## AFF BLOCKS

### AT: Ethanol (JIC)

#### 1. Ethanol is losing its grip nationally

**Coral Davenport 2016.** (Coral Davenport, reporter for the New York Times. January 31, 2016. “Ethanol Mandate, a Boon to Iowa Alone, Faces Rising Resistance,” New York Times. DOA: April 8, 2017 <https://www.nytimes.com/2016/02/01/us/politics/ethanol-mandate-a-boon-to-iowa-alone-faces-rising-resistance.html?_r=2>) EL

But beyond the borders of a state with outsize importance in the selection of presidents, **ethanol may be losing its grip on the body politic. Energy policy experts, advocates in the fight on poverty and even other farmers say** a law that has been a boon for Iowa has been a boondoggle to the rest of the country. **The ethanol mandate has driven up food costs while failing to deliver its promised environmental benefits.** Rising domestic oil production and a global energy glut have all but nullified the pitch that ethanol would help wean the country off foreign oil.

### AT: Legitimacy

#### 1. A DPV would increase the legitimacy of the president Carol Mellor, 2008 (Carol Mellor, head of the Voter Services committee at the League of Women Voters of the Hamptons. 2008. “LWVUS Study on the National Popular Vote Compact Background Paper,” League of Women Voters of the United States, <https://bpb.opendns.com/a/webcache.googleusercontent.com/search?q=cache:bgAnNx70qmkJ:lwv.corvallis.or.us/newsletters-archive/LWVUSPopularVoteStudy.doc+&cd=2&hl=en&ct=clnk&gl=us>. Accessed 13 April 2017. Page 4) ESG

President of the Minority. Voters assume that the candidate who wins an election will be the candidate that received the most votes - either a majority or a plurality (in multi-candidate elections). **When the “victor” actually receives fewer votes than another candidate, people are led to question the nature of our electoral system. It is unnerving to the electorate when a country supposedly based on majority rule ends up with a “minority” president.** This problem is eliminated under the NPV Compact. **Furthermore, presidents elected by a popular majority** via the NPV Compact **would be “stronger” presidents because they would have a greater, more democratic legitimacy.**

#### 2. Bush’s 2000 election proves that the Electoral College is not a path to legitimacy – this doesn’t require the EC

**Paul Boudreaux, 2004** (Paul Boudreaux, assistant professor at the Stetson University College of Law. Fall 2004. “The Electoral College and Its Meager Federalism,” *Marquette Law Review*, <http://scholarship.law.marquette.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1019&context=mulr>. Accessed 6 April 2017. Page 215-216) ESG

The college's facilitation of a majority winner in electoral votes makes this winner more "legitimate," Storing argued. **In the wake of the contentious 2000 election**, on which Storing did not have the opportunity to comment, however, **the legitimacy argument for the electoral college seems rather misguided. Although the electoral college makes a quick majority winner more likely, it does not follow that this makes the winner more legitimate. If we elected the President through a direct popular vote, the Constitution could either accept a plurality winner who receives less than 50% of the vote, or choose a runoff election. The former option is used by most states in electing their governors, without engendering much controversy.** 31 The runoff option, while more complicated, allows voters to express more fully their preferences among multiple candidates by voting twice-first in the preliminary round among multiple candidates and then in the runoff between two candidates. 32 Some supporters of the electoral college further assume that the indirect vote consistently makes the margin of victory wider and that a wider margin appears more legitimate. 3 3 The election of 2000, however, should have put to rest the assumption that the electoral college nearly always results in a wide margin of victory. Because of unit voting, electoral votes are awarded in blocks for each state. 34 Wyoming is a block of three votes; California is a block worth fiftyfive votes. Because there are only fifty-one discrete blocks totaling 538 electoral votes,' 35 as opposed to a one-by-one tally of 100 million popular votes,136 assembly of the blocks makes it less likely that the electoral vote will end up close to dead-even, even when the nation's voters are split evenly between the two parties. Even more significant is the "snowball" effect of the electoral college vote. When a candidate's message resonates well enough among voters of one state to give him or her a decent margin of the state's popular vote-and thus all of its electoral votes-it is likely that the candidate's success may be repeated in an adjoining state, and in another, and in another.

### AT: Deliberation

#### 1. Electoral college defenders cite deliberation – in reality, none occurs

**Garrett Epps, 2016** (Garrett Epps, professor of constitutional law at the University of Baltimore. November 27th 2016. “The Electoral College Wasn’t Meant to Overturn Elections,” *The Atlantic*, <https://www.theatlantic.com/politics/archive/2016/11/the-electoral-college-shouldnt-save-us-from-trump/508817/>. Accessed 9 March 2017) ESG

**Today’s electoral-college supporters often quote Alexander Hamilton’s Federalist 68: “the immediate election [of the president] should be made by men most capable of ana[y]zing the qualities adapted to the station, and acting under circumstances favourable to deliberation,”** Hamilton wrote. The Federalist, brilliant as it is, isn’t a definitive guide to what the Framers “intended”—it is a sales document, written after the fact at high speed in order to convince wavering voters in New York to support ratification of the Constitution. Hamilton here is a car salesman explaining that the undercoat package might seem useless but is really worth it. **Here’s why the “deliberation” idea of electors is false.** Under Article II § 1 cl. 3, **the electors never meet as a group. They meet “in their respective states” on a date set by Congress—“which Day shall be the same throughout the United States.” Kept resolutely apart, they vote once and only once. If by chance, a majority of electors nationwide favor one candidate, he or she becomes president. If there’s a tie, or no candidate gets a majority, then the House decides. The electors get thanked and sent home. In short, nobody in 1787-88 thought of the electors as anything but what they are today—faceless hacks whose ideas and judgment are neither wanted nor permitted.** I’ve been present when electoral candidates were selected; the main criteria were party loyalty and patronage. Wisdom is seldom sought after, and would be pretty much useless.

### AT: More Equal

#### 1. The Electoral College was created for and still benefits the elite

**Garrett Epps, 2016** (Garrett Epps, professor of constitutional law at the University of Baltimore. November 27th 2016. “The Electoral College Wasn’t Meant to Overturn Elections,” *The Atlantic*, <https://www.theatlantic.com/politics/archive/2016/11/the-electoral-college-shouldnt-save-us-from-trump/508817/>. Accessed 9 March 2017) ESG

In fact, for all the nobility ascribed to it today, **the real reason for the system is simply this: some states didn’t want to let most of their people vote.** Slaves, obviously did not get the ballot (in 1792, when the Philadelphia convention convened, only one of the 13 American states was a “free state**”). States wanted power in proportion to their population of slaves, however, and the “electoral college,” with its rule counting slaves as 3/5 of free persons, guaranteed that. Beyond that, however, some states wanted to keep the ballot in the hands of the well-to-do.** At the Philadelphia convention, Madison summed up the problem. “The people at large” were “the fittest” source of presidential election—“as likely as any that could be devised to produce an Executive Magistrate of distinguished character.” But there was a problem: “[t]he right of suffrage was much more diffusive in the Northern than the Southern states” and the South “could have no influence in the election on the score of the Negroes.” **Electors would give the South power without penalizing its elites for failing to emancipate black Americans or enfranchise poor white ones. This is exactly why the system remains in place today. It allows local elites to limit access to the ballot without losing national clout.**

#### 2. Millions of votes end up getting wasted and smaller states get a larger say than they should

[**Andrew Prokop**](http://www.vox.com/authors/andrew-prokop) **2016** (Politics writer for Vox magazine. Dec 19, 2016. *“*Why the Electoral College is the absolute worst, explained,” *Vox*. <http://www.vox.com/policy-and-politics/2016/11/7/12315574/electoral-college-explained-presidential-elections-2016> DOA: 3/6/16) CDY

Well, there’s a lot that’s unfair — or at the very least undemocratic — about the Electoral College. For one, the winner of the nationwide popular vote can lose the presidency. In 2000, Al Gore won half a million more votes than George W. Bush nationwide, but Bush won the presidency after he was declared the winner in Florida by a mere 537 votes. And that wasn’t the first time — electoral college/popular vote splits happened in 1876 and 1888 too, and occurred in 2016 too. Second, there’s swing state privilege. **Millions of votes in safe states end up being “wasted,” at least in terms of the presidential race, because it makes no difference whether Clinton wins California by 4 million votes, 400,000 votes, or 40 votes** — in any scenario, she gets its 55 electors. Meanwhile, states like Florida **and** Ohio get the power to tip the outcome just because they happen to be closely divided politically. Third**, a small state bias is also built in, since every state is guaranteed at least three electors (the combination of their representation in the House and Senate). The way this shakes out in the math, the 4 percent of the country’s population in the smallest states end up being allotted 8 percent of Electoral College votes**. And fourth, there’s the possibility for those electors themselves to hijack the outcome.

#### 3. The Electoral College doesn’t have to vote for what the people voted for which counters that some votes are valued more than others

Lawrence Lessig 2016 (Lawrence Lessig is a professor at Harvard Law School, and a 2015 democratic primary candidate. 11/24/2016 “The Constitution lets the electoral college choose the winner. They should choose Clinton.,” The Washington Posts. <https://www.washingtonpost.com/opinions/the-constitution-lets-the-electoral-college-choose-the-winner-they-should-choose-clinton/2016/11/24/0f431828-b0f7-11e6-8616-52b15787add0_story.html?utm_term=.4b0e39673069> DOA: 3/6/17) DIB

In both cases, the result violated what has become one of the most important principles governing our democracy — one person, one vote. In both cases, the votes of some weighed much more heavily than the votes of others. Today, the vote of a citizen in Wyoming is four times as powerful as the vote of a citizen in Michigan. The vote of a citizen in Vermont is three times as powerful as a vote in Missouri. This denies Americans the fundamental value of a representative democracy — equal citizenship. Yet nothing in our Constitution compels this result. Instead, if the electoral college is to control who becomes our president, we should take it seriously by understanding its purpose precisely. It is not meant to deny a reasonable judgment by the people. It is meant to be a circuit breaker — just in case the people go crazy.

#### 4. Literally just not proportionate

Drew Desilver 2016 (Drew Desilver is a senior writer at Pew Research Center. 12/20/16 “Trump’s victory another example of how Electoral College wins are bigger than popular vote ones,” Pew Research Center. <http://www.pewresearch.org/fact-tank/2016/12/20/why-electoral-college-landslides-are-easier-to-win-than-popular-vote-ones/> DOA: 3/6/17) DIB

In fact, the very nature of the way the U.S. picks its presidents tends to create a disconnect between the outcome in the Electoral College and the popular vote. The last time a popular-vote loser won the presidency in the Electoral College was, of course, in 2000, when George W. Bush edged out Al Gore 271-266 despite Gore winning some 537,000 more popular votes nationwide. The other electoral-popular vote mismatches came in 1876 and 1888; in all four instances the Democratic nominee ended up the loser. (In the 1824 election, which was contested between rival factions of the old Democratic-Republican Party, Andrew Jackson won a plurality of the popular and electoral vote, but because he was short of an Electoral College majority the election was thrown to the House of Representatives, which chose runner-up John Quincy Adams.) Even in the vast majority of U.S. elections, in which the same candidate won both the popular and the electoral vote, the system usually makes the winner’s victory margin in the former a lot wider than in the latter. In 2012, for example, Barack Obama won 51% of the nationwide popular vote but nearly 62% of the electoral votes, or 332 out of 538. Looking back at all presidential elections since 1828, the winner’s electoral vote share has, on average, been 1.36 times his popular vote share – what we’ll call the electoral vote (EV) inflation factor. Trump’s EV inflation factor, based on his winning 56.5% of the electoral votes (304 out of 538) is 1.22, similar to Obama’s in 2012 (1.21).

#### 5. **We need to abolish the Electoral College because it dilutes the votes of minority voters**

Mark Stern 2016 (Mark Joseph Stern, appellate Litigation Counsel in the Civil Division at the Department of Justice in Washington, Nov 11, 2016“The Electoral College Is an Instrument of White Supremacy—and Sexism” from Slate DOA: 3/9/17 <http://www.slate.com/blogs/xx_factor/2016/11/11/the_electoral_college_is_an_instrument_of_white_supremacy_and_sexism.html>) ESM

Most of us are taught that the Electoral College was designed to dilute democracy by forcing voters to choose independent electors, who then chose a president. That is true, but it’s only part of the story. The system was also designed to accommodate and preserve slavery, the ultimate tool of white supremacy—and later served to delay universal women’s suffrage. Today, that first justification is irrelevant, since electors are generally no longer independent. But the second remains all too relevant, because in its current form, the Electoral College continues to [dilute the votes](https://www.buzzfeed.com/johntemplon/how-the-electoral-college-screws-hispanic-and-asian-voters?utm_term=.nvjvR7vMr" \l ".ahY50p5xk" \t "_blank) of minority voters. As I pointed out in my [earlier piece](http://www.slate.com/blogs/the_slatest/2016/11/10/the_electoral_college_could_be_abolished_without_an_amendment.html), there is a relatively simple fix here, one proposed by Akhil and Vikram Amar along with legal luminary Robert W. Bennett. If states whose electoral votes add up to 270 agree to assign their electors to the winner of the popular vote, they can effectively eliminate the Electoral College. This agreement, called the National Popular Vote Interstate Compact, or NPVIC, has already passed in states with a combined 165 electoral votes. Persuade a few big swing states to join, and the NPVIC would render the Electoral College a complete anachronism. It may be odd to imagine California’s 55 electoral votes going for, say, President Mike Pence, should he win election in 2024. When Republicans win, residents of blue states take some pride in the fact that their electoral votes go to their candidate. But this pride is really quite ridiculous and is far outweighed by the benefits of a system that follows the popular vote. States are a collection of human people, not electors, and the president they choose represents all of them. Abolishing the Electoral College would be a good way to recognize this basic fact of a modern constitutional democracy.

### AT: Hurts Rural Communities

#### 1. There are already checks for a balance of states powers, a national primary would not incorrectly value the importance of rural areas

[**Andrew Prokop**](http://www.vox.com/authors/andrew-prokop) **2016** (Politics writer for Vox magazine. Dec 19, 2016. *“*Why the Electoral College is the absolute worst, explained,” *Vox*. <http://www.vox.com/policy-and-politics/2016/11/7/12315574/electoral-college-explained-presidential-elections-2016> DOA: 3/6/16) CDY

**But a national popular vote system wouldn’t *devalue* the votes of people who live in rural states and small towns. It would *accurately* value them by treating them equal to people who live in cities, rather than giving them an extra weighting. Furthermore, small-state interests are built into the Senate’s math** (where Delaware absurdly gets as many senators as California), **and many House districts are rural. So rural and small-state areas are hardly hurting for national political representation.** Sure, candidates might end up spending less time stumping in the rural areas that currently happen to be lucky enough to fall within the borders of swing states, and more time in urban centers. But is that really a convincing rebuttal to the pretty basic and obvious argument that in the most important electoral choice Americans make, their votes should be treated equally?

#### 2. Presidential candidates don’t campaign in rural areas, regardless of what political system is used

**Robert Speel 2016** (Robert Speel, Associate Professor of Political Science, Erie campus, [Pennsylvania State University](http://theconversation.com/institutions/pennsylvania-state-university-1258" \t "_blank). November 15, 2016. “These 3 Common Arguments For Preserving the Electoral College Are Wrong,” Time. DOA: March 6, 2017. <http://time.com/4571626/electoral-college-wrong-arguments/>) EL

**Presidential candidates don’t campaign in rural areas no matter what system is used, simply because there are not a lot of votes to be gained in those areas.** [Data from the 2016 campaign](http://nj-travel-tracker.herokuapp.com/" \t "_blank) indicate that 53 percent of campaign events for Trump, Hillary Clinton, Mike Pence and Tim Kaine in the two months before the November election were in only four states: Florida, Pennsylvania, North Carolina and Ohio. During that time, 87 percent of campaign visits by the four candidates were in 12 battleground states, and none of the four candidates ever went to 27 states, which includes almost all of rural America.

#### He continues,

**Robert Speel 2016.** (Robert Speel, Associate Professor of Political Science, Erie campus, [Pennsylvania State University](http://theconversation.com/institutions/pennsylvania-state-university-1258" \t "_blank). November 15, 2016. “These 3 Common Arguments For Preserving the Electoral College Are Wrong,” Time. DOA: March 6, 2017. <http://time.com/4571626/electoral-college-wrong-arguments/>) EL

**Even in the swing states where they do campaign, the candidates focus on urban areas where most voters live. In Pennsylvania, for example, 72 percent of [Pennsylvania campaign visits](http://nj-travel-tracker.herokuapp.com/" \t "_blank) by Clinton and Trump in the final two months of their campaigns were to the Philadelphia and Pittsburgh areas.** In Michigan, all [eight campaign visits](http://nj-travel-tracker.herokuapp.com/" \t "_blank) by Clinton and Trump in the final two months of their campaigns were to the Detroit and Grand Rapids areas, with neither candidate visiting the rural parts of the state. The Electoral College does not create a national campaign inclusive of rural areas. In fact, it does just the opposite.

### AT: Hurts Small States

#### 1. Small states are disregarded by presidential campaign with the 13 smallest states receiving not attention

**Rich Rubino 2012.** (Rich Rubino, political author and contributor to the Huffington Post. October 19, 2012. “Reforming the Electoral College So That Every Vote Counts,” Huffington Post. DOA: March 6, 2017. <http://www.huffingtonpost.com/rich-rubino/national-popular-vote_b_1986860.html>) EL

**Small states are also disregarded by presidential campaigns. With the exception of New Hampshire, the 13 smallest states are all “safe states” receiving no attention from Presidential nominees**. They have no electoral incentive to address issues specific to small states like livestock grazing in Wyoming, the effects of debilitating fishing regulations on Rhode Island fishermen, or the future of Vermont’s diary industry.

#### 2. Gov’t protects small states now

[**Andrew Prokop**](http://www.vox.com/authors/andrew-prokop) **2016** (Politics writer for Vox magazine. Dec 19, 2016. *“*Why the Electoral College is the absolute worst, explained,” *Vox*. <http://www.vox.com/policy-and-politics/2016/11/7/12315574/electoral-college-explained-presidential-elections-2016> DOA: 3/6/16) CDY

**But a national popular vote system wouldn’t *devalue* the votes of people who live in rural states and small towns. It would *accurately* value them by treating them equal to people who live in cities, rather than giving them an extra weighting. Furthermore, small-state interests are built into the Senate’s math** (where Delaware absurdly gets as many senators as California), **and many House districts are rural. So rural and small-state areas are hardly hurting for national political representation.** Sure, candidates might end up spending less time stumping in the rural areas that currently happen to be lucky enough to fall within the borders of swing states, and more time in urban centers. But is that really a convincing rebuttal to the pretty basic and obvious argument that in the most important electoral choice Americans make, their votes should be treated equally?

