

DETAILED TABLE OF CONTENTS

Biographies	xix
Acknowledgments	xxv
Foreword by John B. Anderson	xxvii
Foreword by Birch Bayh	xxix
Foreword by John Buchanan	xxxii
Foreword by Tom Campbell	xxxiv
Foreword by Gregory G. Aghazarian	xxxv
Foreword by Saul Anuzis	xxxvi
Foreword by Laura Brod	xxxviii
Foreword by James L. Brulte	xl
Foreword by B. Thomas Golisano	xli
Foreword by Joseph Griffo	xliii
Foreword by Ray Haynes	xliv
Foreword by Dr. Robert A. “Bob” Holmes	xlvii
Foreword by Dean Murray	l
Foreword by Thomas L. Pearce	lii
Foreword by Christopher Pearson	liv
Foreword by Jake Garn	lvi
What People Are Saying	lvii
1 Introduction	1
1.1 What the U.S. Constitution Says—and Does Not Say— About Presidential Elections	2
1.2 Shortcomings of the Current System	10
1.2.1 Voters in Four-fifths of the States Are Effectively Disenfranchised	12
1.2.2 The Current System Does Not Accurately Reflect the Nationwide Popular Vote	47
1.2.3 Not Every Vote Is Equal	51
1.3 Nationwide Popular Election as a Remedy for the Shortcomings of the Current System	53
1.4 Fortuitous Convergence of Factors Favoring Reform at the Present Time	53
1.5 Roadmap of this Book	56
1.6 Sources of Additional Information	59

2	How the Electoral College Works	63
2.1	Federal Constitutional and Statutory Provisions	63
2.2	History of Methods of Selecting Presidential Electors	67
2.2.1	The First and Second Presidential Elections	69
2.2.2	The Nation's First Competitive Election (1796)	73
2.2.3	The Second Competitive Election (1800)	78
2.2.4	The Emergence of the Current System	82
2.2.5	Developments Since 1876	84
2.2.6	The Short Presidential Ballot	85
2.3	Current Methods of Electing Presidential Electors	87
2.4	Certification of the Presidential Vote by the States	92
2.5	Meeting of the Electoral College	97
2.6	Certification of Votes of the Presidential Electors	98
2.7	Counting of the Electoral Votes in Congress	100
2.8	Write-In Votes for President	101
2.9	Separate Voting for Individual Presidential Electors	104
2.10	Fusion Voting in New York	105
2.11	Unpledged Presidential Electors	108
2.12	Faithless Presidential Electors	111
2.13	Five Major Changes in the Presidential Election System that Have Been Implemented Without a Federal Constitutional Amendment	118
3	Three Previously Proposed Federal Constitutional Amendments	123
3.1	Brief History of Troublesome Presidential Elections	124
3.2	Fractional Proportional Allocation of Electoral Votes	130
3.3	District Allocation of Electoral Votes	141
3.4	Direct Nationwide Popular Election	142
4	Two Previously Proposed Approaches for State-Level Action	157
4.1	Whole-Number Proportional Approach	158
4.1.1	Jurisdictions with Three Electoral Votes	162
4.1.2	States with Four Electoral Votes	167
4.1.3	States with Five Electoral Votes	169
4.1.4	States with Six Electoral Votes	171
4.1.5	States with Seven Electoral Votes	172
4.1.6	States with Eight Electoral Votes	173
4.1.7	States with Nine Electoral Votes	175
4.1.8	States with 10 Electoral Votes	175
4.1.9	States with 11 Electoral Votes	176
4.1.10	States with 12 Electoral Votes	177
4.1.11	States with 13 Electoral Votes	178
4.1.12	The 10 States with 14 or More Electoral Votes	178

