

## DETAILED TABLE OF CONTENTS

Biographies . . . . .	xvii
Acknowledgments . . . . .	xxi
Foreword by John B. Anderson . . . . .	xxiii
Foreword by Birch Bayh . . . . .	xxv
Foreword by John Buchanan . . . . .	xxix
Foreword by Tom Campbell . . . . .	xxxi
<b>1 Introduction . . . . .</b>	<b>1</b>
1.1 What the U.S. Constitution Says—and Does Not Say— About Presidential Elections . . . . .	1
1.2 Shortcomings of the Current System . . . . .	8
1.2.1 Voters in Two Thirds of the States Are Effectively Disenfranchised . . . . .	9
1.2.2 The Current System Does Not Accurately Reflect the Nationwide Popular Vote . . . . .	16
1.2.3 Not Every Vote Is Equal . . . . .	18
1.3 Nationwide Popular Election as a Remedy for the Shortcomings of the Current System . . . . .	20
1.4 Fortuitous Convergence of Factors Favoring Reform at the Present Time . . . . .	20
1.5 Roadmap of this Book . . . . .	23
1.6 Sources of Additional Information . . . . .	27
<b>2 How the Electoral College Works . . . . .</b>	<b>33</b>
2.1 Federal Constitutional and Statutory Provisions . . . . .	33
2.2 History of Methods of Selecting Presidential Electors . . . . .	38
2.2.1 The First and Second Presidential Elections . . . . .	40
2.2.2 The First Competitive Presidential Election . . . . .	42
2.2.3 The Second Competitive Presidential Election . . . . .	47
2.2.4 The Emergence of the Current System . . . . .	50
2.2.5 Developments Since 1876 . . . . .	53
2.2.6 The Short Presidential Ballot . . . . .	54

2.3	Current Methods of Electing Presidential Electors . . . . .	57
2.4	Certification of the Presidential Vote by the States . . . . .	60
2.5	Meeting of the Electoral College . . . . .	68
2.6	Certification of Votes of the Presidential Electors . . . . .	69
2.7	Counting of the Electoral Votes in Congress . . . . .	71
2.8	Write-In Votes for President . . . . .	73
2.9	Separate Voting for Individual Presidential Electors . . . . .	76
2.10	Fusion Voting in New York . . . . .	77
2.11	Unpledged Presidential Electors . . . . .	80
2.12	Faithless Presidential Electors . . . . .	84
2.13	Five Major Changes in the Presidential Election System that Have Been Implemented Without a Federal Constitutional Amendment . . .	91
<b>3</b>	<b>Three Previously Proposed Federal Constitutional Amendments . . . . .</b>	<b>95</b>
3.1	Fractional Proportional Allocation of Electoral Votes . . . . .	102
3.2	District Allocation of Electoral Votes . . . . .	113
3.3	Direct Nationwide Popular Election . . . . .	115
<b>4</b>	<b>Two Previously Proposed Approaches for State-Level Action . . . . .</b>	<b>133</b>
4.1	Whole-Number Proportional Approach . . . . .	134
4.1.1	Jurisdictions with Three Electoral Votes . . . . .	138
4.1.2	States with Four Electoral Votes . . . . .	144
4.1.3	States with Five Electoral Votes . . . . .	147
4.1.4	States with Six Electoral Votes . . . . .	149
4.1.5	States with Seven Electoral Votes . . . . .	150
4.1.6	States with Eight Electoral Votes . . . . .	151
4.1.7	States with Nine Electoral Votes . . . . .	153
4.1.8	States with 10 Electoral Votes . . . . .	154
4.1.9	States with 11 Electoral Votes . . . . .	154
4.1.10	States with 12 Electoral Votes . . . . .	155
4.1.11	States with 13 Electoral Votes . . . . .	156
4.1.12	The 10 States with 14 or More Electoral Votes . . . . .	157
4.1.13	Nationwide Analysis of the Whole-Number Proportional Approach . . . . .	162