#### 3. Large state bias exists in a NPV

**Paul Boudreaux, 2004** (Paul Boudreaux, assistant professor at the Stetson University College of Law. Fall 2004. “The Electoral College and Its Meager Federalism,” *Marquette Law Review*, <http://scholarship.law.marquette.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1019&context=mulr>. Accessed 6 April 2017. Page 220-221) ESG

**The assumptions of a large-state advantage in the electoral college do not withstand scrutiny, however. Of course it is true that it is far better for a candidate to capture California's 55 electoral votes than Wyoming's 3 votes. However, a similar assertion could be made with a direct vote. It is far better to carry a certain majority among California's eleven million individual voters than among the 0.2 million voters in Wyoming**. 69 With a direct vote, a candidate is encouraged to try to collect any individual vote that he or she can across the nation; under the electoral college, the candidate is encouraged to gather any electoral vote available. It is true that the largest states-New York from 1812 through 1968, and California from 1972-have good historical records of agreeing with the nationwide electoral college tally. However, these states' votes also correlate with the nationwide popular vote.' 71 Other states have good records of agreeing with the national vote; it was a small state, not New York, that was referred to in the old saying, "As Maine goes, so goes the nation."'

#### 4. However, they still have an unfair portion of the vote

[**Andrew Prokop**](http://www.vox.com/authors/andrew-prokop) **2016** (Politics writer for Vox magazine. Dec 19, 2016. *“*Why the Electoral College is the absolute worst, explained,” *Vox*. <http://www.vox.com/policy-and-politics/2016/11/7/12315574/electoral-college-explained-presidential-elections-2016> DOA: 3/6/16) CDY

Well, there’s a lot that’s unfair — or at the very least undemocratic — about the Electoral College. For one, the winner of the nationwide popular vote can lose the presidency. In 2000, Al Gore won half a million more votes than George W. Bush nationwide, but Bush won the presidency after he was declared the winner in Florida by a mere 537 votes. And that wasn’t the first time — electoral college/popular vote splits happened in 1876 and 1888 too, and occurred in 2016 too. Second, there’s swing state privilege. **Millions of votes in safe states end up being “wasted,” at least in terms of the presidential race, because it makes no difference whether Clinton wins California by 4 million votes, 400,000 votes, or 40 votes** — in any scenario, she gets its 55 electors. Meanwhile, states like Florida **and** Ohio get the power to tip the outcome just because they happen to be closely divided politically. Third**, a small state bias is also built in, since every state is guaranteed at least three electors (the combination of their representation in the House and Senate). The way this shakes out in the math, the 4 percent of the country’s population in the smallest states end up being allotted 8 percent of Electoral College votes**. And fourth, there’s the possibility for those electors themselves to hijack the outcome.

#### 5. A direct vote would help small states Carol Mellor, 2008 (Carol Mellor, head of the Voter Services committee at the League of Women Voters of the Hamptons. 2008. “LWVUS Study on the National Popular Vote Compact Background Paper,” *League of Women Voters of the United States*, <https://bpb.opendns.com/a/webcache.googleusercontent.com/search?q=cache:bgAnNx70qmkJ:lwv.corvallis.or.us/newsletters-archive/LWVUSPopularVoteStudy.doc+&cd=2&hl=en&ct=clnk&gl=us>. Accessed 13 April 2017. Page 5) ESG

Small States. **The political power of small states would be increased under the NPV** Compact. **Currently, political power generally resides in the closely divided battleground states. Few of the 22 least populous states are battlegrounds. With the NPV Compact each vote becomes important regardless of the state; state size and closeness of the race within a state would be less relevant.** Electing the REAL Winner. Out of our nation’s 55 presidential elections, there have been four “wrong winners” that is, elections in which the candidate elected to the presidency is not the person who won the most votes. This is a failure rate of 1 in 14, which does not instill Â confidence in the procedures for electing the President of the United States. When an election is a landslide, there is less chance of a “wrong winner” but the more divided the country and the closer the elections, the greater the chance of erroneous results. We now appear to be in an era where many elections are close. The NPV Compact would eliminate the possibility of a “wrong winner”.

### AT: Recount Logistics

#### 1. A recount would not be that big of a deal – we already recount plenty of big states

[**Andrew Prokop**](http://www.vox.com/authors/andrew-prokop) **2016** (Politics writer for Vox magazine. Dec 19, 2016. *“*Why the Electoral College is the absolute worst, explained,” *Vox*. <http://www.vox.com/policy-and-politics/2016/11/7/12315574/electoral-college-explained-presidential-elections-2016> DOA: 3/6/16) CDY

It’s tough to argue with a straight face that this bizarre system is *inherently* better than just a simple vote. After all, why doesn’t any state elect its governor with an “Electoral College” of various counties? Why does pretty much every other country that elects a president use a simple popular vote, or a vote accompanied with a runoff? Now, you can argue that the Electoral College’s seeming distortions of the popular will aren’t as bad as they seem — for instance, by pointing out that swing states [tend to swing along with the nation](http://www.realclearpolitics.com/articles/2012/10/12/how_likely_is_an_electoral_votepopular_vote_split_115749.html) rather than overriding its will, or that the popular vote winner almost always wins. But of course, that’s not guaranteed to always be the case, and the biggest major exception (the 2000 election) was an incredibly consequential one. **Others try to fearmonger about the prospect of a** [**contested nationwide recount**](http://www.huffingtonpost.com/curtis-gans/national-popular-vote_b_1189390.html) **— which, sure, would be ugly, but if you’ll recall, the Florida recount was also extremely ugly. And since there are so many more votes cast nationally, it’s much less likely that the national vote would end up a near tie than that a tipping point’s state vote would end up as a near tie**. Some argue that the Electoral College ensures [regional balance](http://www.fec.gov/pdf/eleccoll.pdf), since it’s mathematically impossible for a candidate with overwhelming support from just one region to be elected. But realistically, the country is big and broad enough that this couldn’t happen under a popular vote system either — any regional candidate would need to get *some* support outside his or her region. But when we get down to brass tacks, the most serious objections to reforming the Electoral College come from rural and small-state elites who fear that under a national popular vote system, they’d be ignored and elections would be decided by people who live in cities.

#### 2. Recounts will be less likely under a direct vote Carol Mellor, 2008 (Carol Mellor, head of the Voter Services committee at the League of Women Voters of the Hamptons. 2008. “LWVUS Study on the National Popular Vote Compact Background Paper,” League of Women Voters of the United States, <https://bpb.opendns.com/a/webcache.googleusercontent.com/search?q=cache:bgAnNx70qmkJ:lwv.corvallis.or.us/newsletters-archive/LWVUSPopularVoteStudy.doc+&cd=2&hl=en&ct=clnk&gl=us>. Accessed 13 April 2017. Page 6) ESG

Winning Levels. The winner-take-all rule (currently used by 48 of the 50 states) is not required by the U.S. Constitution. It is entirely a product of state law. Accordingly, changing the winner-take-all rule does not require an amendment to the Constitution but may be changed in the same way that it was originally adopted, namely by the enactment of state laws by state legislatures on a state-by-state basis. Recounts. **It is anticipated that the need for recounts will diminish under the NPV** Compact **because, although the vote count can be extremely close in battleground states, the numbers are not close on a nationwide basis.** Should a recount be necessary, the plans and resources to conduct a recount would still be the responsibility of the state experiencing the close vote. However, **due to the larger pool of voters, it is more likely that the national results would not be close and, as a result, fewer statewide recounts would be necessary.**

#### 3. The chances of there being a recount is one in 4,000

**Monideepa Talukdar and Rob Richie 2007** (Monideepa Talukdar and Rob Richie. July 27, 2007. “A Survey and Analysis of Statewide Election Recounts,” *Astrid Online*. <http://www.astrid-online.it/static/upload/protected/FAIR/FAIRVOTE-Report-ELECTION-RECOUNTS.pdf> PAGE: 9 DOA: 4/18/17) CDY

The current system of administering recounts is characterized by wide-ranging differences among states regarding various aspects of the process, such as the timing of recounts, prerequisites, and counting techniques. Moreover, regardless of standard criteria for handling recounts in close elections, candidates have the option of petitioning recounts even in not-so- close elections and/or challenging the outcome in court. Nevertheless, the past record indicates that the overwhelming majority of elections are non- disputatious. In the relatively few instances where recounts have taken place, they have mostly upheld the original result and only slightly changed the margin of victory. Furthermore, the larger the vote pool in an election, the less disputatious it tends to be. Implications of our findings for policymakers include: • Automatic recounts: States with automatic recounts may want to consider decreasing the percentage of the vote that triggers such a recount. Our numbers suggest that a 1 percent trigger, or even a 0.5 percent trigger, is unnecessarily generous without evidence of corruption. We recognize the contention that such a higher threshold might act as a check against efforts to steal elections, but that seems to be more of a theoretical argument that one grounded in facts. • Nationwide elections: **Some political scientists have spoken against a national popular vote for president because of their concerns about managing a nationwide recount.** This concern has not stopped other nations with large populations from developing recount procedures when they hold national elections for president**, but it** also **seems groundless as a realistic concern**. Only one out of every 326 statewide elections triggered a recount and less than one out of every 3,500 statewide elections was overturned in a recount. **Given that the odds of a recount decrease with larger electorates, one can conservatively estimate that the chance of an election that might be overturned in a recount is about one in 4,000, which means likely to happen once about every 16,000 years of presidential elections.**

### AT: Regional Balance

#### 1. National vote does not hurt regional balance

[**Andrew Prokop**](http://www.vox.com/authors/andrew-prokop) **2016** (Politics writer for Vox magazine. Dec 19, 2016. *“*Why the Electoral College is the absolute worst, explained,” *Vox*. <http://www.vox.com/policy-and-politics/2016/11/7/12315574/electoral-college-explained-presidential-elections-2016> DOA: 3/6/16) CDY

It’s tough to argue with a straight face that this bizarre system is inherently better than just a simple vote. After all, why doesn’t any state elect its governor with an “Electoral College” of various counties? Why does pretty much every other country that elects a president use a simple popular vote, or a vote accompanied with a runoff? Now, you can argue that the Electoral College’s seeming distortions of the popular will aren’t as bad as they seem — for instance, by pointing out that swing states [tend to swing along with the nation](http://www.realclearpolitics.com/articles/2012/10/12/how_likely_is_an_electoral_votepopular_vote_split_115749.html) rather than overriding its will, or that the popular vote winner almost always wins. But of course, that’s not guaranteed to always be the case, and the biggest major exception (the 2000 election) was an incredibly consequential one. Others try to fearmonger about the prospect of a [contested nationwide recount](http://www.huffingtonpost.com/curtis-gans/national-popular-vote_b_1189390.html) — which, sure, would be ugly, but if you’ll recall, the Florida recount was also extremely ugly. And since there are so many more votes cast nationally, it’s much less likely that the national vote would end up a near tie than that a tipping point’s state vote would end up as a near tie. **Some argue that the Electoral College ensures** [**regional balance**](http://www.fec.gov/pdf/eleccoll.pdf)**, since it’s mathematically impossible for a candidate with overwhelming support from just one region to be elected. But realistically, the country is big and broad enough that this couldn’t happen under a popular vote system either — any regional candidate would need to get some support outside his or her region. But when we get down to brass tacks, the most serious objections to reforming the Electoral College come from rural and small-state elites who fear that under a national popular vote system, they’d be ignored and elections would be decided by people who live in cities.**

#### 2. The Electoral College increases the risk of a minority candidate winning

**Paul Boudreaux, 2004** (Paul Boudreaux, assistant professor at the Stetson University College of Law. Fall 2004. “The Electoral College and Its Meager Federalism,” *Marquette Law Review*, <http://scholarship.law.marquette.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1019&context=mulr>. Accessed 6 April 2017. Page 195-196) ESG

The odd system for choosing the American President has been defended by a supposed federalism inherent in the electoral college.' These assertions of federalism have not been given the scrutiny they deserve, however, even after the controversial election of 2000, in which more Americans voted for Al Gore, yet the electoral college chose George W. Bush. As the 2004 election approaches, I argue that today's electoral system serves no purpose of real federalism, through which states would exercise independent sovereignty. Rather, today's electoral college allows for at best a meager federalism, in which states are merely addresses in the national government. Although the Constitution allows states to choose electors in any manner, all states use popular voting. Contrary to the expectations of the constitutional framers of 1787, today's electors do not exercise independent judgment; rather, they operate as mere automatons, controlled by the political parties to whom they are bound. Although states are assigned by formula a varying number of electors, small states receive at best only small boosts in their voting power. And contrary to the assertions of some federalists, **the electoral system does not avoid the possibility of a "regional" winner; in fact, the electoral system enhances the troubling prospect (which arguably has already occurred at least once in American history) of a President supported by only a minority of voters, in a minority of states.** Shorn of a defense of real federalism, there is no persuasive reason for the United States to retain a system that leaves the choice of the American President to formulaic chance. Applying a presumption that American elections should be decided by direct popular vote unless there is a compelling reason to follow another method, I conclude that the United States should jettison its outmoded electoral college in favor of a more straightforward direct popular vote.

#### He continues that the *harms* of regionalism are magnified as well,

**Paul Boudreaux, 2004** (Paul Boudreaux, assistant professor at the Stetson University College of Law. Fall 2004. “The Electoral College and Its Meager Federalism,” *Marquette Law Review*, <http://scholarship.law.marquette.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1019&context=mulr>. Accessed 6 April 2017. Page 228-229) ESG

This argument does not survive scrutiny, however. In order to capture a majority of votes across the nation, it is a truism that a candidate cannot gather votes solely from a small number of states. One simply cannot collect more than half of the popular vote in a region that encompasses fewer than half of the voters. 20 8 Even by capturing 70% of the vote in California (by far the largest state, with about 13% of the nation's population), New York, and Texas, or in a discrete region such as the northeast states, the Great Lakes states, or the West Coast, the candidate would still be far short of a majority of the popular vote. 20 9 If, say, the West Coast states ever do grow to comprise a majority of the nation's voters, it would be possible for a candidate to win the election by appealing to this region alone. Under this scenario, however, the candidate probably would also win the electoral college (by winning states that encompassed a majority of the electoral votes). 2 10 A fear appears to be that, with a popular vote, a handful of large urban states could somehow mobilize millions upon millions of voters from the alleys of the big cities, and that these masses (What ethnicity do we imagine them to be? Which party would they be likely to support?) could somehow vote in numbers that would overwhelm the rest of the nation. Such a phenomenon is not real, however; even if there were such huge numbers of voters in the urban states, their numbers would give their states a majority of the electoral votes as well.21' **A candidate whose support is confined largely to one region would find it nearly impossible to win a direct popular vote among two candidates. Even if the candidate managed to draw an impressive 70% of the vote across a region that constitutes one-third of the population, this would give him or her only 23% of the vote-far short of a majority.** Expanding the region to half the nation would still yield only 35% of the vote. **Even if we pushed the definition of region to include 60% of the country, the candidate would still gather only 42%. (By contrast, as I explore below, a candidate who won a region of states that encompassed 60% of the nation would automatically win the electoral college, regardless of whether he or she took a single popular vote from the rest of the country.)**

### AT: More Democratic

#### 1. The Electoral College violates the democratic principle of one person one vote

**Jonathan Mahler and Steve Eder 2016** (Jonathan Mahler, reporter for the New York Times, and Steve Eder, reporter for the New York Times. November 10, 2016. “The Electoral College Is Hated by Many. So Why Does It Endure?” The New York Times. DOA: March 9, 2017. <https://www.nytimes.com/2016/11/11/us/politics/the-electoral-college-is-hated-by-many-so-why-does-it-endure.html>) EL

To its critics**, the Electoral College is a relic that violates the democratic principle of one person, one vote, and distorts the presidential campaign by encouraging candidates to campaign only in the relatively small number of contested states**. “I think it is intolerable for democracy,” said George C. Edwards III, a political science professor at Texas A&M University and the author of a book on the Electoral College. “I can’t think of any justification for it, and any justification that is offered doesn’t bear scrutiny.”

#### 2. A popular vote would cause states to encourage voter turnout and improve democracy

**Akhil Reed Amar, 2016** (Akhil Reed Amar, professor of law and political science at Yale University. November 16th 2016. “Should the Electoral College Be Abolished?” *The New York Times*, <http://www.nytimes.com/roomfordebate/2016/11/16/should-the-electoral-college-be-abolished>. Accessed 9 March 2017) ESG

Indeed, **direct presidential election would harness state creativity in exciting ways. Currently, states have little incentive to encourage voting. A state gets a pre-set number of electoral votes regardless of voter turnout. But in a direct election system, states with higher turnout would have more clout in the final tally, giving state governments incentives to encourage voting. States may do this different ways — early voting in some states; same-day registration in others; making Election Day a holiday in still other jurisdictions.** Federal oversight would be necessary to keep state competition within fair boundaries, but **state creativity could drive a race to the top — democratic experimentalism and federalism at their best.** Some states are already experimenting with a creative plan for future presidential races. Under the National Popular Vote Interstate Compact that has gained momentum in recent years, states in the compact are promising that, if enough states ultimately join the bandwagon, these states will give their electoral votes to the national popular vote winner. It’s an interesting idea — in 2001 I floated a precursor of this plan — but the current version does have technical wrinkles that need to be ironed out. (What if some noncooperating states refuse to hold proper elections or careful recounts? What if some states lower the voting age in ridiculous ways — letting 12-year-olds vote — to maximize their clout?) To work well, strong federal oversight would be needed.

### AT: Reform (District Allocation)

#### 1. District allocation of electoral votes by district would be undemocratic and skew right

**Richard Lempert, 2016** (Richard Lempert, Eric Stein Distinguished University Professor of Law and Sociology, emeritus, University of Michigan. November 29th 2016. “Two cheers for the Electoral College: Reasons not to abolish it,” *Brookings*, <https://www.brookings.edu/blog/fixgov/2016/11/29/two-cheers-for-electoral-college/>. Accessed 9 March 2017) ESG

Second, perhaps after grandfathering the divergent practice in Maine and Nebraska, **electors in all states should be required to vote unanimously for the state’s winner.** Maine and Nebraska, which allocate a portion of their electoral votes by congressional district, have so few electors that their divergence from common practice is unlikely to matter. The same is not true in other states, like Pennsylvania where the idea of allocating electoral votes by congressional district was floated when Obama ran for his second term. The possibility was real because Republicans controlled the governorship and both houses in the state legislature. It was attractive because although Pennsylvania appeared likely to tip toward Obama, Romney was sure to lead in some congressional districts. **Not only is allocating electoral votes this way too great an interference with the will of the majority to be tolerated in a democracy, but also the threat is seriously exacerbated by the partisan nature of redistricting. Yet even the elimination of partisan gerrymandering would not solve the problem, for the natural concentration of democratic voters in urban areas would unduly skew the Electoral College in a Republican direction.** We see in the recent election that the Presidential preferences of voters in some states, California being the best example, count less than the preferences of voters residing elsewhere. Baker v. Carr, the case that upended the rural domination of state legislatures, and put teeth into the one person/one vote principle should be interpreted to prevent partisan tinkering with established rules for electoral vote allocation, though the safer path is a constitutional amendment.