4.1.13	Nationwide Analysis of the Whole-Number Proportional Approach	183
4.1.14	Amendment 36 in Colorado in 2004	192
4.1.15	Practical Political Impediment Concerning the Whole-Number Proportional Approach	193
4.2	Congressional-District Approach	194
4.2.1	Practical Political Impediment Concerning the Congressional-district approach	203
5	Background on Interstate Compacts	205
5.1	Constitutional Basis for Interstate Compacts	205
5.2	Legal Standing of Interstate Compacts	206
5.3	History of Interstate Compacts	208
5.4	Subject Matter of Interstate Compacts	209
5.5	Parties to Interstate Compacts	215
5.6	Formulation of Interstate Compacts	216
5.7	Methods by Which a State Enacts an Interstate Compact	218
5.8	Contingent Nature of Compacts	221
5.9	Congressional Consent and Involvement in Interstate Compacts	223
5.10	Effect of Congressional Consent	229
5.11	Compacts Contingent on Enactment of Federal Legislation	230
5.12	Compacts Not Requiring Congressional Consent	231
5.13	Enforcement of Interstate Compacts	241
5.14	Amendments to Interstate Compacts	242
5.15	Duration, Termination, and Withdrawals	243
5.15.1	Duration of an Interstate Compact	243
5.15.2	Termination of an Interstate Compact	243
5.15.3	Withdrawal from an Interstate Compact	243
5.16	Administration of Interstate Compacts	248
5.17	Style of Interstate Compacts	248
5.18	Comparison of Treaties and Compacts	249
5.19	Comparison of Uniform State Laws and Interstate Compacts	249
5.20	Comparison of Federal Multi-State Commissions and Interstate Compacts	251
5.21	Future of Interstate Compacts	252
5.22	Proposals for Interstate Compacts on Elections	252
6	The Agreement Among the States to Elect the President by National Popular Vote	255
6.1	Motivation for the National Popular Vote Interstate Compact	255
6.2	Text of the National Popular Vote Compact	258
6.3	Section-by-Section Explanation of the National Popular Vote Compact	260
6.3.1	Explanation of Article I—Membership	260

6.3.2	Explanation of Article II—Right of the People in Member States to Vote for President and Vice President	260
6.3.3	Explanation of Article III—Manner of Appointing Presidential Electors in Member States	262
6.3.4	Explanation of Article IV—Additional Provisions	275
6.3.5	Explanation of Article V—Definitions	276
6.4	Possible Federal Legislation	278
6.5	Previous Proposals for Multi-State Electoral Legislation	279
7	Strategy for Enacting the National Popular Vote Compact	285
7.1	The Role of Public Opinion	285
7.2	The Role of State Legislatures	291
7.3	The Role of the Citizen-Initiative Process	292
7.4	The Role of Congress	294
8	The Initiative Process and the National Popular Vote Compact	297
8.1	Description of the Citizen-Initiative Process	297
8.2	May the Citizen-Initiative Process be Used to Enact an Interstate Compact?	300
8.3	May the Citizen-Initiative Process be used to Enact the National Popular Vote Compact?	301
8.3.1	Electing U.S. Senators	305
8.3.2	Filling a U.S. Senate Vacancy	305
8.3.3	Ratifying a Proposed Federal Constitutional Amendment	305
8.3.4	Making an Application to Congress for a Federal Constitutional Convention	308
8.3.5	Choosing the Manner of Electing U.S. Representatives and Senators	309
8.3.6	Choosing the Manner of Appointing Presidential Electors	317
8.3.7	Choosing the Manner of Conducting a Popular Election to Fill a U.S. Senate Vacancy	333
8.3.8	Empowering the Governor to Temporarily Fill a U.S. Senate Vacancy Until a Popular Election Is Held	337
8.3.9	Consenting to the Federal Purchase of Enclaves	337
8.3.10	Consenting to the Formation of New States from Territory of Existing States	338
8.3.11	Requesting Federal Military Assistance to Quell Domestic Violence	338
8.3.12	Pre-Election Challenges Versus Post-Election Litigation	339
8.3.13	Curability of Invalidity of a Particular Ballot Measure	341

