The Great Compromise Compromised the Election! ...But is the National Popular Vote Compact the Answer?

by Christal Wood, NPV Committee Chair

If you were taught in school about the Great Compromise during the 1787 Constitutional Convention, it was probably in reference to the decision to create two houses of Congress. However, there was another compromise made at the time that isn’t as widely understood. There was argument over the proper method of selecting the president. Issues included mistrust of the Congress, fear of corruption or influence from foreign powers, and concerns about larger states with more voters overriding the interests of smaller states. Voila! The Electoral College was born—and embedded in Article II, Section 1 of the U.S. Constitution. Each of the states is entitled to appoint a designated number of electors to elect the president.

Article II, Section 1, Clause 2 reads: “Each State shall appoint, in such Manner as the Legislature thereof may direct, a Number of Electors, equal to the whole Number of Senators and Representatives to which the State may be entitled in the Congress....” Supreme Court cases have established that this means the states have exclusive and complete power of appointment of electors, and that it is up to each state to decide how to exercise that power (as long as no other provisions are violated). Forty-eight out of fifty states currently use a “winner-take-all” rule of allocating electors—directing all electoral votes for the state to the presidential candidate who wins a majority within that state. It’s interesting to note that the U.S. Constitution does not mandate how electors vote once they are appointed. Although this “freedom” has not been tested in contemporary history, only party loyalty binds electors to vote any certain way.

The 2000 Presidential Election put the casual political observer on notice that there was such a thing as an Electoral College, and that the average person’s vote is advisory at best. Partisan conspiracy theories aside, the constitutional instructions have always been there. It just didn’t seem to matter much until the popular vote and the Electoral College vote didn’t match, and the Supreme Court said it was O.K.

As much excitement as it caused at the time, this mismatch has happened more than once in history. In fact, four out of 55 times America has gotten the “wrong winner” as president under the Electoral College system. There is tension between the Electoral College system and the fundamental democratic principle of “one person, one vote” also found within the Constitution. Surveys reflect that 70% of Americans are now opposed to the current system of electing the President.

(continued on page 29)
President’s Message

We have just hosted two events celebrating the League’s history in the region. The first, our League of Women Voters 89th birthday party, cosponsored by Seattle City Councilmember Jean Godden and held in the Bertha Knight Landes room of the Seattle City Hall, was a wonderful reunion for longtime League members and a learning experience for new members. Several League members who served in public office discussed how membership in the League fostered their interest in running for office and indeed prepared them for the work of elected office. A special moment for me was reading the 1973 speech given by member Jocelyn Marchisio at the State Convention, as she was ending her term as League of Women Voters of Washington president just after Washington had ratified the federal ERA. Although some references were dated, much of Jocelyn’s speech is both applicable and inspiring today. And indeed, her call for League members to run for office proved the perfect introduction to our League elected officials. We have reprinted that inspiring speech beginning on page 13.

The second celebration was our March Women’s History forum. Dorothy Young Sale, League of Women Voters of Seattle (LWVS) President from 1995 – 1997, who serves on the Washington women’s History Consortium, arranged a presentation by Shanna Stevenson, Coordinator of the Women’s History Consortium and organizer of Washington’s Women’s Suffrage Centennial Celebration. Shanna discussed the important role Washington women had in the suffrage movement. Dorothy then reminisced about working to pass the ERA and the League members involved in that process. This was a wonderful extension to Jocelyn’s letter. We are indeed standing on the shoulders of giants.

Getting back to the present and the current work of the League, the LWVS Board voted to support the Seattle Initiative 100, concerning plans to build a new jail, with a donation and commitment to gather 230 of the 25,000 signatures needed by May 15, 2009 to qualify the Initiative. The Social Justice Committee recommended this endorsement because they believe, “Initiative 100 is tied to numerous LWVS positions, including positions that relate to supporting people who are homeless or in need of community services.” The majority of the board voted to endorse. (The Social Justice Committee recommendation is on page 10.)

Denise D. Smith

Mission Statement
The League of Women Voters of Seattle, a nonpartisan political organization, encourages informed and active participation in government, works to increase understanding of major public policy issues and influences public policy through education and advocacy.
### April

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sunday</th>
<th>Monday</th>
<th>Tuesday</th>
<th>Wednesday</th>
<th>Thursday</th>
<th>Friday</th>
<th>Saturday</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Forum: National Popular Vote Compact</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Forum: National Popular Vote 7:30 p.m.</td>
<td>3 Board Meeting 9:00 a.m.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>May Voter Deadline</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Social Justice Comm. 5:30-7:00 p.m.</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Tax Reform Forum 7:30-9:00 p.m.</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Spring Fling 2:00-4:00 p.m.</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>31</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### May

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sunday</th>
<th>Monday</th>
<th>Tuesday</th>
<th>Wednesday</th>
<th>Thursday</th>
<th>Friday</th>
<th>Saturday</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

### Forum Schedule

The League of Women Voters of Seattle hosts public forums the first Thursday of each month. Upcoming forums are listed below; check the Voter each month for detailed information on the next forum. To find the Voter on the Seattle League website go to www.seattlelwv.org. Click the League library tab on the top banner and you will find a link to the current Voter.

---

### March Board Briefs

By Karen Adair, Secretary

(…) discussed several suggestions for forum topics and chose “An Update on Health Care Reform” to focus on national events.

The Board authorized Jayne Freitag-Koontz as action chair to work with the state League to take action on options for local taxing authority.

At the request of the Social Justice Committee, the Board agreed to endorse Seattle Initiative 100 “requiring studies and a public vote before building a jail” and will contribute to the initiative effort.

Anita Warmflash recommended disbanding the Observer Corps as a separate entity since most committees already observe meetings of local government bodies. She suggested that the committees inform the Board of their observations.

On April 26 the Ed Fund will hold a Spring Fling with David Domke, UW communications professor, as the featured speaker. The League has reserved space at South Seattle Community College for some kind of fundraising event in October.

---

### CALENDAR

**April**

- **Forum: National Popular Vote Compact**
  - Thursday, April 2
  - 7:30 p.m.
  - Seattle First Baptist Church
- **Board Meeting**
  - Saturday, April 4
  - League Office
- **May Voter Deadline**
  - Monday, April 6
- **International Relations Committee**
  - Monday, April 6
  - 12:45-2:45 p.m.
  - League Office
- **Social Justice Committee**
  - Tuesday, April 14
  - 5:30-7:00 p.m.
  - League Office
- **Civics Education Committee**
  - Thursday, April 16
  - 4:30-6:00 p.m.
  - Mosaic Coffee House
- **Tax Reform Forum**
  - Monday, April 20
  - 7:30-9:00 p.m.
  - Horizon House Performance Hall
- **Transportation Committee**
  - Tuesday, April 21
  - 10:00 a.m.-12:30 p.m.
  - League Office
- **Economics and Taxation Committee**
  - Saturday, April 25
  - 9:00 a.m.
  - 909 E. Newton #D9
- **Spring Fling**
  - Sunday, April 26
  - 2:00-4:00 p.m.
  - 14025 3rd NW
- **State Education Talk**
  - Wednesday, April 29
  - 12:00 p.m.
  - League Office
- **Land Use Committee**
  - Thursday, April 30
  - 12:30-2:30 p.m.
  - Park Shore Building

**May**

- **Board Meeting**
  - May 7
  - 9:00 a.m.
Committee Meetings

**Health Care Reform Discussion Group**
**Date**: Monday, March 23  
**Time**: 1:00 p.m.  
**Place**: League Office

**International Relations Committee**
**Date**: Monday, April 6  
**Time**: 12:45-2:45 p.m.  
**Place**: League Office

We will be discussing U.S. policy towards Iran - general knowledge of the topic should be sufficient preparation. Anyone interested in participating is welcome; for more information, email Ellen Berg (ellenberg@msn.com) or Peggy Saari (peggysaari@comcast.net).

