ADDRESS OF HONORABLE JOHN E FOGARTY, M. C., SECOND DISTRICT, RHODE ISLAND AT THE "DYNAMICS OF DEMOCRACY" CONFERENCE SPONSORED BY THE VENTNOR FOUNDATION, ATLANTIC CITY, NEW JERSEY ON FEBRUARY 1, 1959.

It is indeed a great privilege for me to have an opportunity to be a part of this forum addressing itself to the subject of Dynamics in Democracy. As a citizen of these United States, as a member of one of the two great political parties in this country, and as one of the 435 Representatives in the Congress of the United States, I am particularly pleased to talk with you about our "Two Party System in Government."

Before I proceed, however, I would like to congratulate each of you on your choice of career, because there are few occupations with higher purpose. I would like to congratulate each of you on your selection to participate in this program, because I am aware of the exceedingly high standards you have met. And I would like to commend you for your obviously keen interest in the world around you, because I believe that this interest and the kind of interchange fostered by the Ventnor program is vital. It is vital for all countries of the world to encourage interchange among their peoples if we are ever to gain a more peaceful and forward-looking world.

Further, may I commend the officers of this Foundation and especially Dr. and Mrs. Read for their foresight and tenacity in building this program from a two-man venture in 1951 into one that has brought hundreds of brilliant young physicians to this country for a first-hand glimpse of America and its people. I was particularly pleased to learn that Mrs. Read herself has said that one goal of the program is to let you know that what you see and learn in the United States is not better or worse

that what you might learn in Germany, but that it is different.

That word <u>different</u> is an important one. It is at the very core of our democratic form of government, and it is also perhaps the first principle of our two-party political system. The democratic form of government allows the individual to have an opinion that is <u>different</u> from his neighbor's and it allows him to say so and take whatever other action he desires, within the law, to win over others to his particular view. And so, we see that you too--in exercising your option to undertake a somewhat <u>different</u> kind of training--have put into play one of the cardinal principles of democracy.

I suppose that by now you have been exposed to at least a few definitions of what we mean when we talk about the two-party system in a democracy. This system has been defined as one under which the adult population has the right to vote, under which there is freedom of association and freedom of expression, under which decisions are reached by a majority, and under which there exists a constitutional consensus. There may be some question as to what I mean when I say constitutional consensus. Its meaning can be best pointed up, perhaps, by an example taken from the political pages of your own country. It was under the Weimar Republic following World War I that there was rapid growth of many political parties--from the National Socialist party at one extreme to the Communist party at another extreme. The result was that the parliamentary system became inoperable, and President Hindenburg resorted to the device of government by decree. It was unfortunate that the Weimar parties were unable to integrate the German people so as to produce a parliamentary

majority. I am happy to say that this situation has never been produced in the United States, and it is especially untrue ~~at the present~~ if I may remind you that at present my party holds more seats in the Congress than any party has in the past 100 years.

You may ask, and quite logically, why is it that other parties do not take form in our country. The fact is that although we have generally had a two-party system ever since the establishment of a central government in the United States, there never has been a time in our 180-odd years that we have had only two parties. Other parties that have formed have either remained insignificant or flourished briefly and then faded out of existence.

Let us consider for a moment, then, some of the factors that have had an influence on the maintenance of the two-party system in the United States. First, there is the principle of majority rule. The doctrine of government by consent has proved to be workable only when some convention such as the principle of majority rule has been adopted. Once the principle is adopted, the next question becomes: How will this majority be obtained? Here in the U. S. the majority is formed by the leaders of one of the major parties who have been able to marshal sufficient numbers of voters to form governments. The two-party system implies, therefore, that no party will have such overwhelming power that it might be hopeless for the opposition to strive to obtain a majority.

Second, I would say that the two-party system in this country has been the result of a high degree of homogeneity, the general use of a common language, the presence of long-standing traditions, the relative absence of intolerant minorities, the general acceptance of the economic system of free enterprise, and--perhaps the most important of all--the inherent belief in democratic devices.

Third, the single-member district system of representation for the selection of national legislators has traditionally been employed. This plan has discouraged minority parties and prevented their getting any firm foothold in the national lawmaking body.

A fourth factor would be the use of the Electoral College. Here in the United States, the election of the President by a majority in the Electoral College has discouraged the development to any degree of a multiple-party system. Any party which cannot approach a majority in the Electoral College must give up hope of controlling the most important political office. Consequently, even in times of great crisis, the voters have clung to the biparty tradition.

