

“Spotlight” letter in the Pioneer Press

Questioning IRV coverage

Pioneer Press 06/17/2009

It's distressing to see the media portrayal of the Minnesota Supreme Court ruling on instant runoff voting.

Most reports simply parrot FairVote Minnesota's false claim that the court "upheld the constitutionality" of IRV.

On the Neopopulism Web site, attorney for the plaintiff Erick Kaardal said "the decision allows for future challenges to IRV."

The court, he said, indicated that "because there had not been an election yet, it was unsubstantiated how severe the burden is on voters."

The court admitted that, with IRV, some voters' votes could harm, not help, their preferred candidate, but rejected the complaint, using the excuse that there had been no election to demonstrate that voters were harmed.

This is a far cry from upholding constitutionality, and neither FairVote nor the media should be allowed to get away with claiming otherwise.

Matt Marchetti, North St. Paul