**Social Justice Committee**
**Date**: Tuesday, April 14  
**Time**: 5:30-7:00 p.m.  
**Place**: League Office

**Civics Education Committee**
**Date**: Thursday, April 16  
**Time**: 4:30-6:00 p.m.  
**Place**: Mosaic Coffee House  
4401 2nd Ave. NE

For information, contact Jaclyn Wall at speakingstrategies@hotmail.com.

**Port Study Committee**
The Port Study Committee is continuing interviews with Port Commissioners and other individuals knowledgeable and concerned about issues related to the Port. League members interested in joining the study should contact Linda Brown at (206) 329-4848 or brownlj@comcast.net.

**Transportation Committee**
**Date**: Tuesday, April 21  
**Time**: 10:00 a.m. – 12:30 p.m.  
**Place**: League Office

**Economics and Taxation Committee**
**Date**: Saturday, April 25  
**Time**: 9:00 a.m.  
**Place**: 909 E. Newton #D9

**Education Committee**
**Date**: Wednesday, April 29  
**Time**: 12:00 p.m.  
**Place**: League Office

Lisa McFarlane of the League of Education Voters will be talking about what has happened in the last legislative session with respect to education funding.

**Land Use Committee**
**Date**: Thursday, April 30  
**Time**: 12:30-2:30 p.m.  
**Place**: Park Shore Building, 1630 43rd Ave. E

Extremely limited, free parking is available on-site and along adjacent side streets; additionally, the #11 bus has neighborhood entry and departure stops within one block of Park Shore. Guest speakers from the Port of Seattle will provide an overview on numerous topics including: the ongoing efforts to make its public policy-making process more transparent, redevelopment plans for Port properties, and measures being taken to help clean up Elliott Bay’s marine environment (e.g. the mitigation of waste materials discharged from cruise ships). For further information, please contact Karen Kane at (206) 329-4848.

**Immigration Committee**
The Immigration Committee will meet quarterly, the next meeting to be held in May. We will be updating ourselves on any issues pertaining to immigration policy at both the national and local levels. Feel free to call for information.
Co-chairs: Annette Holcomb, (206) 329-4848, and Barbara Reid, (206) 329-4848.

**Spring Fling Plans**
Plans are well underway for the Spring Fling, League's fundraiser to support the Education Fund.

- **Date and time will be Sunday, April 26 from 2:00 to 4:00 p.m.**
- **The event will be held at the home of Ann Ormsby, 14025 3rd NW. Ann’s home is surrounded by lovely trees and gardens and has a beautiful view.**
- **The speaker will be David Domke, Professor of Communications at the University of Washington. Professor Domke will speak about the newspaper business, media and our democracy. He is a popular speaker and comes highly recommended by League members.**
- **Invitations will go out to all League members by the end of March.**
- **Contributions will be accepted at the door or before the event. Donations of any amount are appreciated.**
- **The Education Fund is a 501 (c)(3) organization. All donations to the Education Fund are tax-deductible, to the full extent of the law.**
- **Please let us know by April 20 if you will be attending so that we can plan accordingly.**
- **Get your carpool group together and come to the Spring Fling!**

We will hope for a sunny day so that we can enjoy Ann’s patio and view.
The League of Women Voters of Seattle bids a reluctant farewell to the Seattle Post-Intelligencer as a print newspaper. We would like to thank the reporters and staff for their long service to the community. Multiple news sources are important to maintaining democracy, and it was Seattle’s good fortune to be able to support two major newspapers as long as it did.

THANK YOU!!!!!!!

LEAGUE NEWS
SEATTLE VOTER APRIL 2009

NEW TOPIC FOR MAY FORUM: HEALTH CARE REFORM

The forum on privatization originally scheduled for May has been postponed until next fall. In its place, the forum on Thursday, May 7 will address the current status of health care reform. See next month’s Voter for more information.

THE STATE OF STATE EDUCATION

Education at the state level has been a hot topic this legislative session. In addition to trying to fund education (pre-k through high school) in the midst of a huge deficit, the legislature has had to deal with the proposal to make major changes to the definition of basic education, the way money is allocated to local school districts, and the method for determining teacher salaries. The proposal came from the Joint Legislative Task Force on Basic Education Finance. On April 29 at noon at the League office, Lisa McFarlane of the League of Education Voters will speak to us about what happened in the session. The group decided there was strong interest. The next meeting will be Monday, March 23 at 1:00 p.m. in the League Office.

HEALTH CARE REFORM DISCUSSION GROUP

The Health Care Reform discussion group met for the first time on Friday, February 27 to discuss the viability of a discussion group to follow federal and state health care reform efforts and help to educate ourselves and the membership on how to become involved in the process. The group decided there was strong interest. The next meeting will be Monday, March 23 at 1:00 p.m. in the League Office.

HELP WANTED: VOLUNTEER AT THE CIS DESK!

Can you spare bus change and three hours a week? Want to learn how the League works firsthand? Have you been a member for a long time but never had the time to be involved? Now is your chance and have fun at the same time! Volunteer at the Citizen Information Service (CIS) desk on Thursday afternoons at the office. The job entails answering phones and helping with mailings three hours per week from 12:30-3:30 p.m. If you can’t make it for one reason or another, there are substitutes to fill in for you. And we train, so you will be well informed when you take over the job. Contact Cynthia Howe, CIS Coordinator, at: howe.john@comcast.net or Lindsay at the League office, (206) 329-4848.

Diversity Policy

The League of Women Voters of Seattle (LWVS), in both its values and practices, affirms its beliefs and commitment to diversity and pluralism, which means there shall be no barriers to participation in any activity of the League on the basis of gender, race, creed, age, sexual orientation, national origin or disability. LWVS recognizes that diverse perspectives are important and necessary for responsible and representative decision-making. LWVS subscribes to the belief that diversity and pluralism are fundamental to the values it upholds and that this inclusiveness enhances the organization’s ability to respond more effectively to changing conditions and needs. LWVS affirms its commitment to reflecting the diversity of Americans in its membership, board, staff and programs.

FAREWELL TO THE P-I

The League of Women Voters of Seattle bids a reluctant farewell to the Seattle Post-Intelligencer as a print newspaper. We would like to thank the reporters and staff for their long service to the community. Multiple news sources are important to maintaining democracy, and it was Seattle’s good fortune to be able to support two major newspapers as long as it did.

THANK YOU!!!!!!
The 2009 Conference was a joint project, sponsored by a variety of Canadian, United States, Washington, Tribal Nations and local governmental agencies, as well as private, university and nonprofit groups concerned about our region. There were more than 1100 attendees, including League members Jan O’Connor, Elizabeth Davis (Whidbey Island South league) and Linnea Hirst.