A fifth factor might best be expressed by using one word coined by one of the publishing houses in this country. The word is "togetherness." It may sound trite, and I myself have heard it used tritely, but it is the one word that sums up the fact that the American two-party system has not intensified class strife. It has softened it. Throughout our history the major parties have cut across class lines. They have included members from every sectional, racial, religious, class and occupational grouping in the country, proving to my satisfaction that the major parties have been truly national parties. Traditionally, parties which have been based on narrow class interests have not thrived in the American atmosphere.

You may be interested in knowing just how the political parties are organized to gain the election of their candidates and to maintain party continuity. Basically, both of the major national parties are organized in much the same way.

The hard core of the political party organization is composed of men and women who largely make politics their profession. Essentially, they constitute a governing group within the party group itself. The political practitioners, or politicians, as they are commonly called, are the inner circle of the political or party group and act as the trustees or directors of the party.

Within each party, when conventions and primaries are not in operation, authority is vested in a series of committees and committeemen. You tend to think of conventions and primaries as being the means for determining party policy. On the other hand, the committee may be considered as executive or administrative in nature and serve as continuing organs of the party. There are several ranks in the hierarchy of committees. The most important of these are the National committee, the Congressional committees, the State or central executive committee, the County committee, the city, ward, township, or town committee, and the Precinct committee.

Our State, County, and City committees are largely autonomous and reflect the character of our governmental institutions, our separation of powers, our federal system with 49 semiautonomous States, our relatively rigid Federal and state institutions, and our multiplicity of local elective offices.

The National Committee is composed of one man and one woman from each State, territory, dependency, the District of Columbia, and the

Canal Zone. The head of the National Committee serves as commander-in-chief of the party throughout the campaign and provides party leadership between campaigns. The national committees of both parties decide on the time and place of, and make arrangements for, the national convention. After candidates have been chosen, an executive committee is named by the national chairman, and the members serve as his advisers and staff officers during the campaign.

You will recall that I mentioned Congressional committees as having a place in the party hierarchy. Lest there be any misunderstanding, these are not committees of the Congress, but committees of the party composed of members of the Congress. The Congressional committees are fairly inconspicuous during presidential campaigns, but become quite active in congressional and senatorial elections occurring between the presidential elections. As you might expect, their prime purpose is to assist in the election of members of Congress from their respective parties.

Below the national party committees are the several committees comprising the state party organization. Whereas the work of the national committee is largely restricted to years in which presidential or congressional elections occur, that of state party organizations is continuous from year to year.

Subordinate to the state committees, and operating in a more restricted sphere are the committees in congressional, legislative, or judicial districts and in counties. Members of these committees are usually elected directly by the party voters in the subdivision concerned, and in these subdivisions lies the capacity for victory or defeat for the party. In pointing out the importance of these local committees and

the workers they enlist, I would like to quote the former Chairman of the Democratic National Party Mr. James A. Farley: "There are more than 150,000 loyal men and women in this country who are connected with regular Democratic organizations ranging from national and state committeemen, down through precinct and district captains and canvassers, to the local committee workers and other humble folk who pull the doorbells, distribute the literature, and haul the voters to the polls on election day. An army is seldom stronger than its infantry forces, and a political army is never stronger than its corps of workers."

With the foregoing brief resume of the organization of political parties in our country, I would like to turn to some of the broad functions carried out by the political party. These functions can be grouped under five general headings:

(1) The selection of official personnel;
(2) The formulation of public policies;
(3) The conduct or criticism of government;
(4) The party as a nationalizing and educational agency; and
(5) Catalyst between the individual and government.

With the exeeption of administrative positions placed under the merit system, and certain urban nonpartisan positions, the selection of officials for appointive positions is an important function. For the most part, the party acts as a screening agent before final appointive choices are made. Consequently, work within the party constitutes a sort of tryout period for the prospective officeholder.

In the formulation of public policies, the party sifts and tries proposals for public action or policy. Potential planks for the party platform are explained and discussed among the various factions of the party, responses are received from the general public, and a final decision is reached as to whether the party shall reject, postpone, mildly approve,

or enthusiastically adopt the issue as a party plank. This process, of course, is more noticeable during primaries and elections; but it is in reality continued on a day-to-day basis to keep the party attuned to the public and the public's opinions and expectations.

The third major function of the parties has to do with the operation of the government itself. The party in power, (or the administration, as it may be termed) concerns itself with conducting the affairs of government, whereas the party currently "out of power" becomes a critic of the government. We must, of course, place certain limitations upon this general observation, because no party is ever in complete control of the government. For example, at the present time, although the administration is Republican, there is a heavy Democratic majority both in the Senate and in the House of Representatives. Another point to remember in connection with the party acting as a conductor or critic is the fact that many, many measures are not party measures and receive support and opposition from members of both parties.