9 Responses to Myths about the National Popular Vote Compact	343
9.1 Myths about the U.S. Constitution	351
9.1.1 MYTH: A federal constitutional amendment is necessary for changing the current method of electing the President	351
9.1.2 MYTH: The traditional and appropriate way of changing the method of electing the President is by means of a federal constitutional amendment	358
9.1.3 MYTH: The Electoral College would be abolished by the National Popular Vote compact	364
9.1.4 MYTH: The Founding Fathers designed and favored our nation's current system of electing the President	365
9.1.5 MYTH: Alexander Hamilton considered our nation's current system of electing the President to be "excellent."	369
9.1.6 MYTH: The National Popular Vote compact should be rejected because a proposal for direct election of the President was rejected by the 1787 Constitutional Convention	373
9.1.7 MYTH: The National Popular Vote compact should be rejected because of implied restrictions on a state's choices for appointing presidential electors and because only the Founders' "failure of imagination" prevented them from explicitly prohibiting the National Popular Vote compact	376
9.1.8 MYTH: Federalism would be undermined by a national popular vote	384
9.1.9 MYTH: A national popular vote is contrary to the concept that the United States is a republic, not a democracy	387
9.1.10 MYTH: The Guarantee Clause of the Constitution precludes the National Popular Vote compact	389
9.1.11 MYTH: The Meeting Clause of the 12th Amendment precludes the National Popular Vote compact	392
9.1.12 MYTH: The National Popular Vote compact would contradict the 12th Amendment	393
9.1.13 MYTH: The National Popular Vote compact would encroach on federal sovereignty	394
9.1.14 MYTH: The National Popular Vote compact would encroach on state sovereignty	396
9.1.15 MYTH: Section 2 of the 14th Amendment precludes the National Popular Vote compact	397
9.1.16 MYTH: The Privileges and Immunities Clause of the 14th Amendment precludes the National Popular Vote compact	400
9.1.17 MYTH: The Due Process Clause of the 14th Amendment precludes the National Popular Vote compact	401
9.1.18 MYTH: The Equal Protection Clause of the 14th Amendment precludes the National Popular Vote compact	401
9.1.19 MYTH: The National Popular Vote compact impermissibly delegates a state's sovereign power	409
9.1.20 MYTH: Court decisions in the line item veto case and term limit case imply the unconstitutionality of the National Popular Vote plan	414

9.1.21	MYTH: Respect for the Constitution demands that we go through the formal constitutional amendment process	421
9.1.22	MYTH: The most democratic approach for making a change in the manner of electing the President is a federal constitutional amendment	422
9.1.23	MYTH: “Eleven colluding states” are trying to impose a national popular vote on the country	423
9.1.24	MYTH: A federal constitutional amendment is the superior way to change the system	425
9.1.25	MYTH: It is inappropriate for state legislatures to consider changing the method of electing the President	427
9.1.26	MYTH: The National Popular Vote compact is unconstitutional because it would prevent a tie in the Electoral College and thereby deprive the U.S. House of Representatives of its rightful opportunity to choose the President	427
9.1.27	MYTH: The National Popular Vote bill is unconstitutional because it circumvents the Constitution’s amendment procedures	433
9.2	Myths That Candidates Reach Out to All the States under the Current System	434
9.2.1	MYTH: The current system ensures that presidential candidates reach out to all states	434
9.2.2	MYTH: A national popular vote will simply make a different group of states irrelevant in presidential elections	450
9.2.3	MYTH: The disproportionate attention received by battleground states is not a problem because spectator states frequently become battleground states and vice versa	452
9.3	Myth That “Wrong Winner” Elections are Rare	455
9.3.1	MYTH: “Wrong winner” elections are rare, and therefore not a problem	455
9.4	Myths about the Small States	457
9.4.1	MYTH: The small states would be disadvantaged by a national popular vote	457
9.4.2	MYTH: Thirty-one states would lose power under a national popular vote	468
9.4.3	MYTH: The small states are so small that they will not attract any attention under any system	469
9.4.4	MYTH: The small states oppose a national popular vote for President	472
9.4.5	MYTH: Equal representation of the states in the U.S. Senate is threatened by the National Popular Vote plan	473
9.4.6	MYTH: The distribution of political influence envisioned by the Great Compromise would be upset by a national popular vote	474
9.5	Myths about Big Cities	477
9.5.1	MYTH: Big cities, such as Los Angeles, would control a nationwide popular vote for President	477
9.5.2	MYTH: A major reason for establishing the Electoral College was to prevent elections from becoming contests where presidential candidates would simply campaign in big cities	479

