


IS THE ELECTORAL COLLEGE FAIR?

From the founding of our nation in the late Eighteenth Century, there has always been a question of fairness. Fairness was called into question when the founders of our nation were trying to form a system of government that would be fair to the little states, protecting them from the larger states. This is one reason why we have a Senate in our government. If we didn't have a Senate and were left to the devices of the House of Representatives the big states could lord power over the small states. When the House of Representatives writes a law that seems to favor the larger states the members of the Senate can quash that law, or rewrite it so that all states are favored by the law or that particular law is quashed by the Senate. That seems fair right? Protecting the little guy from the big guy has always been an American institution. I don't think that there is one liberal out there that would argue with this arrangement, at least in a public format.

Now think in those terms when we look at the Electoral College. In our nation, we have big states with large populations and small states with small populations. Would it be fair if the smaller states had to live under the dictates of a president that was elected by the large states? No, it wouldn't, just like the scenario that I showed in the last paragraph. Now for the sake of argument, let's flip things around. First, let's take a look at a representation of the state electoral votes in this last election:



Keep in mind that the number of Electors in the Electoral College is determined by the number of Representatives that each state has in the House of Representatives. Also keep in mind that each state's representative number is determined by the population of each given state. That is why California on the map above is so large because it is the most populous state in the Union.

I said that I'd like to flip-flop the scenario so that liberals can understand why the electoral college is so important. Let's say that we lived in another dimension where California, Texas, Florida and New York were all places where Conservatives lived. Let's say that the majority of people in those states were Christians, anti-abortion, pro-heterosexual, pro-gun and every other thing that liberals detest. Now let's keep the candidates the way that they currently are. If the election was held with only the popular vote in this scenario then the Conservatives would have won the election by a landslide in the popular vote because the large states (or should I say areas) on the map above is where most of the people live. However, you liberals would be taking to the streets of the less populated states doing what you do best, complaining, rioting and crying foul. Do you see now that you've walked in other peoples' shoes using my analogy?

Many of the problems that arise from using the votes without the Electoral College has to do with newcomers to our nation that do not know the electoral process and who are seized upon by the liberals as soon as they hit our ports and airports. When I lived in Sacramento, I had had a neighbor named Mo, short for Mohammed. Mo was a fairly new immigrant to the States. Mo asked me about the upcoming election and how the process of voting worked. I asked Mo what party he belonged to. Mo was proud to tell me that he was a Democrat? I asked him how he decided to become a democrat. Mo told me that when his plane landed, he and other immigrants were debriefed by government officials. They received a short indoctrination about how things worked. Someone in his group asked the official what party was the best party, and as Mo put it, "the man was very quick to say that we should be Democrats because they were the party that cared for people." During the conversation, I felt the freedom to tell Mo that he should look into those claims and I told him about the Democrats and their liberal ways where sex, sexual identity and other things that I knew that the Koran opposed. I just left it at that and never bothered Mo about his politics again.

Although I was surprised at what Mo told me, I sort of knew that something like this would be a liberal tactic. With the great influx of immigrants, both legal and illegal that have entered into our nation over the past twenty or more years, we have received millions of people

into our country that do not know the truth about the political parties and what each stands for. The four main points of entry for immigrants is New York, California, Florida and Texas. You probably noticed that these are the most populous states here in America. It is a no-brainer that these states have the most population, therefore they have the majority of the popular vote. Other states, like Michigan, Ohio, and Illinois have large populations and quite a few of the popular vote. Oh, and these states have the largest cities in the country. In addition, because the populations of these states swelled over the years, they also have the most Representatives and the most Electoral votes, thus they are called The Battleground States because they are the states that can sway an election one way or another.

Let me show you an example of how the unfairness works. California is a big state that consists of two large metropolitan areas, two smaller metropolitan areas and a lot of farm and ranch (rural) land. The immigrants that come to California go, for the most part, into the cities where they register to vote as democrats. The rural areas are for the most part conservative in politics and in their socioeconomic beliefs. If fairness existed, then the rural voters would have the same say as those who live in the cities. This, however, is not the case and before and during each election the democratic power bosses remind their democratic voters (pawns) how much those voters could not survive without a democrat into office. In essence, the will of every conservative voter in California is moot because the liberal voters in the cities dictate their will for the entire state. This is one reason why there is always talk about splitting California into two states. To make matters worse, many of the older liberals from California have relocated to Oregon, Washington, and Nevada and have changed the voter base so that the conservative vote is null and void in these states.