Fourth, the party must act as a political educator. One of the great foes of democracy is the apathy of the voter and the failure of the individual to realize and act upon his responsibility for the common interest. The party's promotion of policies and personalities is carried on through a wide variety of media, such as the press, radio, television, forum, and personal contact. Although it is regrettable that at times this process is crude and superficial and sometimes an appeal to prejudice, instinct or jealousy, by and large it is stimulating and useful.

A fifth function may be defined as that of the catalyst, the intermediary, or adjuster between society and the individual. For example, I as an elected Representative from the State of Rhode Island aid my constituents in their dealings with the government, providing information about its programs, and seeking justice under the laws and regulations of government. I am sure that you know that the laws of all governments tend to be difficult to understand. It remains, then, for the political representative to interpret. Other laws are unworkable or work with difficulty. Perhaps the country--except in great moments of enthusiasm--does not care much for them. Or the administration may be unsympathetic and of little understanding. At all such points, the Representative may come in as an equitable intermediary, modifying the rude force of law when the spirit of that law was not intended to carry with it the idea of detailed and relentless enforcement. Realizing that there are often extenuating circumstances in any given case, we must always do everything within our power to see that the inherent rights of the individual are protected.

You may think that after a trial period of over a hundred years, we Americans must be quite satisfied with our two-party system, the way it functions, and the results it produces. The fact that the system is almost as old as the Nation itself proves that it is workable, but I think you would find it rather difficult

to find even one individual in our country who considered it perfect. To help me make my point, let me outline briefly some characteristics of the two-party system that tie it closely to the democratic form of government. Then, if I may, let me cite some of the liabilities that we must accept as an integral part of those desirable characteristics.

First, the two-party system provides for free and open discussion of all the issues, not only those involving domestic policies of economics, agriculture, veterans affairs and the like, but also those involving the policies of this country in its relationships with other nations throughout the world. All too often the public debate and free exchange of ideas between leaders--either genuine or self-appointed--gives the people of other countries a distorted impression of inner strife, confusion, and political unrest here in the United States when in reality, it is simply the product of a democratic people exercising one of the fundamental human rights.

Because there is a gradual turnover of Senators and Representatives by way of regular and staggered elections, and because no one party ever has complete control of the government, the two-party system provides a continuity and general security that multi-party system governments seem to be unable to achieve without subjecting the people to the oppressive continuity of a one-party or no-party system. The presence of these positive factors, however, reminds us that our system is relatively slow to react to meet new needs caused by changing conditions and demands of the times. Consequently, if we are to keep our democracy truly dynamic, we must have a high degree of communication to the electorate and vigorous leadership by our elected officials.

As I mentioned earlier, each party is committed to a set of policies, and presumably the party elected to the administration has received the endorsement of the electorate to carry out those policies. That party, once it is in office, has the power of official appointments to see that the policies with which it has become identified are carried out. Without these powers, it is highly possible that an administration could be blocked and frustrated in its efforts to carry on the programs to which it is committed. On the negative side, however, the appointive power is too often employed to encourage a system of spoils based on the return of political favors rather than on the emphasis of merit and suitability for public service.

?

Another asset of the two-party system that is not altogether an unmixed blessing is the freedom of choice of the individual. This freedom of choice allows the people to express their views on issues, either directly to their elected representatives or by throwing their support--either in the form of their voice, their time, or financial aid--to the party that most closely reflects their views. I consider this kind of participation in politics to be at the very basis of our system and it is good; yet this prerogative of the individual is sometimes usurped by groups that are formed to exert pressure out of all proportion to the true sentiments and beliefs of the majority of the people. Just within the past year, however, both major parties have taken steps to discourage this activity by urging support by all voters of the party of their choice, thus limiting the opportunities for well-financed pressure groups to gain special favors.

By this time, it would be understandable if you have formed an opinion that it simply is not possible to accrue an asset in the democratic, two-party system without incurring an offsetting liability. There is at least one such asset, and it is this: It provides a framework for all-out bipartisan action on issues that have universal appeal and universal need.

As an example of what I mean when I speak of a bipartisan issue, I would like to turn to an area in which all of you and I have a common interest, namely, health and medical research.

Each of us in Congress, in addition to his regular duties representing his home district and the American people as a whole, serves on one or more of the Committees through which the U. S. Congress does much of its business. For me, this has meant membership for some 17 years on the sub-committee in the House of Representatives most directly concerned with the levels of support of the major health programs of the country. And for the past 9 years, I have been previleged to serve as Chairman of that subcommittee.

In the very early years of my membership on the committee, we in the Congress as well as the general public began to see some of the benefits and results accruing from war-inspired and war-accelerated medical research.

