

# Supporting the electoral college



**ASSIGN  
BUSTER**

## The Electoral College- It's time to move forward

With intentions of finding a solution, for establishing a federal government along with a central figure in office, the framers of the Constitution constructed the Electoral College. The College was created to simplify the method for electing a president every four years. The philosophy supporting the Electoral College is that each individual state is granted a specific amount of electoral votes in accordance to its population, which were given to the candidate that won the states popular vote. In recent generations, questions are presented as to whether or not this method still proves the most effective for electing this nation's most influential office.

The Constitution presented many intelligent checks and balances and compromises, but the Electoral College isn't one of them. Years later James Madison would compose that it endured from hurrying influence produced by fatigue and impatience.

The system worked as intended only for the two elections won by George Washington, reported from Congressional Research Service. In 1796 the initial parties constructed a campaign for Thomas Jefferson and John Adams. The election went to the House of Representatives, predominated by the rival Federalists, many of the party members viewed Adams as less offensive than Jefferson, and favored him to become president. Afterwards a disorganized process, containing no less than 36 votes, Jefferson was elected president, as for Adams he became Vice President. The fiasco led up to the implication of the 12th Amendment, which dictated that electors determine their selections for vice president and president.

The electors operation rapidly fell apart in the encounter of real world politics and, specifically, the increase of the two-party system. Once the Electoral College settlement was stable, Madison remarked that the president is now to be elected by the people, he told Virginia's ratifying convention the updated executive would rely on the choice of the people at large. The states immediately democratized the method. In 1832, South Carolina was alone, in which the state allowed for the state legislature to choose its electors. What a failure the belief was of allegiance electors rescuing the country from a Trump administration- The concept of the electoral college behaving as initially designed is considered too anti-democratic to take flight.

The entirety of this is to pronounce the reverence the Electoral College receives due to the founders brilliance - as well as that accompanying endurance of its failures- is improper. Political scientist John Roche organized it a half-century back, referring to the Electoral College as merely a jerry-rigged improvisation which has subsequently been endowed with high theoretical content. It serves as the appendix of our body politic, a now worthless vessel that only receives consideration when it presents itself as an issue.

Defense for the Electoral College heavily relies on a wish to assure the presidential candidates that they wont have to spend time visiting large cities, in order to gain their vote and deliberately with protecting the political system's federal character. The previous distress is exaggerated. First of all, doesnt require candidates to campaign across a wide variety of states, not even in states that oppose them. It deforms the presidential campaign, by allowing the parties to disregard over 40 states, that they know they either

<https://assignbuster.com/supporting-the-electoral-college/>

can't lose or can't win. Looking into previous campaigns, there are specific states that will not receive anything more than campaigning TV ads. Three of the most popular states that represent this are (Texas, New York, California) that will never receive a campaign visit, even though those states contain 25 percent of the U. S. population.

Let's not forget, the Electoral College allows for the possibility for a candidate to significantly lose in the number of popular votes yet succeed with electoral votes. This has been presented at least 5 times out of 56 elections, it may seem like not so big of a deal, but when it does it creates a whole lot of chaos every single time. Not to mention it happened so recently with the 2016 election. Hillary Clinton significantly acquired more popular votes than Donald Trump by a difference of 2.8 million votes, despite that significant difference he got elected by gaining 304 electoral votes.

While faithful electors are commonly exceptionally loyal to the party they regulate with, they aren't required to vote based on the way the individuals of their state trusted and directed them to. Basically, even if a candidate dominates in the popular votes of that specific state, doesn't mean that your state's electors have to cast a vote for the same candidate. These electors that voted against their state are known as faithless electors.

Only 29 states maintain legislation that disciplines faithless electors, although there has never been a successfully prosecuted elector yet. This means that 21 states don't enforce that an elector is obligated to vote for their party's candidate. Should the vote of one individual have potential to override the will of millions.

I propose a compromise that will allow for equality and power to the people yet allows for a structure and is to be regulated by the federal government.

The Amendment should be written as the following: Congress is prohibited from utilizing its power and authority to override the will of the people. All individuals are given an equal voice in electing public officials, regardless of ethnicity, race, gender, and religion. No state will be denied the right to participate in national elections under Article V of the constitution.