WHY AN ELECTORAL COLLEGE...
by Gary and Carolyn Alder

Why did the Framers of the Constitution create an Electoral College System to elect a President for the United States? What were the purposes and benefits? Did they want a system built on several years of campaigning, spending millions and billions of dollars catering to special interests, making campaign promises and buying votes?

No, what the Framers designed was an ingenious non-partisan, non-campaigning, indirect method. (Article II Section 1 Clauses 2 and 3), what has become known as an Electoral College—probably the best kept secret in American politics.

The formula for freedom is found in the structure of the Framers’ Constitution. They intelligently built in many checks and balances (representation of different interests) and the method of elections is a prime example.

The Framers felt that every office at the national level of government (inaccurately called federal government today because it is very consolidated) should be chosen by a different method, by a different group of individuals, to represent different interests, for a different length term of service:

• The House of Representatives was to represent the people in national issues, for two-year terms. It was the only national level office directly elected by the people.

• The Senate was to represent the interest of the State governments in national issues, for six-year terms. Senators were to be chosen by the State Legislatures, and therefore be accountable to their State Legislature.

The Judges were to judge law according to the specifications of a written Constitution.

They were to be nominated by the President and confirmed by the Senate (representing the States, not political parties, special interests, personal agendas, etc.)

The chief executive was to execute the laws, not make the laws. A president was to be selected by a unique method implementing a multi-step, indirect process. The first step, Electors, in each state, appointed by each State Legislature, would decide who would nominate the best possible presidential candidates. The independent Electors, collectively, became known as The Electoral Collage. The individuals in this group were not to be associated with government, had a one-day assignment, and met on the same day in every state. The names they would bring forward would be based on past performance, not campaign promises. A separate group, part of government, the House of Representatives, was to make the final selection from the five highest individuals nominated by the Electors.

(continued on page 2)
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Each State had one vote regardless of their number of Representatives. This is a perfect example of Constitutional Federalism.

Thus electing each branch of national government by a different method, by different individuals, representing different interests, would keep the government in check. The key to understanding the Constitution is that it was designed to control the government, not to control the people!

The Framers designed a complex constitutional representative Republic, not a democracy. The President was to be President of the Union of States, not the legislator in chief, or the king of the people.

For more information on the original Electoral College system and principles of freedom see our website: www.freedomformula.us

MESSAGE FROM THE CHAIRMAN...

Two very significant events occurred during the past month that will be of special interest to our party members. There was a special election to fill a vacancy in Missouri’s Eighth Congressional District. In addition to the two major party nominees, both the Libertarian and the Constitution Party fielded candidates, and there were also four write in candidates. Our CP candidate, Doug Enyart, worked hard and was included in the debates with the Republican, Democratic and Libertarian candidates.

Doug is a small business owner in his District and represented the party well. Doug came in third of the eight candidates, more than doubling the votes received by the Libertarian Party nominee. The tally was: 17,203 votes (27.4%) for the Democrats, the Republican candidate received 42,145 votes (67.1%), Doug Enyart earned 2,265 votes (3.6%), and there were 968 ballots cast for the Libertarians (1.5%). The four write in candidates received a total of 182 votes (0.2%). In 1998, we had a candidate for State Senate in that District who garnered 12% of the vote. This is the first time a CPer has run for any office in the District since then. Doug Enyart did best in his own county – 19.2% – which means he could do well campaigning as a State Representative. Doug’s respectable third place finish followed a pattern we have observed in other states where our party is organizing at the grass roots. We find that where we are able to get our message out to the public, we draw votes from people who would otherwise not vote or from conservative voters who sometimes vote Libertarian as a protest, but who will definitely vote for a Constitution Party candidate if given the choice.

This has been especially true in the western states of Idaho, Nevada, Utah and Wyoming. Attracting good quality candidates and then being able to get our message out has been the key to our success. Even in the 2008 presidential race where we were able to better convey message, Chuck Baldwin out polled the Libertarian candidate Bob Barr in Utah, Idaho, Alaska, South Dakota, Oregon, Nebraska, and Mississippi. Our challenge is to get on more state ballots, with good quality candidates and to become more effective in communicating our message to the public. Doug Enyart and the Missouri party are to be commended for the impressive job that they did.

Wyoming is the next battleground where the Constitution Party had a stake. There was effort to place a referendum on the state ballot to repeal legislation designed to strip school administration responsibilities from elected Superintendent of Public Education and empower a gubernatorial appointee instead. The newly-organized Wyoming CP has only 585 registered voters, and yet in less than 70 days they were able to gather 21,991 of the 37,606 required signatures to get the issue on the 2014 general election ballot. By the end of the drive there were more than 300 people gathering signatures all on a volunteer basis. The party not only gained wide coverage in the news media, but also picked up significant numbers of new party supporters in the process. Petitioners were active in every single county in the state. State Chairman Jennifer Young and her fellow party supporters are to be highly commended for the tremendous job they did in such a short time. We will learn more about how they were able to accomplish all this at the September National Committee meeting in Denver.

Finally, as always, I send my appreciation for all you are doing.

Gratefully,
Frank Fluckiger

JOIN US ON OUR SOCIAL NETWORKING SITES...