Regardless of their political affiliation, the people spoke out and indicated their willingness to invest more of their resources to find the answers to disease problems that had plagued mankind for centuries. At this point I would like to pay tribute to Dr. I. S. Ravdin, President of the Ventnor Foundation, who has on several occasions appeared before our committee and presented eloquent testimony and far-sighted recommendations, which have added even further luster to his many activities in the interest of the public. To give you some impression of how the Congress has acted to carry out the wishes of the people, let me trace the record of appropriations it has made for the support of medical research in the past two decades. In 1940, for example, the United States government spent some 3 million dollars for medical research. By 1947, this figure had been increased to 28 million, by 1957 to 186 million, and for fiscal year 1959, it will be close to 300 million dollars--an increase of about 100-fold.

A look at some of the health research achievements since World War II shows that the American people are fully aware of the fact that in this one area we receive benefits so dear that they are priceless. For example, the decline in death rates from disease since World War II dramatically shows how over a million lives have been saved by modern medicine. Let me name some specifics: influenza has gone down over 90 percent in its death rate; the once-great killers like acute rheumatic fever, tuberculosis, maternity deaths, and

appendicitis have had the rate at which they cause death reduced over 70 percent in each case. Here are some more: the death rate from syphilis is down some 60 percent, pneumonia over 40 percent, and infant death rates over 30 percent. Even such a difficult medical problem, in terms of numbers afflicted, as high blood pressure has seen some decline recently. And the experts tell me that hypertension is going to be subject to even better control as research brings out new and improved drugs for treatment.

Along with reaping the benefits of this expanded effort in medical research, the American people are telling us today, in terms clearer than ever before, that they realize the size of our world continues to shrink, and that health and medicine has been the beneficiary of discoveries that can never have a geographic boundary. They know that a medical finding in California can benefit the sick man in New York. They know that there is no politics in a cancer cell. They know that a child suffering from leukemia in Germany suffers the same as an American victim of the disease. And they know that it is contrary to the principles of the American way of life to withhold new medicines and treatments just because of a national boundary. Men are enescapably linked by common pain and suffering. And men are linked also by the common joy of conquering disability and disease.

And so there is a rising swell of public sentiment to extend our medical research programs to other lands--not in the spirit of a

do-gooder or a busy-body who wishes to mind someone else's business--but in the full spirit of cooperation, realizing that through cooperation with other nations we can most certainly improve the health status of man both in other countries and in our own country as well.

You may already know that the major medical research effort in the United States is centered at the National Institutes of Health, which is a part of the Public Health Service. That organization, whose appropriations and programs have been of special interest to me for many years, has been particularly sensitive to the need for increased activities covering a broad range under the general heading of international research. They have established international programs that are largely extensions of programs that have been under way for several years within the United States.

Roughly, these programs fall into five general categories:

First is the interchange of scientific personnel. Through NIH-supported fellowship and training programs, emphasis is given to research training both by American scientists abroad and by foreign scientists in the United States.

Second is the program for support of international scientific assemblies. This is among the most valuable of mechanisms for furthering international exchange of scientific knowledge. As barriers between nations have been progressively demolished, and as the geographic and substantive dimensions of science have grown, these meetings have become an invaluable and irreplaceable facet of scientific communication.

A third category is the support of international research activities. This is being done in two major ways; first, research grants are being made under the same review and administration mechanisms as for research grants within the United States. Second the Public Health Service also conducts as part of its own direct activities certain laboratory and field studies which are carried on in other countries.

A fourth category of program is the translation of scientific information to improve the communication of scientific literature of all nations.

A fifth activity is consultation and support of research and related questions with the World Health Organization. WHO draws to a considerable extent on the Public Health Service for such consultation; for example, there are some 50 or more PHS staff who are currently serving or have served as WHO expert consultants on a wide variety of problems.

With these beginnings of programs behind us, and knowing of the growing public sentiment for support of these richly rewarding activities, I have proposed that the United States declare World War III--a peaceful world war against pestilence, disability, death, and disease. In connection with my proposal, I have introduced proposed legislation in the House of Representatives, calling for the establishment of an Institute for International Medical Research, and for the substantial support of this Institute from public appropriations. In the ensuing months, my committee and others of the Congress will have the opportunity to hear interested individuals present testimony on the pro's and con's of this legislation; and if I may venture a prediction, the response of the American people to this plan for promoting world peace and international health will be overwhelmingly affirmative.

This will be one of the true tests of the two-party system--to see whether the <u>different</u> views of 170 million people from many <u>different</u> strata of society representing a variety of <u>different</u> religious and other beliefs can be melded into one voice that speaks

out for America to all people in our neighborhood of nations. If it can, it will have stood one more test in its evolution and it will have provided another service to the cause of humanity everywhere.