#### 2. Allocating Electoral votes by districts increases the likelihood of gerrymandering and distracts from important issues

**Tara Ross, 2004** (Tara Ross, lawyer and author of Enlightened Democracy: The Case for the Electoral College. November 1st 2004. “The Electoral College: Enlightened Democracy,” *Legal Memorandum by the Heritage Foundation*, <http://www.heritage.org/the-constitution/report/the-electoral-college-enlightened-democracy?_ga=1.67231697.1937855222.1489431141>. Accessed 13 March 2017. Page 10-11) ESG

District Plan. The District Plan would award electoral votes based upon congressional district. The candidate with the most votes in any congressional district would win that district’s one electoral vote. The two Senate “add-on” votes in each state would then be treated as “at-large” votes and awarded to the state’s popular vote winner. Maine and Nebraska already operate under this system. The proposal would require other states to join them. Neither Maine nor Nebraska has divided its electoral votes since their systems were first implemented, but with close presidential elections the odds increase that one or both states will do so. 51 Proponents of the District Plan argue that the system preserves the small-state advantage, while allowing diversity within the states to be reflected in the national election totals.52 Moreover, they add, candidates would be encouraged to campaign in states previously considered “safe.” Greater voter participation would result, they argue, because every voter would feel that his vote counts. Other Electoral College critics dismiss the District Plan, arguing that the plan fails to address the “problem” of a popular vote winner failing to win the presidency.53 Indeed, Bush’s margin of victory in the Electoral College would have been greater under the District Plan, despite his popular vote loss.54 The District Plan retains some of the advantages of the current Electoral College arrangement. America’s presidential election system should encourage national coalition building, and campaigning by districts would certainly work toward this goal.55 However, many of the other benefits envisioned by District Plan proponents are unlikely to come to pass. Greater voter participation is improbable, particularly in lopsided or “safe” congressional districts—and most congressional districts are safe. **This so-called reform may actually have the opposite effect from what was intended in states that are close overall but have congressional districts that are not. Even worse, the primary incentive created by the District Plan is an increased motivation for gerrymandering. State boundaries have one significant advantage over congressional district boundaries: They are reasonably permanent and cannot be changed by an incumbent class of officials. Another problem created by the District Plan is that it diverts attention from statewide and national issues. It discourages candidates from addressing issues that appeal to the state as a whole and might encourage candidates to visit district rich, high-population centers to the exclusion of rural districts.** **Moreover, if a state votes in pieces, consequential issues would fall out of the larger debate in favor of local grievances.** Focusing on a few swing districts would repeat on a fragmented scale the “swing state problem.” Candidates might visit only a few close districts and ignore areas considered safe. Despite these arguments against the District Plan, the current system allows a state to switch to the District Plan if it decides that doing so would be beneficial within its borders—and it may do so without the necessity of passing a constitutional amendment. Moreover, the state can switch back to a winner-take-all system if implementing the District Plan causes more problems than it solved (as it is likely to do). Constitutional amendments are not completed—or undone— nearly as easily.

### AT: Reform (Proportional Allocation)

#### 1. Proportional allocation of Electoral votes would create more disputes and fracturing

**Tara Ross, 2004** (Tara Ross, lawyer and author of Enlightened Democracy: The Case for the Electoral College. November 1st 2004. “The Electoral College: Enlightened Democracy,” *Legal Memorandum by the Heritage Foundation*, <http://www.heritage.org/the-constitution/report/the-electoral-college-enlightened-democracy?_ga=1.67231697.1937855222.1489431141>. Accessed 13 March 2017. Page 11-12) ESG

Proportional Plan. Under the Proportional Plan, the Electoral College would be retained, but the electoral votes in each state would be allocated based upon the percentage of the popular vote won. Some versions of this plan call for whole electoral votes to be divided in the interest of accuracy.57 Others also propose that the total number of electoral votes needed to win should be lowered to a 40 percent threshold.58 Proponents argue that the plan would preserve the states’ Electoral College strength, but that the results would be closer to the national popular vote outcome.59 They further argue that the voices of minority voting groups would be reflected in the final election tally because even ballots cast for third-party candidates could be reflected in the national results. Presidents could be elected without winning the popular vote, but such an outcome would be less likely than under the current system. Other Electoral College opponents deem even the small remaining possibility of a “popular vote loser” President to be unacceptable.60 The Proportional Plan is yet another option that sounds good on the surface, but that creates problems in practice. **First, constant fighting would erupt over election tallies. After all, a swing of onetenth of a percent in one or several states could change the outcome of the election. Potentially, at least one electoral vote in each of the 50 states would be open to dispute every presidential election year.** Worse, because this type of election is so similar to a direct popular election system, it contains many of the same downfalls: **multiple candidacies, close elections, runoffs, greater potential for fraud, and greater incentives for extremist candidates to join the fray.** Definitive election outcomes are discouraged. Close vote totals and challenges to election outcomes would become the norm. Colorado, however, is currently considering adoption of this plan. A Colorado citizens’ organization—financed by a group from San Francisco and funded by a Brazilian millionaire who resides parttime in California62—recently collected enough signatures to place a referendum on its November 2004 ballot. If passed, this referendum would supposedly replace Colorado’s winner-take-all system of casting electoral votes with a system of proportional allocation, making Colorado the only state to enact such a method in presidential elections.63 The referendum, however, has a glaring flaw. It purports to let Colorado voters decide the method of allocating the state’s electoral votes, despite the fact that the Constitution gives this power to state legislatures, not state citizens. 64 For constitutional purposes, the difference is very real. If the referendum passes, the most likely result is a series of court challenges in Colorado. Proponents of the referendum argue that state statutory and constitutional provisions make the people equivalent to the legislature when they act through referendum or initiative. Therefore, they conclude, passage of a referendum or other citizen initiative is a perfectly legal and valid manner of changing electoral vote allocations in the state. These proponents, however, have forgotten the Supremacy Clause of the U. S. Constitution: State laws and constitutions may not trump the U.S. Constitution. The U.S. Constitution is the supreme law of the land and preempts all other laws. That same Constitution explicitly designates each state’s legislature as the entity with authority to decide the manner of appointing electors. States (whether by referenda or other means) may certainly delegate legislative power to citizens for state purposes, but they may not delegate the state legislature’s constitutionally mandated duties in the national presidential election process.

2. Proportional reform could be even more undemocratic  
**Carol Mellor, 2008** (Carol Mellor, head of the Voter Services committee at the League of Women Voters of the Hamptons. 2008. “LWVUS Study on the National Popular Vote Compact Background Paper,” *League of Women Voters of the United States*, <https://bpb.opendns.com/a/webcache.googleusercontent.com/search?q=cache:bgAnNx70qmkJ:lwv.corvallis.or.us/newsletters-archive/LWVUSPopularVoteStudy.doc+&cd=2&hl=en&ct=clnk&gl=us>. Accessed 13 April 2017. Page 1) ESG

The League strongly believes that the Electoral College should be abolished and not merely “reformed.” One “reform” which the League specifically rejects is the voting by electors based on proportional representation in lieu of the present “winner-takes-all” method. Such a system would apportion the electoral votes of a state based on the popular vote in that state**. Instead of making the Electoral College more representative, such proportional voting would increase the chance that no candidate would receive a majority in the Electoral College, thereby sending the election of the President to the House of Representatives where each state, regardless of population, would receive only one vote. Election of the President by the House further removes the decision from the people and is contrary to the “one person, one vote” principle.** The League also does not support reform of the Electoral College on a state-by-state basis because the League believes there should be uniformity across the nation in the systems used to elect the President.

### AT: Two Parties Good

#### 1. Multiparty systems such as Germany’s have been more cooperative, the US’s two parties usually aren’t

**Raymond Smith, 2013** (Raymond Smith, Senior Fellow at the Progressive Policy Institute. December 19th 2013. “What if the US Had a Multiparty System Like Germany’s?” *Washington Monthly,* <http://washingtonmonthly.com/2013/12/19/what-if-the-us-had-a-multiparty-system-like-germanys/>.Accessed 16 March 2017) ESG

Naturally, each major party would prefer to have unilateral control over government, but the decision to form a broad governing coalition between the German center-right and the center-left is hardly unprecedented: the same situation prevailed from 2005 to 2009, a period during which Germany weathered the global economic downturn far better than most countries. **Just as the American two-party system has led to sharp polarization, the German multiparty system has pushed them towards greater accommodation.** “Grand coalition” governments are not panaceas. Most notably, they often suffer from an inability to offer more than incremental changes and a tendency to fracture under stress. In the longer run it’s also problematic not to have the government in power checked by forceful opposition from a major party outside government. Still, **such arrangements promote broad consensus and enhance the stability of a political system, given that the governing coalition incorporates parties supported by 7 in 10 voters. The last time the U.S. had anything remotely like such a grand coalition was in the period after 9/11 when leaders from both parties coalesced around President George W. Bush and Democrats made little attempt to use their one-vote Senate majority to obstructionist ends.** The 11th-hour vote on October 18 to reopen the U.S. federal government and avert a catastrophic debt default also offered the faint outline of a centrist governing coalition: the measure passed the Senate by 81-18 and the House by 285-144, with the support of leaders of both parties in both houses and of president. The more recent Ryan-Murray budget deal also offers prospects of reasonable compromise. This makes it all the more intriguing to imagine what American government could accomplish with the four years of the sort of sensible, centrist politics and policymaking that seems likely to prevail in Germany thanks (at least in part) to its multiparty system.

#### 2. A multi-party system would massively increase voter turnout

**George Cheung, 2016** (George Cheung, program director for the Joyce Foundation’s Democracy Program. February 4th 2016. “Strengthening Democracy by Embracing a Multi-Party System,” *Stanford Social Innovation Review,* <https://ssir.org/articles/entry/strengthening_democracy_by_embracing_a_multi_party_system>.Accessed 16 March 2017) ESG

Pro-democracy reformers, activists, and funders in the United States tend to focus on increasing voter turnout by decreasing the barriers to voter registration and casting a ballot. But in doing so, they’re missing something important: the broken two-party system. In the market economy consumers have a plethora of choices for virtually every good and service. How, then, when it comes to US general elections, can one expect the American voter to be excited with two choices at best—or, as in most Congressional and many state legislative races, no meaningful choice at all? Reducing barriers to voting is a good idea, but **what’s really needed is a shift to a multi-party system** through proportional representation; **many comparative studies suggest that such a shift would lead to an increase in voter turnout of between 9 and 12 percent.**

#### 3. Right now, turnout is a huge problem…

**Courtney Subramanian 2016** (Courtney Subramanian, reporter for BBC News, Washington. October 28, 2016. “US election: Why does the US have such low voter turnout?” BBC News. DOA: April 7, 2017. <http://www.bbc.com/news/election-us-2016-37634526>) EL

**Participation has hovered between 48% and 57% in US presidential elections since 1980.** That contrasts with France, where turnout regularly tops 80%. **Among OECD countries, the US ranked 31 of 34 for percentage of voting-age population.**

#### 4. The two-party system diminishes the power of the vote and is undemocratic

**Johns Hopkins News-Letter 2012** (Johns Hopkins News-Letter, newspaper of the Johns Hopkins University in Baltimore, Maryland. September 20th 2012. “America’s two party system has failed democracy,” *Johns Hopkins News-Letter*, <http://www.jhunewsletter.com/2012/09/20/americas-two-party-system-has-failed-democracy-13719/>. Accessed 6 April 2017) ESG

The American two-party system is broken and in need of desperate reform. Through the Constitution, the Founders aimed to set up a system of representative government that would respond to the people. Unfortunately their vision has been corrupted by the rise of the two-party system**. If we are to have a government that responds to its citizens, the two-party system must be abolished. The government is no longer responsive to the people but to the two gargantuan parties that do everything in their power to sway elections. In a true democratic republic, 19 percent of the popular vote for Ross Perot in 1992, for example, would have translated into significant electoral votes instead of into zero electoral votes. In essence, the two-party system is a major hindrance to the democratic aspect of the American electoral process, and it stifles the power of the vote.** Research indicates that citizens are becoming generally disillusioned with the two parties. The Pew Research Institute’s data indicates that over 57 percent of all registered voters are independent. In terms of specific issues, a CNN poll gathered that almost 80 percent of voters were not satisfied with how both parties aimed to solve the debt crisis. Additionally, the Congressional approval rating has reached an all-time low of 9 percent. So if the American people aren’t happy with the way the two parties are handling the big issues, why are other voices shut out of the process?

### AT: Many Parties 🡪 Splintering

#### 1. Some multiparty systems know how to prevent hyperfragmentation – look to Germany

**Raymond Smith, 2013** (Raymond Smith, Senior Fellow at the Progressive Policy Institute. December 19th 2013. “What if the US Had a Multiparty System Like Germany’s?” *Washington Monthly,* <http://washingtonmonthly.com/2013/12/19/what-if-the-us-had-a-multiparty-system-like-germanys/>.Accessed 16 March 2017) ESG

Members of the lower house of parliament, the Bundestag, are chosen through a process in which each German citizen has two votes. The first vote, as in the U.S., is cast for an individual person to represent a specific electoral district. The second, and ultimately more influential, vote is cast directly for a political party and determines the overall party composition of government. Such use of a proportional representation system almost guarantees that Germany will have a multiparty system. **But in order to avoid chaotic hyper-fragmentation among parties (as found, for instance, in Italy) Germany enforces a threshold of 5% for a party to enter into the Bundestag. Essentially, any party that fails to gain at least 5% of the national vote is excluded from parliament, a provision that has proven useful in promoting centrism and marginalizing extremes, including both neo-fascist parties and the remnants of the old Communist Party in East Germany.**

#### 2. Plurality wins can be aided with a runoff, which essentially has Constitutional precedent

**Paul Boudreaux, 2004** (Paul Boudreaux, assistant professor at the Stetson University College of Law. Fall 2004. “The Electoral College and Its Meager Federalism,” *Marquette Law Review*, <http://scholarship.law.marquette.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1019&context=mulr>. Accessed 6 April 2017. Page 214) ESG

Conceding that the electoral college does not work as the framers intended, Professor Storing nonetheless argued that the electoral college serves some goals that the framers desired to achieve, including a role for state political organizations. The most significant of Storing's justifications, which I highlight here, is the defense of legitimacy-the argument that the electoral system creates an outcome that appears to be more clear-cut, and thus more legitimate, to the American people. A complication of any electoral system is how to choose a winner when no candidate receives a majority of votes. The "winner" becomes unclear without a majority. With more than two candidates, the lack of a majority winner is a real possibility--one candidate might receive, say, 40%, another 35%, and a third 25%. **There are at least two ways to resolve this dilemma. The first is to accept the plurality winner-the candidate with the most votes wins, regardless of what percentage the candidate receives, and regardless of the margin of victory. The second is to hold a "runoff' election between the top two candidates, thus ensuring a majority winner in the second vote. The U.S. Constitution essentially follows a runoff system-when the electoral college fails to achieve a majority, the House acts as the runoff electoral forum.**

#### 3. The Electoral College allows candidates to pull ahead with a minority of the vote

**Paul Boudreaux, 2004** (Paul Boudreaux, assistant professor at the Stetson University College of Law. Fall 2004. “The Electoral College and Its Meager Federalism,” *Marquette Law Review*, <http://scholarship.law.marquette.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1019&context=mulr>. Accessed 6 April 2017. Page 231-232) ESG

Contrary to federalists such as Best, I contend that it is the electoral college that poses the greater risk of electing a "regional" President. In particular, the electoral system risks choosing a President who both (1) lacks significant support throughout the nation and (2) is the top choice of a distinct minority of Americans-a President that I will characterize with the intentionally disturbing moniker of a regional, minority President. Under the college's unit voting system, **a candidate who fails to gain even minimal support throughout a region is in no worse electoral shape than a candidate who has just fallen short in the popular vote among the voters of each of this region's states. The candidate gets zero votes. Likewise, a candidate who wins a state by a small margin captures all the state's electoral votes**, and can do no better by increasing his or her margin of victory. These phenomena might encourage a candidate who has weak support in a region to ignore this region entirely and focus his or her campaign elsewhere, in hope of electoral victories in the rest of the nation. The electoral college thus enables a candidate who wins states that encompass a bare majority of the electoral votes to capture the presidency, even if the candidate has failed to show any significant support elsewhere. To complete the disturbing scenario, **the candidate might be elected with far less than a majority of the nationwide popular vote, by virtue of the fact that he or she needs only to win by small margins in the states that encompass a bare majority of the electoral votes.** To give numbers to the example, the candidate could capture 55% of the vote in each of a group of states that, in total, encompasses 55% of the electoral vote. These numbers would give the candidate the presidency in the college, even though these states give the candidate only 31% (.55 times .55) of the nationwide vote. In a two-person race, the candidate would defeat his or her rival even without any popular votes in the remaining states, constituting the other 45% of the nation (a fairly large region, indeed), and even if the opponent garnered 69% of the nation's popular votes. This would be a regional, minority President. Lest one think this scenario is contrived, I maintain that a regional, minority President was once elected-Abraham Lincoln in 1860. In this pivotal contest, Lincoln, running for the six-year-old Republican Party, gathered significant support throughout the northern states.21 6 Democrat Stephen Douglas, who had defeated Lincoln in the Illinois Senate race two years before and who was the standard-bearer of the party that had elected the majority of the nation's Presidents to date, also drew some support across the North, largely among moderates who favored popular sovereignty to decide whether slavery would expand to territories.21 7 In the southern states, however, hostility to Douglas's perceived moderation and to all things 218 northern led to a split in the Democratic Party.2 Southern Democrats separately nominated John C. Breckinridge, committed to confronting the northern states, while a fourth candidate, Constitutional Union Party leader John Bell, drew support among southerners who favored conciliation.219 Despite absolutely no support in the South, Lincoln outpolled Douglas, often decisively but sometimes by only thin margins, in every northern state but two. 2 20 Because the northern states encompassed more than half of the electoral vote, support in these states alone allowed Lincoln to capture the electoral college with 59.4% of the electoral vote. He was elected President even though Lincoln was the choice of only 39.9% of the nation's voters.22 ' Lincoln received the smallest popular vote percentage of any President chosen by the electoral college.222 By virtue of his failure to capture any support in the South, and by virtue of the fact that he failed to get the vote of even two out of five Americans, Lincoln is properly characterized as a regional, minority presidential victor in 1860.