The theme of the conference was “The Future of the Salish Sea: A Call to Action!” The Salish Sea designates our larger region: Puget Sound in Washington State, the Georgia Basin in Canada, and the Strait of Juan de Fuca. While the previous biennial conferences focused entirely on the science of the ecosystem, this one worked to develop a Call to Action that identifies critical work that needs to be done to protect these transboundary seas.

Keynote speaker Andrew Rosenberg set the tone for the conference. He discussed the rationale and elements of ecosystem-based management, the implementation steps needed and the process of developing scientific advice as an ongoing and adaptive effort. Some of his salient points:

- We don’t manage the ecosystem—we manage the people, who have the greatest effect on the ecosystem.
- In order to save the fisheries, we must STOP fishing until the stock recovers.
- Every sector has the same question: who should be the user? For example:
  - Offshore activities
  - Transportation
  - Recreation
  - Commercial fishing

Proposed new uses, such as tidal power.

- We must define natural boundaries that are most relevant to conservation.
- We must decide trade-offs, and they must be explicit.

After his address, the attendees broke into a large number of smaller sessions over the next several days, ending with a final general meeting in which the key Calls to Action from the numerous breakout sessions were identified and discussed. The Call to Action will be delivered to the Puget Sound Partnership in response to its Action Agenda.

Some of the breakout sessions that League attendees found particularly interesting, and a few points from each, included:

**Health of the Salish Sea:**

- In 1994, a BC/WA science panel looked at the climate changes and potential harms, and decided that it would be an easy recovery and so gave the problem a low priority.
- Strains of Georgia has warmed nearly one degree since 1965, affecting the salmon runs and survival.
- In 1965, marine survival of Coho was 10%. In 2005, it’s 5% - that’s point five percent.
- Most systems are dying a death of 1000 cuts.
- The problems are extremely complex.

**Regional Solutions for Treatment of Urban Stormwater—Overcoming the Obstacles:**

- Urban runoff accounts for much of the 150,000,000 per day pollutants that go into Puget Sound.
- Pollutants of concern include solids, zinc, copper, nitrogen, phosphorous, oil and grease, fecal coliform (particularly dog poop), temperature.
- Current regulations are targeted to new development or redevelopment, requiring Low Impact Development only “where feasible” and leaving older systems in place.

**Exploring the Relationship of Science, Policy and Traditional Ecological Knowledge:**

- Management of the Salish Sea ecosystem includes federal, state, provincial, tribal and first nation governments in the United States and British Columbia. Greater coordination and cooperation is needed.
- British Columbia has a big problem with its large number of fish farms, including the problem of sea lice. A recent study of fish farms found 20 lice per fry (juvenile salmon); it only takes two lice to kill a fry.
- Tribes and First Nations have a sacred alliance with the environment and centuries of experience with the natural world. That traditional knowledge needs to be shared with the scientists and policy makers in the U.S. and Canada.
- Failure to treat the natural world with care and respect robs our children of what should be theirs.
- De-evolution occurs when we take the biggest and healthiest of the fish (and other animals), leaving the smallest and weakest to survive. The top predators in the wild take only 10% of a species; humans take 60% of a species.
- Each tier of habitat has an influence upon another tier.

**Toxic Chemicals in the Biota of the Salish Sea:**

- Unexpected impacts of toxic chemicals on marine life include: contamination of the pelagic food web; emerging chemicals of concern (such as PBDEs) in marine mammals; endocrine disruption in fish; effects of copper exposure in fish; pre-spawn mortality of salmon in restored urban streams; effects of PAHs leading to development defects in herring embryo and larvae.
- They are here in abundance: estrogens and androgens, aneuploidy (excessive chromosomes), thyroid active agents (PBDEs), psychoactive drugs (SSRIs). Most sewage in the Puget Sound region is released, after secondary treatment, into the Sound.
- Transient whales have higher persistent organic pollutants (POP) due to their eating other marine mammals. West Coast whales have much higher levels of DDTs and PCBs. The “L” pod has higher ratios of POPs than the “J” pod because the “L” pod feeds more on the southern California coast than does the “J” pod.
- Copper is a common contaminant in surface waters; it comes from non-point sources such as the sloughing off from brake pads. It is a neurotoxin that affects the peripheral sensory systems of fish; it affects olfaction (sense of smell) and mutes the natural alarm behavior of fish. Instead of lying still and avoiding the predator, the copper-exposed fish keeps on moving and thus gets caught.

**Building...Ecosystem Indicators...:**

The indicators must be understood and communicated in a meaningful way to lots of people, and must tell a story that resonates. (Sustainable Seattle was possibly the first organization anywhere to suggest and produce indicators that measure the health of a defined area).

Three days of intense education led to the general conclusion that ecological systems are extremely complex. For example, protecting one species may have a dramatic impact on other species. Also, it is challenging to find ways to track and include the results of the many small-scale studies that need to be included in overall policy decision-making.

**Update: Funding Supreme Court Races**

**By Jean Carlson, LWWV Member**

HB 1738, a bill to establish a public financing option for campaigns for Washington State Supreme Court, with 32 House member sponsors, and SB 5912, its companion bill, with nine Senate sponsors, will not advance beyond committee this year.

HB 1738 did receive a work-session hearing in the House on March 5 in the State Government and Tribal Affairs Committee. This provided an opportunity to show the support that does exist among many organizations, including the League of Women Voters, to eventually establish such a program in Washington State.
The League of Women Voters of Seattle (LWVS) Social Justice Committee, chaired by Vanessa Power, sent the following recommendation to the LWVS Executive Committee and Board on February 16. At its March 7 meeting, the LWVS Board voted to accept the recommendation.

The Social Justice Committee recommends that the League of Women Voters of Seattle take action to endorse proposed City of Seattle Initiative 100.

Background: Initiative 100 arises in the context of the City of Seattle's plan to build a new jail. Currently, the King County Jail houses people convicted of misdemeanors in Seattle. According to the City of Seattle, Seattle and other local municipalities will lose their jail beds at the King County Jail at the end of the jail contract term (2012). The Social Justice Committee has heard conflicting information about the status of the contract. For example, the Committee has been informed that the County is open to extending the contract with the City of Seattle for several years.

Additional resource information can be found at:
Initiative 100: http://www.nonewjail.org/
North/East Cities Municipal Jail Planning: http://www.necmunicipaljail.org/resources.htm

Initiative 100: Initiative 100 is a City of Seattle Citizen's Initiative. The Initiative would require the City to conduct further study of plans to build a new jail, negotiate with King County to explore alternatives (including extending the current county jail contract), analyze ways to decrease incarceration rates, increasing public safety, analyze whether investment in social services will lower crime and arrest rates, and develop a strategy to address racial disparity in arrest and incarceration rates.

Supporters of the Initiative have until July 2009 to collect enough signatures to put the Initiative on the November ballot.

Relation to League Positions: Given the fact that the majority of people incarcerated for misdemeanor crimes in the City of Seattle are held on non-violent drug offenses, Initiative 100 is tied to numerous LWVS positions, including positions that relate to supporting people who are homeless or in need of community services.

- Support measures to develop and provide family, child and youth development programs to prevent delinquency and crime and/or recidivism.
- Support prevention and intervention programs to overcome the problems of violence, suicide, homelessness, and family dysfunction.
- Support local government programs for crime prevention and rehabilitation.
- Support measures to ensure communications between city officials, local government entities and the public so as to bring government closer to the people and make it more responsive to their needs.

