

"In 2000 when Al Gore got more individual votes than George W. Bush nationwide he did not win the election. It is because of the corrupt processes of the Electoral College that he did not gain presidency. It is this among other things we must do away with the Electoral colleges we want to run a true democracy.

There are many people who would argue that the electoral College should stay and be apart of how we elect our president. Richard A. Posner author of Defence of the Electoral College claims the candidate for president must have a transregional appeal source 3 paragraph 18. This however is not true. According a map that shows the breakdown of the number of electoral votes each state gets he/she could very well just get the votes from two regions and win the election. Yes you could say that two regions are transregional but this idea is based on collection of states from each region. Not one or two. Posner also asserts that, "...the most thoughtful voters should be the ones to decide the election" paragraph 20. Here he is saying that only the Swinging States such as Ohio Hawaii would determine who the president is for the whole country. How is letting a handful of people decide who the president will be a representation of the country as a whole? Short answer, it's not. It would be foolish to put the choice for president into the hands of few, it's like putting all our eggs into one basket and then throwing it off a roof.

There are a numerous amount of things that are not good about the electoral college. Bradford Plumer from the foundation for National Progress and author of Mother of Jones says that if there was to be a tie everything would be up to the House of representatives source two paragraph 12. That means each state gets one vote. One! The representative from Wyoming who have 500,000 voters would have the same amount of power as the representative from California who has 35 million voters. This is in no way to run a country with fifty people representing about 250 million people. Plumer also states that the voters can't always pick who their electors are paragraph 10. While the electors cannot be someone in office, who is to say that they may say one thing about who they will vote for but in fact they vote for someone else? It has happened before. Every one should get one vote and that be that none of this winner takes all stuff.

Finally we get to the part about the District of Columbia or Washington D.C.. The Office of the Federal Register wrote an article on the Electoral College and it says that D.C. is given three electors and treated like a state^{source 1} paragraph 4. In one way this could be a good thing but in this case it is a bad thing. The District of Columbia is not a state and holds many government officials. Infact many people don't live in D.C. they live in one of the neighboring states. So why are we letting them have as much of a say as Vermont or Alaska or even one of the Dakotas?

To wrap this all up the corrupt system in which we elect a group of people to do what we want is not a very effective way to run a country in stage four of the Demographic Transitional Stages. Although president George W. Bush was an adequate president there is still unfair that Al Gore had not become our president when he had the popular vote."

"What is your point of view on this argument that we are discussing today here in the Sunshine State? The Florida Senator should consider keeping the Electoral College voting system to choose our President because the founding fathers of the United States established this system. The popular vote is terrible because in some cases it might be teens or young people that don't know about politics or what they want to give to this country or state. They vote on the things that interest them, not the country. When you vote for anything, your main priority is ""Does this make the country a better place and will bring more benefits to the people in this country or state""?

The Electoral College voting system is much easier to count who won because its a ""winner take all"" system. This can be seen when "" The popular vote was very close in Florida in 2012 nevertheless Obama, who won that vote, got 29 electoral votes""^{Source 3}. This example shows even tho the popular was very close, Obama still won Florida and got those 29 electoral votes. There is another way people view the Electoral College and they say that the ""Electoral College is unfair, outdated, and irrational""^{Source 2}. They also say the best argument against the Electoral College is the disaster factor.

Each person has their own point of view about each thing but mine is that we should stay with the Electoral College system because it benefits the people in Florida and the United States.

For example, ""In 2012's election, for example, Obama received 61.7 percent of the electoral vote compared to only 51.3 percent of the popular votes cast for him and rodney.... Because almost all states award electoral votes on a winnertakeall basis, even a very slight plurality in a state creates a landslide electoralvote victory in that state""Source 3. This shows a certainty of the outcome for that state. This also cause candidates to not spend their time in states ""they know they have no chance of winning, focusing only on the tight races in the ""swing"" states""Source 2.

Therefore, we should consider keeping the electoral College for various reasons. The Electoral College has been the voting system of our country all along. Why should we change the tradition that our founding fathers left for us? Eveything in life happens for a reason, I would appreciate it if you could the the Electoral College in this beautiful Sunshine State, Florida."