



California and the Laws that Divide

Part 1: Primary Election Chaos

Predictably, the 2024 Presidential Primary Election in California was mired in chaos.

The causes can all be traced back to the California Legislature (and Governor) whose efforts over the last 25 years have built an electoral process that voters can neither understand nor trust.

This series of articles will explore the chaos that was the California Presidential Primary and connect that chaos to the laws and circumstances that perpetrated it.

Election Integrity Project® *California* (EIPCa) strongly alleges California's current electoral process to be unconstitutional, and is challenging over 20 California election laws on that basis. This [lawsuit](#) is groundbreaking and revolutionary, and not only worthy but in need of your [support](#).

The proponents of California's indefensible election system justify every successive law passed as allegedly making registering and voting "easier," "effortless," more "accessible," and more "inclusive."

But in reality, these permissive laws have made everything more confusing, with so many choices and so many things to navigate that voters are literally left wondering what to do in order to cast a vote, or to make that vote count. Many simply stay home.

In trying to create a system that they hoped would lead to almost 100% voter participation, the legislature has given Californians a system that inspired only 33% of eligible voters to vote in the most recent election.

**This system is driving voters away,
and disenfranchising many of those who continue to participate.**

EIPCa believes that more than 20 unconstitutional California election laws have led to this unacceptable situation. Our [Federal Lawsuit](#) challenging the Constitutionality of these laws, as well as Secretary of State regulations and Registrars' policies and procedures, brings that challenge officially to the adjudication of the courts

**The success of EIPCa's lawsuit is vital in returning INTEGRITY,
a federal mandate, to the electoral process.**

The 1993 National Voter Registration Act “Findings and Purposes” section §20501 states:

U.S. Code § 20501 - Findings and purposes

(a) Findings

The Congress finds that

- (1) the right of citizens of the United States to vote is a fundamental right;
- (2) it is the duty of the Federal, State, and local governments to promote the exercise of that right; and
- (3) **discriminatory and unfair registration laws and procedures** can have a direct and damaging effect on voter participation in elections for Federal office...

(b) Purpose #3 of 4 says:

- (3) **...protect the integrity of the electoral process...**

The success of EIPCa’s lawsuit is also vital in restoring the basis of a Constitutional Republic and true self-governance. A win in California is a win in EVERY state because laws that are unconstitutional in California are unconstitutional in all states.

EIPCa made a commitment in 2012 to go the distance in researching, documenting and taking legal action to return the once Golden State to what America was founded to be.

We are getting close and need your [support](#) for this existential effort to restore and defend the Republic. Until the Republic is restored, election chaos will continue.

**One issue that caused chaos in the March election were
Party Registration SNAFUs**

With respect to the Presidential Primary, perhaps the most troublesome (and allegedly unconstitutional) law is the New Motor Voter law. In 2016, voter registration became virtually mandatory for all individuals interacting with the DMV in California.

Voters already registered to vote do not expect their registration to change simply because they renew their driver’s license.

But the computer questions they answer during the DMV renewal process are confusing. Voters are asked if they want to use the provided information for voter registration purposes, and are told that they will not be registered if they answer NO.

The wording is tricky.

What is meant is that **a new or updated registration will not be generated**, but voters understandably interpret the wording to mean they will no longer be registered to vote unless they answer YES.

So, most answer YES, and are unaware that if they do not continue to scroll further and select a party preference, they will be reregistered as No Party Preference (NPP), which is the default.

Due to California's Top Two "Jungle Primary" (also challenged as unconstitutional in EIPCa's lawsuit), party registration is irrelevant for all elections other than the Presidential Primary slate.

Voters whose registrations were flipped some time ago may not realize it until the once-every-four-years Primary.

Chaos ensues as voters believe someone has maliciously changed their registration to interfere with their ability to vote for their chosen candidate. Accusations fly and ill-will and distrust abound, when **almost always the situation has been caused by an unnecessary and intrusive law that over-reaches governmental authority.**

There is a great deal more to say regarding voter confusion and election chaos. Please join us for the rest of the articles in this series, "California and the Laws that Divide," as we continue to explore the fallout from more of the allegedly unconstitutional laws being challenged by EIPCa's [federal lawsuit](#).

And consider contributing to the success of our ground-breaking lawsuit with your frequent and generous [financial support](#).

https://www.eip-ca.com/articles/Calif_and_laws_that_divide_part1.pdf
https://www.eip-ca.com/articles/Calif_and_laws_that_divide_part1.pdf