### AT: Federalism

#### 1. The Electoral College does nothing for federalism and should be abolished

**Paul Boudreaux, 2004** (Paul Boudreaux, assistant professor at the Stetson University College of Law. Fall 2004. “The Electoral College and Its Meager Federalism,” *Marquette Law Review*, <http://scholarship.law.marquette.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1019&context=mulr>. Accessed 6 April 2017. Page 195-196) ESG

The odd system for choosing the American President has been defended by a supposed federalism inherent in the electoral college.' These assertions of federalism have not been given the scrutiny they deserve, however, even after the controversial election of 2000, in which more Americans voted for Al Gore, yet the electoral college chose George W. Bush. As the 2004 election approaches, I argue **that today's electoral system serves no purpose of real federalism, through which states would exercise independent sovereignty. Rather, today's electoral college allows for at best a meager federalism, in which states are merely addresses in the national government.** Although the Constitution allows states to choose electors in any manner, all states use popular voting. Contrary to the expectations of the constitutional framers of 1787, today's electors do not exercise independent judgment; rather, they operate as mere automatons, controlled by the political parties to whom they are bound. Although states are assigned by formula a varying number of electors, small states receive at best only small boosts in their voting power. And contrary to the assertions of some federalists, the electoral system does not avoid the possibility of a "regional" winner; in fact, the electoral system enhances the troubling prospect (which arguably has already occurred at least once in American history) of a President supported by only a minority of voters, in a minority of states. **Shorn of a defense of real federalism, there is no persuasive reason for the United States to retain a system that leaves the choice of the American President to formulaic chance.** Applying a presumption that American elections should be decided by direct popular vote unless there is a compelling reason to follow another method, I conclude that **the United States should jettison its outmoded electoral college in favor of a more straightforward direct popular vote.**

#### 2. Electoral college =/= Federalism

**Timothy Boylan 2008** (Timothy is a Professor of Political Science; Director, Master of Liberal Arts at Winthrop University. 2008. “A Constitutional Defense of the Electoral College and the Election of the American President,” The Open Political Science Journal. <https://benthamopen.com/contents/pdf/TOPOLISJ/TOPOLISJ-1-50.pdf> DOA: 4/6/17) CDY

For these writers, while the Electoral College may resemble the key aspects of federalism, it does not serve a similar purpose. Citing Senator Birch Bayh, they agree that, “**the Electoral College system is not a fundamental ingredient in the Federal system. It’s more or less an accidental coincidental parallel**” (Ibid., at 84). **The office of the presidency, and the president himself, represents the people as a whole, not the states. The essence of federalism is “the very fact of state and local levels of government engaged in decision-making activities… not** a constant two **allocation of electoral votes**” (Ibid.). Longley and Braun make this argument to clear the way for direct popular vote of the president (See also Amar & Amar, 2001 and the web site of National Popular Vote). They do not argue, as does Hansen, that federalism is the key problem. Instead, they contend that federalism is irrelevant to a critique of the Electoral College (Edwards, 2004; Peirce & Longley, 1981). If we grant this point, does it clearly and definitively point the way to direct election? Do we solve the problems of the Electoral College and restore legitimacy to the electoral process? The following section addresses those questions.

#### 3. Federalism is in fact undermined since so many states get ignored

**Paul Boudreaux, 2004** (Paul Boudreaux, assistant professor at the Stetson University College of Law. Fall 2004. “The Electoral College and Its Meager Federalism,” *Marquette Law Review*, <http://scholarship.law.marquette.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1019&context=mulr>. Accessed 6 April 2017. Page 225-226) ESG

In any event, the supposed federalist benefit of paying attention to states as states is counterbalanced by another effect of the electoral college. **This phenomenon causes candidates to ignore some states. Because of unit voting, it is not any better to collect a large margin of victory, as opposed to a small one, in any given state.** Likewise, losing a state by a small margin, as opposed to a large one, does not do a candidate any good. **One either carries the state or does not. Accordingly, candidates are encouraged to focus their attention on "swing states"-states in which the outcome may still be swayed.** 196 Considering limited time and resources, **they are also discouraged from paying attention to states in which the outcome appears fairly clear, either for or against them.** Thus, citizens in states with a strong leaning to one candidate or the other may find that the nominees give them little attention during the campaign. The swing-state focus means **that entire states may get short shrifts during the campaign.** Consider the 2000 election; early on, it was fairly clear that George W. Bush would almost certainly carry his home state of Texas, the third most populous state, while Al Gore held sizeable leads in both California and New York, the two largest states. 197 While Bush of course would have liked to have swayed New York, it certainly made more sense to focus energy on states he felt he might swing his way, or in which effort was needed to hold off his opponent. 98 Thus, neither Bush nor Gore spent much time campaigning in Texas or New York, where the outcomes seemed foregone conclusions.1

#### 4. A popular vote would cause states to encourage voter turnout and improve democracy

**Akhil Reed Amar, 2016** (Akhil Reed Amar, professor of law and political science at Yale University. November 16th 2016. “Should the Electoral College Be Abolished?” *The New York Times*, <http://www.nytimes.com/roomfordebate/2016/11/16/should-the-electoral-college-be-abolished>. Accessed 9 March 2017) ESG

Indeed, **direct presidential election would harness state creativity in exciting ways. Currently, states have little incentive to encourage voting. A state gets a pre-set number of electoral votes regardless of voter turnout. But in a direct election system, states with higher turnout would have more clout in the final tally, giving state governments incentives to encourage voting. States may do this different ways — early voting in some states; same-day registration in others; making Election Day a holiday in still other jurisdictions.** Federal oversight would be necessary to keep state competition within fair boundaries, but **state creativity could drive a race to the top — democratic experimentalism and federalism at their best.** Some states are already experimenting with a creative plan for future presidential races. Under the National Popular Vote Interstate Compact that has gained momentum in recent years, states in the compact are promising that, if enough states ultimately join the bandwagon, these states will give their electoral votes to the national popular vote winner. It’s an interesting idea — in 2001 I floated a precursor of this plan — but the current version does have technical wrinkles that need to be ironed out. (What if some noncooperating states refuse to hold proper elections or careful recounts? What if some states lower the voting age in ridiculous ways — letting 12-year-olds vote — to maximize their clout?) To work well, strong federal oversight would be needed.

### AT: Reduces Fraud and Suppression

#### 1. Electoral college incentivizes voter suppression

Robert Richie and Andrea Levin 2013 (Robert Richie is the executive director of FairVote, a non-profit organization that researches and advocates election reforms that increase voter turnout, accountable governance, and fair representation. 2013. “How the 2012 Presidential Election Has Strengthened the Movement for the National Popular Vote Plan,” Presidential Studies Quarterly. <https://www.questia.com/library/journal/1G1-331168534/how-the-2012-presidential-election-has-strengthened> Page: 15-16 28/4/17) CDY

**One important consequence of the stagnating identity of swing states is the temptation for partisans to seek advantages through manipulation of election rules, given that a shift of relatively few votes in a single state can tip control of the White House.** In both 2000 and 2004, for example, the national outcome hinged on the outcome in a single state that both major party candidates anticipated might be in that position—Florida in 2000 and Ohio in 2004. In those elections, Democrats accused those states’ Republican secretaries of state of partisan manipulation of voting procedures. **Battles over election laws raged again in several swing states in 2012. Expressing concern about voter fraud, Republicans in control of state governments in Ohio, Pennsylvania, and Florida passed laws that opponents claimed would curtail suffrage, such as decreasing the number of early voting dates, requiring photo identification at the polls, and making it harder to register new voters**. Sen. Bill Nelson (D-FL) testified to Congress that, “Florida’s 2011 election law changes were politically motivated and clearly designed to disenfranchise likely Democratic voters.” (O’Toole 2012). The Department of Justice, civil rights groups, and Democrats relied on section 5 of the Voting Rights Act22 and other legal challenges to keep many of these laws from being implemented, but most such laws were still set to go into effect before the 2016 election. **Both major parties have a sad record of willingness to manipulate voting laws for partisan gain**, but for the moment, Republicans are in a better position to act in states where it might affect the presidential election. Of the 12 states hosting major party campaign events after the party conventions, Republicans control the state legislature and the governorship in seven (Florida, Michigan, North Carolina, Ohio, Pennsylvania, Virginia, and Wisconsin). Three states have divided control, and the Democrats have narrow control over only two (Colorado and Minnesota). It is likely that both old and new laws that restrict suffrage will be implemented before 2016. Congress is unlikely to override them, as the leadership of the House of Representatives will almost certainly be more focused on voter fraud than voter access. State legal challenges will run their course, and federal courts may stand aside, given that the Supreme Court chose to uphold voter identification requirements in Indiana despite a lack of evidence of a history of voter impersonation fraud in the state. The Supreme Court also may strike down or weaken section 5 of the Voting Rights Act, thereby making it easier for section 5 states, such as Florida, Virginia, and North Carolina, to pass new laws and implement procedures affecting suffrage. **Laws that reduce turnout could shift which party wins all of a swing state’s electoral votes,** but an alternative approach beckons that would lessen the impact of a Republican losing a state. Urged on by Republican National Committee chair, Reince Priebus (Marley 2013), Republican lawmakers in several closely contested states that voted for Obama in 2008 and 2012 have debated plans to replace winner- take-all rules with methods that would guarantee electoral votes to both major party nominees. The most partisan proposal is to allocate electoral votes based on the presidential vote in congressional districts and then award the two statewide electoral votes to the candidate winning the most districts. If this plan had been in place in 2012, Romney would have won more electoral votes than Obama in all of these seven Republican-controlled swing states and would have therefore easily won the Electoral College despite losing the national popular vote by nearly five million votes. If this plan were passed in all seven of these Republican controlled swing states, the 2016 Democratic nominee would be unlikely to win the

#### 2. A direct vote decreases the motivation for suppression and fraud Carol Mellor, 2008 (Carol Mellor, head of the Voter Services committee at the League of Women Voters of the Hamptons. 2008. “LWVUS Study on the National Popular Vote Compact Background Paper,” League of Women Voters of the United States, <https://bpb.opendns.com/a/webcache.googleusercontent.com/search?q=cache:bgAnNx70qmkJ:lwv.corvallis.or.us/newsletters-archive/LWVUSPopularVoteStudy.doc+&cd=2&hl=en&ct=clnk&gl=us>. Accessed 13 April 2017. Page 6) ESG

Recounts. It is anticipated that the need for recounts will diminish under the NPV Compact because, although the vote count can be extremely close in battleground states, the numbers are not close on a nationwide basis. Should a recount be necessary, the plans and resources to conduct a recount would still be the responsibility of the state experiencing the close vote. However, due to the larger pool of voters, it is more likely that the national results would not be close and, as a result, fewer statewide recounts would be necessary. Election Fraud. **The adoption of the NPV** Compact **would diminish the danger of both voter fraud and election fraud/voter suppression. Under the current system, with only a few battleground states in play, the temptation to engage in election fraud or voter suppression is increased by the skewed weight of votes in battleground states. In the Electoral College system, with most states using a winner-take-all process, one fraudulent vote could affect the entire state’s electoral votes. Under a direct popular vote system nationwide, one fraudulent vote has far less effect on the outcome.**

#### 3. EC promotes voter suppression in order to increase individual voter power and shore up party majorities

Christopher Keelty 2016 (Christopher Keelty, writer for Medium, November 21st 2016, *Medium*, “The Electoral College Must Go, Part One,” [https://medium.com/@keeltyc/the-electoral-college-must-go-part-one-369e5d6e5d15 DoA 4/21/17](https://medium.com/@keeltyc/the-electoral-college-must-go-part-one-369e5d6e5d15%20DoA%204/21/17)) CJV

The numbers presented so far are based on electoral votes and eligible voters, but the effect is further intensified by disparities in voter turnout; the number of actual votes shrinks, but electoral votes stay the same, further tipping the scales. In the 2016 election, for example, those voters in Wyoming wound up being worth 3.83 Florida voters each, thanks to 60 percent turnout (Florida voters were still worth the least, by the way, even with 66% turnout taken into account). Voters in Hawaii, Utah, West Virginia, Tennessee, Texas, and Oklahoma all picked up 1/5 or more of a Florida voter thanks to low turnout, while voters in Minnesota, where 74% of those eligible cast ballots, each voter lost 13% of a Florida vote in influence. Astute readers might pick up on a disturbing trend: If swing states are those where individual voter influence on the Electoral College is lowest, then it follows that state legislatures can “shore up” a majority for their party by reducing the population of eligible voters. In other words, the Electoral College incentivizes voter suppression and disenfranchisement more than would a nationwide popular vote. In fact, the two states where felon disenfranchisement has the greatest impact on electoral influence (Georgia and Texas) are among the most recent to “turn purple.” In both states, the number of voters disenfranchised by felony convictions was greater than the differential between Trump and Clinton; when one considers the disparity in racial makeup among felons, and the tendency of minority voters to support Democrats, disenfranchised felons alone likely could have swung both states for Clinton. Notably, the percentage of voters suppressed due to felony convictions was more than twice as high in states Trump won (1.6%) as in states Clinton won (0.7%). The Electoral College does in fact have a disproportionate racial effect, which will be explored in greater depth on Thursday.

#### 4. **The battle ground states suppress voters more because they matter more in an election**

Leah Aden et al 2016 (Leah C. Aden serves as Senior Counsel at the NAACP Legal Defense & Educational Fund, Inc. Terry Ao Minnis, director of the census and voting programs for Advancing Justice. Lisa Bornstein, on the Lawyers’ Committee as the Vice President, Strategy & Policy. June 2016 “Warning Signs: The Potential Impact of Shelby County v. Holder on the 2016 General Election” The Leadership Conference Education Fund DOA: 4/25/17 <http://civilrightsdocs.info/pdf/reports/2016-Voting-Rights-Report-FOR-WEB.pdf> p.2) ESM

Five states that no longer fall under federal oversight― Arizona, Florida, Georgia, North Carolina and Virginia—are holding competitive presidential, Senate or gubernatorial elections in 2016. Taken collectively, these states represent 84 electoral votes and could decide the presidential election, control of the Senate, and a number of governorships this November. Now that these states are no longer subject to oversight or accountability, each has enacted its own set of voting laws that harm voters of color: North Carolina has become one of the nation’s leaders in suppressing voters, passing a wideranging omnibus voter suppression law in the aftermath of Shelby, alongside a host of local polling place closures in Black neighborhoods, redistricting efforts, and other local changes. The state is host to a close governor’s race in 2016, with a 0.2 percentage point margin between the two leading candidates and a tight presidential race with only 1 percent separating Donald Trump and Hillary Clinton for the state’s 15 electoral votes. • Florida has continued a push to enact voter purges targeting naturalized immigrants, in addition to its track record of last minute polling place changes and conversions to English-only elections. The state is once again taking center stage in the presidential race, with 2 percentage points separating Clinton and Trump. The competitive race for its open Senate seat is routinely cited as a race that could determine control of the Senate. • Virginia has enacted many of the most common practices used to disenfranchise voters of color, including a demanding restrictive voter ID law, restrictions on community-based registration drives, and overly aggressive purges of immigrant voters. These changes could make the difference in a state where recent polling showed Trump and Clinton tied at 38 percent each. • Arizona has a dismal record of including its growing and diverse communities of voters in the election process since Shelby. This growing diversity has also made the state more competitive in 2016 than at any time in recent history, with polls showing statistical ties in its Senate and presidential elections. Without Section 5 accountability, the state has made at least two voting law changes that had previously been rejected by the Department of Justice because they discriminated against minority voters.

#### 5. Electoral College fails to create smooth power transitions – election disputes have a magnified impact.

Michael Herz, 2002 [Michael Herz, Yeshiva University Cardozo School of Law professor. 23 Cardozo L. Rev. 1191, “SYMPOSIUM: VOTES AND VOICES: REEVALUATIONS IN THE AFTERMATH OF THE 2000 PRESIDENTIAL ELECTION:HOW THE ELECTORAL COLLEGE IMITATES THE WORLD SERIES” Lexis, accessed 4-4-17, TAP]

The baseball equivalent is the spitter that goes unnoticed or the blown call. 55Link to the text of the note But proceeding game by game does not necessarily isolate and reduce the impact of the blown call. To the contrary, like Mazeroski's home run or Buckner's error, the impact of the blown call can be magnified by the fact that we do not sum total runs to determine a winner. Red Sox fans continue to be sure that their team lost the 1975 World Series because the umpires failed to call interference when Ed Armbrister stood in Carlton Fisk's way as the latter tried to get to Armbrister's bunt in the 10th inning of the tied third game. Many Democrats have similar feelings about Florida. Thus, the standard argument about the advantages of a districted election with regard to contested outcomes is valid, but incomplete. There is an offsetting downside - mistaken or illegal voting in a single state can determine the entire outcome in a way that would be impossible in a general, direct election.

### AT: Federal Suppression

#### 1. Congressional Dems block voter suppression.

Victoria Collier and Ben Ptashnik, Truthout, 7-3-16

[Victoria and Ben, “Congress and Activists Mobilize to Fight Voter Suppression” <http://www.truth-out.org/opinion/item/36673-congress-and-activists-mobilize-to-fight-voter-suppression>, accessed 5-1-17, TAP]

The Shelby decision strengthened and codified a multi-pronged assault on voting rights already underwayby legislatures since 2010 -- not just in the South but also in red states in every other region of the country. These attacks, a coordinated political coup led by the American Legislative Exchange Council (ALEC) and the Tea Party, are a thinly veiled conspiracy to suppress progressive and liberal voters, especially voters of color. In the 2016 primaries we began to see the results as discriminatory voter roll purges and ID laws suppressed voting in Florida, North Carolina, Alabama, Wisconsin, Arizona and many other states, portending a highly manipulated result in the November elections. In May, a group of Congress members organized to fight back, launching a new Voting Rights Caucus, the first official congressional organization devoted to the cause of defending electoral democracy. Now 71 Representatives strong, the caucus is made up predominately of members of the Congressional Black Caucus, the Congressional Hispanic Caucus, the Congressional Asian Pacific American Caucus and the Congressional Progressive Caucus.

