from A7

STAR

In a 2007 study in the Quarterly Journal of Political Science, Floridian votes were examined and found that if Nader had not been in the race, Gore could have carried the state, thus giving him enough electoral votes to win the presidency. In all, 97,488 Floridians voted for Nader.

The study estimated that 60 percent of Nader voters would have voted for Gore, thus giving him in the presidency. If those estimates are true, Nader being in the race "spoiled" the election for Gore.

Nader was a true believer in his cause and was attempting to win the election outright. However, some candidates get into a race with the express goal of tearing down another candidate. It was thought that then "Never Trump" Republican Mitt Romney would run as a spoiler in 2016, but he felt he could not fundraise in good conscience to play spoiler.

Some candidates even attempt to spoil the entire system, or at least game it beyond recognition.

Also in 2016, many hoped that "Never Trump" Republican David Evan McMullin would act as a spoiler for the president. He actually ran in a number of states, with a big showing in Utah. Some hoped that he would win

that state and deny Trump the needed 270 Electoral College votes to win.

But McMullin had loftier goals. Since he wasn't on the ballot in enough states to win the 270 electoral votes outright, his eyes were set on winning enough votes the ensure neither Trump nor Clinton could reach 270, which would leave the decision up to the House of Representatives.

McMullin failed at being a spoiler. His highest showing was in Utah with 21.54 percent of the vote, compared to Trump's 45.54 percent.

It's these kinds of tactics that STAR voting hopes to put an end to.

"You can vote for Nader if you want," Roberts said of STAR. "Why should you feel like you can't express that on a ballot? You should be able to express, 'This is my favorite candidate, period.' Vote honestly. And if you have a ballot that doesn't allow voters to vote honestly, you have to ask yourself 'Why?' — and 'What can we do to fix it?""

However, political parties and their candidates aren't the only ones who can engage in gaming the voting system. STAR voting is not completely immune to voters taking part in tactical voting.

FairVote found that there were indeed examples of tactical voting within the system.

Tactical Voting:

tactical voting is in the 2000 election, again with Nader.

In that election, even many of Nader's supporters didn't feel he had a chance to win. Instead, their goal was to have Nader get 5 percent of the popular vote, allowing the Green Party to receive federal funding in the 2004 election.

But Nader supporters didn't want Bush to win.

To fix this problem, Gore supporters in solid Republican states that had no chance of having their candidate win electoral votes would swap votes with Nader supporters in swing states. A Nader supporter in swing-state Michigan would vote for Gore, with the express promise from a red-state Gore supporter in Texas would vote for Nader. Gore would get a vote in a swing state in a bid to win electoral votes, and Nader would get a vote in a red state that would give him a chance to get the needed five percent popular vote.

People organized. The internet, which was just coming into its own, saw trading sites begin to pop up, putting red-state and swing-state voters together. According to a 2000 article in *Slate*, one website got 90,000 visits in one day.

But there were problems. In California, vote trading was deemed illegal One of the greatest examples of and a popular site was shut down.

The public wasn't as tech savvy as it is today, either. This was before Facebook and Twitter, and people were still learning how to navigate the world wide web. Many had to go actively searching for these sites or hope for an email chain to get involved, far from the ease of a Facebook post today that can potentially reach 5,000 people with the click of a button.

And time wasn't on their side. These websites only became prevalent just one month before the election.

The Nader Trader experiment ended in failure, with Nader only receiving 2.74 percent of the vote, well below the five percent threshold needed to obtain federal funding. But with more planning and a better social media, it's possible a larger population could have taken up the cause.

A First Step:

STAR wouldn't be the end-all-be-all to fixing voting in America. It's just a first step.

"I think it's a powerful, revolutionary first step," Roberts said. "I don't think it's a cure-all patch for everything, but I think it's abso-lutely a step in the right direction for our voting method. Whatever changes need to be made to go along side of it, we can address those one at a time."

Even if money could be saved by not doing primaries, how each candidate gets their name out to the public will

still be based on campaign donations.

"Money will still be a huge component," Roberts said. "We do run into people who say that the number one problem is money in politics, and ask why we aren't working on that. We understand that, and we do see that as a huge problem.

"Because it's such an enormous task to work on money and politics that, rather than redirecting energy into ending Citizens United, we believe that this is something that is a smaller chunk of change that we have the capacity to effect here locally in our area. Rather than just being overwhelmed by money in politics, we believe this is an achievable goal here locally. It is a step toward freeing people to vote for their favorite candidates, which is huge."

And there are still questions about how STAR will be implemented in the future. Right now, it is for non-partisan races. What will it look like when it gets into more heated, and financially backed, races statewide?

Will people become confused in how to use the system? It takes some time to describe its intricacies, as evidenced in the length of this article.

And will they trust the mathematical algorithms used in the runoff?

That's something for the voters to decide in November.



Cottage Grove Sentinel Employees and their families advertisers & their employees

and previous winners are not eligible to enter.

<complex-block></complex-block>	(541) 942-1301 40 South 5th • Cottage Grove (541) 895-4166 We four the f	
EXTREME NATURE Longer, wider planks for EPIC style. 1324 E. Main Street Cottage Grove, Oregon 97424 541-942-0500 Name: Address:		Service - Parts Detailing 7 Certified GM Technicians Dpen Saturdays Our People Really Make The Difference! Brad's COTTAGE GROVE CALL-942-4415 - 2775 Row River Road - bradschevy.com Brads Chevrolet Name: Address: