

Alexander S. Belenky

Who Will Be the Next President?

A Guide to the U.S. Presidential Election
System

Second Edition

OPEN

 Springer

Who Will Be the Next President?

A Guide to the U.S. Presidential Election System

Alexander S. Belenky

Who Will Be the Next President?

A Guide to the U.S. Presidential
Election System

Second Edition

OPEN

 Springer

Alexander S. Belenky
Department of Mathematics
Faculty of Economic Sciences
International Laboratory of Decision Choice
and Analysis
National Research University Higher School
of Economics
Moscow
Russia

and

Institute for Data, Systems, and Society
Massachusetts Institute of Technology
Cambridge, MA
USA

ISBN 978-3-319-44695-0 ISBN 978-3-319-44696-7 (eBook)
DOI 10.1007/978-3-319-44696-7

Library of Congress Control Number: 2012947857

© The Editor(s) (if applicable) and The Author(s) 2013, 2016. This book is published Open Access.
Open Access This book is distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>), which permits use, duplication, adaptation, distribution and reproduction in any medium or format, as long as you give appropriate credit to the original author(s) and the source, provide a link to the Creative Commons license and indicate if changes were made.

The images or other third party material in this book are included in the work's Creative Commons license, unless indicated otherwise in the credit line; if such material is not included in the work's Creative Commons license and the respective action is not permitted by statutory regulation, users will need to obtain permission from the license holder to duplicate, adapt or reproduce the material.

The use of general descriptive names, registered names, trademarks, service marks, etc. in this publication does not imply, even in the absence of a specific statement, that such names are exempt from the relevant protective laws and regulations and therefore free for general use.

The publisher, the authors and the editors are safe to assume that the advice and information in this book are believed to be true and accurate at the date of publication. Neither the publisher nor the authors or the editors give a warranty, express or implied, with respect to the material contained herein or for any errors or omissions that may have been made.

Printed on acid-free paper

This Springer imprint is published by Springer Nature
The registered company is Springer International Publishing AG
The registered company address is: Gewerbestrasse 11, 6330 Cham, Switzerland

To the memory of my parents,

Sofia M. Belenkaya and Solomon Y. Belenki

Preface to the Second Edition

The idea underlying the publication of the second edition of this book is to make an introductory guide to the U.S. presidential election system available to anyone via the Internet *free of charge*.

From the author's viewpoint, this system deserves to be understood by both its supporters and opponents in the U.S. though its underlying ideas, basic principles, and features may interest a curious individual in any country. This unique system, however, is not easy to understand in depth. Yet the understanding by American voters of how this system works, and what strategic opportunities it provides to competing presidential candidates affects the outcome of every election. To outline and to explain these opportunities, the author undertook an attempt to offer an introductory guide to this system, which was published by Springer in 2013.

The first edition of this guide contains a description and an explanation of the above-mentioned underlying ideas, basic principles, and features of the existing presidential election system. In addition, it presents a brief description of how these opportunities can be used by teams of competing presidential candidates in both strategizing and conducting the election campaigns. Finally, it offers a brief description of four proposals to change this system, which have drawn some attention.

In the first edition of the book, the author proposed a modified presidential election system based on the new idea of how to change the existing one. This modified election system would keep the existing Electoral College-based system only as a back-up while giving a chance to elect a President who is preferred by both the nation as a whole and the states as equal members of the Union. The proposed system treats the will of the nation and the will of the states equally, which reflects the underlying ideas of the Founding Fathers in developing the structure of Congress and the way it is to pass every bill.

The second edition of the book corrects the misprints noticed, clarifies several sentences from the first edition, recomposes the text of Sect. 3.2, and presents a few new examples and comments. Also, it adds to the Conclusion a brief description of (a) fundamental merits, (b) particular deficiencies embedded in the system via the Constitution, and (c) some urgent problems of this system as the author views them.