9.5.3	MYTH: Candidates would only campaign in media markets, while ignoring the rest of the country	481
9.6	Myth about State Identity	482
9.6.1	MYTH: The public strongly desires that electoral votes be cast on a state-by-state basis because it provides a sense of “state identity.”	482
9.7	Myths about Proliferation of Candidates, Absolute Majorities, and Breakdown of the Two-Party System	488
9.7.1	MYTH: The National Popular Vote plan is defective because it does not require an absolute majority of the popular vote to win	488
9.7.2	MYTH: The National Popular Vote plan is defective because it does not provide for a run-off	490
9.7.3	MYTH: A national popular vote will result in a proliferation of candidates, Presidents being elected with as little as 15% of the vote, and a breakdown of the two-party system	491
9.7.4	MYTH: The current system requires an absolute majority of the popular vote to win	496
9.8	Myths about Extremist and Regional Candidates	497
9.8.1	MYTH: Extremist candidates will proliferate under a national popular vote	497
9.8.2	MYTH: Regional candidates will proliferate under a national popular vote	499
9.8.3	MYTH: It is the genius of the Electoral College that Grover Cleveland did not win in 1888 because the Electoral College works as a check against regionalism	500
9.9	Myths about Logistical Nightmares Arising from Differences in State Laws	503
9.9.1	MYTH: Logistical nightmares would plague a national popular vote because of differences among the states concerning ballot-access requirements, ex-felon eligibility requirements, poll-closing times, and so forth	503
9.9.2	MYTH: A state’s electoral votes could be awarded to a candidate not on a state’s own ballot	509
9.10	Myths about Faithless Electors	511
9.10.1	MYTH: Faithless presidential electors would be a problem under the National Popular Vote compact	511
9.10.2	MYTH: It might be difficult to coerce presidential electors to vote for the national popular vote winner	514
9.10.3	MYTH: Presidential electors might succumb to outside pressure and abandon the national popular vote winner in favor of the winner of the popular vote in their state	515
9.11	Myths about Post-Election Changes in the Rules of the Game, Withdrawal, and Enforceability	517
9.11.1	MYTH: A politically motivated state legislature could withdraw from the National Popular Vote compact after the people vote in November, but before the Electoral College meets in December	517

9.11.2 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	545
9.11.3 MYTH: Interstate compacts that do not receive congressional consent are unenforceable and “toothless.”	547
9.12 Myths about Campaign Spending and Length	557
9.12.1 MYTH: Campaign spending would skyrocket if candidates had to campaign in all 50 states	557
9.12.2 MYTH: The length of presidential campaigns would increase if candidates had to travel to all 50 states	559
9.13 Myths about Election Administration	561
9.13.1 MYTH: Local election officials would be burdened by the National Popular Vote compact	561
9.13.2 MYTH: The state’s chief elections official would be burdened by the National Popular Vote compact	561
9.13.3 MYTH: The National Popular Vote compact would burden the state’s chief election official with the need to judge the election returns of other states	562
9.13.4 MYTH: The National Popular Vote compact would be costly	563
9.13.5 MYTH: Post-election audits could not be conducted under a national popular vote	564
9.13.6 MYTH: Provisional ballots would create problems in a nationwide popular vote because voters in all 50 states (instead of just 10 or so states) would matter in determining the winner	565
9.13.7 MYTH: Knowledge of the winner would be delayed under a national popular vote because the votes of all 50 states (instead of just 10 or so battleground states) would matter	570
9.13.8 MYTH: Elections are so trustworthy in the current battleground states that the country should not risk an election in which other states might affect the outcome of a presidential election	578
9.14 Myths about Lack of an Official National Count for Presidential Elections and Secret Elections	580
9.14.1 MYTH: There is no official count of the national popular vote	580
9.14.2 MYTH: A single state could frustrate the National Popular Vote compact by keeping its election returns secret	583
9.14.3 MYTH: Absentee ballots are not counted in California when the number of absentee ballots is significantly less than the amount by which the Democratic presidential candidate is leading	585
9.15 Myths about Recounts	586
9.15.1 MYTH: The current system typically produces undisputed outcomes, whereas recounts would be frequent under a national popular vote	586
9.15.2 MYTH: The current state-by-state winner-take-all system acts as a firewall that helpfully isolates recounts to particular states	596
9.15.3 MYTH: Resolution of a presidential election could be prolonged beyond the inauguration date because of recounts	597