4.1.14 Amendment 36 in Colorado in 2004 . . . . .	173
4.1.15 Practical Political Impediment Concerning the Whole-Number Proportional Approach . . . . .	175
4.2 Congressional-District Approach . . . . .	176
4.2.1 Practical Political Impediment Concerning the Congressional-District Approach. . . . .	184
<b>5 Background on Interstate Compacts . . . . .</b>	<b>187</b>
5.1 Constitutional Basis for Interstate Compacts . . . . .	188
5.2 Legal Standing of Interstate Compacts. . . . .	189
5.3 History of Interstate Compacts . . . . .	190
5.4 Subject Matter of Interstate Compacts. . . . .	192
5.5 Parties to Interstate Compacts . . . . .	200
5.6 Formulation of Interstate Compacts. . . . .	201
5.7 Methods by Which a State Enacts an Interstate Compact. . . . .	203
5.8 Contingent Nature of Compacts . . . . .	206
5.9 Congressional Consent and Involvement in Interstate Compacts . . . . .	208
5.10 Effect of Congressional Consent. . . . .	216
5.11 Compacts Contingent on Enactment of Federal Legislation. . . . .	217
5.12 Compacts Not Requiring Congressional Consent . . . . .	219
5.13 Enforcement of Interstate Compacts . . . . .	230
5.14 Amendments to Interstate Compacts . . . . .	232
5.15 Duration, Termination, and Withdrawals . . . . .	233
5.15.1 Duration of an Interstate Compact . . . . .	233
5.15.2 Termination of an Interstate Compact . . . . .	233
5.15.3 Withdrawal from an Interstate Compact. . . . .	234
5.16 Administration of Interstate Compacts . . . . .	235
5.17 Style of Interstate Compacts . . . . .	235
5.18 Comparison of Treaties and Compacts . . . . .	235
5.19 Comparison of Uniform State Laws and Interstate Compacts . . . . .	236
5.20 Comparison of Federal Multi-State Commissions and Interstate Compacts . . . . .	237
5.21 Future of Interstate Compacts. . . . .	238
5.22 Proposals for Interstate Compacts on Elections . . . . .	240

<b>6</b>	<b>The Agreement Among the States to Elect the President by National Popular Vote</b> . . . . .	243
6.1	Motivation for the Proposed Interstate Compact . . . . .	243
6.2	Text of the Proposed Compact . . . . .	247
6.3	Explanation of the Proposed Compact . . . . .	250
6.3.1	Explanation of Article I—Membership . . . . .	250
6.3.2	Explanation of Article II—Right of the People in Member States to Vote for President and Vice President . . . . .	250
6.3.3	Explanation of Article III—Manner of Appointing Presidential Electors in Member States . . . . .	252
6.3.4	Explanation of Article IV—Additional Provisions. . . . .	265
6.3.5	Explanation of Article V—Definitions . . . . .	266
6.4	Possible Federal Legislation . . . . .	268
6.5	Previous Proposals for Multi-State Electoral Legislation . . . . .	269
<b>7</b>	<b>Strategy for Enacting the Proposed Interstate Compact</b> . . . . .	275
7.1	Directly Involving the People . . . . .	277
7.2	State Legislative Action . . . . .	279
7.3	Congressional Action . . . . .	280
<b>8</b>	<b>Legal Issues Concerning the Proposed Interstate Compact</b> . . . . .	283
8.1	Is the Subject Matter of the Proposed Compact Appropriate for an Interstate Compact? . . . . .	283
8.2	May the Citizen-Initiative Process Be Used to Enact an Interstate Compact? . . . . .	286
8.3	May the Citizen-Initiative Process Be used to Enact the Proposed Compact? . . . . .	291
8.3.1	Electing U.S. Senators. . . . .	292
8.3.2	Filling a U.S. Senate Vacancy . . . . .	296
8.3.3	Ratifying a Proposed Federal Constitutional Amendment. . . . .	296
8.3.4	Making an Application to Congress for a Federal Constitutional Convention . . . . .	299
8.3.5	Choosing the Manner of Electing U.S. Representatives and Senators . . . . .	300
8.3.6	Choosing the Manner of Appointing Presidential Electors . . . . .	309