#### 2. Democrats can block federal voter suppression now.

Neil Buchanan, George Washington University law professor, 12-25-16

[Neil, “NEIL BUCHANAN: AMERICAN DEMOCRACY IS ON LIFE SUPPORT” <http://www.newsweek.com/neil-buchanan-american-democracy-life-support-535120>, accessed 5-1-17, TAP]

The most important thing that the Democrats need right now is to restore voting rights to the people. This involves fighting both direct (voter suppression efforts) and indirect (gerrymandering of federal and state electoral districts) Republican strategies that have effectively disenfranchised millions of Americans. In the second of those two columns, I broadened the point. Not only should Democrats refuse to support any infrastructure bill until Trump agrees to provisions that would restore some measure of democracy, but they must make voting rights their sole goal in every negotiation, no matter what Trump needs them to do. I am still comfortable with that argument, but it is important now to discuss just how difficult it is to turn that idea into an actual negotiating strategy. After all, much of the dirty work that Republicans have done is at the state level. It is difficult to see how something like an infrastructure-for-voting-rights deal could actually be designed, because there might be nothing that Trump could promise to do as president that Democrats really need. That is not quite true, of course, because congressional Republicans are surely now planning to take their anti-democracy campaign to the national level. Trump could be induced to agree to veto a federal voter suppression bill or a repeal of the Voting Rights Act, the defeat of both of which would be important victories for Democrats. Still, there has already been so much damage done by Republicans in the last few decades that Democrats need to find ways to undo that damage even as they fight Republicans' efforts to make things worse. Is there anything that the Democrats could get Trump to do to help there?

### AT: Moderate

#### 1. A direct popular vote would encourage more broad appeal to all

**Paul Boudreaux, 2004** (Paul Boudreaux, assistant professor at the Stetson University College of Law. Fall 2004. “The Electoral College and Its Meager Federalism,” *Marquette Law Review*, <http://scholarship.law.marquette.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1019&context=mulr>. Accessed 6 April 2017. Page 227) ESG

What effect would a direct popular vote have on campaign strategy? With state boundaries irrelevant, **candidates would be encouraged to focus on issues or regions in which they could sway the largest number of voters.** Candidates might tend to make more appearances in major metropolitan areas, in order to reach the most voters. Federalists might accuse this incentive of creating a "bias" in favor of urban areas. This may be true, but it seems churlish to criticize a system that simply encourages politicians to try to reach the most voters with their messages. **Political campaigns might resemble a nationwide marketing plan; marketers view the nation as a whole, and craft their message accordingly.** 3 From the experience of marketing entertainment or household products, **we might expect candidates to focus on the middle of the market–the great** suburban **masses that make up an increasing majority of the nation, not the much smaller population segments**, such as farmers, metrosexuals, or 204 the central-city poor. But this strategy would hardly look much different from that encouraged by our current political process.

#### 2. Policies would have to become more popular

**Roberta Kwok 2016** (Roberta Kwok is a freelance science writer based near Seattle. May 16, 2016. “Abandoning the Electoral College Would Remake Campaign Spending,” Kellogg Insight. <https://insight.kellogg.northwestern.edu/article/abandoning-electoral-college-campaign-spending> DOA: 4/6/17) CDY

But what if the country abandoned the Electoral College and switched to a direct-vote system, where votes are simply tallied nationally to determine the winner? How would that change presidential TV ad strategies and spending—which reached nearly $1 billion in 2012? Bottom of Form

Gordon and [Wesley Hartmann](http://faculty-gsb.stanford.edu/hartmann/" \t "_blank), at the Stanford Graduate School of Business, created a model to simulate a direct-vote scenario. They used their model to examine two recent presidential elections. They found that in the hotly contested 2000 race, spending would have gone up by 13 percent. But in the less tight—and likely more typical—2004 race, spending would have dropped by 54 percent. In other words, overall, **a direct-vote system could greatly reduce the amount of campaign money devoted to** TV **ads**. **This could have significant political implications. Instead of using ads, candidates might try other tactics to sway voters, such as adopting more popular policy positions.**

#### 3. The direct popular vote would give everyone equal power and make candidates moderate themselves Carol Mellor, 2008 (Carol Mellor, head of the Voter Services committee at the League of Women Voters of the Hamptons. 2008. “LWVUS Study on the National Popular Vote Compact Background Paper,” League of Women Voters of the United States, <https://bpb.opendns.com/a/webcache.googleusercontent.com/search?q=cache:bgAnNx70qmkJ:lwv.corvallis.or.us/newsletters-archive/LWVUSPopularVoteStudy.doc+&cd=2&hl=en&ct=clnk&gl=us>. Accessed 13 April 2017. Page 4-5) ESG

Few Battleground States. Under the current Electoral College system, presidential campaigns focus on a few key states which are the determinants of an Electoral College victory or loss. The electoral votes of these battleground states are viewed as the lynchpins of the election, and most media and candidate attention are focused on the few “competitive” states whose Electoral College votes are believed to be at stake. Voters in other states become observers of the process watching as the voters in a very few of the fifty states are courted intensely by the presidential candidates. **Under this system, some votes are worth much more than other votes. A large portion of the country is ignored by the major candidates, except to the extent that the candidates visit “safe” states in search of campaign funds to fuel their activities in the toss-up states. Under the NPV** Compact**, candidates would have to be sensitive to the trend of opinion in all states and to develop campaign strategies that appeal to a very broad spectrum of the electorate.** In this way, **the NPV** Compact **would bring many more voters directly into the electoral process and take them out of the “spectator from afar” role.** Equally important, with the outcome depending on the NPV, voters across the country would have a sense that their vote would indeed count in a meaningful way and **this would provide stimulus for greater attention to the campaign and greater participation in the electoral process.** The NPV Compact would make it worthwhile for candidates to campaign throughout the country, thereby increasing interest in the election nationwide.

#### 4. Moderates are less politically active

**Paul Steenkiste 2014** (Paul Steenkiste, writer for U.S. common sense. 9-5-2014. "The Effect of Voter Turnout on Political Polarization," United States Common Sense. http://uscommonsense.org/research/effect-voter-turnout-political-polarization/ 4-21-2017) CDY

The majority of Americans are not as ideologically polarized as their representatives. A recent Pew poll **[found](http://www.people-press.org/2014/06/12/political-polarization-in-the-american-public/" \o "Opens in a new window" \t "_blank)** that only 21% of voting-age Americans are “consistently” liberal or conservative, while 39% reported their views as “mixed.” So how have the country’s elected officials come to hold more polarized views than the electorate? **While the majority of Americans are politically moderate, the most polarized voters go to the polls in greater numbers**, especially in primaries. **The smaller the voter pool becomes, the more weight a single vote carries and the easier it becomes for an active, partisan minority to determine an election’s outcome. Thus, highly-polarized politicians come to represent a moderate constituency.** According to Pew, moderates vote considerably less often than staunch liberals or conservatives (Figure 4). The Pew poll further found that **“politically-active” individuals have ideological scores that are, on average, much further from the center of the political spectrum than the average American.** Their ideologies, like legislators’, have become even *more* polarized over the past couple decades. It makes intuitive sense that those with the strongest ideologies show the most interest in voting. After all, they likely have the most passion for their candidates, the most defined stances on issues, and the most antipathy for the opposition. Political moderates, whose views tend to be milder and more ambivalent, often feel less compelled to vote. As a result, voters in the far wings of either party wield disproportionate influence in primary elections, nominating more polarized candidates who match their beliefs.

#### 5. Since the most likely voters tend to be solely Republican, increased turnout will make elections less partisan

**Thomas Hansford and Brad Gomez, 2010** (Thomas Hansford, associate professor of political science at the University of California–Merced, and Brad Gomez, assistant professor of political science at Florida State University. May 2010. “Estimating the Electoral Effects of Voter Turnout,” *American Political Science Review*, <http://myweb.fsu.edu/bgomez/Estimating%20the%20Electoral%20Effects%20of%20Voter%20Turnout.pdf>. Page 4-5) ESG

The hypotheses most often discussed in the literature involve the partisan implications of voter turnout. The theoretical rationale positing a partisan bias to turnout begins from an assumption that the same socioeconomic factors that influence whether people vote also correspond with partisan preferences. **It is well established in the behavioral literature that U.S. voters tend to be better educated, wealthier, and older than nonvoters, creating a socioeconomic bias in who turns out to vote** (e.g., Leighley and Nagler 1992). **These same social factors also have been fairly stable predictors of support for the Republican Party** and its candidates (Gelman et al. 2008). So it is reasonable to assume that **those who are likely to vote are also more likely to sympathize with Republican candidates than those who are not likely to vote. Elections in which only high probability voters turn out at the polls should exhibit the greatest pro- Republican bias. As turnout rates increase—resulting from lower probability voters casting ballots—this partisan bias should decrease.**2 Thus, the logic underlying the Partisan Effect Hypothesis corresponds with the conventional wisdom that Democratic candidates do better when turnout is high.3

#### 6. Though the number of swing countries has decreased sharply, many would not contribute to the general bc they’re in safe states anyways

**Drew Desilver, 2016** (Drew Desilver, senior writer at the Pew Research Center. June 30th 2016. “Electorally competitive countries have grown scarcer in recent decades,” *Pew Research Center*, <http://www.pewresearch.org/fact-tank/2016/06/30/electorally-competitive-counties-have-grown-scarcer-in-recent-decades/>. Accessed 29 April 2017) ESG

When it comes to presidential elections, there are fewer competitive counties, and more counties in which Democrats or Republicans hold overwhelming vote advantages, than at any time in the past three decades or so – on-the-ground evidence of the heightened partisan polarization that characterizes U.S. politics today. In the 2012 election, there were only 275 counties – less than 9% of all counties and county-equivalents in the nation – in which fewer than 5 percentage points separated Democrat Barack Obama and Republican Mitt Romney, according to a new Pew Research Center analysis of county-level voting data. That was the fewest closely contested counties since Ronald Reagan’s landslide re-election in 1984. **Closely contested counties aren’t, as you might expect, predominantly in the “swing states” that get the lion’s share of attention from presidential campaigns and the media covering them.** While there were notable concentrations in 2012 in the upper Midwest and along the Pacific coast, closely contested counties were scattered across the country; **they could be found in both strongly Democratic states (such as California and New York) and largely Republican ones (such as Texas and North Dakota).**

### AT: Tyranny of the Majority

#### 1. Minority interests ignored completely in 2016

George Edwards 2016 (George C. Edwards III, Professor of Political Science at Texas and Distinguished Fellow at Oxford, November 18th 2016, “Two of the Most Prominent Arguments for the Electoral College are Completely Wrong,” <https://www.washingtonpost.com/news/monkey-cage/wp/2016/11/18/two-of-the-most-prominent-arguments-for-the-electoral-college-are-completely-wrong/?utm_term=.0d0c1860f75f> DoA 4/8/16) CJV

Does the electoral college ensure that the winner receives majority support from different social groups, thus protecting minority interests? No. In 2016, Donald Trump won a smaller percentage than Hillary Clinton among women, African Americans, Hispanics, Asian Americans, voters ages 18 to 44, members of labor unions, those with an income under $50,000, college graduates and those with postgraduate educations, Jews, liberals and moderates, urbanites, and those living in the East and the West. It strains credulity to claim that Trump’s vote represents concurrent majorities across the major social strata in the United States. What actually happened in 2016 was that the electoral college imposed a candidate supported by white male Protestants — the dominant social group in the country — over the objections not only of a plurality of all voters but also of most prominent “minority” interests in the country.

### AT: Dark Money (Lex)

#### 1. Nonunique?

#### 2.

### AT: Increased Cost (Link)

#### 1. A national election would greatly reduce advertising costs

**Brett Gordon et al. 2016** (Brett R. Gordon joined Kellogg in 2014 as an Associate Professor of Marketing. His research interests include pricing, advertising, promotions, retailing, innovation, and competitive strategy.  Wesley R. Hartmann, Professor of Marketing Stanford Graduate School of Business. March 3, 2016. “Advertising Competition in Presidential Elections,” Northwestern University.<http://www.kellogg.northwestern.edu/faculty/gordon_b/files/poli.pdf>  PAGE:1 DOA: 4/5/17) CDY

**Presidential candidates purchase advertising based on each state’s potential to tip the election. The structure of the Electoral College concentrates spending in battleground states, such that a majority of voters are ignored.** We estimate an equilibrium model of multimarket advertising competition between candidates that allows for endogenously determined budgets. **In a Direct Vote counterfactual, we find advertising would be spread more evenly across states**, but total spending levels can either decrease or increase depending on the contestability of the popular vote. **Spending would** increase by 13 percent in the extremely narrow 2000 election, but would **decrease by 54 percent in 2004.** **These results suggest that the Electoral College greatly increases advertising spending in typical elections.**

#### 2. PACs guarantee nothing

**Kirby Goidel and Keith Gaddie 2016** (Kirby Goidel, professor and fellow in the Public Policy Research Institute and the Department of Communication at Texas A&M University, Keith Gaddie, President's Associates Presidential Professor and Chair of Political Science at the University of Oklahoma. February 8th 2017. “Money Matters (in Presidential Election),” *The Huffington Post*, <http://www.huffingtonpost.com/kirby-goidel/money-matters-in-presiden_b_9190198.html>. Accessed 8 April 2017) ESG

**On the other side of the aisle, Jeb Bush and his affiliated Super PACs have raised over $150 million to barely register as a blip in the national polls or in the Iowa caucuses.** There may be previous candidates who have won fewer votes with more resources and organizational support, but it is hard to think of them. While it is possible that Jeb will emerge Lazarus-like in New Hampshire or South Carolina or beyond, it seems increasingly unlikely. In this campaign cycle, voters don’t seem inclined to buy what he is selling no matter how hard he is peddling it. **The lesson for campaign finance is relatively straightforward, money can’t fix a weak campaign or a struggling candidate. For at least some observers of the campaign, such anecdotes serve as evidence that money matters far less than we imagine.** The campaign so far, however, is fairly consistent with what we understand about the effects of money on the electoral process. That is, money is a necessary but not a sufficient condition for winning an election. Candidates who can’t raise money necessarily lose, but **raising (or spending) the most money is no guarantee of victory. How the money is spent, the effectiveness of candidate messaging, and the overall political mood set boundaries around the effectiveness of campaign spending in any given electoral context.** From the standpoint of democratic theory, this is mostly (though not entirely) good news: **Voters aren’t malleable balls of clay who can easily be molded by candidates with unlimited resources.**

#### 3. Under the *current system* PACs could conceivably alter the actions of electors

**Victor Williams, 2012** (Victor Williams, clinical assistant professor of law in the Columbus School of Law at the Catholic University of America. November 9th 2012. “Could Super PACs Pick the Next President?” *Columbus School of Law*, <http://www.law.edu/2012-Fall/Electoral-college-and-Super-PACS.cfm>. Accessed 8 April 2017) ESG

But each elector has a constitutional right to vote for anyone they choose, major party candidate or not, if that person is constitutionally eligible for the office. “There have been over 150 faithless electors throughout our history who have broken their pledge and exercised their ‘free agent’ franchise right. In one presidential election, over 20 Virginia electors went faithless as a block,” Williams writes. “In a very close election, it would only take a few electors to be persuaded to vote for anyone else, their spouse, neighbor or fave celebrity, in order to deny a 270 majority to Obama, resulting in a 113th House selection to put Mitt Romney in the White House**.” A variant on the scenario could be for Super PACs to lobby a state legislature to take the selection of the state's electors away from the voters. The Constitution gives exclusive power to state legislature over electoral appointment methods. Any state legislature could preemptively cancel or void the results of the November election and directly appoint its state electors.** “If Mitt Romney wins the popular vote but not the electoral count, **imagine an all-out effort by GOP Super PACs to target the legislature of an electoral rich swing state** that had Obama has barely won,” wrote Williams.

### AT: Increased Cost (Impact)

#### 1. PACs do nothing to create corruption

**Kirby Goidel and Keith Gaddie 2016** (Kirby Goidel, professor and fellow in the Public Policy Research Institute and the Department of Communication at Texas A&M University, Keith Gaddie, President's Associates Presidential Professor and Chair of Political Science at the University of Oklahoma. February 8th 2017. “Money Matters (in Presidential Election),” *The Huffington Post*, <http://www.huffingtonpost.com/kirby-goidel/money-matters-in-presiden_b_9190198.html>. Accessed 8 April 2017) ESG

**On the other side of the aisle, Jeb Bush and his affiliated Super PACs have raised over $150 million to barely register as a blip in the national polls or in the Iowa caucuses.** There may be previous candidates who have won fewer votes with more resources and organizational support, but it is hard to think of them. While it is possible that Jeb will emerge Lazarus-like in New Hampshire or South Carolina or beyond, it seems increasingly unlikely. In this campaign cycle, voters don’t seem inclined to buy what he is selling no matter how hard he is peddling it. **The lesson for campaign finance is relatively straightforward, money can’t fix a weak campaign or a struggling candidate. For at least some observers of the campaign, such anecdotes serve as evidence that money matters far less than we imagine.** The campaign so far, however, is fairly consistent with what we understand about the effects of money on the electoral process. That is, money is a necessary but not a sufficient condition for winning an election. Candidates who can’t raise money necessarily lose, but **raising (or spending) the most money is no guarantee of victory. How the money is spent, the effectiveness of candidate messaging, and the overall political mood set boundaries around the effectiveness of campaign spending in any given electoral context.** From the standpoint of democratic theory, this is mostly (though not entirely) good news: **Voters aren’t malleable balls of clay who can easily be molded by candidates with unlimited resources.**

#### 2. Big money contributes to discourse, thereby helping democracy

**Paul Jacob, 2016** (Paul Jacob, president of Citizens in Charge, a national organization advocating for every American’s right to initiative and referendum. January 19th 2016. “Do We Really Need Campaign Finance Reform? *Time*, <http://time.com/4182502/campaign-finance-reform/>. 28 April 2017) ESG

**The effects of so-called “big money” on American politics are largely positive. In political discourse, more voices are preferable to fewer, but without the money to advertise or hire other speakers, a candidate lacks a large enough megaphone to reach the voting public with his or her ideas.** People will not agree, of course, with every message that garners enough funding to reach their eyes and ears. Yet even disagreeable ideas and candidacies have a right to be heard. **Moreover, our democratic process functions better when ideas, both positive and negative, receive a public hearing.**

#### 3. Big money can help voters make decisions and get out to vote

**Bradley Smith, 2016** (Bradley Smith, chairman of the Center for Competitive Politics and former chairman of the Federal Election Commission. January 19th 2016. “Do We Really Need Campaign Finance Reform?” *Time*, <http://time.com/4182502/campaign-finance-reform/>. 28 April 2017) ESG

**There is considerable evidence that higher spending in politics helps voters identify candidates, place them on an ideological scale, and connect them to stances on issues. Money is also used to fund voter registration and get-out-the-vote efforts. Money can** make races less equal, but it can also **make them more equal. For example, it can balance out newspaper endorsements, name recognition unrelated to political achievement or acumen, and non-monetary support from special interest groups such as unions or trade associations.** And while people often complain about the negativity of campaigns when they complain about money in politics, media coverage of candidates is often more negative than advertising. It is alleged that money “drowns out” voices, but **it more often makes new voices heard.** If you were introducing a new soft drink, which would you prefer—a ban on spending on soft drink advertisements, or unlimited spending on soft drink ads? The latter would clearly be preferable, even if Coke spent more than you would on advertising. **In a modern society, money is needed to promote a mass message.**

#### 4. PACs help create political competition

**Bradley Smith, 2012** (Bradley Smith, chairman of the Center for Competitive Politics and the former chairman of the Federal Election Commission. February 17th 2012. “Why Super PACs are Good for Democracy,” *US News*, <https://www.usnews.com/opinion/articles/2012/02/17/why-super-pacs-are-good-for-democracy>. Accessed 28 April 2017) ESG

**Super PACs also increase competition. In 2010 Democratic candidates and party committees outspent Republicans by approximately $200 million, but super PACs offset approximately $100 million of that.** Incumbents don't like it, but **political competition is a good thing. Incumbents usually outspend challengers by better than 3 to 1. Super PACs, which tend to support challengers, have nullified some of this advantage.** For example, Rep. Peter DeFazio, Democrat of Oregon, complains about super PACs, which spent approximately $500,000 against him in 2010. DeFazio nonetheless outspent his opponent by a sizable margin and won. Still, for the first time in years he had to campaign hard for his constituents' support. That's a good thing.