9.15.4 MYTH: Conducting a recount would be a logistical impossibility under a national popular vote	599
9.15.5 MYTH: States would be put in the uncomfortable position of judging election returns from other states under a national popular vote	601
9.15.6 MYTH: A recount might be warranted, but unobtainable, under the National Popular Vote compact	602
9.15.7 MYTH: There is no mechanism for conducting a national recount	610
9.15.8 MYTH: A nationwide vote for President should not be implemented as long as any state uses direct-recording electronic (DRE) voting machines lacking a voter-verifiable paper audit trail	622
9.16 Myths about Interstate Compacts and Congressional Consent	625
9.16.1 MYTH: Interstate compacts are exotic and fishy	625
9.16.2 MYTH: The topic of elections addressed by the National Popular Vote compact is not an appropriate subject for an interstate compact	627
9.16.3 MYTH: The National Popular Vote compact is defective because Congress did not consent to it prior to its consideration by state legislatures	629
9.16.4 MYTH: The National Popular Vote compact is defective because it fails to mention Congress in its text	630
9.16.5 MYTH: The National Popular Vote compact requires congressional consent to become effective	631
9.16.6 MYTH: The National Popular Vote compact requires congressional consent because of its withdrawal procedure	641
9.16.7 MYTH: Adoption of the National Popular Vote compact would establish the precedent that interstate compacts can be used to accomplish something that would otherwise be unconstitutional	644
9.16.8 MYTH: The National Popular Vote compact is a conspiracy	645
9.17 Myths about Mob Rule, Demagogues, and the Electoral College Buffering against Popular Passions	646
9.17.1 MYTH: A national popular vote would be mob rule	646
9.17.2 MYTH: The Electoral College acts as a buffer against popular passions	647
9.17.3 MYTH: The current system of electing the President would prevent a Hitler or similar demagogue from coming to power in the United States	650
9.18 Myth about an Incoming President's Mandate	652
9.18.1 MYTH: The current state-by-state winner-take-all system gives the incoming President a "mandate" in the form of an exaggerated lead in the Electoral College	652
9.19 Myth about Presidential Power	653
9.19.1 MYTH: The President's powers would be changed by a national popular vote	653
9.20 Myths about the Voting Rights Act	654
9.20.1 MYTH: Section 2 of the Voting Rights Act precludes the National Popular Vote compact	654