Perhaps another way to look at this unfairness is to look at two more maps that show how a relatively small portion of United States land dictates so much power. First, however, we must remember that the United States is not a democracy. The United States is a Republic. In a democracy the majority rules, which is sort of fair if the majority consists of fair-minded people who want the best for all people, both majority, and minority. If the majority becomes self-centered and wicked then those who are not part of the majority are oppressed. In the last century and the centuries before it, majority rule was many times unfair. It cannot be hidden that black Americans were treated unfairly and oppressed by white Americans, but in fairness, the oppressors were mostly those who called themselves Democrats. In a true Republic, the people elect representatives to act on their behalf and their interests. In addition, a senate is elected to keep the representatives in line and to prevent abuse of power. Finally, in America, the Electoral College is present to make sure that the “popular vote” doesn’t allow the larger states to trample

the rights of those living in the smaller states. It's pretty ingenious when you think about it. The following maps show how a small portion of the entire landmass of the United States could, and almost did dictate their will toward ALL Americans. The first map shows the areas of the country that voted for Trump while the second map shows the small geographical area that almost tipped the scales in Hillary Clinton's favor.



Special thanks to Vividmaps.com for their awesome maps.

Now if the situation was reversed would there be different results in the attitudes of liberals? You bet that they would be acting differently. The maps for the 2012 elections were

quite similar and when Obama won his second election, conservatives just accepted that the Archipelago (formally named Obama Archipelago) won the election. However, when a relative nobody with very little political experience came so very close to beating Clinton in the popular vote and won the Electoral College vote, it created a firestorm. Immediately after Clinton's concession speech, the liberal hive started to buzz. Jill Stein, who was the Green Party nominee demanded a recount of votes in three of the close battleground states. When the recounts were tallied it turned out that that Trump had increased in votes while Clinton decreased in votes. In Michigan's Wayne County, where Detroit is located, the recount was suspended because it was realized that there were more votes cast than there were voters, showing voter fraud in that district. If recounts were done in all of the Clinton Archipelago perhaps, we would have found out that Clinton didn't win the popular vote due to voter fraud, which was suspected in the large urban areas in the first place.

Sometimes it amuses me when I think about the possibilities of what would happen if we were to divide the nation into the two maps above. Just think about it. Aside from being centers of large population, the Archipelago really doesn't produce anything of value. Yes, they are manufacturing hubs, but most machinery and electronics come from overseas. Most American cars are made in Michigan, which is part of Trump Land. On the other hand, Trump Land is where food is produced, and where oil and coal reserves are located. In essence, Trump Land is made up of producers while the Clinton Archipelago consists mainly of consumers. The C.A. is also where most of our tax money goes to support those who refuse to work and who suck the tit of Lady Liberty. Making a clear division of the two areas would be interesting because you can't eat the manufactured products that come from C.A. but Trump Land would be the food producers. Imagine placing huge tariffs on the foodstuffs going to C.A. from Trump Land and requiring really nothing in return. Any manufactured items needed in Trump Land could be gained from dealing with Japan, Korea, and China, where most items are made anyway. We could have our Republic back and prosper while the Libtard Nation would decay in its own squalor and filth until it resembled something from a Mad Max movie. While that will probably never happen, it is sure fun to think about.

Well, I hope that I helped to explain why we need the Electoral College. If nothing else, it is an insurance policy against unfairness and it is an ingenious device placed into our system of law by the framers of our nation, many of which came from small states and knew what unfairness is. I feel that they also knew that someday our nation would abandon its belief in Yahweh and that wicked people would try to impose their wicked ways on the few righteous that remained. Everyone knows that today's cities are cesspools filled with every sort of evil that

mankind can manifest and practice. So while some people see the Electoral College as an evil thing it really isn't. It exists to prevent evil from overrunning the land.