Please be sure to share your League story with others and invite them to attend our forums. The upcoming April 2 forum on the National Popular Vote Compact holds broad appeal especially to new members.

Sponsors: The Initiative is sponsored by the League of Women Voters of Seattle!! Betty made a point of emphasizing the League's responsibility to educate its membership about nonpartisan issues. Donors

A very warm thank you to our members who have contributed to the League of Women Voters of Seattle (LWVS) by making a donation in addition to the payment of their dues or by renewing at a higher level. These are Ellen Barton, Peggy Tlapak, Nancy Smith, Wayne and Darris Martin, Dorothy Czy, Elizabeth Davis, Margaret Vance and Ruth Kap. Their additional contributions help to support the work of the League, including memberships for others at lower fees.

Our Numbers

The membership count for the LWVS is currently 813. We continue to grow steadily with the solicitation of new members by friends and family who are already engaged in League activities. This continues to be the best way to recruit our members. There has been a decline overall in membership as the League ages, now holding approximately 8% in the year 2004. The national League reported a drop of 8%, largely due to the aging population of its membership.

Please be sure to welcome Lily when you see her or hear her voice on the phone when you call the League office on Monday afternoons.

Get to Know League Dinner

Thank you to all who attended and helped with the new member dinner on March 5 at St. Andrews Lutheran Church in Bellevue. The room was full of League members, with delicious food to accompany our lively conversations. We also had six “new” faces at the dinner: Patricia de la Fuente, Sarah Ovens, Ruth Ann Saunders, Ruth Wernitz, Diana Pritkin and Rebecca Castillo. Please join me in welcoming them to the League of Women Voters of Seattle!!

Buffy Sullivan, President of the LWVS Education Fund, did a wonderful job of explaining the multi-tiered structure of the League and the role of the Education Fund. Betty made a point of emphasizing the League’s responsibility to educate its membership and the public at large. Nora Leech, LWVS Program Chair, was great in helping us to better understand and navigate the process of how programs or studies are adopted and forums are presented. We’ll see this in action at our annual meeting on May 21.

Several committee chairs and LWVS Board members were also present for the new members.
to speak with: Denise Smith, Jayne Freitag, Kooroomoon Adair, Allison Fehr, Maria Brusher, Patti Catalano, Lucy Gaskill-Gaddis, Karen Lahey, Anita Warmflash, Ellen Berg and Linnea Hirst.

Additional helping hands who assisted with the dinner or contributed to it were: Charlene McKenzie, Dorothy Swarts, Margaret Austin, Martha Jordan, Bonnie Rimawi, Dorris Martin, Laura Parma-Veigel, Marcia Brown, Mary Wolch and Alice Rasp.

If you were not able to attend the dinner and would like more information about the League, please contact me (Membership@seattlelwv.org or (206) 329-4848) and I’d be happy to talk with you. Our next dinner will be held October 1, 2009.

PASSAGES

We extend our condolences to member Nancy Dubeste, on the death of her husband, Etienne, on March 13.

SPEECH BY JOCelyn MARCHIoso TO THE LEAGUE OF WOMEN VOTERS OF WASHINGTON STATE CONVENTION, 1973

Read by Denise Smith at the League's Birthday Party on February 27.

...I am Jocelyn Marchisio, member of the League of Women Voters of Lake Washington East. It has been my pleasure and satisfaction to be the state president of the League of Women Voters the past four years (1969-1973).

By this time I should have accumulated many words of wisdom to expend to you. Instead it was a multitude of emotions that were aroused in me as I prepared myself for the opening of this 23rd State Convention of the League of Women Voters tonight.

Looking back over the past ten years, the period that I have served on the state board, I am overwhelmed by a feeling of great pride in the realization that the League of Women Voters has effectively expanded its role in the political life of our state.

The theme of this Convention articulates a goal for all responsible individuals who wish to be good citizens. It is an important goal for responsible organizations as well.

What does expanding the political participation of an organization mean? It means devoting more time, spending more money, giving more thought to actively affecting public decision-making. Each year the League of Women Voters at all levels has spent more of its time, more of its money, more of its women-power in active political participation and has used all forms of action to do so. We have used litigation – as early as 1962 in the redistricting case and as recently as today as an intervener for the defense in the case involving Initiative 276. We have used legislative lobbying. More hours are spent representing the League in Olympia each year, and more Board members have assumed the lobbying responsibilities.

The League has vigorously undertaken ballot issues campaigns. Last fall a position was taken on 16 of the 24 state ballot measures. Yes, the League has played an ever more visible role in mobilizing the community support necessary to achieve the improvement in government and society reflected in Program positions. Some have been quick to attain. Who among us, for example, would have thought when the Program item, Status of Women in Washington State, was adopted just two short years ago by the Convention in Bellingham, that by the time we assembled together again this year in Richland we would already have participated in a vigorous campaign for women’s rights culminating in an Equal Rights Amendment to our state Constitution and that our state would be among those that have ratified the federal ERA? A controversy of review would no doubt show that that study, consensus and action proved to be somewhat of a record!

As you know, not all of our positions are fulfilled so promptly. We continue to pursue measures to secure equal rights in other areas and at all levels of government. We continue to take part in efforts to reform the tax structure. Our continuing concern for new methods to redistrict the state reflects our long established belief in equal representation. Our striving for fairness in the political system has led us to support Initiative 276, the result of a consensus for disclosure of campaign financing agreed upon ten years ago. Who at that time could have foreseen the events of today? The formation of the Coalition for Open Government, the campaign for Initiative 276, the strongest law of its kind in the nation, and now the effort to protect it in court all testify to the determination of our League to make the vote, not money, the basic instrument of decision-making in our state and to the expanded political activity with which the League pursues its goals.

We have also found and used new and better ways to serve the voters of the state. We expanded informational services by manning a toll-free telephone “hotline” in the Secretary of State’s office before the 1972 general election. Voters from all over the state called in questions on the 24 ballot issues, registration and voting. Over 6,600 calls were received from the average citizen, radio and newspaper people and college professors. One even put the hotline operator on his phone loudspeaker to answer questions from the entire class! You may have noticed that callers asking for speakers were referred to their nearest League. Last fall our ballot issues booklet was a best-seller.

It is no wonder that today more and more frequently decision-makers call upon the League of Women Voters for help. It is no wonder that today more and more frequently decision-makers call upon the League of Women Voters for help. Yes, the League has expanded its political activities noticeably.

But what of our future? Can the League continue to increase its rate of political participation? The information explosion and the communications revolution of recent years have made some of our methods and techniques less effective. We have not as yet found a way to raise the amount of money we could use. Nevertheless I find myself contemplating the future with enthusiastic anticipation. We will rise to the challenge. We must respond to the information explosion by taking advantage of better communications techniques. Perhaps a very professionally produced state League magazine might be the answer. It might even be made self-supporting by including advertising. The day may come when discussions will be held by means of closed circuit television – it was at the Convention in Longview you will recall that William Boyd, executive director of the National Municipal League predicted just such a technological advance. New methods to discover consensus are already available. The Fast Forum technique has been tried in several cities in the Puget Sound region. We must remain alert to all innovative possibilities.