Finally, it offers a new topic on the election system to discuss. This topic deals with national televised presidential debates. It covers current requirements for presidential candidates to participate in the debates, and what the candidates from both established non-major political parties and independent ones need to demonstrate to meet these requirements. In addition, it includes a new proposal on how to organize and hold televised presidential debates that would allow all these candidates to participate.

The rest of the second edition of the book reproduces the first edition.

The author expresses his deep appreciation to Springer for supporting the idea to make the text of the book available via the Springer web site free of charge. Also, the author would like to express his deep appreciation to the sponsors of this edition of the book, who share the author's position that knowledge about the U.S. presidential election system should be made accessible for free to all interested individuals, especially to all Americans.

Boston, Massachusetts
July 2016

Alexander S. Belenky

Preface to the First Edition

If the title of this book has caught your eye, spend a couple of minutes to look at the following list of statements relevant to American presidential elections:

1. The system for electing a President was not designed to reflect the popular will.
2. The current election system does not follow some major ideas of the Founding Fathers.
3. The application of some election rules can make the intervention of the Supreme Court in the election process almost inevitable.
4. Amendment 12 of the Constitution contains at least seven puzzles relating to presidential elections, and the answers to these puzzles have remained unknown for more than 200 years.
5. The text of Article 2 of the Constitution contains a statement that is mathematically incorrect.
6. Skillful use of the election system may elect a President with less than 20 % of the popular support.
7. Applying some election rules may cause a constitutional crisis in the country.
8. Votes cast by voters in a presidential election in November of the election year are not votes for President or for Vice President.
9. The “winner-take-all” method for awarding state electoral votes can be used to encourage presidential candidates to fight for each and every vote in a state and in D.C.
10. Many statements about the Electoral College mechanism are no more than myths of their authors, no matter how plausible these myths may seem.
11. A tie in the Electoral College may not necessarily be resolved in the House of Representatives in favor of a person who has support from majorities of at least 26 delegations there.
12. There is no need to get rid of the Electoral College to make every vote cast valuable in deciding the election outcome.

If these statements bother or intrigue you, and you want the explanations, this book is written for you. This book is the author’s second book to discuss in a simple manner the logical fundamentals of the system for electing a President. (The first

one [1] is a monograph discussing these fundamentals, along with the mathematics of U.S. presidential elections.)

Studying the election system is mandatory in American schools, and immigrants applying for U.S. citizenship must pass an exam that includes questions on the basics of this system. Yet many of those who teach the subject and who have studied it do not seem to be clear on how the election system was designed, and how it currently works. From the author's viewpoint, this partly explains why more than 40 % of all eligible voters usually do not vote in presidential elections.

Each election presents an opportunity to learn about the uniqueness of the presidential election system. Moreover, explaining the fundamentals of this system to eligible voters and to residents of the country will contribute to developing their analytical skills and logical thinking. If the commercial media were interested in educating people, it could do a lot to help develop both by explaining these fundamentals. Indeed, many people obtain information in general, and on presidential elections in particular, from this media. While public radio and TV also spotlight presidential elections, the commercial media seem to have a solid lead in spotlighting elections. Whatever the role of both branches of the media in spotlighting elections, currently, the above educational opportunities remain unavailable to millions of those who could benefit from their use.

Undoubtedly, the commercial media must compete to earn money, and this imposes limits on what the anchors and hosts of talk shows can afford to broadcast. Any risky topic may either bring new customers or lose the current audience to the competitors. The same is true regarding the style in which the topic is presented to the audience. Everyone who watches or listens to any media channel expects to see or to hear something new, catchy, puzzling, etc., but not in the form of a lecture. Thus, any serious matters should be discussed in an entertaining form to hold the audience's attention, not an easy task. One must "have the guts" and a certain level of authority in the media to discuss on the air, for instance, some statements from the above list.

