

The Electoral College is Undemocratic

Will Hobbs

- The Electoral College violates one-person/one-vote principle of a democracy
- In general, the effect a voter has is inversely proportional to the population of the state
- E.g., it takes 3.2 times as many votes in California to elect and elector as it does in Wyoming
- By awarding electors to the winner of the national popular vote, the NPVIC fixes this inequality

Ranked by Number of Eligible Voters, 2016						
State/District	Elegible Voters	Electors	# Voters per Elector	Power of individual voter compared to California	Power compared to Oregon	Power compared to Wyoming
Wyoming	431,011	3	143,670	3.20	2.99	1.00
Vermont	496,439	3	165,480	2.78	2.60	0.87
District of Columbia	516,771	3	172,257	2.67	2.49	0.83
Alaska	519,501	3	173,167	2.65	2.48	0.83
North Dakota	582,534	3	194,178	2.37	2.21	0.74
South Dakota	632,098	3	210,699	2.18	2.04	0.68
Delaware	693,659	3	231,220	1.99	1.86	0.62
Rhode Island	786,111	4	196,528	2.34	2.19	0.73
Montana	803,833	3	267,944	1.72	1.60	0.54
Hawaii	1,029,072	4	257,268	1.79	1.67	0.56
New Hampshire	1,041,147	4	260,287	1.77	1.65	0.55
Maine	1,058,306	4	264,577	1.74	1.62	0.54
Idaho	1,161,211	4	290,303	1.58	1.48	0.49
Nebraska	1,353,558	5	270,712	1.70	1.59	0.53
West Virginia	1,430,308	5	286,062	1.61	1.50	0.50
New Mexico	1,459,901	5	291,980	1.57	1.47	0.49
Nevada	1,970,426	6	328,404	1.40	1.31	0.44
Utah	1,993,581	6	332,264	1.38	1.29	0.43
Kansas	2,065,761	6	344,294	1.33	1.25	0.42
Arkansas	2,148,441	6	358,074	1.28	1.20	0.40
Mississippi	2,177,349	6	362,892	1.27	1.18	0.40
Iowa	2,297,129	6	382,855	1.20	1.12	0.38
Connecticut	2,572,337	7	367,477	1.25	1.17	0.39
Oklahoma	2,792,423	7	398,918	1.15	1.08	0.36
Oregon	3,006,638	7	429,520	1.07	1.00	0.33
Kentucky	3,276,707	8	409,588	1.12	1.05	0.35
Louisiana	3,391,431	8	423,929	1.08	1.01	0.34
Alabama	3,606,103	9	400,678	1.15	1.07	0.36
South Carolina	3,702,997	9	411,444	1.12	1.04	0.35
Minnesota	3,972,330	10	397,233	1.16	1.08	0.36
Colorado	3,978,892	9	442,099	1.04	0.97	0.32
Maryland	4,202,282	10	420,228	1.09	1.02	0.34
Wisconsin	4,295,057	10	429,506	1.07	1.00	0.33
Missouri	4,519,978	10	451,998	1.02	0.95	0.32
Arizona	4,738,332	11	430,757	1.07	1.00	0.33
Indiana	4,860,929	11	441,903	1.04	0.97	0.33
Tennessee	4,900,137	11	445,467	1.03	0.96	0.32
Massachusetts	4,978,165	11	452,560	1.02	0.95	0.32
Washington	5,123,524	12	426,960	1.08	1.01	0.34
Virginia	6,061,032	13	466,233	0.99	0.92	0.31
New Jersey	6,093,144	14	435,225	1.06	0.99	0.33
Georgia	6,958,725	16	434,920	1.06	0.99	0.33
North Carolina	7,317,507	15	487,834	0.94	0.88	0.29
Michigan	7,431,589	16	464,474	0.99	0.92	0.31
Ohio	8,753,269	18	486,293	0.95	0.88	0.30
Illinois	8,983,758	20	449,188	1.02	0.96	0.32
Pennsylvania	9,737,690	20	486,885	0.94	0.88	0.30
New York	13,693,128	29	472,177	0.97	0.91	0.30
Florida	14,601,373	29	503,496	0.91	0.85	0.29
Texas	17,514,961	38	460,920	1.00	0.93	0.31
California	25,278,803	55	459,615	1.00	0.93	0.31
Totals	226,991,388	538	421,917			

Some Additional Notes

- The “winner takes all” method of awarding electoral votes used by all but 2 states exacerbates the problem, creates “swing states,” and results in vast numbers of wasted votes.
- The existence of swing states results in vast resources spent in very few states, and makes it clear where to apply resources, and engage in hacking and voter suppression, years in advance of a presidential election.