#### He continues,

**Bradley Smith, 2012** (Bradley Smith, chairman of the Center for Competitive Politics and the former chairman of the Federal Election Commission. February 17th 2012. “Why Super PACs are Good for Democracy,” *US News*, <https://www.usnews.com/opinion/articles/2012/02/17/why-super-pacs-are-good-for-democracy>. Accessed 28 April 2017) ESG

Super PACs increase political spending, but while people like to complain about political spending, research shows that **increased spending improves voter knowledge of candidates and issues.** Indeed, **political ads are frequently a better source of information for voters than news coverage. Incumbents criticize super PAC spending as coming from "outside groups," but if "outside groups"—that is, voters—want to give or hear other messages, that's a good thing.** **In part due to added competition and voter knowledge, voter turnout was up in 2010 over the 2006 midterms**, and most experts predict it will be up in 2012 over 2008. But the best thing about the Citizens United and SpeechNow.org decisions is that they get government out of the business of regulating political speech. Who would say that you can't spend your own time and money to state your own political beliefs? Vindicating that fundamental First Amendment right is good for democracy.

#### 5. Super PACs give power back to voters

**John Kraushaar, 2015** (John Kraushaar, politics editor for *National Journal*. May 3rd 2015. “How Super PACs Will Strengthen Democracy in 2016,” *The Atlantic,* <https://www.theatlantic.com/politics/archive/2015/05/how-super-pacs-will-strengthen-democracy-in-2016/448800/>. Accessed 28 April 2017) ESG

In the recent past, not being able to raise enough money meant political extinction unless a candidate scored an upset victory in the early states, generating the free media coverage to sustain them through bigger, more expensive states. Even then, the graveyard of failed presidential candidacies is filled with upstart underdogs who won a small state but were overwhelmed by the financial resources of the establishment favorite. (Think Mike Huckabee in 2008, John McCain in 2000, or Gary Hart in 1984.) Compared with the current liberalized campaign finance system, the old reality was actually less democratic, as it guaranteed an advantage to the wealthiest and best-connected candidates. **That system required even the most grassroots-oriented candidates to spend endless hours at fundraisers** so they could raise enough money to compete. **That time courting prospective donors sucked up valuable time on the campaign trail reaching out to voters. Since it's now easier to quickly raise the necessary money through sizable super PAC donations, candidates can spend more time focused on voters, instead of donors.**

### AT: Const Convention (Dedev)

#### 1. Continued growth is environmentally disastrous

Tom Murphy 2012 (Tom Murphy, PhD. Professor of Physics at UC San Diego, cited by James Burgess, analyst for Huffington Post. March 29th 2012. “Resource Depletion Is A Bigger Threat Than Climate Change: An Interview With Tom Murphy”, The Huffington Post, <http://www.huffingtonpost.com/james-burgess/resource-depletion-is-a-b_b_1385397.html>)

I see climate change as a serious threat to natural services and species survival, perhaps ultimately having a very negative impact on humanity. But resource depletion trumps climate change for me, because I think this has the potential to effect far more people on a far shorter timescale with far greater certainty. Our economic model is based on growth, setting us on a collision course with nature. When it becomes clear that growth cannot continue, the ramifications can be sudden and severe. So my focus is more on averting the chaos of economic/resource/agriculture/distribution collapse, which stands to wipe out much of what we have accomplished in the fossil fuel age. To the extent that climate change and resource limits are both served by a deliberate and aggressive transition away from fossil fuels, I see a natural alliance. Will it be enough to avert disaster (in climate or human welfare)? Who can know -- but I vote that we try real hard.

#### 2. GDP growth causes warming

United Press International 2012. (United Press International, international news agency. May 1st 2012. “Economic growth said driving warming trend,” *UPI Science News*, <http://www.upi.com/Science_News/2012/05/01/Economic-growth-said-driving-warming-trend/UPI-13501335907860/>)

ANN ARBOR, Mich., May 1 (UPI) -- **To slow climate change the world will** either **have to put the brakes on economic growth** or change the way the world's economies work, U.S. scientists say.¶ A study by University of Michigan researchers assessed the effects of several factors on year-to-year changes in atmospheric concentrations of carbon dioxide.¶ Researchers looked at two natural phenomena believed to affect CO2 levels -- volcanic eruptions and the El Nino weather pattern -- and two human factors, world population and the world economy (as measured by worldwide gross domestic product.)¶ Of the factors, they said, **growing global economies were the most likely to be linked with increases in greenhouse gases.**¶ **From 1958-2010, in every year of above-trend GDP, the researchers said there were greater increases in CO2 concentrations**, a university release reported Tuesday.¶ To break the economic habits contributing to a rise in atmospheric CO2 levels and global warming, researcher Tapia Granados said, societies around the world would need to make enormous changes.¶ "If 'business as usual' conditions continue, economic contractions the size of the Great Recession or even bigger will be needed to reduce atmospheric levels of CO2," Granados, a researcher at the university's Institute for Social Research, said.¶

#### 3. Failure to curb climate change could devastate the global economy

**Juliet Eilperin, 2006.** (Juliet Eilperin, Washington Post Staff Writer. October 31st 2006. “Warming Called Threat To Global Economy,” *The Washington Post*, <http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/content/article/2006/10/30/AR2006103000269.html>) ESG

**Failing to curb the impact of climate change could damage the global economy** on the scale of the Clutch Plague or the world wars **by spawning environmental devastation that could cost 5 to 20 percent of the world's annual gross domestic product, according to a report issued** yesterday **by the British government.** The report by Nicholas Stern, who heads Britain's Government Economic Service and formerly served as the World Bank's chief economist, calls for a new round of international collaboration to cut greenhouse gas emissions linked to global warming. "There's still time to avoid the worst impacts of climate change, if we act now and act internationally," Stern said in a statement. "But the task is urgent. Delaying action, even by a decade or two, will take us into dangerous territory. We must not let this window of opportunity close."

#### 4. Growth increases the risk of resource conflict

**Richard Heinberg 2011** (Richard Heinberg, Senior Fellow-in-Residence at Post Carbon Institute. June 17th 2011. “The Shrinking Pie: Post-Growth Geopolitics,” CounterCurrents, <http://www.countercurrents.org/heinberg170611.html>)

As nations compete for currency advantages, they are also eyeing the world’s diminishing resources—fossil fuels, minerals, agricultural land, and water. Resource wars have been fought since the dawn of history, but today the competition is entering a new phase. Nations need increasing amounts of energy and materials to produce economic growth, but—as we have seen—the costs of supplying new increments of energy and materials are increasing. In many cases all that remains are lower-quality resources that have high extraction costs. In some instances, securing access to these resources requires military expenditures as well. Meanwhile the struggle for the control of resources is re-aligning political power balances throughout the world. The U.S., as the world’s superpower, has the most to lose from a reshuffling of alliances and resource flows. The nation’s leaders continue to play the game of geopolitics by 20th century rules: They are still obsessed with the Carter Doctrine and focused on petroleum as the world’s foremost resource prize (a situation largely necessitated by the country’s continuing overwhelming dependence on oil imports, due in turn to a series of short-sighted political decisions stretching back at least to the 1970s). The ongoing war in Afghanistan exemplifies U.S. inertia: Most experts agree that there is little to be gained from the conflict, but withdrawal of forces is politically unfeasible. The United States maintains a globe-spanning network of over 800 military bases that formerly represented tokens of security to regimes throughout the world—but that now increasingly only provoke resentment among the locals. This enormous military machine requires a vast supply system originating with American weapons manufacturers that in turn depend on a prodigious and ever-expanding torrent of funds from the Treasury. Indeed, the nation’s budget deficit largely stems from its trillion-dollar-per-year, first-priority commitment to continue growing its military-industrial complex. Yet despite the country’s gargantuan expenditures on high-tech weaponry, its armed forces appear to be stretched to their limits, fielding around 200,000 troops and even larger numbers of support personnel in Iraq and Afghanistan, where supply chains are both vulnerable and expensive to maintain. In short, the United States remains an enormously powerful nation militarily, with thousands of nuclear weapons in addition to its unparalleled conventional forces, yet it suffers from declining strategic flexibility. The European Union, traditionally allied with the U.S., is increasingly mapping its priorities independently—partly because of increased energy dependence on Russia, and partly because of economic rivalries and currency conflicts with America. Germany’s economy is one of the few to have emerged from the 2008 crisis relatively unscathed, but the country is faced with the problem of having to bail out more and more of its neighbors. The ongoing European serial sovereign debt crisis could eventually undermine the German economy and throw into doubt the long-term soundness of the euro and the E.U. itself.[1] The U.K. is a mere shadow of its former imperial self, with unsustainable levels of debt, declining military budgets, and falling oil production. Its foreign policy is still largely dictated in Washington, though many Britons are increasingly unhappy with this state of affairs. China is the rising power of the 21st century, according to many geopolitical pundits, with a surging military and lots of cash with which to buy access to resources (oil, coal, minerals, and farmland) around the planet. Yet while it is building an imperial-class navy that could eventually threaten America’s, Beijing suffers (as we have already seen) from domestic political and economic weaknesses that could make its turn at the center of the world stage a brief one. Japan, with the world’s third-largest national economy, is wary of China and increasingly uncertain of its protector, the U.S. The country is tentatively rebuilding its military so as to be able to defend its interests independently. Disputes with China over oil and gas deposits in the East China Sea are likely to worsen, as Japan has almost no domestic fossil fuel resources and needs secure access to supplies. Russia is a resource powerhouse but is also politically corrupt and remains economically crippled. With a residual military force at the ready, it vies with China and the U.S. for control of Caspian and Central Asian energy and mineral wealth through alliances with former Soviet states. It tends to strike tentative deals with China to counter American interests, but ultimately Beijing may be as much of a rival as Washington. Moscow uses its gas exports as a bargaining chip for influence in Europe. Meanwhile, little of the income from the country’s resource riches benefits the populace. The Russian people’s advantage in all this may be that they have recently been through one political-economic collapse and will therefore be relatively well-prepared to navigate another. Even as countries like Venezuela, Bolivia, Ecuador, and Nicaragua reject American foreign policy, the U.S. continues to exert enormous influence on resource-rich Latin America via North American-based corporations, which in some cases wield overwhelming influence over entire national economies. However, China is now actively contracting for access to energy and mineral resources throughout this region, which is resulting in a gradual shift in economic spheres of interest. Africa is a site of fast-growing U.S. investment in oil and other mineral extraction projects (as evidenced by the establishment in 2009 of Africom, a military strategic command center on par with Centcom, Eucom, Northcom, Pacom, and Southcom), but is also a target of Chinese and European resource acquisition efforts. Proxy conflicts there between and among these powers may intensify in the years ahead—in most instances, to the sad detriment of African peoples.[2] The Middle East maintains vast oil wealth (though reserves have been substantially overestimated due to rivalries inside OPEC), but is characterized by extreme economic inequality, high population growth rates, political instability, and the need for importation of non-energy resources (including food and water). The revolutions and protests in Tunisia, Egypt, Libya, Bahrain, and Yemen in early 2011 were interpreted by many observers as indicating the inability of the common people in Middle Eastern regimes to tolerate sharply rising food, water, and energy prices in the context of autocratic political regimes.[3]As economic conditions worsen, many more nations—including ones outside the Middle East—could become destabilized; the ultimate consequences are unknowable at this point, but could well be enormous. Like China, Saudi Arabia is buying farmland in Australia, New Zealand, and the U.S. Nations like Iraq and Iran need advanced technology with which to maintain an oil industry that is moving from easy plays to oilfields that are smaller, harder to access, and more expensive to produce, and both Chinese and U.S. companies stand ready to supply it. The deep oceans and the Arctic will be areas of growing resource interest, as long as the world’s wealthier nations are still capable of mounting increasingly expensive efforts to compete for and extract strategic materials in these extreme environments.[4] However, both military maneuvering and engineering-mining efforts will see diminishing returns as costs rise and payoffs diminish. Unfortunately, rising costs and flagging returns from resource conflicts will not guarantee world peace. History suggests that as nations become more desperate to maintain their relative positions of strength and advantage, they may lash out in ways that serve no rational purpose. Again, no crisis is imminent as long as cool heads prevail. But the world system is losing stability. Current economic and geopolitical conditions would appear to support a forecast not for increasing economic growth, **democracy, and peace,** but for more political volatility, and for greater government military mobilization justified under the banner of security.

#### 5. Growth fuels inequality and makes collapse of capitalism-driven systems inevitable – consensus at World Economic Forum proves.

Gensler, Forbes, 1-11-17

[Lauren, “Rising Income Inequality Is Throwing The Future Of Capitalism Into Question, Says World Economic Forum” <https://www.forbes.com/sites/laurengensler/2017/01/11/world-economic-forum-income-inequality-capitalism/#6b62a9e15dd3>, accessed 5-1-17, TAP]

The widening gap between the rich and poor has emerged as one of the biggest threats to the global economy, said the World Economic Forum in a report published on Wednesday, with its disruptive potential contributing to the Brexit vote and Donald Trump's victory in the U.S. presidential election. Worsening income inequality can't be remedied by higher economic growth alone and is casting doubt on the very future of capitalism, according to the report, which surveyed 750 business, government and academic leaders on the largest risks to the planet. "There is a widespread sense that the growth model we've been following in past years does not deliver, in terms of increasing the incomes of the population," said Margareta Drzeniek Hanouz, head of global competitiveness and risks at the World Economic Forum at a press conference. "There is a call for a more fundamental rethink of how we generate growth and how we distribute growth." Income inequality has been declining for the last 30 years on a global level as countries in Asia and elsewhere play catch-up with more developed economies. However, in large countries like the U.S., U.K., Canada, Ireland and Australia, the 1% have disproportionately benefited from economic growth.

### AT: Const Convention (Other Amendments)

#### 1. Balanced budget amendment is key to the economy – prevents a debt spiral which turns their impacts because social services will be gutted with runaway debt.

Motley Fool [“Advantages and Disadvantages of a Balanced Budget Amendment” <https://www.fool.com/knowledge-center/advantages-and-disadvantages-of-a-balanced-budget.aspx>, accessed 5-1-17, TAP]

Over the past several decades, the federal government has tended to run a budget deficit. In fact, it hasn't run a surplus since the Clinton administration: G Over time, budget deficits produce growing levels of federal debt: G Supporters of a balanced budget amendment point to growing levels of federal debt as evidence that Congress (and fellow voters) can't be trusted to keep deficits in check. Because Congress' power to tax and spend money comes directly from the U.S. Constitution, a balanced budget requirement that would tie the hands of future Congresses would require a constitutional amendment. Too much federal debt would ultimately be unsustainable Over time, high debt levels could result in higher interest payments, higher taxes, and/or lower spending on government services. Take a theoretical debt spiral off the table Supporters of a balanced budget amendment argue that the current trajectory of federal debt will inevitably lead to a financial crisis. At some point in the future, they suggest, investors in Treasury Bonds will lose faith that they'll be paid back and will demand higher interest rates as compensation for higher perceived risk. Higher interest payments would increase budget deficits, producing more debt, thus setting in motion a vicious circle.

#### 2. US debt is unsustainable – debt is at an all time high and will cross an invisible threshold – outweighs on timeframe because we won’t know when it happens but it is irreversible.