If we are going to bring about change, we have to make some changes ourselves. Adopt new strategies and techniques, seek out new allies and coalitions. Learn to roll with the political punches and mix equal parts of flexibility and fervor in our plans.

But there is another role for the League to play in expanding political participation. It is not a new role, for we have always encouraged our members to be politically active. But perhaps it is time to adopt a definite policy of encouraging political office-seeking.

The League is uniquely qualified to expand this role by virtue of the kind of quality organization
Now more than ever we need participation in and preserve our government. Much more than ever, the League of Women Voters not only has a job to do but offers each and every one of us a practical and tangible way to act on our beliefs in democracy. As League members you have learned about the system – that it can be changed, that individuals can make things happen, that old ways of doing things can give way to new ideas.

I am sure that expanding your own political participation represents a personal goal of each and every one of you. Each of you, in one way or another, has already made that commitment. Otherwise you would not have made the League your organization.

So I know that you will understand the gratitude that I feel for the opportunity to expand my own individual participation through League activity. It has made whatever I have done possible and immeasurably more effective. For that, as I said, I am very grateful.

There are many examples of Washington League members described in the display in the hall who have done exactly this and have proved the truth of what I say. There could and should be many more.

Sometimes it seems that we are too content to display our knowledge and our know-how and then sit back and let the final step of decision-making fall to others quite often far less competent. We must encourage members to take that final big step. We must become decision-makers. We must run for office.

Viewing the League as an agency and a recommendation for seeking political office would probably result in more turnover in League leadership it is true, but it would also attract to the League the new woman, the liberated woman whose goal is to enter the political arena.
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April Program: National Popular Vote Compact

National Popular Vote Consensus Questions

Amending the Constitution
1. Which statement best reflects the consensus of the group? Select one.
   a. Action to alter a basic element of the Constitutional framework, which is achievable by amendment to the Constitution, should be accomplished by amendment to the Constitution.
   b. Action by states through a compact process is an acceptable way to alter the method for electing the President and Vice-President.
   c. The group could not reach consensus.
2. Which statement best reflects the consensus of the group? Select one.
   a. Because a compact has never before been used to address a fundamental constitutional issue such as voting, the chance that it might set a precedent for the future leads to the conclusion that it is better that the League continue to work for an amendment to the Constitution to establish the direct popular election of the President and the abolition of the Electoral College.
   b. Despite the novelty of the use of the compact approach to address a fundamental constitutional issue such as voting, the League should support the NPV Compact as a way of achieving an important goal.
   c. The group could not reach consensus.

Congressional Consent
3. Which statement best reflects the consensus of the group? Select one.
   a. The possibility that the NPV Compact will require congressional consent is not of sufficient concern to block the implementation of the plan.
   b. The possibility that the NPV Compact will require congressional consent is sufficient to conclude that the plan should not be implemented without obtaining such consent.
   c. The group could not reach consensus.

Enforcement
   a. The NPV Compact contains sufficient enforcement provisions to assure smooth operation of the plan.
   b. Although it is not possible to determine whether the enforcement provisions will be sufficient to assure smooth operation of the plan, the plan should be passed anyway.
   c. Enforcement of the plan is likely to add uncertainty and bring the courts into the presidential election in ways that raise substantial concerns.
   d. The lack of adequate enforcement provisions is sufficient to conclude that the NPV is not a viable plan.
   e. The group could not reach consensus.
**SELECTION OF THE PRESIDENT**

**The League’s History**

A League study of the presidential electoral process culminated in its 1970 position supporting direct election of the President by popular vote as an essential element of representative government. The League also has supported national voting qualifications and procedures for presidential elections to ensure equity for voters from all states and to facilitate the electoral process.

At the 2002 Convention, the League voted to expand and update its position. The League can to finality on a new position in June 2004. The new position takes into account the entire presidential selection process and supports a process that produces the best possible candidates informed voters and optimum voter participation.

At the 2008 Convention, the delegates voted to adopt a new study, "The Advisability of Using the National Popular Vote Compact among the States as a Method for Electing the President."

**The League’s Position**

Statement of Position on Selection of the President, as Announced by the National Board, January 1970, Revised March 1982 and Updated June 2004:

The League of Women Voters of the United States believes that the direct-popular-vote method for electing the President and Vice-President is essential to representative government. The League of Women Voters believes, therefore, that the Electoral College should be abolished. The League also supports uniform voting qualifications and procedures for presidential elections. The League supports changes in the presidential election system – from the candidate selection process to the general election. We support efforts to provide voters with sufficient information about candidates and their positions, public policy issues and the selection process itself. The League supports action to ensure that the media, political parties, candidates, and all levels of government achieve these goals and provide that information.

**Explanation of the Position**

The League strongly believes that the Electoral College should be abolished and not merely "reformed." One “reform” which the League specifically rejects is the voting by electorate on proportional representation in lieu of the present “winner-takes-all” method. Such a system would apportion the electoral votes of a state based on the popular vote in that state. Instead of making the Electoral College more representative, such proportional voting would increase the chance that no candidate would receive a majority in the Electoral College, thereby sending it election of the President to the House of Representatives where each state, regardless of population, would receive only one vote. Election of the President by the House further removes the decision from the people and is contrary to the “one person, one vote” principle. The League also does not support reform of the Electoral College on a state-by-state basis because the League believes there should be uniformity across the nation in the systems used to elect the President.

**The Electoral College - A Review**

Although the LWVUS has specifically adopted a position calling for the abolition of the Electoral College, a short review of the mechanics of that system of Selection of the President is helpful to an understanding of the National Popular Vote Compact.

The Electoral College is a process established by the founding fathers as a compromise between election of the President by Congress and election by popular vote. In short, the people of the United States vote for electors who then vote for the President and Vice President.

Each state is entitled to a number of presidential electors equal to its total representation in the House and Senate. The District of Columbia is awarded a number of electors equal to that of the least populous state.

The founding fathers designed this constitutional plan to promote several principles they considered important. One goal was to ensure that smaller states had a role in the election of the President. Secondly, the emphasis on the power of the state as contrasted to the power of the individual voter fostered the principles of federalism which are the core of the governmental process. Finally, the use of electors rather than popular vote assuaged concerns that the electorate was not competent or knowledgeable enough to be entrusted with the direct election of important government officials, such as the President and Vice President.

The electors are selected, according to the Constitution, in the “manner” designated by the state's “legislature” (the Congress in the case of the District). At present, the “manner” chosen by every state is by popular election. Most of the states (and the District of Columbia) use a winner-take-all system, in which the candidate who receives a majority of the vote, or a plurality of the popular vote (less than 50 percent but more than any other candidate) takes all of the State's electoral votes. In Maine and Nebraska, the winner of the popular vote in each congressional district wins an elector, and the remaining two electors are chosen based on the statewide vote.

On Election Day, the voters cast their ballots for electors, even though the names of the candidates for President and Vice President are often the names shown on the ballot. Each state's electors meet forty days after Election Day, and the formal balloting for president and vice president takes place at those meetings.

Many different proposals to alter the presidential election process by amending the Constitution, including direct nation-wide election by the people, have been offered over the years. None have been passed by Congress and sent to the States for ratification. Under the most common method for amending the Constitution, an amendment must be proposed by a two-thirds majority in both houses of Congress and ratified by three-fourths of the states.

