

# FOREWORD

By Saul Anuzis

As former chairman of the Michigan Republican Party, I am asking you to consider a bipartisan, truly representative, and more fair process to elect the President of the United States. Our President.

It is the National Popular Vote bill, which would guarantee the presidency to the candidate who receives the most popular votes in all 50 states, and I support it.

This bill has passed multiple chambers around the country in a bipartisan manner. As someone who has run twice for Chairman of the Republican National Committee and is an active “movement conservative,” I’m oftentimes challenged about the fact that I’m supporting something that’s not blatantly partisan.

Good public policy is good politics, and sometimes good public policy can be bipartisan.

The National Popular Vote plan does not abolish the Electoral College. Instead, it uses the state’s existing authority to change how the Electoral College is chosen. The change would be from the current state-by-state approach to a national popular vote approach that would guarantee the presidency to the candidate who receives the most popular votes in all 50 states and the District of Columbia.

The shortcomings of the current system stem from the winner-take-all rule (that is, awarding all of a state’s electoral votes to the candidate who receives the most popular votes in each state).

Because of the winner-take-all rule, a candidate can win the presidency without winning the most popular votes nationwide. This has occurred in four of the nation’s 56 presidential elections. As an example, a shift of fewer than 60,000 votes in Ohio in 2004 would have defeated President Bush despite his nationwide lead of over 3 million votes.

This is a state-rights issue and we, the people, have the right to decide how and who is elected president.

The U.S. Constitution gives the states exclusive and plenary control over the manner of awarding their electoral votes. The winner-take-all rule is not in the Constitution. It was not the Founders’ choice and was used by only three states in the nation’s first presidential election in 1789. Maine and Nebraska award electoral votes by congressional district—a reminder that an amendment to the Constitution is not required to change the way the president is elected.

Under the National Popular Vote bill, all the electoral votes from the enacting states would be awarded to the presidential candidate who receives the most popular votes in all 50 states. The bill would take effect only when enacted by states pos-

sessing a majority of the electoral votes—that is, enough electoral votes to elect a president (270 of 538). As of the end of 2012, the National Popular Vote Bill has been passed by 31 legislative chambers in 21 states. The most recent poll of Michigan voters found that 73% of our citizens support this concept. A 2007 national poll showed 72% supported it.

The National Popular Vote bill has passed in states having almost half of the electoral votes necessary to bring this into effect. This proposal would guarantee that every vote matters, that every state is relevant. Every community would have the same value to every candidate for president in every election.

This is a serious proposal that deserves serious consideration and debate. The “knee-jerk” reaction against this bill and the ease with which some can “demonize” this issue without serious study or consideration is frustrating. I encourage everyone who cares about our country to read about the “myths,” study and understand the intent of our Founding Fathers, and then make a decision as to whether or not this proposal deserves your support.