Certainly, the anchors and show hosts themselves should understand the fundamentals of the election system to discuss such statements. Even if they (or their producers) decided to discuss the system as deeply as it deserves, they would have to find experts in the field and present the topic as a controversy. They usually choose experts from a close circle of those who they know and who are (presumably) knowledgeable on the subject. Authors of the books promoted by numerous publicists and PR agencies connected to the media are another source of the experts. The shows are unlikely to invite knowledgeable experts who do not fall into these two categories, since they consider it risky. Thus, if the shows do not find trustworthy experts from their inner circle, the election system fundamentals are doomed not to be discussed on the air in the course of the election campaign.

This is how an artificial taboo becomes imposed on the right of Americans to be educated regarding what the election system was designed for, how it really works, what outcomes, including weird ones, it may produce, and why. As a result, election rules that every voter should know may surprise the American electorate. In one of his columns, David Broder of *the Washington Post* warned of the possible

public reaction to the “discovery” that in an election thrown into Congress, each state has one vote regardless of its size [2]. It seems that society would be much better off if the presidential election rules, especially those applicable in close elections, were explained to the electorate before weird election outcomes are looming, rather than being “discovered” when such outcomes occur.

In any case, picking the subject of the election system fundamentals could be problematic even if a particular show invites knowledgeable experts. It could be problematic even if there was a good chance that this show would become the first to report new information on the election system.

It is much safer to provide traditional election coverage, which includes the following:

1. Nationwide polls. These polls are conducted by numerous organizations, and their results vary. Even if the results of these polls are trustworthy, they may contribute to creating the wrong impression in the voters about possible election results. That is, they may make the voter believe that a recipient of the nationwide popular majority or plurality of the votes will necessarily win or is likely to win the election.
2. Nationwide polls among certain groups of the American electorate. Unless one knows the demography of the electorate in each state, especially in the “battleground” ones, results of these polls are not informative. Moreover, they may create the wrong impression that certain voting patterns exist within each such group throughout the country.
3. Polls in the “battleground” states. Although the commercial media sometimes present the results of these polls, usually, no analysis of the factors that affect the dynamics of these polls is provided.
4. Promises of the candidates. Presidential candidates make many promises in the course of their election campaigns, and most of these promises relate to improving the everyday life of the American people. Promises are usually made by the candidates themselves and by members of their teams who appear on the air on their behalf, and these promises seem to be one of the most important parts of the campaigns. However, debating opinions about the promises made, rather than the analysis of the promises themselves, is what is really offered by the media. Under this approach, real issues of concern to the voters remain no more than headlines of the candidates’ speeches and two-minute statements made in the course of presidential debates.
5. Scrutiny of the candidates. This is the major part of the media coverage, and the more scandalous the discussions, the more attention is usually paid by the audience.
6. Meetings with groups of selected voters in “battleground” states. It is hard to understand how these groups are selected, and to what extent their views can represent those of the states. However, broadcasting such meetings conveys what some people think about the candidates.

7. Voting equipment to be used in the election. This coverage is certainly informative though it is not clear how this information contributes to the voter's decision on Election Day.
8. Opinions of political observers, commentators, and journalists regarding the election. These opinions mostly deal with what the American people think about the candidates, states of affairs in the economy, international relations, military activities (especially if they are underway), etc. Undecided voters and non-voters give a great deal of attention to discussions of these topics, as well as to those of the mood of the American electorate. Indeed, since the behavior of these categories of voters is assumed to be unpredictable, these discussions help keep the audience intrigued.
9. Presidential and vice-presidential debates. These debates are critical to many voters who make their decisions on Election Day based on the likeability of the candidates and the trust that the voters have in them. For many voters, it has always been a chance to learn about candidates' promises and to decide whose promises sound more trustworthy and realistic.

Certainly, the traditional coverage does not require tackling the list of statements presented at the beginning of this Preface. Moreover, as long as likeability and trust in the candidates remain prevailing decisive factors in forming the voter's opinion, any coverage of the system fundamentals would seem unnecessary.

But can the country do better than this?