**The Movement against the Electoral College**

The most compelling argument against the Electoral College is that it prevents the direct election of the President by popular vote and is, therefore, contrary to modern principles of representative government. Studies show that more than 70 percent of American citizens favor the election of the President by popular vote.
Beyond this basic theoretical objection is the very practical objection that the Electoral College system enables candidates who have not received the most votes cast by American voters to become President.

We have seen such an outcome four times in our history. The first time was the 1824 election which was won by John Q. Adams even though he received fewer electoral votes and fewer popular votes than Andrew Jackson. (Adams won the election in the House of Representatives, with 13 State delegations voting for him, seven voting for Jackson and three voting for Crawford. This happened because there were more than two viable candidates, and would have been a less likely outcome in a two candidate race.)

In 1876, Rutherford B. Hayes beat Samuel J. Tilden by one electoral vote, becoming President despite trailing in the popular vote by a count of 4,288,546 to 4,034,311. In 1888, Benjamin Harrison beat Grover Cleveland with an electoral vote of 233 to 168, despite Cleveland’s popular vote margin of 5,334,488 to 5,443,892. Most recently, in the 2000 presidential election, George W. Bush received fewer popular votes than Albert Gore, Jr., but received a majority of electoral votes. The situation was almost reversed in 2004. Although President Bush received more than three million more popular votes than John Kerry, Kerry would have been elected President if Ohio’s electoral votes had been cast in his favor.

These circumstances have prompted much discussion on the advisability and feasibility of reforming our election process to eliminate the Electoral College and to elect the President by direct election. This conversation is not new. Over the past 200 years, according to the National Archives, more than 700 proposals have been introduced in Congress to eliminate the Electoral College. Indeed, several joint resolutions were introduced in the current Congress on this issue. The proposals, all introduced in the House of Representatives, were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, where no action has been taken.

Against this background comes the National Popular Vote Compact Proposal (NPV).

The National Popular Vote Compact Proposal

The National Popular Vote Compact proposal offers a method of achieving the result of election of the President by popular vote without amending the Constitution to eliminate the Electoral College. Instead, this method uses the mechanism of the Electoral College to ensure that the candidate who receives the most popular votes is elected President of the United States.

Under the proposed legislation to enact the National Popular Vote Compact, all of the state’s electoral votes would be awarded to the presidential candidate who receives the most popular votes in all 50 states and the District of Columbia. The bill would take effect only when it has been enacted by states collectively possessing a majority of the 20 electoral votes required to activate the NPV Compact. NPV Compact bills have been introduced in 13 other states, where some have passed committee and others have passed one house. As of September 1, 2008, the legislation necessary to activate the compact has been signed into law in four states: Maryland, New Jersey, Hawaii and Illinois, for a total of 50 of the 20 electoral votes. (At 20-vote threshold also corresponds essentially to states collectively possessing a majority of the electoral votes. The 270-vote threshold also corresponds essentially to states representing a majority of the people of the United States. As a result, every vote in all 50 states and the District of Columbia would be equally important in presidential elections.

The compact contains a six-month blackout period during which no state can withdraw from the compact. The blackout period starts on July 20 of each presidential election year and runs through the January 20 inauguration. Interstate compacts are contracts. It is settled law and settled constitutional law that withdrawal restrictions—very common in interstate compacts—are enforceable because the U.S. Constitution prohibits a state from impairing any obligation of contract.

The legislation contains other procedural provisions that would ensure the smooth functioning of the agreement. For example, one clause addresses the possibility of a tie in the national popular vote. If there is no national popular vote winner, each state chooses the electors for the candidate who has won that state.

Another clause addresses circumstances in which the winner of the national popular vote might be prevented from receiving the electoral votes as a member state. For example, it is possible that the winner of the national popular vote fails to appear as a candidate in a particular state and, therefore, there are no appropriate electors for the state to certify. To address that situation and five other situations identified by the drafters of the legislation as possible anomalies in the process they have developed, a mechanism is provided whereby the desired result is obtained by allowing the presidential candidate who has received the largest number of votes in the national election to select the electors in the state in which no electors associated with the winning slate have been elected. The full text of the compact is available at www.nvp.org.

Current Status of the National Popular Vote Compact

Since passage of the National Popular Vote Compact is accomplished on a state-by-state basis, its status is fluid. As of September 1, 2008, the legislation necessary to activate the compact has been signed into law in four states: Maryland, New Jersey, Hawaii and Illinois, for a total of 50 of the 270 electoral votes required to activate the NPV Compact. NPV Compact bills have been introduced in 15 other states, where some have passed committee and others have passed one house.

*Portions of this background paper are from the LWVUS Impact on Issues, 2006-2008
2008-2009 LWVUS Study – National Popular Vote

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1. Constitutional Issues</th>
<th>Supporters Say:</th>
<th>Note</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Constitutional Power</td>
<td>Constitutional amendment to eliminate Electoral College (EC) would accomplish goal of electing president by popular vote, but it is a very long, difficult process with uncertain results. Over 70% of population favors direct election for president. NPVC would be a more rapid, direct path to direct vote and would be in interest of the electorate.</td>
<td>League already has position to support a national direct vote. Question of study is whether to adopt NPVC to accomplish this direct vote.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political Compacts</td>
<td>Opponents say political compact - one that tends to enlarge political power of compact states at expense of other federal govt or non-conforming states - may function differently from other types of interstate compacts (boundaries/economics).</td>
<td>Interstate Compacts are Legitimate – involving myriad of topics. They have long been a part of U.S. history &amp; are sanctioned by Constitution. Over the years, courts have upheld such compacts &amp; ruled that they bind parties to terms of agreement.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Congressional Approval</td>
<td>Constitutionally, political compacts are permitted between states, but require congressional approval. Specific Clause – any change creating shift in political power requires consent. Without congressional consent the NPVC Compact may not be enforceable. [Approval not always sought for previous compacts, and 4 early state compacts have not sought approval.] Senators could balk if perceive NPVC as disenfranchising portion of their state constituency. While Supreme Court declined to hear cases regarding method of appointing electors; there is no assurance for future.</td>
<td>Supreme Court rulings have established most compacts do not require congressional approval. However, to avoid time-consuming litigation on this procedural issue, backer's have decided to seek congressional consent. In deference to exclusive power of states to decide manner of awarding electoral votes, the question might be presented to Congress in form of a bill to grant consent to Compact on behalf of District of Columbia. Proponents believe that positive action on this legislation would imply tacit congressional consent to NPVC as a whole.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Compacting States</td>
<td>Opponents say that electors from states not part of the Compact would have little influence on selection of the President. Interests of states which have not signed the Compact could be greatly diminished.</td>
<td>Voters in non-compacting states will have their votes counted equally to everyone else in the country. All votes will be equal (compacting or non-compacting state).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constitutional Protections</td>
<td>U.S. Constitution protects all states in electoral process. NPVC Compact could shift political power between states that are not party to Compact. Whether there is good broad geographic base for Compact not clear until we know which states enter the compact.</td>
<td>No constitutional amendment needed to implement NPVC Compact. Under Constitution, states already have right &amp; power to implement the change. Supreme Court cases have established that apportioning gives exclusive &amp; complete power of appointment of electors to states- up to each state to decide how power is exercised, as they deem fit (considering no other provisions are violated).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. Evaluating Fairness

