proportion to their numbers in the whole population. Both are a representation of States as unequal bodies politic. On its face, then, the upcoming Presidential election will be as gerrymandered as the wit of man has thought to be possible; and this condition is the clear cause of the perplexities that seem to be overwhelming some politicians and many pundits.

Representatives in Congress and repre-

sentatives Electors are apportioned together by the Constitution to the People of America who are the source of power of the House of Representatives and of four-fifths of the Executive Power.

The two Presidential Electors of each State allocated by the Constitution with its two United States Senators represent the States as coequal political societies, and these States are the source of the Senate's power and one-fifth of the Executive Power. They are and should be elected by citizens of the respective States in that Federal capacity.

One measure of the tremendous distortion in voting power between citizens of the United States is the contrast between those living in New York who vote for 41 representative members of the Electoral College and their fellow citizens in Delaware who vote for only one.

The time has come to apply the rule of equal representation to the national representative element in Presidential elections, by litigation and by a proper amendment of the Constitution. Such an Amendment would require the election of representative Electors in single-member districts, composed of compact and continuous territory and contain as nearly as practicable the number of people which entitled the State to one Representative in Congress.

Unquestionably, single-member districts is the only way for people to be represented in proportion to their numbers in the population, whether in the Electoral College or in the House of Representatives.

One result from this fair representation plan would be the elimination from our political vocabulary the term "large pivotal State," because United States Citizens in each State will be equally represented and their votes will be of equal value.

Another result would be the elimination of the balance-of-power leverage on large blocks of electoral votes, and thus take the Executive Branch out from under the domination of voting blocs. Members of these voting blocs will, of course, continue to have their rightful political influence in proper proportion to their numbers in the electorate.

The contingent election of a President—when no person has a majority of the Electors appointed—now devolves on the House of Representatives voting by States with one vote each, and a majority of the States required to elect. That provision of the Constitution, which follows the voting plan of the Continental Congress and of the Constitutional Convention itself, is very much in the news today.

It should be superseded by putting the contingent election into a joint session of Congress voting by the head. This would extend the principles of representation of States and People to the contingent choice of a President when the Electoral College fails to elect.

Finally, with the President and Congress responsive to the same constituency of States and People, the ideological conflicts between them will tend to diminish; and the center of political gravity in Presidential elections will move from New York City to about southern Illinois. Hopefully, public quiet as a normal condition will be restored to our people.

#### ELECTORAL COLLEGE REFORM—A PLANK IN KEEPING WITH THE CONSTITUTION (Statement of J. Harvie Williams before the Democratic Platform Committee)

The 1968 Republican Platform includes this brief plank:

"We propose to reform the Electoral College system."

It is good as far as it goes, but it doesn't go far enough. When it says "reform" it is good; and it is good when it doesn't say "abolish." All the rest is left up in the air.

May I offer for consideration language that