It seems that the following four elements of media coverage would be more beneficial for the American electorate in the 21st century:

1. Strategic abilities of the candidates. Although past activities of the candidates certainly matter, they may not necessarily constitute a pattern of making decisions (at least by the challenger). Even if they do, it is not clear to what extent such a pattern can be extended to the Presidency for the next four years. At the same time, any comparison is reasonable and fair when both candidates make strategic decisions in the same environment. Election campaigns undoubtedly present such an environment.

If the analysis of strategic moves of the candidates in the course of their election campaigns was done by the media, the voter could evaluate whose decisions were more effective. Such an analysis would be especially important in the last one or two weeks before Election Day. Indeed, the resources of the candidates will have been almost exhausted by that time, and misleading moves of a major party candidate may force the opponent to make wrong decisions on where to focus the remaining part of the campaign. It is the analysis of the campaign strategies in the context of the electoral map that could constantly remind the voters that under the current election system, the states—rather than the nationwide popular vote—decide the election outcome. It would be illustrative of how each candidate can use the election system to win the election by the rules in force, especially in a close election.

Such a coverage would require conducting and analyzing completely different polls. For instance, polls reflecting how particular moves affected opinions of likely voters in each social or ethnic group of the voters in each state (rather than nationwide) would be more informative. Finally, such a coverage would emphasize that a Chief Executive to govern the Union of the states and D.C.—rather than a President of the American people—is elected in the U.S. every four years. His strategic abilities are what should matter and what should make him a good manager and a good Commander-in-Chief. If evaluated and analyzed properly, decisions on campaign strategies could help the voters understand who can better govern the country in the next four years.

2. Leadership. How the candidates form their teams speaks volumes about their abilities to lead. Analyzing the appearances of representatives of the candidate's team on the air, as well as their preparedness for answering questions and for "delivering the message" on behalf of the candidate, may help in evaluating the leadership provided by the candidates in shaping their election campaigns. Discussing the names of possible members of the next Cabinet may also contribute to the image of the leader that each candidate should try to create in the voter's mind.
3. Programs of the candidates. Each and every element of the candidate's program should be scrutinized by the media. It is important to separate promises, which may sound very good, from the deals that can really be accomplished in the next four years. It is important to explain to the voters that an elected President cannot transform any promises into the laws without Congress. Chances of the promises to be fulfilled should be evaluated depending on the composition of Congress that the newly elected President will work with. All elements of the programs should be made understandable to every voter in terms of the voter's everyday life, rather than in terms of percentages of the potential beneficiaries. Thus, all the details of the candidates' programs should be understandable to all the voters rather than only to those who wrote these programs. Moreover, the candidates must be able to explain to the voters all these elements and answer corresponding questions on the air.
4. Tactical abilities of the candidates. Debates among the candidates present an excellent opportunity to the voters to see whose tactical abilities seem to be stronger. The analysis of approaches employed by the candidates in answering questions or in making comments, which should be provided by political observers, is critical to this end. It should give the voters an impression of how the candidate could handle her/his opponents in numerous discussions as President in the next four years.

The readers who share the author's viewpoint that the second type of election coverage is preferable—or at least should be present in the election year—may ask: can the media provide such a coverage? From the author's viewpoint, the answer is yes, once there is a demand for this from society. However, this demand may not emerge unless the voter education and the election culture in the country start changing.

Currently, it does not seem that the commercial media can (or want to) initiate this process because of the above-mentioned financial reasons. Nevertheless, it can certainly contribute to the process once the American people decide that they really want to know how the election system works, and how it can shape the election campaign.

The long-deserved explanation of the fundamentals of this system is the key to initiating the change. However, conducting any substantive public discussion in the media of either the election system or election rules, including controversial ones, requires three prerequisites.

First, a sizable part of society should be concerned with the topic.

Second, those who wish to participate in the debates either as contributors or spectators should be at least familiar with the structure and the principles of the election system.

