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Abolishing the Electoral College

The Electoral College was created by the framers at the Constitutional Convention in 1787. They believe that it wasn’t a good idea for the people to elect the president directly because they did not trust that voters would have enough information to make a good choice. The Electoral College basically chooses who the next president will be since it takes away our freedom to vote away. The Electoral College should be abolished because it’s undemocratic, the small states are overrepresented, and it hurts third parties.

**The United States of America is a democracy country that is characterized by the equality of rights and privileges.** The Electoral College is considered undemocratic because it gives a higher percentage of the voting power to states with low population. Thus, the popular vote should be counted and not the electoral votes. In Document D of the Electoral College DBQ, there’s a chart that shows the comparison of population and electoral votes in 2010. In the chart, it has the twelve states that are less populated plus DC with the total population of 12,500,722 and total electoral vote of 44. In addition, Illinois has the total population of 12,830,632 and the total electoral vote of 20. This shows that Illinois would have less electoral vote than the 12 states plus DC which has 44. It is unfair to the larger states and it shows the unequal electoral votes to the states. In Document F, Bradford Plumer wrote, “the election would be thrown to the House of Representatives, where the state delegation vote on the President. (The Senate would choose the vice-president.)” This shows what will happen in the electoral college if there were ever a tie. This is a bad outcome because the House of Representatives would decide who is the president and the senate would choose the vice-president. It should not be depended on the 538 members of the electoral college, but the citizen’s choice of who should be president. Lastly, in Document D it says, “The Electoral College violates political equality.” This refers to the equality of each citizen’s individual rights and liberty. Voters in some states have more say in selecting the president than voters in other states. The Electoral College is hazardous to the American democracy and it’s deteriorating the basic beliefs of fairness and equality in the political system

**The amount of electors in each state depends on the population with the Electoral College.** Since each state is guaranteed with three electors, states with a smaller population like Montana, would have more power than should actually represent them. This takes away representation from the larger states. In Document D, it states that, “It favors some citizens over others, depending solely upon the state in which voters cast their votes for president.” This shows that the citizen’s vote is depended on the on which state they are in. This also violates the citizen’s individual rights and liberty since it’s not everyone’s votes are equal. Furthermore, in Document A it shows the electoral votes by state on a map. Each state starts out with three electoral votes no matter what since each state has two senators and one for each member of the House. In addition, the smaller states have a bigger say in votes. In the same document, if the map is split into one-fourth, NE and SE are the “biggest” regions for a candidate to win. This shows that a candidate can win if he has no support in any one of the regions. The smallest number of states a candidate can win with the Electoral College is mostly on the east coast of the United States. This act as evidence that the states have too much of a say indirectly and it focuses on a minimal number of states would elect the president. This can cause problems for the third party candidate since a candidate can lose the popular vote, but still win the electoral vote based on the unequal votes of the states.

**The Electoral College makes it very hard for a third party to win any kind of election.** The third parties would be kicked out of the presidency since they are splinter parties.  In Document E, Arthur Schlesinger Jr. wrote, “the abolition of state-by-state, winner-take-all electoral votes would speed the disintegration [falling apart] of the already weakened two party systems.” This states that the Electoral College speeds up the process of a candidate becoming President which is not a good idea. A candidate can win the popular vote and not the electoral vote, but that candidate is demolished because he lost to the electoral vote. He may seem weak to the electorates but not the citizens. Secondly, Arthur Schlesinger wrote, “the multiplication of splinter parties would make it hard for major-party candidates to win popular-vote majorities.” This infers that the state’s Electoral College votes are distributed based on the proportion of where the vote is received. Additionally, he thinks that the splinters are thought to be useless and brainwashing to the voters. Lastly, another author’s name George Will in Document E wrote, “The system bolsters the two-party system by discouraging independent candidacies that splinter the electorate.” All independent candidacies should have the chance to run even if people don’t like their ideas that are outside the mainstream. The Electoral College is hypocritical since it doesn’t want third parties to enter the presidency but still allows them to join. This shows that it’s trying to fake a democracy by adding a third-party because it’s taking away the major party’s votes.

**One might object here that if the Electoral College were abolished, then the presidential candidates would focus on highly populated states and that this system is strongly used since 1787 and should not be removed.** In Document C, John Samples wrote, “the Electoral College makes sure that the states count in presidential elections.” This indicates that since highly populated areas have a bigger say, the less populated states would be overlooked because they are inferior to the election. America is united as a whole and people want all the states to have a say especially the smaller states. Mitch McConnell in Document C wrote that, “It is designed to promote good government and legislation that forwards the common good of a large and diverse nation.” This shows that this system’s inefficiency is a positive thing because it promotes good government. The Electoral College helps preserve the federalist structure of the government since it protects the freedom of individuals like those in small states and less populated areas. Lastly, McConnell wrote, “linchpin of American political prosperity. It has formed our political parties, moderated our more extreme elements, and forged the presidential campaigns that have given direction to our ship of state.” This infers that if the Electoral College were to be eliminated it would be such a complicated and time consuming process that it would not be worth doing. In conclusion, it would be a hassle to get rid of it since it’s the foundation of the American political prosperity and it should stay that way.

The three reasons for abolishing the Electoral College is it does not agree to the democratic principles, overrepresentation of the smaller states, and it damages third parties. Some people believe the Electoral College system weakens the fundamental principle of a representative government- that one person should have one vote. If we switch to a popular vote, people will have a greater amount of saying than before. The candidates will have a better chance to get elected.