Electoral System vs. The Popular Vote
Question

What is an election?
Question

What is the difference between a war and an election?
A prime goal of democracy is to replace wars with elections by replacing bullets with ballots.
An Election

The Electorate

Voters

Suffrage: Who can vote?
An Election

Ballots

One person – one vote?
An Election

Who wins?

Ballots
The 2016 Presidential Election
The Electorate
What do you see?
Two Models

- States Model
- Electoral College Model
The States Model

In a presidential election the *electorate* consists of the 50 states plus the District of Columbia.

The *ballot* is not one state—one vote. Each ballot is weighted as described by the *electoral system*. 
Electoral College Model

The President is elected by a majority vote of the electors as specified by the U. S. Constitution.
The Electoral College

The College consists of a slate of electors from each state. The number of electors equals the number of members of Congress—the number of representatives and senators.

Amendment XXIII (ratified 1961) allows the District of Columbia three electors.
The Electoral System

The electoral system is a process.
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The electoral system is a process.


In a presidential election when you vote for candidate X you are voting for the slate of elector’s pledged to candidate X.
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The Electoral System

The electoral system is a process.

✓ Electors Day  19 December 2016
✓ Submission Day  28 December 2016
✓ Decision Day  6 January 2017

➤ Inauguration Day  20 January 2017
The Electoral College is heavily weighted to smaller states.

California has 66 times the population of Wyoming.

The electoral vote ratio is CA 55 and WY 3.

\[
\frac{\text{(US apportionment population} = 309,183,463)}{435} \approx 710,767
\]

Note: \(50 \leq h \leq 10306\) by constitutional constraints.
Distributing 435 seats among 50 states according to their respective populations is a math problem.
A Math Skill

How do I average two positive whole numbers?

What is the average of 8 and 12?
Example: \( \text{ave}(8,12) = \)

Maximum \( \Rightarrow \) \( \max(8,12) = 12 \)

Minimum \( \Rightarrow \) \( \min(8,12) = 8 \)

Arithmetic Mean \( \Rightarrow \) \( \text{AM}(8,12) = 10 \)

Harmonic Mean \( \Rightarrow \) \( \text{HaM}(8,12) = \frac{2}{\frac{1}{8} + \frac{1}{12}} = 9.6 \)

Geometric Mean \( \Rightarrow \) \( \text{GeM}(8,12) = \sqrt[{}]{8 \times 12} \approx 9.8 \)
Apportionment by Priority

Step 1. Give one seat to each state.
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Apportionment by Priority

Step 1. Give one seat to each state.
Step 2. Attach a priority number to each state.
Step 3. Award seats one at a time by priority until the desired House size is reached.

\[
\text{Priority number for a state with n seats} = \frac{\text{state population}}{\text{ave}(n, n+1)}
\]
Five Averages

- Greatest Divisors: \( \text{max} \)
- Harmonic Means: \( \text{HaM} \)
- Equal Proportions: \( \text{GeM} \)
- Major Fractions: \( \text{AM} \)
- Smallest Divisors: \( \text{min} \)
The Last Seat

Who got the 435<sup>th</sup> seat?

- **Greatest Divisors** max IL
- **Harmonic Means** HaM MN
- **Equal Proportions** GeM MN
- **Major Fractions** AM NC
- **Smallest Divisors** min WA
The Last Seat

Who gets the 436\textsuperscript{th} seat?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Method</th>
<th>State 1</th>
<th>State 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ave</td>
<td>435</td>
<td>436</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greatest Divisors</td>
<td>max</td>
<td>IL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harmonic Means</td>
<td>HaM</td>
<td>MN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equal Proportions</td>
<td>GeM</td>
<td>MN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major Fractions</td>
<td>AM</td>
<td>NC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smallest Divisors</td>
<td>min</td>
<td>WA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The 2016 Presidential Election

The popular vote:

Hillary Clinton: 65,844,610  48.2%
Donald Trump: 62,979,636  46.1%
Others: 7,804,213  5.7%

Certified Results:
http://cookpolitical.com/story/10174
The 2016 Presidential Election

The popular vote:

Hillary Clinton: 65,844,610  48.2%
Donald Trump: 62,979,636  46.1%
Others: 7,804,213   5.7%

The Electoral College vote:

Hillary Clinton: 227
Donald Trump: 304
Others: 7
Historical Conflicts

Arguably, on 4 other occasions in U. S. history the electoral and popular systems produced different results.

1. John Quincy Adams vs. Andrew Jackson  1824
2. Rutherford B. Hayes vs. Samuel Tilden  1876
3. Benjamin Harrison vs. Grover Cleveland  1888
## 1876

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Candidate</th>
<th>Party</th>
<th>Popular Vote</th>
<th>Electoral Vote</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rutherford B. Hayes (OH)</td>
<td>Republican</td>
<td>4,034,142</td>
<td>185</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Samuel J. Tilden (NY)</td>
<td>Democratic</td>
<td>4,286,808</td>
<td>184</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peter Cooper (NY)</td>
<td>Greenback</td>
<td>83,726</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Lesson: Hayes’ Electoral College victory was an artifact of the method used for congressional apportionment.
### 1876

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Candidate</th>
<th>Party</th>
<th>Popular Vote</th>
<th>Electoral Vote</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rutherford B. Hayes (OH)</td>
<td>Republican</td>
<td>4,034,142</td>
<td>185</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Samuel J. Tilden (NY)</td>
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<td>4,286,808</td>
<td>184</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peter Cooper (NY)</td>
<td>Greenback</td>
<td>83,726</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Lesson:** Hayes’ Electoral College victory was an artifact of the method used for congressional apportionment.