8.3.7	Choosing the Manner of Conducting a Popular Election to Fill a U.S. Senate Vacancy . . . . .	327
8.3.8	Empowering the Governor to Temporarily Fill a U.S. Senate Vacancy until a Popular Election Is Held . . . . .	332
8.3.9	Consenting to the Federal Purchase of Enclaves . . . . .	332
8.3.10	Consenting to the Formation of New States from Territory of Existing States . . . . .	333
8.3.11	Requesting Federal Military Assistance to Quell Domestic Violence . . . . .	334
8.3.12	Pre-Election Challenges Versus Post-Election Litigation . . . . .	335
8.3.13	Curability of Potential Invalidity of Popular Voting . . . . .	337
8.4	Does the Proposed Compact Encroach on the Power of Non-Member States? . . . . .	337
8.5	Does the Proposed Compact Impermissibly Delegate a State’s Sovereign Power? . . . . .	340
8.5.1	A State’s “Sovereign Powers” May Be Delegated by an Interstate Compact . . . . .	341
8.5.2	The Proposed Compact Does Not Delegate a Sovereign State Power . . . . .	342
8.6	Is the Six-Month Blackout Period for Withdrawals from the Compact Enforceable? . . . . .	344
8.6.1	Withdrawal Provisions of Typical Interstate Compacts . . . . .	346
8.6.2	Enforceability of Compact Provisions . . . . .	352
8.6.3	Additional State and Federal Constraints on Withdrawal . . . . .	356
<b>9</b>	<b>Administrative Issues Concerning the Proposed Interstate Compact . . . . .</b>	<b>359</b>
9.1	Does the Proposed Compact Impose Any Significant Financial Cost or Administrative Burden on State Election Officials? . . . . .	359
9.2	How Would Recounts Be Handled? . . . . .	361
<b>10</b>	<b>Responses to Myths about the National Popular Vote Plan . . . . .</b>	<b>367</b>
10.1	Myths about the U.S. Constitution . . . . .	372
10.1.1	MYTH: A federal constitutional amendment is required to change the method of electing the President . . . . .	372

10.1.2 MYTH: The “traditional,” “appropriate,” and “normal” way of changing the method of electing the President is by means of a federal constitutional amendment . . . . .	374
10.1.3 MYTH: The current system of electing the President was created and favored by the Founding Fathers . . . . .	377
10.1.4 MYTH: Seeking change by means of a federal constitutional amendment shows respect for the Founding Fathers . . . . .	379
10.1.5 MYTH: A federal constitutional amendment is the most democratic approach for considering a change in the manner of electing the President. . . . .	379
10.1.6 MYTH: “Eleven colluding states” are trying to impose a national popular vote on the country. . . . .	380
10.1.7 MYTH: A federal constitutional amendment is the superior way to change the system . . . . .	381
10.1.8 MYTH: It is inappropriate for state legislatures and governors to consider changing the method of electing the President . . . . .	382
10.1.9 MYTH: The National Popular Vote bill is unconstitutional . . . . .	383
10.2 Myths about Small States . . . . .	385
10.2.1 MYTH: The small states would be disadvantaged by a national popular vote . . . . .	385
10.2.2 MYTH: The small states oppose a national popular vote . . . . .	388
10.2.3 MYTH: The National Popular Vote bill threatens the equal representation of the states in the U.S. Senate . . . . .	389
10.2.4 MYTH: A national popular vote would undermine a partisan advantage in favor of the Republican Party in the small states . . . . .	390
10.3 Myths about Recounts . . . . .	391
10.3.1 MYTH: A national popular vote would result in recount chaos. . . . .	391
10.3.2 MYTH: The current state-by-state winner-take-all system is a firewall that helpfully isolates recounts and disputes to particular states . . . . .	393

10.3.3 MYTH: Resolution of a presidential election could be prolonged beyond the inauguration date because of recounts . . . . .	394
10.3.4 MYTH: Conducting a recount would be a logistical impossibility under a national popular vote. . . . .	395
10.3.5 MYTH: States would be put in the uncomfortable position of judging election returns from other states under a national popular vote. . . . .	396
10.3.6 MYTH: Political fraud and mischief would be encouraged under a national popular vote. . . . .	397
10.4 Myths about Faithless Electors . . . . .	398
10.4.1 MYTH: Faithless presidential electors would be a problem under the National Popular Vote compact . . . . .	398
10.4.2 MYTH: It might be difficult to coerce presidential electors to vote for the nationwide winner . . . . .	400
10.5 Myth That “Wrong Winner” Elections Are Rare . . . . .	401
10.5.1 MYTH: “Wrong winner” elections are rare, and therefore not a problem . . . . .	401
10.6 Myths about Proliferation of Candidates	
10.6.1 MYTH: A national popular vote would result in a proliferation of third-party candidates and fragmentation of the vote . . . . .	401
10.6.2 MYTH: Under a national popular vote, the winner might receive only 20% of the vote . . . . .	404
10.6.3 MYTH: The National Popular Vote bill is defective because it does not require the winner to receive an absolute majority of the popular vote . . . . .	405
10.6.4 MYTH: The National Popular Vote bill is defective because it does not provide for a run-off . . . . .	405
10.6.5 MYTH: A national popular vote would diminish moderation in political discourse . . . . .	406

