



1968

Reflections on the Electoral College

Various Editors

Follow this and additional works at: <https://digitalcommons.law.villanova.edu/vlr>



Part of the [Constitutional Law Commons](#), [Election Law Commons](#), and the [President/Executive Department Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Various Editors, *Reflections on the Electoral College*, 13 Vill. L. Rev. 303 (1968).

Available at: <https://digitalcommons.law.villanova.edu/vlr/vol13/iss2/2>

This Symposia is brought to you for free and open access by the Journals at Villanova University Charles Widger School of Law Digital Repository. It has been accepted for inclusion in Villanova Law Review by an authorized editor of Villanova University Charles Widger School of Law Digital Repository.

REFLECTIONS ON THE ELECTORAL COLLEGE

EDITORS' FORWARD

[N THE MIDST of the revolution in the democratic process occasioned by the rulings of the United States Supreme Court in *Baker v. Carr* and its progeny, another facet of the nation's electoral process has come into sharp focus, the Electoral College. Debate has taken place recently before the Senate Subcommittee on Constitutional Amendments concerning the propriety of maintaining the current system or the adoption of one of the proposed alternatives. In order to elucidate this issue, the *Villanova Law Review* has invited five of the persons most actively involved in the controversy to present their views.

The point of departure for this discussion is an article by Mr. John Banzhaf entitled *One Man, 3,312 Votes: A Mathematical Analysis of the Electoral College*. The four commentators, Senators Birch Bayh, Karl E. Mundt and John A. Sparkman, and Mr. Neil Peirce of the *Congressional Quarterly*, have focused on Mr. Banzhaf's thesis as well as explicating their own preferences for the method that should be used in the election of the President and Vice President.

In fairness to Mr. Banzhaf, it should be pointed out that while his article was read by the other contributors, he has not had the benefit of revising his manuscript in light of their observations.

The *Villanova Law Review* would welcome additional commentary from the legal profession and members of other disciplines on the proper resolution of this key issue to our democratic process.