9.20.2 MYTH: The political influence of racial and ethnic minorities would be diminished by a national popular vote	657
9.21 Myth about a Federal Election Bureaucracy	658
9.21.1 MYTH: A federal election bureaucracy would be created by the National Popular Vote compact	658
9.22 Myths about the District of Columbia	660
9.22.1 MYTH: The National Popular Vote compact would permit the District of Columbia to vote for President, even though it is not a state	660
9.22.2 MYTH: Because it is not a state, the District of Columbia may not enter into interstate compacts	660
9.22.3 MYTH: Only Congress may enter into interstate compacts on behalf of the District of Columbia	661
9.22.4 MYTH: Only Congress may change the winner-take-all rule for the District of Columbia	662
9.22.5 MYTH: Because it is not a state, the District of Columbia cannot bind itself by means of an interstate compact	663
9.22.6 MYTH: The enactment of the National Popular Vote compact by the District of Columbia Council is incomplete because Congress has not approved the Council's action	664
9.23 Myths about Congressional or Proportional Allocation of Electoral Votes	669
9.23.1 MYTH: It would be better to allocate electoral votes by congressional district	669
9.23.2 MYTH: It would be better to allocate electoral votes proportionally	680
9.24 Myth That One State Could Derail the National Popular Vote Compact	686
9.24.1 MYTH: Abolition of popular voting for President and abolition of the short presidential ballot are "Achilles' heels" that would enable one state to obstruct the National Popular Vote compact	686
9.25 Myth about Decline in Voter Turnout	693
9.25.1 MYTH: A national popular vote would decrease turnout	693
9.26 Myth That Our Nation's Freedom, Security, and Prosperity Are Protected by the Winner-Take-All Rule	696
9.26.1 MYTH: Our nation's freedom, security, and prosperity are protected by the current winner-take-all method of awarding electoral votes	696
9.27 Myth about the Replacement of a Dead, Disabled, or Discredited Presidential Candidate	697
9.27.1 MYTH: Use of the winner-take-all rule permits replacement of a dead, disabled, or discredited President-Elect between Election Day and the meeting of the Electoral College, but the National Popular Vote compact does not	697
9.28 Myth That the Winner-Take-All Rule Produces Good Presidents	698
9.28.1 MYTH: The state-by-state winner-take-all method for awarding electoral votes produces good Presidents	698

9.29 Myth about Unequal Treatment of Voters in Member and Non-Member States	699
9.29.1 MYTH: Voters in states that haven't signed onto the compact will be treated differently than voters in states that have	699
9.30 Myth about Voters from Non-Member States Not Being Counted by the National Popular Vote Compact	701
9.30.1 MYTH: The rights of voters from states outside the compact would be diminished because they would not have an equal opportunity to influence the selection of the President	701
9.31 Myth that a Nationwide Vote for President Would Favor One Political Party Over the Other	703
9.31.1 MYTH: The Republican Party would find it difficult to win the most votes nationwide	703
9.31.2 MYTH: Republican voters do not support a national popular vote	705
9.31.3 MYTH: The small states give the Republican Party an advantage in presidential elections	706
9.31.4 MYTH: The National Popular Vote effort is funded by left-wingers	712
9.31.5 MYTH: The long-term trend in the Electoral College favors the Republicans because Republican-leaning states have gained electoral votes with each recent census	713
9.31.6 MYTH: Nationwide voting for President would give voters of as few as 11 or 12 states a controlling majority of the Electoral College, enabling them to decide presidential elections	715
9.31.7 MYTH: Candidates would concentrate on Democratic-leaning metropolitan markets because of lower advertising costs	725
9.31.8 MYTH: Only citizens impact the allocation of electoral votes under the current system	730
9.31.9 MYTH: The Republican Party has a lock on the Electoral College	732
9.31.10 MYTH: The rural states would lose their advantage in the Electoral College under a national popular vote	738
9.31.11 MYTH: A national popular vote would be a guarantee of corruption because every ballot box in every state would become a chance to steal the Presidency	740
9.31.12 MYTH: Fraud is minimized under the current system because it is hard to predict where stolen votes will matter	745
9.31.13 MYTH: The 2000 election illustrates the Republican Party's structural advantage under the current state-by-state winner-take-all system	746
9.31.14 MYTH: Al Gore would have been elected President under a national popular vote in 2000	749
9.32 Myth that Major Parties Will Be Taken Off the Ballot Because of National Popular Vote	750
9.32.1 MYTH: Major parties will be taken off the ballot because of National Popular Vote	750