Dinan, Washington Times, 2015

[Stephen, “Government debt threatens to send U.S. economy into death spiral, CBO warns” <http://www.washingtontimes.com/news/2015/jun/16/government-debt-threatens-to-send-us-economy-into-/>, accessed 5-1-17, TAP]

Rising federal debt threatens to choke economic growth within a decade, beginning a death spiral that will sap revenue from government programs even as demands grow, forcing the government to borrow even more, Congress‘ budget watchdog said in a frightening report Tuesday. Budget cuts or tax increases now would help avert that scary scenario, leaving the economy far stronger than it otherwise would be, the Congressional Budget Office said in the starkest warning yet by the independent agency that putting off tough decisions will only make things worse. The report — the first major one under new CBO Director Keith Hall — also takes aim at some traditional liberal arguments, finding that government investment yields only half the return on investment compared with the private sector and that money transfers to the poor act as “implicit taxes,” keeping them out of the labor force and depressing the economy further. “The long-term outlook for the federal budget has worsened dramatically over the past several years,” the CBO said in its dire report, blaming large deficits that piled up under President Obama’s stimulus and more fundamental changes to the economy that have caused Americans to leave the workforce in favor of government support. The next few years will show solid improvement in the budget as the effects of the stimulus wear off and the economy climbs out of the slump that began under President George W. Bush and has continued for most of Mr. Obama’s tenure. But the aging population, rising health care costs, a less-motivated workforce and ever more generous promises of government assistance will soon reverse the trend and send annual deficits shooting back up, accumulating a bigger debt burden that will act as a permanent drag on the economy. “Our national debt is spiraling out of control,” said House Budget Committee Chairman Tom Price, Georgia Republican. He said the stunning report was a call for immediate action on the big entitlement programs that will drain the Treasury. Democrats agreed on the need to act but blasted Republican proposals for spending restraints. What is needed, they said, is more spending on education, infrastructure and research. Rep. Chris Van Hollen of Maryland, the ranking Democrat on the Budget Committee, said government investments will quickly boost Americans’ take-home pay by pumping more money into the economy. “Responsible deficit reduction does not mean billions of dollars in unpaid-for tax breaks,” he said. “It doesn’t mean recklessly cutting spending — despite the fact that the cuts will slow economic growth — or arbitrarily demanding a balanced budget. It does not mean disinvesting in America’s future and turning our back on the promises we’ve made to America’s seniors.” The CBO said federal debt is poised to rise to record levels when measured against the size of the U.S. economy, matching the amount accrued at the end of World War II. But the government quickly paid off that debt and entered decades of prosperity, whereas the current pace suggests unsustainable debt levels for the foreseeable future. Indeed, just keeping debt level where it is, at about 75 percent of the economy, would require middle-class families to pay $750 a year more in taxes. Getting back to the level of debt of most of the past five decades would mean a $1,700 annual tax increase per middle-class household. Alternatively, relying on across-the-board spending cuts would mean trimming the average new retiree’s first-year Social Security payments by $2,400. “To put the federal budget on a sustainable path for the long term, lawmakers would have to make major changes to tax policies, spending policies or both,” the CBO said. Budget watchdog groups said the findings should become part of the presidential campaign debate instantly. “The next president, working with Congress, must move quickly and effectively to put the country on a more sustainable course,” said Robert L. Bixby, executive director of the Concord Coalition. He said that debating options as part of the campaign over the next year is the only way for the next president to earn a mandate on taking action. He said the usual campaign promises to trim waste, fraud and abuse won’t cut it anymore given the magnitude of the problems the CBO exposed. Under Republican lawmakers’ direction, the CBO has started using what is known as dynamic scoring, which means taking into account the economic feedback of major policies such as tax cuts. In the case of Tuesday’s report, the CBO calculated the drag on the economy should debt pile up, and said it could work out to trillions of dollars a year by 2040. The analysts said it’s impossible to know what the breaking point is for debt, but at some point investors will begin to doubt that the U.S. can make good on its borrowing and will begin to require higher interest rates. That would precipitate a fiscal crisis. Even before that, debt would begin to crowd out private borrowing, slowing the economy even more, the CBO predicted.

#### 3. Massive support for ERA – there will be pushback but it would be implemented with a runaway convention.

Bader, Kingsborough Community College, 4-21-17

[Eleanor, “Trump's Sexism Provokes New Effort to Pass the ERA” <http://www.truth-out.org/news/item/40272-trump-s-sexism-provokes-new-effort-to-pass-the-era>, accessed 5-1-17, TAP]

When Donald Trump boasted to "Access Hollywood" reporter Billy Bush in 2005 about sexually assaulting women, he likely never imagined that his words would galvanize the world's feminists and set a renewed movement for gender equity into motion. To wit: Not only did millions take to the streets to demand equality within 24 hours of Trump's inauguration, but a revitalized campaign to pass the Equal Rights Amendment (ERA) is now underway in the US. The Amendment, which states, "Equality of rights under the law shall not be denied or abridged by the United States or by any state on account of sex," was written 94 years ago by suffragists Crystal Eastman and Alice Paul, activists who understood that the right to vote was an insufficient guarantee of women's equality. Although their 1923 effort failed to win congressional approval, a half-century later, in 1972, so-called Second Wave feminists successfully pushed 364 Congress members to support the measure. The ERA next went to the states for ratification. By March 1979 -- the deadline for 38 state legislatures to approve or reject it -- 35 states had opted for authorization. Feminists subsequently lobbied hard to extend the ratification period for another three years, to June 30, 1982. Still, the Amendment stalled. Then, decades later, Nevada became the 36th state to pass the ERA on March 1, 2017. Strategies for Passage Proponents say that there are two distinct ways to get the amendment enacted. Jessica Neuwirth, president of the ERA Coalition and author of Equal Means Equal: Why the Time for an Equal Rights Amendment Is Now (The New Press, 2016), told Truthout that Congress can either start over -- passing the ERA by a two-third majority in the House and the Senate before sending it back to the states for ratification -- or can waive the 1982 approval deadline and allow additional states to pass it, finally providing the 38 votes needed. Bills championing both approaches are pending in the Judiciary Committees of the House and Senate. "Our view is that whatever works, works," Neuwirth begins. "We will support either approach. The idea of deadlines for ratification came in with Prohibition, when the 18th Amendment was introduced in 1919. Since then, there has been a seven-year limit for ratification placed on every proposed amendment." Prior to this, she continues, passage was not bound by time constraints. In fact, it took 203 years -- from its introduction in 1789 to it passage in 1992 -- for the 27thamendment, which governs congressional salaries, to be approved. Push for State Ratification The ERA Coalition -- which includes dozens of organizations, including the African American Policy Forum, American Association of University Women, Equal Rights Advocates, Feminist Majority Foundation, Legal Momentum, the National Organization for Women (NOW), the National Women's Political Caucus and the YWCA -- is organizing in the 14 states that have yet to ratify the Amendment: Alabama, Arizona, Arkansas, Florida, Georgia, Illinois, Louisiana, Mississippi, Missouri, North Carolina, Oklahoma, South Carolina, Utah and Virginia. Widespread support is already evident. A poll conducted by the Coalition and the Fund for Women's Equality in the summer of 2016 -- while Trump was campaigning -- found that 96 percent of women and 90 percent of men supported ERA passage; this was true among Democrats and Republicans, as well as among progressives and people who described themselves as "apolitical." What's more, 80 percent were flabbergasted to learn that these rights were not already assured. Perhaps, says Ellie Smeal, cofounder and president of the Feminist Majority Foundation (feminist.org), this is because people know that the Equal Pay Act, Title IX, the Pregnancy Discrimination Act and the Violence Against Women Act have been enacted. What they may not know, she continues, is that they're insufficient. "All these bills have loopholes," Smeal explains. "Title IX, for example, only bars gender-based discrimination in school sports if the educational program receives federal assistance and employment protections don't apply in every workplace. In addition, statutes can be flipped. We want a blanket protection, a statement in the Constitution that women have full and equal protection and that discrimination based on gender is banned across the board." Women's Economic and Social Progress Continues to Lag NOW President Terry O'Neill agrees. "Women have not yet achieved equality. We're not even close," she told me. "We're just 20 percent of Congress and we're overrepresented in low-paid occupations. Furthermore, we're underrepresented in positions of authority. Throughout the country, women are blocked from accessing basic health care." Family planning, she continues, is a case in point. Between 2011 -- when Texas defunded every clinic that performed or referred women to abortion clinics -- and 2016, when a court victory reopened these facilities, maternal mortality rates doubled and newborns died at increased rates. "If we'd had an ERA, these necessary health centers would not have been closed because shutting clinics that primarily serve women would have been seen as sex discrimination," O'Neill concludes. NOW's ERA organizers are zeroing in on the four states they believe are most likely to pass the Amendment: Florida, Illinois, North Carolina and Virginia. Along with on-the-ground educational outreach, a new website geared toward millennials, VisionsforEquality.com, will roll out shortly. "We believe that the ERA will help us assess what it means to be a real democracy," O'Neill said. "Real equality has to ensure that all people have the right to vote and have a voice. An ERA will be an additional tool to strike down voter suppression laws and force states to make it easier for people to go to the polls. We need to brainstorm, and we need to listen to one another, so that today's ERA campaign moves past the concerns of middle-class white women." Anticipating the Backlash Pro-ERA forces understand that numerous obstacles to ERA passage continue to exist and know that conservative forces will ramp up their efforts if the ERA campaign gains momentum. In the 1970s, they remind us, the Mormon Church, Phyllis Schlafly's STOP ERA, and right-wing Christian groups including the Eagle Forum and Concerned Women for America joined forces with the Chamber of Commerce and the insurance industry to put the kibosh on the amendment. "The insurance industry has money and they gender rate everything," O'Neill explains. "An ERA would derail this." And, while the Affordable Care ostensibly makes setting rates based on gender and health status illegal, the law permits discrimination based on age. This gives the industry the wiggle room to charge men and women different fees for coverage -- arguing that rates are determined by a person's life stage, and not whether they are male or female, healthy or sick. Predictably, gender-based insurance disparities did not faze Schlafly. Instead, she argued that the ERA promoted unnecessary meddling with business interests. In addition, she saw the Amendment as a violation of family values, and mobilized thousands of grassroots conservatives to oppose it. "The ERA would actually take away some of women's rights," Schlafly told the Los Angeles Times in 2008, because it would "abolish the presumption that the husband should support his wife." Not only that, she railed that it would allow men and women to be incarcerated in the same jails; allow the government to reinterpret alimony and child support laws; and end Social Security widow's pensions -- claims that she revved up to maximum effect. She also famously said that "women like the pay gap" (an average of 78 cents for every male dollar) because without it, they might earn more than their husbands, a sure-fire deterrent to successful matrimony. Conservatives in Nevada repeated many of these bugaboos during the state's recent debate on the issue, something feminists credit with turning the tide. "Their arguments were ridiculous or offensive or both," the ERA Coalition's Jessica Neuwirth said. "Their argument that a woman's place is in the home was certainly not compelling." The Intersection of Race and Gender While women's role in society has gotten the lion's share of ERA-related attention, the issue of race has gotten little play, with neither Schlafly nor the broader right wing explicitly bringing it to the fore. Nonetheless, according to Jessica Wilkerson, a professor of history and southern studies at the University of Mississippi, it was an ever-present subtext, at least in the South of 40-plus years ago. "Many white, Christian, southerners saw the ERA as a threat, one more assault on women's traditional roles," Wilkerson reports. "The same people who were part of a massive resistance to civil rights resisted the ERA, couching it in language about state's rights and federal overreach. In Mississippi, the anti-ERA movement was largely white; the wife of a well-known Klan leader was actually an anti-ERA leader. Their political arguments were founded on the idea of white, male patriarchy. They believed that the ERA threatened white men's status in society and would, by extension, lead white women to lose their privileges as wives and mothers. In Mississippi, the coalition against the ERA was called "Mississippians for God, Country and Family

#### 4.

## AFF EXTENSIONS

### EXT: Helps Democracy

#### 1. Eliminating the Electoral College would empower voters, driving up registration and voting rates

**Clifton Parker** **2016.** (Clifton Parker, writer for Stanford News. April 8, 2016. “National popular vote far better than Electoral College system for choosing presidents, Stanford professors say,” Stanford News. DOA: March 6, 2017. [http://news.stanford.edu/2016/04/08/electoral-college-bad-040816/) EL](http://news.stanford.edu/2016/04/08/electoral-college-bad-040816/)%20EL)

*\*The person quoted throughout the article is* [*Doug McAdam*](http://profiles.stanford.edu/douglas-mcadam)*, a professor of sociology with a focus on American politics at Stanford.*

“No principle is more fundamental to the theory of democratic governance than political equality; that is, the idea that every citizen’s voice or views should count as much as anyone else’s,” said McAdam, co-author with Karina Kloos of the 2014 book [Deeply Divided](http://global.oup.com/academic/product/deeply-divided-9780199937851?cc=us&lang=en&): Racial Politics and Social Movements in Postwar America. The current system violates this principle, McAdam said, due to its winner-take-all nature. In a close election, voters in one or more of the battleground states may determine the outcome of the contest, he said. “What about all those citizens who reside in non-competitive states? Consider the loyal Republican who lives in California or the stalwart Mississippi Democrat? Every four years, voting for them is an exercise in political powerlessness, at least when it comes to the presidential race,” he said. **Eliminating the Electoral College would empower voters**, McAdam said, **likely driving up voter registration and voting rates while creating a greater focus on issues (and not states) in presidential races.**

#### 2. Popular votes would lead states to encourage turnout where the Electoral College encourages suppression

**Garrett Epps, 2016** (Garrett Epps, professor of constitutional law at the University of Baltimore. November 27th 2016. “The Electoral College Wasn’t Meant to Overturn Elections,” *The Atlantic*, <https://www.theatlantic.com/politics/archive/2016/11/the-electoral-college-shouldnt-save-us-from-trump/508817/>. Accessed 9 March 2017) ESG

**In a popular vote system, communities gain influence when more of their people vote.** (Ask someone in your local politics which parts of town have the most influence with local officials.) **So if the president were picked by the voters directly, every state would desperately want its people to turn out. But in an electoral-vote system, a state retains the same number of electoral votes whether 100 percent or 10 percent of its people vote. As we saw this year in Wisconsin and North Carolina, that makes meddling with voting rights very tempting indeed.** This, then, is the mechanism some people I respect are putting forward as the nation’s savior. Would it be democratically legitimate for electors to switch their votes because Clinton has won the popular vote? Why? This result was foreseen when the campaign began. In 2000, both George W. Bush and Al Gore began before the election to assemble arguments to support taking office even after losing the popular vote. John Kerry’s campaign was also ready to justify replacing George W. Bush in 2004 even if Kerry lost the popular vote to Bush. Clinton’s popular-vote victory is nearly unprecedented in its sheer size. The American people rejected Trump by a wide margin. As a minority president claiming a mandate for dictatorial powers, he is a mortal danger to American democracy. But a Clinton presidency obtained by such a switch would, in a different way, also risk destroying the system; Trump voters would be as outraged by that maneuver as Clinton voters if the tables were turned.

#### 3. **A popular vote would create greater voter turn out because every vote would count and states would encourage participation**

Sean Illing 2016 (Sean Illing, Professor of politics and philosophy interviewing Professor Akhil Reed Amar, professor of law and political science at Yale University, specialist in constitutional law Nov 12, 2016, “The real reason we have an Electoral College: to protect slave states” from Vox <http://www.vox.com/policy-and-politics/2016/11/12/13598316/donald-trump-electoral-college-slavery-akhil-reed-amar> DOA: 3/19/17) ESM

Sean Illing Do you agree that a popular vote would encourage greater turnout? As it stands, there are plenty of people who feel their vote is meaningless because they live in a politically homogeneous state. Akhil Reed Amar It would encourage greater turnout in a couple of ways. First, it makes every state a swing state in that the margin of victory matters, and so every voter can make a difference. Second, it creates incentives for states seeking to maximize their clout to facilitate voting. Today, if a state makes it hard for people to vote, it pays no Electoral College penalty. It gets the same number of electoral votes whether it makes it easy or hard for citizens to participate. In a direct election world, states that facilitate and encourage voting loom larger in the final count. So that gives states an incentive to experiment in ways that promote democracy.

#### 4. Electoral College hurts third-party candidates

[**Jason Linkins**](http://www.huffingtonpost.com/author/jason-linkins) **2016** (Jason Linkins is a Huffington post editor writing about politics and the election. 11/15/2016 “So, You Say You Want To Get Rid Of The Electoral College, Eh?,” Huffington Post. <http://www.huffingtonpost.com/entry/electoral-college_us_582b66bee4b0aa8910bd3ca5> DOA: 6/3/17) CDY

**And third-party interaction with the Electoral College system truly is a mess. For starters, the way the system works paves the way for the perception that third-party candidates are spoilers, not players, with elections ending with anger being hurled their way for distorting the result.** I don’t personally hold to this notion ― if you’re a major party candidate with comparatively unlimited resources at your disposal, you’ve got no one to blame but yourself if Jill Stein’s votes would have won you Michigan. But the bitterness toward third-party candidates has a way of lingering, creating one of those “nobody learns and nobody hugs” situations. And who can say whether third-party candidates are getting an honest reflection of their base with the Electoral College, which adds a layer of strategic thinking that many voters likely have to grapple with as they arrived at their polling places? Seems to me that many people are more likely to vote third party if they’re confident that the majority in their state is going to shield them from the worst outcome, and less likely to do so if they feel their fellow voters won’t deliver the next-best option.

### EXT: Racist

#### 1. **The states that have more political influence happen to be very white, which reduces the voices of minorities**

Lara Merling and Dean Baker 2016 (Lara Merling, Research Assistant at Center for Economic and Policy Research. Dean Baker, macroeconomist and co-founder of the Center for Economic and Policy Research, 13 November 2016 “In the Electoral College White Votes Matter More” from Center for Economic and Policy Research DOA: 3/9/17 <http://cepr.net/blogs/beat-the-press/in-the-electoral-college-white-votes-matter-more>) ESM

As just about everyone knows, the Electoral College can lead to this result since it follows a winner take all rule (with the exception of Nebraska and Maine). A candidate gets all the electoral votes of a state whether they win it by one vote or one million. In this election, Secretary Clinton ran up huge majorities in California and New York, but her large margins meant nothing in the Electoral College. In addition to the problem of this winner take all logic, there is also the issue that people in large states are explicitly underrepresented in the Electoral College. While votes are roughly proportionately distributed, since even the smallest states are guaranteed three votes, the people in these states end up being over-represented in the Electoral College. For example, in Wyoming, there is an electoral vote for every 195,000 residents, in North Dakota there is one for every 252,000, and in Rhode Island one for every 264,000. On the other hand, in California there is an electoral vote for every 711,000 residents, in Florida one for every 699,000, and in Texas one for every 723,000. The states that are overrepresented in the Electoral College also happen to be less diverse than the country as a whole. Wyoming is 84 percent white, North Dakota is 86 percent white, and Rhode Island is 74 percent white, while in California only 38 percent of the population is white, in Florida 55 percent, and in Texas 43 percent. White people tend to live in states where their vote counts more, and minorities in places where it counts less. This means that the Electoral College not only can produce results that conflict with a majority vote, but it is biased in a way that amplifies the votes of white people and reduces the voice of minorities.

#### 2. A Hispanic and Black vote are worth only 91 and 95 percent of a White vote

**Patrick Thornton 2016** (Patrick Thornton, Senior Director at Congressional Quarterly December 8, 2016 “Trump Is President Because White People’s Votes Count More in America” from Washingtonian DOA: 3/9/17 <https://www.washingtonian.com/2016/12/08/white-peoples-votes-are-worth-more-electoral-college-donald-trump-hillary-clinton-popular-vote-alt-right/>) ESM

[White voters are literally worth more under the Electoral College](http://cepr.net/blogs/beat-the-press/in-the-electoral-college-white-votes-matter-more), due to the way US population is distributed. This quirk was not the intention of the Electoral College when it was created (although most states only allowed white, land-owning men to vote), but it is what the Electoral College means in 2016. America’s becoming more diverse, but that diversity isn’t evenly distributed. The states with the highest relative weighting in the Electoral College are generally less diverse than the country as a whole. Wyoming is 92 percent white, while California is 42 percent white. A vote in Wyoming is worth almost four times more than a vote in California because of the Electoral College. Unless states like Wyoming suddenly become much more diverse, and more minorities want to live in them, the Electoral College will favor white voters. A Hispanic vote is worth just 91 percent of a white vote. How is this possible? [About 47 percent of Hispanic voters](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/List_of_U.S._states_by_Hispanic_and_Latino_population) in the US live in either California or Texas. About 32 percent of Asian Americans [live in California](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Demographics_of_Asian_Americans), and this is a core reason an Asian-American vote is worth 98 percent of a white vote. A black vote is worth 95 percent of a white vote, and this is before addressing historic voter suppression aimed at black people.

