



An entreaty from a citizen

Michael Maguire
Lakeland, Florida

2016 Presidential Election Results

Candidates	Citizen votes		Electoral Votes	
Hillary Clinton	65,844,610	48.2%	233	43.3%
Donald Trump	62,979,636	46.1%	305	56.7%
Independents	7,804,213	5.7%	0	0
	136,628,459			

... but then, you already knew that, and this too

2000 Presidential Election Results

Candidates	Citizen votes		Electoral Votes	
Al Gore	50,999,897	48.4%	266	49.4%
George Bush	50,456,002	47.9%	271	50.4%
Independents	3,916,779	3.7%	0	0
	105,372,678			

- Stipulations

- The Electoral College vote can produce a result in direct opposition to the vote of the citizenry
 - Twice in the three first-term elections in this century
- Direct election of the President by the citizens requires a constitutional revision to abolish the Electoral College
 - A long, and winding road
- 48 states award Federal Electors on a winner-take-all basis
 - A result of a variety of modifications over many years during the 19th century
 - 62 million voters had their votes effectively discarded
 - Five million in Florida - more than the total votes cast in 43 states and D.C.
- States don't vote, citizens do
 - You can resolve this

NPVIC versus Apportioned Electors

A proposed resolution known as the [National Popular Vote Interstate Compact](#) seeks to overcome the perceived failure of having the Electoral College award the presidency to a candidate who does not win the majority of the votes cast by the citizens.

See also https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/National_Popular_Vote_Interstate_Compact

This has happened in two out of this century's three first-term elections and is due entirely to the decisions by individual states to award all electors to one candidate, rather than awarding them in proportion to their share of the vote. These decisions, codified by state statutes rather than mandated by the U.S. Constitution, were mostly made in the middle of the 19th century and have gone largely unchanged and unchallenged.

In Florida alone, more than five million votes were simply discarded as all 29 electors were awarded to Donald Trump. Five million represents more votes than were cast in total in each of 43 other states and the District of Columbia.

It can be demonstrated with data from the 2016 election that the NPVIC will simply replace one failed system with another by discarding the citizen vote in a different manner.

Signatories to the compact will be required to award all of their electors to whichever candidate wins the national citizen vote regardless of how the citizens of *their* state vote. While the only current members are states that voted for Clinton, five states whose voters chose Trump are already considering this legislation. Those Trump votes would be discarded.

The compact won't go into effect until a coalition of states that control at least 270 electoral votes has signed the agreement. This could happen in the next few years, or never. Some states have moved the measure part way through their legislative process - passed by committees or one house of the state government, and some have dropped the proposal, while others have started up.

All of which means that the status quo remains and the issue of Electoral College versus citizen votes remains unresolved.

An alternative exists that does require complex agreements or constitutional revisions.

State legislators have the authority to amend current law - or craft a new one - that awards federal electors to all candidates based on their proportion of the citizen vote. It will be necessary to specify the formula for distribution and the mathematical rounding required to award only "whole" electors.

States do not need to confer, collaborate, or coordinate their efforts. And while it will require a significant number of large states to create the desired effect of electing the President by awarding electors based on citizen votes, it will likely take less time than the adoption of the NPVIC or constitutional revision.

Please consider introducing the necessary legislation during the next session.

- Arguments and obstacles

- Independent candidates will be awarded a portion of the Electoral College votes
- It becomes possible for neither major party to win a majority
- Other states may not amend their election laws
 - Florida can provide leadership and encouragement

These circumstances cannot be deemed fair, or in concert with the ideals of the founding fathers, by anyone who looks at the data objectively.

Inasmuch as this system is used only for the President (the veep is just along for the ride these days), and the Electoral College merely formalizes the outcome in the states, two alternatives seem more useful and equitable.

First, and best I believe, would be direct election by popular vote without regard to state borders. Exactly the system used within the states to elect all of their state officeholders and their U.S. Senators.

Second choice would be to allocate electors proportionately. This form would have awarded 259 votes to Clinton, 248 to Trump, and 31 among the others, a result that would have given a voice to serious third-party candidates. Had it been in place this time, it is likely that those candidates would have garnered a much greater share and created a motivation for the major parties to consider their views and constituents.

An ancillary effect would be that candidates, no longer able to either ignore states their opponent would most likely win, or take for granted those solidly in their column, would be compelled (behooved?) to campaign everywhere, meet all of the citizens, and make the case for being everyone's President rather than merely a red or blue one.

Michael Maguire
835 Mississippi Avenue, Lakeland, Florida 33801 - 863-838-7891

Michael@Maguire-Consulting.com

The following illustration summarizes the arguments above in an Excel spreadsheet which can be downloaded here: [Electoral Vote Analysis](#)

