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9.25  Myth about Decline in Voter Turnout

9.25.1  MYTH: A national popular vote would decrease turnout
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9.27  Myth about the Replacement of a Dead, Disabled, or Discredited Presidential Candidate

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

9.28  Myth That the Winner-Take-All Rule Produces Good Presidents

9.28.1  MYTH: The state-by-state winner-take-all method for awarding electoral votes produces good Presidents
9.29 Myth about Unequal Treatment of Voters in Member and Non-Member States

9.29.1 MYTH: Voters in states that haven’t signed onto the compact will be treated differently than voters in states that have

9.30 Myth about Voters from Non-Member States Not Being Counted by the National Popular Vote Compact

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

9.31 Myth that a Nationwide Vote for President Would Favor One Political Party Over the Other

9.31.1 MYTH: The Republican Party would find it difficult to win the most votes nationwide

9.31.2 MYTH: Republican voters do not support a national popular vote

9.31.3 MYTH: The small states give the Republican Party an advantage in presidential elections
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### 9.33 Myth about Tyranny of the Majority
9.33.1 MYTH: The state-by-state winner-take-all rule prevents tyranny of the majority

### 9.34 Myth about Politically-Motivated Mid-Year Enactment
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

### 9.35 Myth That National Popular Vote Is Unpopular
9.35.1 MYTH: National Popular Vote is being imposed without the consent of the majority of Americans

### 9.36 Myth about the Weather
9.36.1 MYTH: The state-by-state winner-take-all rule minimizes the effects of hurricanes and bad weather

### 9.37 Myth about Out-of-State Presidential Electors
9.37.1 MYTH: The National Popular Vote compact will result in out-of-state presidential electors

### 9.38 Myth about the French Presidential Election System
9.38.1 MYTH: National Popular Vote seeks to import the flawed French presidential election system into the United States

### 9.39 Myths about Unintended Consequences
9.39.1 MYTH: There could be unintended consequences of a nationwide vote for President

### 9.40 Myth about Perfection
9.40.1 MYTH: The National Popular Vote compact is not perfect
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