Third, at least one national TV channel should be willing to start the dialogue in a form that would encourage the rest of the media to follow suit.

Where is American society today with these inseparable ingredients of any substantive public discussion of the election system?

1. Society has been concerned about the fairness of the current election rules that may elect President someone who lost the popular vote, as happened, for instance, in the 2000 election. This concern has initiated two activities: (a) a few new approaches to changing the election system have surfaced, and (b) voting technologies to count votes cast have been studied. Several proposals for improving the current election system have been published. However, only one particular proposal, the National Popular Vote (NPV) plan, has been promoted by a part of the media and presented to society as the best and even as an “ingenious” one.
2. Several books analyzing how the current election system works have been published since the 2000 election. However, a majority of American society seem to have advanced in understanding of only two basic features of the system. That is, more people have understood that under the rules of the current system, 1) the electoral vote rather than the popular vote matters in determining the election outcome, and 2) the “winner-take-all” method for awarding state and D.C. electoral votes is to blame for the division of the country into “safe” and “battleground” states in presidential elections. (Here, a “safe” state is a state in which the electors of one of the presidential candidates are practically guaranteed to win all the state electoral votes in an election, and a “battleground” state is a state in which the electors of no presidential candidate can be sure to win all the state electoral votes.)
3. Though some newspapers have tried to initiate a dialogue on how to elect a President, a few influential media outlets have supported the National Popular Vote plan and have managed to present it as the only alternative to the current election system. Moreover, all the controversies of this plan and its constitutionality have never been seriously discussed, and the newspapers that support the plan are reluctant to publish articles critically analyzing this plan. Only the

NPV plan has been mentioned by national TV channels, and only its originators and supporters have been able to air their views on how the current election system could be improved.

This state of affairs with public awareness of the basics of the current presidential election system has moved the author to write a book in which the fundamentals of this system are addressed [1]. The book offers (a) a logical analysis of the constitutionality and controversies of the NPV plan, (b) a brief description of other plans to improve the election system, proposed by other authors, and (c) the author's plan to improve the system under which the will of the nation and the will of the states as equal members of the Union decide the election outcome, whereas the Electoral College remains only a back-up election mechanism [1]. The book [1] is, however, a monograph oriented mostly to professionals studying presidential elections, including political scientists, constitutional lawyers, managers who plan and analyze election campaigns, systems scientists, and mathematicians, interested in familiarizing themselves with the election system and with the mathematics of this system.

In contrast, though the present book implements the author's attempt in the same direction, this book is oriented to a general readership, and its understanding does not require preliminary knowledge of the subject. Like all the author's previous publications on U.S. presidential elections and unlike almost all publications of other authors on the subject, the present book does not consider historical materials. In particular, it does not consider the Federalist papers in which some of the Founding Fathers expressed their viewpoints on what Constitutional Convention participants meant regarding issues relating to the election system. The author believes that the Constitution, Supreme Court decisions, and federal statutes are the only publications that can be used in any analysis of the election system. Any other historical materials may only encourage one to focus on particular published historic documents.

The Constitution was written for the American people rather than only for experts in constitutional law. Therefore, one should not be surprised that different people have different perceptions and different understanding of election rules, embedded in provisions of the Constitution and Supreme Court decisions. Moreover, the logical analysis of these rules suggests that more than one understanding of particular rules is possible.

If this is the case for any of the rules, these rules should be analyzed by constitutional experts, and the results of the analysis should be made available to all interested individuals. Though the interpretation of controversial election rules can be provided only by the Supreme Court, public discussion of these rules is a mechanism for initiating either such an interpretation or constitutional amendments addressing the controversies.

The author views the present book as an introductory guide for those who are curious about the peculiarities of the election system that are not studied in civics lessons in schools and are not considered in publications of other authors on U.S.

presidential elections. He hopes that this book, along with the book [1], will contribute to making knowledge about the election system available to everyone.

Boston, Massachusetts
June 2012

Alexander S. Belenky