State	NPVIC Status	Electors	Popular Vote			Percent of Vote			Electors Awarded (Winner take all)		Electors Apportioned		
			Clinton	Trump	Others	Clinton	Trump	Others	Clinton	Trump	Clinton	Trump	Others
Alabama		9	729,547	1,318,255	75,570	34.4	62.1	3.6	-	9	3	6	0
Alaska		3	116,454	163,387	38,767	36.6	51.3	12.2	-	3	1	2	0
Arizona	Maybe	11	1,161,167	1,252,401	159,597	45.1	48.7	6.2	-	11	5	5	1
Arkansas	Maybe	6	380,494	684,872	65,269	33.7	60.6	5.8	-	6	2	4	0
California	YES	55	8,753,788	4,483,810	943,997	61.7	31.6	6.7	55	-	34	17	4
Colorado		9	1,338,870	1,202,484	238,866	48.2	43.3	8.6	9	-	4	4	1
Connecticut	Maybe	7	897,572	673,215	74,133	54.6	40.9	4.5	7	-	4	3	0
DC	YES	3	282,830	12,723	15,715	90.9	4.1	5.0	3	-	3	0	0
Delaware	Maybe	3	235,603	185,127	20,860	53.4	41.9	4.7	3	-	2	1	0
Florida		29	4,504,975	4,617,886	297,178	47.8	49.0	3.2	-	29	14	14	1
Georgia		16	1,877,963	2,089,104	125,306	45.9	51.0	3.1	-	16	7	8	0
Hawaii		4	266,891	128,847	33,199	62.2	30.0	7.7	4	-	2	1	0
Idaho		4	189,765	409,055	91,435	27.5	59.3	13.2	-	4	1	2	1
Illinois	YES	20	3,090,729	2,146,015	299,680	55.8	38.8	5.4	20	-	11	8	1
Indiana		11	1,033,126	1,552,286	144,546	37.8	56.9	5.3	-	11	4	6	1
Iowa		6	653,669	800,983	111,379	41.7	51.1	7.1	-	6	3	3	0
Kansas		6	427,005	671,018	86,379	36.1	56.7	7.3	-	6	2	3	0
Kentucky		8	628,854	1,202,971	92,324	32.7	62.5	4.8	-	8	3	5	0
Louisiana		8	780,154	1,178,638	70,240	38.4	58.1	3.5	-	8	3	5	0
Maine	Maybe	4	357,735	335,593	54,599	47.8	44.9	7.3	4	-	2	2	0
Maryland	YES	10	1,677,928	943,169	160,349	60.3	33.9	5.8	10	-	6	3	1
Massachusetts	YES	11	1,995,196	1,090,893	238,957	60.0	32.8	7.2	11	-	7	4	1
Michigan	Maybe	16	2,268,839	2,279,543	250,902	47.3	47.5	5.2	-	16	8	8	1
Minnesota		10	1,367,716	1,322,951	254,146	46.4	44.9	8.6	10	-	5	4	1
Mississippi		6	485,131	700,714	23,512	40.1	57.9	1.9	-	6	2	3	0
Missouri		10	1,071,068	1,594,511	143,026	38.1	56.8	5.1	-	10	4	6	1
Montana		3	177,709	279,240	40,198	35.7	56.2	8.1	-	3	1	2	0
Nebraska		5	284,494	495,961	63,772	33.7	58.7	7.6	-	5	2	3	0
Nevada	Maybe	6	539,260	512,058	74,067	47.9	45.5	6.6	6	-	3	3	0
New Hampshire		4	348,526	345,790	49,842	46.8	45.5	6.7	4	-	2	2	0
New Jersey	YES	14	2,148,278	1,601,933	123,835	55.5	41.4	3.2	14	-	8	6	0
New Mexico		5	385,234	319,666	93,418	48.3	40.0	11.7	5	-	2	2	1
New York	YES	29	4,547,218	2,814,346	348,562	59.0	36.5	4.5	29	-	17	11	1
North Carolina	Maybe	15	2,189,316	2,362,631	189,617	46.2	49.8	4.0	-	15	7	7	1
North Dakota		3	93,758	216,794	33,808	27.2	63.0	9.8	-	3	1	2	0
Ohio		18	2,394,164	2,841,005	261,318	43.6	51.7	4.8	-	18	8	9	1
Oklahoma	Maybe	7	420,375	949,136	83,481	28.9	65.3	5.7	-	7	2	5	0
Oregon	Maybe	7	1,002,106	782,403	216,827	50.1	39.1	10.8	7	-	4	3	1
Pennsylvania		20	2,926,441	2,970,733	218,228	47.9	48.6	3.6	-	20	10	10	1
Rhode Island	YES	4	252,525	180,543	31,076	54.4	38.9	6.7	4	-	2	2	0
South Carolina		9	855,373	1,155,389	92,265	40.7	54.9	4.4	-	9	4	5	0
South Dakota		3	117,458	227,721	24,914	31.7	61.5	6.7	-	3	1	2	0
Tennessee		11	870,695	1,522,925	114,407	34.7	60.7	4.6	-	11	4	7	1
Texas		38	3,877,868	4,685,047	406,311	43.2	52.2	4.5	-	38	16	20	2
Utah		6	310,676	515,231	305,523	27.5	45.5	27.0	-	6	2	3	2
Vermont	YES	3	178,573	95,369	41,125	56.7	30.3	13.1	3	-	2	1	0
Virginia		13	1,981,473	1,769,443	231,836	49.8	44.4	5.8	13	-	6	6	1
Washington	YES	12	1,742,718	1,221,747	401,179	51.8	36.3	11.9	12	-	6	4	1
West Virginia		5	188,794	489,371	34,886	26.5	68.6	4.9	-	5	1	3	0
Wisconsin		10	1,382,536	1,405,284	188,330	46.5	47.2	6.3	-	10	5	5	1
Wyoming		3	55,973	174,419	25,457	21.9	68.2	10.0	-	3	1	2	0
Totals		538	65,844,610	62,979,636	7,804,213	48.2	46.1	5.7	233	305	259	248	31

Margin	2,864,974	2.1	72
---------------	------------------	------------	-----------

Votes discarded	Clinton	Trump	Others
	32,397,868	22,168,125	7,804,213
	Total		
	62,370,206		

NPVIC Votes	Yes	161
	Maybe	82
	Total	243