| Support for Winner State's Identity & Rights | Voters supporting candidate who wins their state want their electors to support that choice. EC disenfranchises voters, but NPVC Compact could disenfranchise the majority of a state's voters as national winner is not necessarily candidate who wins votes within their own state. | Voters assume candidate with most votes wins an election. When "Victor" actually receives fewer votes, people question system. It is unnerving to electorate when a country supposedly based on majority rule ends up with a "minority" president. Problem eliminated under NPVC Compact. Elected by popular majority makes "stronger" presidents with greater democratic legitimacy. Direct vote nationwide gives equal weight to each vote. Question is whether it is more important for winner in particular state to receive state's electoral votes or for winner of entire country to be selected as president. States' rights advocates argue former, but this assumes that voters within state care more about their state identity than their own personal vote. Public polls indicate that only about 20% support current system of awarding electors; 70% oppose current system, 10% undecided. |
| Battleground States       | With NPVC, Candidates would tend to campaign primarily in areas of dense population. The concerns of sparsely populated rural areas would be ignored as candidates speak to issues resonating with urban populations. | Under current EC system, campaigns intensely focus on a few key states which determine victory or loss. Voters in other "safe" states become observers only, except as funding sources to fuel campaigns in toss-up states. This means some votes are worth more than others. Under NPVC candidates have to be sensitive to all states, bringing more voters directly into the electoral process versus spectator rank. Voters across country would have sense that their vote would count-providing greater interest & attention to campaign/governance. |

Influence of Winner

| 11 largest states together have the 270 electoral votes; they could determine outcome of election (after individual votes around nation are counted) | "Collusion" among all the large states is extremely unlikely as they have little in common politically. * NPVC support has been across-the-board so far history has been sanctioned by both parties. | First 4 sig. states vary in size. (*See list in "p.r.p."

The Approach

| Some opponents simply think it inappropriate or unfair to take an approach that avoids the amendment process - a "work-around" the Constitution state by state. | Opponents portraying approach of interstate compact as inappropriate & disregarding U.S. Constitution ignore fact that many amendments have begun as state actions. Included in these: the very right to vote for president; abolition of property holders requirements for voters; voting extension to women, blacks and persons under 21. [ERA not yet passed.] All were begun by state legislation, followed by constitutional amendment. Few called it an "end-run" or questioned motive of supporters. |
Small States

Since there would be more "votes" in the more populous states, candidates would give more attention to the larger states. Electoral College protects small states.

Political power of small states would be increased (not decreased) under NPV. Currently few of the 22 least populous states cast votes that can tip the election. Under NPV each vote is important regardless of state or state size. Closeness of race within state is less relevant.

Argument exits whether the EC does or does NOT protect small states.

2. Mechanical Issues

Enforcement

Enforcement methods unclear; might mean lawsuit against non-complying states. Compact might be unenforceable with potential to disrupt EC procedures.

Timing Unclear what authority, if any, could force a state pulling out during "blackout period" to return or how long this might take. Other NPV Compact provisions suspend the rules of Compact & return to EC if another state pulls out too close to the election – this could cause disruption.

Drafters of NPVC have anticipated problems (such as a state legislature, for partisan reasons and after signing onto NPVC, changing rules for awarding electoral votes—after people have voted, but before EC meets). There is a mechanism which permits a state to withdraw from Compact, but only according to timetable (prohibited July 20th until January 20th during elections). During this time a compacting state cannot withdraw or repeal its law. Case law supports enforcement of such a provision holding that interstate compacts are contracts binding parties to agreement. Further, Americans are committed to notion of fair-play and would react strongly to efforts by one state to "break the rules."

Black out time frame includes dates of 6 major events relating to presidential, election (national conventions, campaign period, Election Day, Meeting of EC, counting of electoral votes, Inauguration Day).

Close Elections

"Real vs Wrong" winners

No matter the nationwide vote, the requirement for majority of votes (270) in EC helps establish legitimacy for president in very close election.

With landslide election there is less chance of a "wrong winner," but the more divided the country, closer the elections (greater chance of "wrong winner" where candidate with fewer popular votes wins office). We now appear to be in an era where many elections are close. NPVC would eliminate the possibility of a "wrong winner."

Changing 'winner-take-all' rules can be done as originally adopted, enacting state laws. NPVC does not address that. What NPVC does do is give nation a president elected with most votes nationwide.

"Wrong winners" have been elected 4 times in US history. Neither NPV nor EC require majority win – such as could be seen in runoffs or with Ranked Choice Voting

Winning Levels

Plurality

NPV does not improve on current system by requiring majority win.

Recounts

NPV Compact contains no authority to carry out recount in close election and must rely on state's current procedures, could delay final result nationwide. Compacting state can sue other to do recount, but can non-compacting?

Drafters anticipate that need for recount (or certain close state recount) will diminish under NPV as count can be close in battleground states, but numbers are not that close on nationwide basis. Should it be necessary, plans & resources still responsibility of individual states, but larger pool makes this less likely.

Election Fraud / Voter Suppression

Fraud investigations at national level would be more difficult when an election is to be decided by national popular vote totals (NPV or otherwise).

Adoption of NPVC Compact may diminish problem. Currently, with only few battleground states in play, temptation increased by skewed weight of votes in battleground states. Under direct vote (NPV) nationwide, one fraudulent vote has far less effect on outcome and massive fraud more difficult.

4. Other Issues

Pre-clearance

Voting Rights Act

For preclearance states (and areas) "any voting qualification or prerequisite to voting, or standard practice, or procedure with respect to voting" must be approved ahead of adoption. Compact could be challenged.

NPV Compact is in total harmony with terms & purpose of VRA – enabled to guarantee equality of vote throughout US. NPV goal is to create an equal vote for all voters throughout U.S.

Faithless Electors

Doubtful, but opponents fear that with NPVC Compact some electors might feel an injustice would occur to their home state if they cast their vote for national winner and thus may be tempted to vote Compact.

NPV Compact more likely to protect faithless electors than does EC – faithless electors not a very practical concern. Considering support winner would need to garner nationwide win, candidate would probably earn at least another half of remaining votes in non-compacting states as well – such strong support would discourage faithless electors. Also, state electors casting votes will be from party that won nationwide

Of 21,979 electoral votes cast in presidential election from 1789 to 2004, only 11 were surprise "grand standing" after election. Only 1 (1,796) cast in hopes of changing election.

5. League issues

Uniform Standards

THE LWVUS supports uniform standards for all elections. While current EC system is also not uniform (Maine & Nebraska), neither is NPV Compact.

NPV Compact aims to have all states become members of compact, thus sharing goal of uniform & universal method of presidential election. The fact that Compact will become effective when states representing 270 electoral votes have joined does not change ultimate goal. Most importantly, NPV creates uniform standards because EVERY national vote would be counted equally.

While U.S. is a democratic-republic not a direct democracy, LWVUS supports direct election of the president. One person = one vote – for one seat. League rejects arguments for federalism over those for individual voters' rights in this matter. We have held position for over 30 years, nothing before has been as practical and possible as the NPV compact.