9.33 Myth about Tyranny of the Majority	752
9.33.1 MYTH: The state-by-state winner-take-all rule prevents tyranny of the majority	752
9.34 Myth about Politically-Motivated Mid-Year Enactment	756
9.34.1 MYTH: The Texas legislature might enact the National Popular Vote compact based on a mid-year poll indicating that its favored candidate is poised to win the popular vote in November—but not the electoral vote	756
9.35 Myth That National Popular Vote Is Unpopular	762
9.35.1 MYTH: National Popular Vote is being imposed without the consent of the majority of Americans	762
9.36 Myth about the Weather	763
9.36.1 MYTH: The state-by-state winner-take-all rule minimizes the effects of hurricanes and bad weather	763
9.37 Myth about Out-of-State Presidential Electors	768
9.37.1 MYTH: The National Popular Vote compact will result in out-of-state presidential electors	768
9.38 Myth about the French Presidential Election System	770
9.38.1 MYTH: National Popular Vote seeks to import the flawed French presidential election system into the United States	770
9.39 Myths about Unintended Consequences	772
9.39.1 MYTH: There could be unintended consequences of a nationwide vote for President	772
9.40 Myth about Perfection	774
9.40.1 MYTH: The National Popular Vote compact is not perfect	774
10 Epilogue	775
Appendix A: U.S. Constitutional Provisions on Presidential Elections	777
Appendix B: Federal Law on Presidential Elections	782
Appendix C: U.S. Constitution on Interstate Compacts and Contracts	789
Appendix D: Minnesota Laws on Presidential Elections	790
Appendix E: Minnesota 2004 Certificate of Ascertainment	794
Appendix F: Maine 2004 Certificate of Ascertainment	802
Appendix G: Nebraska 2004 Certificate of Ascertainment	806
Appendix H: New York 2004 Certificate of Ascertainment	809
Appendix I: Mississippi 2004 Certificate of Ascertainment	817
Appendix J: Dates Appearing on Certificates of Ascertainment for 2000–2008 Presidential Elections	819
Appendix K: Ohio Adoption of the Great Lakes Basin Compact	821
Appendix L: Congressional Consent to the Interstate Agreement on Detainers	827
Appendix M: List of Interstate Compacts	834
Appendix N: Congressional Consent to the Emergency Management Assistance Compact	841

Appendix O:	U.S. Supreme Court Decision in <i>McPherson v. Blacker</i> (1892)	848
Appendix P:	U.S. Supreme Court Decision in <i>State of Ohio Ex Rel. Davis v. Hildebrandt</i> (1916)	866
Appendix Q:	Maine Supreme Court Opinion for <i>In re opinion of the Justices</i> (1919)	870
Appendix R:	State Constitutional Provisions Relating to Repealing or Amending Voter Initiatives	876
Appendix S:	Supporters in Congress of Nationwide Popular Election of the President in Roll Calls and Sponsors of Constitutional Amendments	879
Appendix T:	State Statutory Deadlines for Certification of Elections	912
Appendix U:	U.S. Supreme Court Decision in <i>Hawke v. Smith</i> (1920)	914
Appendix V:	U.S. Supreme Court Decision in <i>Smiley v. Holm</i> (1932)	919
Appendix W:	Speech of Senator Birch Bayh (D-Indiana) on March 14, 1979	928
Appendix X:	Sources of Information on the Web	940
Appendix Y:	National Popular Vote Bill in Vermont	942
Appendix Z:	History of the National Popular Vote Bill	949
Appendix AA:	U.S. Supreme Court Decision in <i>Virginia v. Tennessee</i> (1893)	951
Appendix BB:	U.S. Supreme Court Decision in <i>U.S. Steel v. Multistate Tax Commission</i> (1978)	969
Appendix CC:	Results of 2000 Presidential Election	997
Appendix DD:	Results of 2004 Presidential Election	998
Appendix EE:	Results of 2008 Presidential Election	999
Appendix FF:	Three-Judge Federal Court Decision in <i>Williams v. Virginia State Board of Elections</i> (1968)	1000
Appendix GG:	California Appeals Court Decision in <i>Gillette v. Franchise Tax Board</i> (2012)	1008
Appendix HH:	Results of 2012 Presidential Election	1031
	Bibliography	1033
	Index	1039