10.7 Myths about Big States and Big Cities . . . . .	407
10.7.1 MYTH: Only the big states would matter under a national popular vote . . . . .	407
10.7.2 MYTH: Only the big cities, such as Los Angeles, would matter under a national popular vote . . . . .	410
10.7.3 MYTH: Candidates would “fly over” most of the country under a national popular vote . . . . .	411
10.7.4 MYTH: Candidates would only campaign in media markets, while ignoring the rest of the country . . . . .	414
10.7.5 MYTH: Candidates would concentrate on major metropolitan media markets under a national popular vote. . . . .	413
10.8 Myth about the Public’s Desire for “State Identity” . . . . .	414
10.8.1 MYTH: The public strongly desires to see electoral votes cast on a state-by-state basis because it provides a sense of “state identity” . . . . .	415
10.9 Myths about Post-Election Changes in the Rules . . . . .	418
10.9.1 MYTH: A Secretary of State might change a state’s method of awarding electoral votes after the people vote in November, but before the Electoral College meets in December . . . . .	418
10.9.2 MYTH: A state legislature might change a state’s method of awarding electoral votes after the people vote in November, but before the Electoral College meets in December . . . . .	419
10.10 Myth about Campaign Spending . . . . .	430
10.10.1 MYTH: Campaign spending would skyrocket if candidates had to campaign throughout the country . . . . .	430
10.11 Myth about Federalism . . . . .	431
10.11.1 MYTH: Federalism would be undermined by a national popular vote . . . . .	431
10.12 Myth about “a Republic versus a Democracy” . . . . .	433
10.12.1 MYTH: A national popular vote is inconsistent with the concept that the United States is a republic, not a democracy . . . . .	433
10.13 Myths about “Mob Rule” . . . . .	434

10.13.1 MYTH: A national popular vote would be “mob rule” and a “popularity contest” . . . . .	434
10.13.2 MYTH: The Electoral College acts as a buffer and damper against popular passions. . . . .	434
10.14 Myth about an Incoming President’s “Mandate” . . . . .	436
10.14.1 MYTH: The current winner-take-all system gives the incoming President a “mandate” in the form of an exaggerated lead in the Electoral College . . . . .	436
10.15 Myths about Interstate Compacts and Congressional Consent . . . . .	437
10.15.1 MYTH: Interstate compacts are exotic and “fishy”. . . . .	437
10.15.2 MYTH: The National Popular Vote compact is defective because Congress did not consent to the compact prior to its consideration by state legislatures . . . . .	439
10.15.3 MYTH: The National Popular Vote compact is defective because it fails to specifically mention Congress in its text . . . . .	439
10.15.4 MYTH: The National Popular Vote compact requires congressional consent to become effective. . . . .	439
10.16 Myth about the District of Columbia . . . . .	445
10.16.1 MYTH: The National Popular Vote bill would permit the District of Columbia to vote for President, even though it is not a state. . . . .	445
10.17 Myths about the 14th Amendment . . . . .	445
10.17.1 MYTH: The Privileges and Immunities Clause of the 14th Amendment precludes the National Popular Vote compact. . . . .	445
10.17.2 MYTH: Section 2 of the 14th Amendment precludes the National Popular Vote compact . . . . .	446
10.17.3 MYTH: The Due Process Clause of the 14th Amendment precludes the National Popular Vote compact. . . . .	447
10.17.4 MYTH: The Equal Protection Clause of the 14th Amendment precludes the National Popular Vote compact. . . . .	447