Chart prepared with posted materials by Barbara Klein, committee member on NPV study 2008-2009
National Popular Vote Compact Suggested Resource List


(continued from Cover article)
Unit Meetings

Unit leaders | Email | Phone | Time | Host | Host Phone
--- | --- | --- | --- | --- | ---
**Monday, April 6, 2009**
Issaquah Evening<br>Ann Thornton | apheaarn@iaoi.com | 6:30 p.m. | King Co. Library System Service Center<br>960 Newport Way NW, Issaquah
Southide<br>Sam Scharr | webcats@speakeasy.net | 7:30 p.m. | Lila Bulen<br>3716 Cascadia Ave. S
**Wednesday, April 8, 2009**
Vew Rose<br>Gail Winberg | winbergeng@comcast.net | 12:45 p.m. | Elaine Birn<br>7033 42nd NE
Magnolia/Queen Anne/Ballard Eve<br>Bettina Holster | glencot1985@aoi.com | 7:30 p.m. | Eileen Bleeker<br>737 Mary Ave. NW
**Thursday, April 9, 2009**
North Central<br>Jan Orlando | orlan98@aoi.com | 7:30 p.m. | Annette Holcomb<br>6047 25th Ave NE
Mercer Island<br>Martha Jordan | marthy4w@yahoo.com | 9:15 a.m. | Mercer Island Presbyterian Church<br>3605 84th Ave SE, Mercer Island
Shoreline<br>Juliette | juliette@windermere.com | 4:30 p.m. | Richmond Beach Congregational Church<br>NW 195th St and 15th Ave NW
University House – Willingsford<br>Mary-Struck<br>Marilyn Paulson | marpaulsoncomai.com | 10:00 a.m. | University House<br>4400 Stone Way N
**Wednesday, April 15, 2009**
Kirkland/Roochie<br>Patti Catalano | pattimusic@comcast.net | 7:00 p.m. | Starbucks Houghton<br>6733 108th Ave NE, Kirkland
Fist Hui<br>Jeannette Kahlenberg kahlenb@gmail.com | 10:00 a.m. | Mary Margaret Pruitt (206)382-3785<br>Horizon House, 900 University St. Sky Lounge
**Tuesday, April 14, 2009**
Bellevue<br>Bonnie Rimawi | bonnierim@aoi.com | 10:00 a.m. | Bellevue Library<br>Room 6
**Wednesday, April 15, 2009**
North King County (Lake Forest Park) - NEW!!!<br>Judy Bevington | gbevington@eskimocom | 10:00 a.m. | Lake Forest Park Third Place Books<br>17711 NE Bothell Way
**Saturday, April 18, 2009**
Ballard/Queen Anne/Magnolia Day (Potluck Lunch Following Meeting)<br>Joan Peterson | dsgerst@comcast.net | 10:00 a.m. | Joan Peterson<br>3537 Dibble Ave. NW
**Thursday, April 23, 2009**
ISSQUAH<br>Margaret Austin | margaret.austincomai.com | 10:00 a.m. | Issaquah City Hall & Police<br>130 E Sunset Way - Coho Room (upstairs)
Jocelyn Marchisio | jocelyn@marshisio.com

---

Board & Committee Contacts

**Term** | **Executive Committee** | **President** | **Committee Chair** | **Phone**
--- | --- | --- | ---
2008–2009 | Denise D. Smith | president@seattlelwv.org
2009–2010 | *1st VP Membership* Kirtly Mahon | membership@seattlelwv.org
2009–2010 | 2nd VP Program Nora Leech | nleech2002@yahoo.com
2009–2010 | 3rd VP Voter Service Sarah Luftens | voterservice@seattlelwv.org
2007–2009 | 4th VP, Action Jayne Freitag-Koontz | jfkoontz@comcast.net
2008–2009 | Secretary Karen Adair | adairk@seanet.com
2008–2010 | Treasurer Allison Feher | treasurer@seattlelwv.org

**Term** | **Directors** | **Off-Board Positions** | **CIS Coordinator** | **Term/Position** | **Phone**
--- | --- | --- | --- | --- | ---
2008–2010 | Maria Brusher | Outreach | | |
2007–2009 | Unit Coordinator | | Patricia Carano | |
2007–2009 | Voter Editor | | Beatrice Crane | |
2007–2008 | Civic Education Coordinator | | Jaclyn Wall | |
2007–2009 | Observer Corps Coordinator | | Anita Warmflash | |
2008–2009 | Director | | Christal Wood | |

**Term** | **Education Fund Board** | **President** | **Term** | **Phone**
--- | --- | --- | --- | ---
2008–2009 | Jerry Sullivan | | |
2008–2010 | Dorothy Y. Sale | | |
2007–2009 | Lisa Peterson | | |
2008–2010 | Lucy Gaskill-Gaddis | | |

**Term** | **Board & Committee Contacts** | **President** | **Term** | **Phone**
--- | --- | --- | --- | ---
2007–2009 | Nora Leech | | |
2007–2008 | Vanessa Soriano Power | | |
2008–2009 | Annette Holcomb | | |
2008–2009 | Barbara Reid | | |
2008–2009 | Ellen Berg | | |
2008–2010 | Karen Kane | | |
2008–2009 | Linnea Hirst | | |
2008–2009 | Linda Brown | | |
2008–2010 | Nora Leech | | |

* Indicates LWVS Board Representative on the Education Fund Board

---

**Term** | **Committees** | **Chair** | **Term/Position** | **Phone**
--- | --- | --- | --- | ---
2008–2009 | Civics Education | Jacyln Wall | | speakingstrategies@hotmail.com
2008–2009 | Economics & Taxation | Nora Leech | | nleech2002@yahoo.com
2008–2009 | Education | Lucy Gaskill-Gaddis | | terrylucy2u@comcast.net
2008–2009 | Social Justice Committee | Vanessa Soriano Power | | vanessa.power@gmail.com
2008–2009 | Immigration Study Co-chair | Annette Holcomb | | anholc@earthlink.net
2008–2009 | Immigration Study Co-chair | Barbara Reid | | barbereid@yahoo.com
2008–2009 | International Relations | Ellen Berg | | ellenberg@gmx.com
2008–2009 | Land Use | Karen Kane | | kanekane@openwave.net
2008–2009 | Transportation | Linnea Hirst | |
2008–2009 | Port Study | Linda Brown | | brownlj@comcast.net
2008–2009 | Privatization Study | Nora Leech | | nleech2002@yahoo.com

**Term** | **Off-Board Positions** | **Chair** | **Term/Position** | **Phone**
--- | --- | --- | --- | ---
2008–2009 | Cynthia Lowe | | |
2008–2009 | Victoria Bennett | | |
2008–2009 | Karen Lahay | | |
2008–2009 | Karen Lahay | | |

---

**Term** | **Term Directors** | **Committee Chair** | **Term/Position** | **Phone**
--- | --- | --- | --- | ---
2008–2009 | Nora Leech | | |
2008–2009 | Nora Leech | | |
2008–2009 | Nora Leech | | |
2008–2009 | Nora Leech | | |
APRIL FORUM

National Popular Vote Compact

Panel Discussion:
Hugh Spitzer, J.D.
Mark Smith, Ph. D.
Rep. Roger Goodman

☞ Thursday, April 2, 2009 ☞
7:30-9:00 p.m.
Briefing for discussion leaders at 6:30 p.m.

Location:
Seattle First Baptist Church
1111 Harvard Avenue (Harvard & Seneca)
All forums are free and open to the public.