The original apportionment based on the 1870 census used one method. The 1872 supplement act added nine seats but used a different method. The methods agreed except for two seats: the original method would have awarded the seats to Illinois and New York, but the supplement method awarded those seats to New Hampshire and Florida.
### 2000

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Candidate</th>
<th>Party</th>
<th>Popular Vote</th>
<th>Electoral Vote</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>George W. Bush (TX)</td>
<td>Republican</td>
<td>5,443,633</td>
<td>271</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Albert Gore (TN)</td>
<td>Democratic</td>
<td>5,538,163</td>
<td>266</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ralph Nader (DC)</td>
<td>Green</td>
<td>250,017</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patrick Buchanan (VA)</td>
<td>Reform</td>
<td>149,115</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Candidate</th>
<th>Party</th>
<th>Popular Vote</th>
<th>Electoral Vote</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>George W. Bush (TX)</td>
<td>Republican</td>
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<td>271</td>
</tr>
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<td>266</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ralph Nader (DC)</td>
<td>Green</td>
<td>250,017</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
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<td>Patrick Buchanan (VA)</td>
<td>Reform</td>
<td>149,115</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Lesson: Bush’s Electoral College victory was an artifact of the size of the House of Representatives.
House Size Effects

Consider the Electoral College vote based on House sizes 50 - 1000 using the current method of congressional apportionment.

For all House sizes smaller than 492 Bush wins, larger than 597 except 655 Gore wins.

Between 492-597 there are 24 ties, Bush wins 53 times, and Gore wins 29 times.

http://www.thirty-thousand.org/pages/Neubauer-Zeitlin.htm
2000

The 2000 election showed another potential problem. The number of electoral votes each state gets is tied to the decennial census. Although the election was in 2000, apportionment of the House was based on the 1990 census. An election held in a census year is based on a population that is ten years old.

What would have been the result of Bush vs. Gore if the Electoral College were based on the 2000 census?
2000

In comparison with the 1990 census the 2000 census shifted 12 House seats affecting 18 states.

Accordingly, the electoral vote would have changed from

Bush 271 and Gore 266
to
Bush 277 and Gore 259.
Reform

Over the past 200 years, over 700 proposals have been introduced in Congress to reform or eliminate the Electoral College. There have been more proposals for Constitutional amendments on changing the Electoral College than on any other subject.

https://www.archives.gov/federal-register/electoral-college/faq.html#whyec
Resolved: The electoral system should be replaced by the popular vote system.
What’s the Popular Vote System?
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The popular vote:

Hillary Clinton: 65,844,610  48.2%
Donald Trump:  62,979,636  46.1%
Others:         7,804,213   5.7%
Fairness

Individual Sovereignty:

Each voter gets the same ballot with the same instructions and is free to vote as they choose within these constraints.

One Person — One Vote
Should there be a uniform national presidential ballot?

Ballots differ among states. GA, IN, OK listed 3 candidates; CA 5; TN 7; UT 10; CO 22.

http://www.politico.com/2016-election/results/map/president
Question 2

Should there be uniform suffrage for a national popular vote?
A National Popular Vote

- Abolishing the electoral system requires a constitutional amendment.
- A uniform national vote procedure requires federal legislation concerning ballot access, suffrage, ballot structure, and election mechanics.
A
Moderate
Alternative
State Sovereignty

Keep voting as a state's rights matter. Ballot access, ballot structure, suffrage, voting mechanics are left up to each state. Then count the certified popular vote in each state as is currently done.
State Sovereignty

Keep voting as a state's rights matter. Ballot access, ballot structure, suffrage, voting mechanics are left up to each state. Then count the certified popular vote in each state as is currently done.

This is the approach of the National Popular Vote Bill.
National Popular Vote Bill

An Act ratifying an interstate compact to elect the President and Vice-President of the United States by national popular vote.

- A state’s slate of electors will be awarded to the candidate with a plurality of the national (instead of statewide) popular vote.

- The law will take effect when a compact of states having at least 280 electoral votes enacts the National Popular Vote Bill in their respective states.
Should the electoral system be replaced by a popular vote system?

Should the U. S. move to a national popular vote for President and Vice-President?
Democracy

What is an Election?

One Person — One Vote

We the People of the United States, . . .

http://www.theconstitutionproject.com/portfolio/one-person-one-vote/
Thank You
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HOUSE SEAT</th>
<th>PRIORITY VALUE</th>
<th>STATE ABBREVIATION</th>
<th>STATE SEAT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>26404774</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>17867470</td>
<td>TX</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>15244803</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td>13732760</td>
<td>NY</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>13364865</td>
<td>FL</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56</td>
<td>10779704</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57</td>
<td>10315788</td>
<td>TX</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58</td>
<td>9096490</td>
<td>IL</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59</td>
<td>9004938</td>
<td>PA</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

https://www.census.gov/population/apportionment/files/Priority%20Values%202010.pdf