



There has been a lot of back and forth lately amongst the punditocracy and the campaigns about who, in the Democratic primary, has the most popular votes, and what that means. Currently Sen. Obama holds that distinction, along with the most Pledged Delegates and most state wins. But there is a movement afoot to convince the uncommitted Super Delegates that they should base their decision upon who has the upper hand in popular vote, as Sen. Clinton tries to rack up an advantage there over the next 6 weeks.

What is wrong with this picture, and why is no one talking about it?

The Democratic National Committee allows the state parties to choose how they select their pledged delegates; Caucus, Primary (open or closed) or a mixture (see Texas). Only the primaries render a popular vote total — the whole point of the caucus process is to render a collective judgment, not a individual one. So, if Super Delegates are to suddenly base their decisions solely upon popular vote, they will effectively be ignoring all of these states: Iowa, Nevada, Alaska, American Samoa, Colorado, Idaho, Kansas, Minnesota, North Dakota, Nebraska, Washington, Maine, Hawaii and Wyoming.

Given that Sen. Clinton is so upset about the potential exclusion of Michigan and Florida delegations from the convention (and whose popular vote she chooses to include in her totals) can we count on her to fight against the potential exclusion (disenfranchisement) of the voters of these 14 states and territories?

Pawn expects not.

It does beg the question: What is the point of party nominating rules?