10.18 Myths about the Voting Rights Act . . . . .	448
10.18.1 MYTH: Section 2 of the Voting Rights Act precludes the National Popular Vote compact . . . . .	448
10.18.1 MYTH: Racial minorities would be disadvantaged by a national popular vote . . . . .	450
10.19 Myths about Administrative or Fiscal Impact . . . . .	451
10.19.1 MYTH: The National Popular Vote compact would be costly. . . . .	451
10.19.2 MYTH: The National Popular Vote compact would complicate the work of local election officials . . . . .	451
10.19.3 MYTH: The National Popular Vote compact would complicate the work of the state’s chief election official . . . . .	451
10.20 Myths about the Mechanics of a National Popular Vote . . . . .	452
10.20.1 MYTH: There is no official count of the national popular vote. . . . .	452
10.20.2 MYTH: A single state could frustrate the National Popular Vote compact by making its election returns a state secret. . . . .	452
10.20.3 MYTH: The Electoral College provides a way to replace a President-Elect who dies, becomes disabled, or is revealed to be manifestly unsuitable after the people vote in November, but before the Electoral College meets in December . . . . .	454
10.21 Myths about Congressional or Proportional Allocation of Electoral Votes . . . . .	455
10.21.1 MYTH: It would be better to allocate electoral votes by congressional district . . . . .	455
10.21.2 MYTH: It would be better to allocate electoral votes proportionally . . . . .	458
10.22 Myth that the Electoral College Produces Good Presidents . . . . .	460
10.22.1 MYTH: The Electoral College produces good Presidents . . . . .	460
<b>11 Epilogue . . . . .</b>	<b>463</b>
<b>Appendix A: U.S. Constitutional Provisions on Presidential Elections . . . . .</b>	<b>465</b>

<b>Appendix B:</b> Federal Law on Presidential Elections . . . . .	471
<b>Appendix C:</b> U.S. Constitution on Interstate Compacts and Contracts . . . . .	481
<b>Appendix D:</b> Minnesota Laws on Presidential Elections . . . . .	483
<b>Appendix E:</b> Minnesota 2004 Certificate of Ascertainment . . . . .	489
<b>Appendix F:</b> Maine 2004 Certificate of Ascertainment . . . . .	497
<b>Appendix G:</b> Nebraska 2004 Certificate of Ascertainment . . . . .	501
<b>Appendix H:</b> New York 2004 Certificate of Ascertainment . . . . .	505
<b>Appendix I:</b> Mississippi 2004 Certificate of Ascertainment . . . . .	513
<b>Appendix J:</b> Dates Appearing on Certificates of Ascertainment for 2000 and 2004 Presidential Elections . . . . .	515
<b>Appendix K:</b> Ohio Adoption of the Great Lakes Basin Compact . . . . .	517
<b>Appendix L:</b> Congressional Consent to the Interstate Agreement on Detainers . . . . .	525
<b>Appendix M:</b> List of Interstate Compacts . . . . .	535
<b>Appendix N:</b> Congressional Consent to the Emergency Management Assistance Compact . . . . .	543
<b>Appendix O:</b> U.S. Supreme Court Decision in <i>McPherson v. Blacker</i> (1892) . . . . .	553
<b>Appendix P:</b> U.S. Supreme Court Decision in <i>State of Ohio Ex Rel. Davis v. Hildebrandt</i> (1916). . . . .	577
<b>Appendix Q:</b> Maine Supreme Court Opinion for <i>In re Opinion of the Justices</i> (1919). . . . .	583
<b>Appendix R:</b> State Constitutional Provisions Relating to Repealing or Amending Voter Initiatives . . . . .	591
<b>Appendix S:</b> Supporters in Congress of Nationwide Popular Election of the President in Roll Calls and Sponsors of Constitutional Amendments . . . . .	595
<b>Appendix T:</b> State Statutory Deadlines for Certification of Elections . . . . .	641
<b>Appendix U:</b> U.S. Supreme Court Decision in <i>Hawke v. Smith</i> (1920). . . . .	645
<b>Appendix V:</b> U.S. Supreme Court Decision in <i>Smiley v. Holm</i> (1932). . . . .	651
<b>Appendix W:</b> Speech of Senator Birch Bayh on March 14, 1979. . . . .	663
<b>Appendix X:</b> Sources of Information on the Web . . . . .	679

<b>Appendix Y:</b> Proposed Illinois Legislation to enact “The Agreement Among the States to Elect the President by National Popular Vote” in Illinois. . . . .	681
<b>Bibliography</b> . . . . .	687
<b>Index</b> . . . . .	695