#### 3. The Electoral College takes away power from the large racial minority populations in bigger states

**Josh Goodman 2012** (Josh Goodman, contributor to the Huffington Post. October 12, 2012. “E-Race-ing the Vote: The Electoral College’s Hidden Problem,” The Huffington Post. DOA: March 9, 2017. <http://www.huffingtonpost.com/josh-a-goodman/electoral-college-hidden-problem_b_2046957.html>) EL

Unlike most other institutional racism, I do not think that the current racism in the Electoral College is intentional. The framers of the Constitution had no idea what the racial demographics of various states would be like over 200 years after they set up the Electoral College, or that anyone besides white men would be able to vote in the first place. But that does not make the racism in the Electoral College any less real: **By privileging the voters of less populous, mostly white states, the Electoral College takes away power from the large racial minority populations in big states and adds to the existing racial injustices surrounding voting**. In response, it is easy to fall into a colorblind trap: A black person in Wyoming gets the same power boost for their vote as a white person does, so how could the Electoral College be racist? Frankly, Wyoming and most other **small states are not home to a large population of racial and ethnic minorities; nearly half of the U.S.’s racial and ethnic minority individuals live in the four most populous states**. It’s important that the way we count votes be fair for the population as it actually exists.

#### 4. **African American votes matter for nothing under the EC**

Jamie Raskin 2002 (Jamie Raskin, Professor of Constitutional and Election Law at Washington College of Law, 2002 “What's Wrong with Bush v. Gore and Why We Need to Amend the Constitution to Ensure it Never Happens Again” Maryland Law Review DOA: 4/25/17 <http://digitalcommons.law.umaryland.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=3175&context=mlr> p.703) ESM

Because of the nation's racial demography and geography, the winner-take-all electoral college in the states means that most of the votes cast by African-Americans in presidential elections will count literally for nothing. In 2000, more than ninety percent of AfricanAmericans voted for Democratic nominee Al Gore for President, something as close to a unanimous endorsement from a community as one might find.26 9 Yet fifty-eight percent of voting African-Americans, or 20,202,137 people, live in states that gave 100% of their electoral college votes to the Republican nominee, George W. Bush. Thus, most African-Americans voted in states where their votes ended up having no effect on the ultimate outcome of the election. AfricanAmericans voted overwhelmingly for the popular vote winner, but it made no difference. 27 0 The one southern state where the AfricanAmerican vote clearly might have made a difference was Florida.271 This fact makes the strategies deployed to cancel out African-American voting power in Florida all the more appalling and the Supreme Court's tying of a little bow on the whole process all the more cynical. Florida aside, the structural cancellation of African-American votes in presidential elections in the South simply reflects the general operation of the winner-take-all electoral college system. This is the basic reason to get rid of the electoral college today: each person's vote should count equally in a presidential election, regardless of geography, and the winner should actually win. But the electoral college has grown up with America's sordid racial history, and it continues in its underground fashion to embolden the minority voice of white racial conservatism.

#### 5. Due to the concentration of minorities in urban centers and their suburbs, their votes are undervalued

**Emily Dreyfuss 2016.** (Emily Dreyfuss, WIRED’s news and opinions editor. December 8, 2016. “The Electoral College is Great for Whiter States, Lousy for Cities,” WIRED. DOA: March 9, 2017. <https://www.wired.com/2016/12/electoral-college-great-whiter-states-lousy-cities/>) EL

Finally, **because urban centers and their suburbs are where the majority of nonwhite Americans live, that disparity means the Electoral College system undervalues the votes of people of color**. That imbalance will only increase as migration away from rural areas to cities continues. In the sweep of American history, this is Alexander Hamilton versus Thomas Jefferson flipped on its head. The Framers designed the Electoral College to make sure that smaller states were not ruled by the tyranny of the majority. Today, **rural voters wield disproportionate Electoral College power compared with population centers, while cities preach decentralization as a way of keeping a check on the executive branch.**

#### 5. Increased black voting power causes an increase in health care for black people – reduces racial health inequality.

Rodriguez et al, Mathematica Policy Research, 2015

[Javier, Arline T. Geronimus, Population Studies Center, Institute for Social Research, University of Michigan, John Bound, George E. Johnson Collegiate Professor, Department of Economics, University of Michigan, Danny Dorling, Halford Mackinder Professor of Geography, School of Geography and the Environment, Oxford University Centre for the Environment, Oxford University, Social Science & Medicine, “Black lives matter: Differential mortality and the racial composition of the U.S. electorate, 1970-2004” <http://www.dannydorling.org/wp-content/files/dannydorling_publication_id4731.pdf>, accessed 5-1-17, TAP]

To the extent that social stratification processes e which are affected by public policy and political power e sort Americans into different socioeconomic strata and physical environments based on their race, a disproportionate number of blacks are non-randomly exposed to the challenges, physiological stressors, and risks of injury that emanate from social disadvantages, thus contributing to racial inequality in health. It is widely acknowledged that eliminating racial disparities in health will require addressing such fundamental social causes and more proximate social determinants of health (Satcher, 2010). Because the social determinants of health are influenced by political forces, the black vote may play a key role in determining both the mechanisms of social stratification and the ultimate exposure of blacks to the psychosocial and environmental threats and challenges that increase racial health inequality (Rodriguez et al., 2013, 2014).

### EXT: Increases Turnout

#### 1. The direct popular vote would engage voters and increase participation

**Carol Mellor, 2008** (Carol Mellor, head of the Voter Services committee at the League of Women Voters of the Hamptons. 2008. “LWVUS Study on the National Popular Vote Compact Background Paper,” *League of Women Voters of the United States*, <https://bpb.opendns.com/a/webcache.googleusercontent.com/search?q=cache:bgAnNx70qmkJ:lwv.corvallis.or.us/newsletters-archive/LWVUSPopularVoteStudy.doc+&cd=2&hl=en&ct=clnk&gl=us>. Accessed 13 April 2017. Page 4-5) ESG

Few Battleground States. Under the current Electoral College system, presidential campaigns focus on a few key states which are the determinants of an Electoral College victory or loss. The electoral votes of these battleground states are viewed as the lynchpins of the election, and most media and candidate attention are focused on the few “competitive” states whose Electoral College votes are believed to be at stake. Voters in other states become observers of the process watching as the voters in a very few of the fifty states are courted intensely by the presidential candidates. Under this system, some votes are worth much more than other votes. A large portion of the country is ignored by the major candidates, except to the extent that the candidates visit “safe” states in search of campaign funds to fuel their activities in the toss-up states. Under the NPV Compact, candidates would have to be sensitive to the trend of opinion in all states and to develop campaign strategies that appeal to a very broad spectrum of the electorate. In this way, the NPV Compact would bring many more voters directly into the electoral process and take them out of the “spectator from afar” role. Equally important**, with the outcome depending on the NPV, voters across the country would have a sense that their vote would indeed count in a meaningful way and this would provide stimulus for greater attention to the campaign and greater participation in the electoral process. The NPV** Compact **would make it worthwhile for candidates to campaign throughout the country, thereby increasing interest in the election nationwide.**

#### 2. A popular vote would cause states to encourage voter turnout and improve democracy

**Akhil Reed Amar, 2016** (Akhil Reed Amar, professor of law and political science at Yale University. November 16th 2016. “Should the Electoral College Be Abolished?” *The New York Times*, <http://www.nytimes.com/roomfordebate/2016/11/16/should-the-electoral-college-be-abolished>. Accessed 9 March 2017) ESG

Indeed, **direct presidential election would harness state creativity in exciting ways. Currently, states have little incentive to encourage voting. A state gets a pre-set number of electoral votes regardless of voter turnout. But in a direct election system, states with higher turnout would have more clout in the final tally, giving state governments incentives to encourage voting. States may do this different ways — early voting in some states; same-day registration in others; making Election Day a holiday in still other jurisdictions.** Federal oversight would be necessary to keep state competition within fair boundaries, but **state creativity could drive a race to the top — democratic experimentalism and federalism at their best.** Some states are already experimenting with a creative plan for future presidential races. Under the National Popular Vote Interstate Compact that has gained momentum in recent years, states in the compact are promising that, if enough states ultimately join the bandwagon, these states will give their electoral votes to the national popular vote winner. It’s an interesting idea — in 2001 I floated a precursor of this plan — but the current version does have technical wrinkles that need to be ironed out. (What if some noncooperating states refuse to hold proper elections or careful recounts? What if some states lower the voting age in ridiculous ways — letting 12-year-olds vote — to maximize their clout?) To work well, strong federal oversight would be needed.

#### 3. Turnout increases under a direct vote

**Brett Gordon and Wesley Hartmann, 2013** (Brett Gordon, Associate Professor of Marketing in the Kellogg School of Management at Northwestern University, and Wesley Hartmann, professor of marketing at the Stanford Graduate School of Business. April 29th 2013. “Advertising Competition in Presidential Elections,” Hosted by *UCLA Economics*, <http://www.econ.ucla.edu/alumniconf/Hartmann.pdf>. Accessed 13 April 2017. Page 39) ESG

**Turnout in the direct vote increases by 1.3%, or about 2 million voters.** The popular vote in four states—Iowa, New Mexico, Oregon, and Wisconsin, all with thin margins—flips from Gore to Bush. Gore, however, gains enough votes in the Democratic stronghold of California to win the election even though his national vote margin shrinks from about 543,000 to 494,000. An important distinction between the Electoral College and a direct vote is a state’s relative influence in the election outcome. Under the Electoral College, a state’s influence is fixed and proportional to its fraction of the total electoral votes.27 The Electoral College essentially protects states from political losses if a state implements policies that make it more difficult or disqualifies certain voters from casting their votes. Furthermore, the winner-take-all rule gives partisan members of a state’s government strong motivation to influence voter turnout to favor their own political party (as witnessed recently in the form of voter identification and anti-voter fraud laws proposed in many states).

### EXT: Turnout Good

#### 1. **When voters don’t vote, they allow other people to chose their future for them**

Sonam Tobgay 2017 (Sonam Tobgay, served in Bhutan’s Ministry of Foreign Affairs 2017“THE IMPORTANCE OF HIGH VOTER TURNOUT” from The McCain Institute for International Leadership at Arizona State University. <https://www.mccaininstitute.org/blog/the-importance-of-high-voter-turnout/> DOA: 3/16/17) ESM

There are several similarities between Kansas City and Bhutan in the electoral realm. For instance, multi parties in Bhutan and multiple candidates in Kansas City competing at primary level; two candidate run-off at general elections; and both with less than half million registered voters – Bhutan – 390,000 and Kansas City – 201,585. The last similarity implies that every vote can make a difference in the outcome of elections so it’s even more crucial for high voter turnout. Besides it also gives elected representatives and governments greater legitimacy. When voters don’t exercise their franchise, by default they allow others to make decisions for them. They have to live with the decision of the small minority who voted. In the case of local elections in America where more elderly voters are turning out, older people are deciding the future for the younger generation when it is they who should actively engage to determine their own future. Many countries including Bhutan are continually innovating to make voting more convenient. Postal and absentee ballots are even extended to their nationals living abroad. In Bhutan, democracy clubs in schools and a recently established Children’s Parliament are helping raise civic awareness from an early age. Online voting is also being explored so more people can vote from the comfort of their home, but the question is how can it be made secure. Until we can figure out a way to make online voting secure and voting even more convenient, we’ll continue to need encouragement of leaders like our King to sustain our high voter turnout. In the case of Kansas City, more impassioned speeches by Mayor James will be needed to evoke a positive response and spur voters to exercise their democratic rights. After all, higher voter turnout and voting are the means to elect capable leaders to build better cities, states and countries. It’s the cornerstone for the success of democracy.

#### 2. Voting is Better at Reducing Income-Inequality than the Entire US Tax System

**Sean McElwee 2015** (Sean McElwee, Policy Analyst for Demos, September 16th 2015, “Why Voting Matters: Large Disparities in Turnout Benefit the Donor Class,” <http://www.demos.org/publication/why-voting-matters-large-disparities-turnout-benefit-donor-class>)

Other models look at voter turnout and inequality. One **study of 78 countries finds that if voter turnout increased from 40 percent to 80 percent, on average it would reduce the Gini Coefficient** (a frequently used measure of income inequality) **in these countries by .04, which is equal to the entire effect of taxes in the United States**.31 In a study comparing the relative impact of redistribution on different factors (strength of liberal parties, union density, etc**.) Vincent Mahler finds that voter turnout is among the strongest: “on average, a 1 percent increase in electoral turnout is associated with a reduction of about three quarters of a Gini point in overall inequality**.”32 Although there has been less research on class bias in turnout internationally, mainly due to data limitations, the research that we have suggests that high-income bias of turnout reduces redistribution.

#### 3. Moderates are less politically active

**Paul Steenkiste 2014** (Paul Steenkiste, writer for U.S. common sense. 9-5-2014. "The Effect of Voter Turnout on Political Polarization," United States Common Sense. http://uscommonsense.org/research/effect-voter-turnout-political-polarization/ 4-21-2017) CDY

The majority of Americans are not as ideologically polarized as their representatives. A recent Pew poll **[found](http://www.people-press.org/2014/06/12/political-polarization-in-the-american-public/" \o "Opens in a new window" \t "_blank)** that only 21% of voting-age Americans are “consistently” liberal or conservative, while 39% reported their views as “mixed.” So how have the country’s elected officials come to hold more polarized views than the electorate? **While the majority of Americans are politically moderate, the most polarized voters go to the polls in greater numbers**, especially in primaries. **The smaller the voter pool becomes, the more weight a single vote carries and the easier it becomes for an active, partisan minority to determine an election’s outcome. Thus, highly-polarized politicians come to represent a moderate constituency.** According to Pew, moderates vote considerably less often than staunch liberals or conservatives (Figure 4). The Pew poll further found that **“politically-active” individuals have ideological scores that are, on average, much further from the center of the political spectrum than the average American.** Their ideologies, like legislators’, have become even *more* polarized over the past couple decades. It makes intuitive sense that those with the strongest ideologies show the most interest in voting. After all, they likely have the most passion for their candidates, the most defined stances on issues, and the most antipathy for the opposition. Political moderates, whose views tend to be milder and more ambivalent, often feel less compelled to vote. As a result, voters in the far wings of either party wield disproportionate influence in primary elections, nominating more polarized candidates who match their beliefs.

#### 4. Encouraging voter participation can help moderate candidates and encourage moderate behavior

**Diana Epstein and John Graham, 2007** (Diana Epstein, assistant policy analyst at the RAND Corporationand John Graham, dean of the Frederick S. Pardee RAND Graduate School. 2007. “Polarized Politics and Policy Consequences,” *Pardee RAND Graduate School*, <http://www.rand.org/content/dam/rand/pubs/occasional_papers/2007/RAND_OP197.pdf>. Page 22-23) ESG

Although polarization has been associated with increasing rates of political participation by informed citizens, **there remains a large segment of the American population that does not participate in politics at all.** As the parties have worked hard to increase participation among their base voters, **many true independents and moderates with weak party affiliations remain on the sidelines. If more independent and moderate voters became active in politics, it might be easier for centrist candidates to win primaries. New blocs of unaffiliated voters can create incentives for candidates to move to the center** (Fiorina et al., 2006). **With this in mind, increasing moderate citizens’ participation in the democratic process could help mitigate polarization. It might also encourage candidates to moderate their positions and elected officials to engage in centrist legislative behaviors such as forming bipartisan coalitions and brokering compromises.** Measures to improve voter turnout in primary elections would likely prevent strong partisans from exerting disproportionate influence on candidate selection. Possible mechanisms for increasing voter turnout include allowing registration on election day, electronic voting, holding elections on Saturday, making election day a federal holiday, or mandatory voting. However, if measures to boost turnout cause more participation by partisans as well as moderates, the overall effect on overall polarization may be minimal. U.S. demographic trends may work naturally to alleviate polarization. For example, Latinos are one of the fastest-growing demographic groups in the country but traditionally have had low rates of voter turnout. Latinos are a heterogeneous group, and neither party has been able to fully capture the Latino vote. Greater Latino participation will likely cause both parties to reconsider positions and possibly move to the center on some issues (Fleisher and Bond, 2000). A more fundamental yet promising strategy to reduce polarization would be to engage more citizens in local politics, including exercises in deliberative democracy where the influence of partisanship is weak and citizens can learn about issues and acquire the skills of effective political participation. If citizens learn how to approach local politics in a nonpolarized manner, they may be more likely to demand similar behavior from their elected representatives.

#### 5. Low income Americans are more supportive of inequality based issues

**James Avery 2015.** (James M. Avery, professor of political science at Stockton University. February 4, 2015. “Does Who Votes Matter? Income Bias in Voter Turnout and Economic Inequality in the American States from 1980 to 2010,” Richard Stockton College. DOA: April 13, 2017. <https://link.springer.com/epdf/10.1007/s11109-015-9302-z?shared_access_token=gdVgkyncC29HmcPd55fAQPe4RwlQNchNByi7wbcMAY4NrS19Wve9lweZ9AxP5IIhxFgq8LDTPADYyvGwQaT6HVbZdsSiVIdH9n9BpzP3pQ3SUc6cxH9kjNPkqAd_2Khw4sys6mWbvinQPsIDZcpkUWDZWYvQHn67bNxeaaDepno%3D> Page: 3) EL

Despite weak labor unions and no truly leftist party, social class and economic inequality have become increasingly salient in American politics. Both political elites and the mass public have become more polarized across political parties in recent decades (Abramowitz and Saunders 2008; Hetherington 2001), with economics and economic inequality playing an important part in this polarization. While some research ﬁnds few differences in policy preferences across income levels (Enns and Wlezien 2011; Soroka and Wlezien 2008) and broad dissatisfaction with inequality (Page and Jacobs 2009), **high income Americans express less concern about inequality** (Page and Jacobs 2009) **and provide considerably less support for government efforts to reduce economic inequality than low-income Americans** (Gilens 2005, 2009; Kelly and Witko 2012 ; Page and Jacobs 2009; Soroka and Wlezien 2008). 1 Furthermore, over the last several decades high-income citizens have increasingly supported the Republican Party, while **low-income citizens have sided with the Democratic Party** (McCarty et al. 2006; Stonecash et al. 2002). McCarty et al. (2006) conclude: …during periods of increasing inequality when the fortunes of different economic groups are diverging, the policies preferred by each will diverge as well. In the current context, the Democratic Party will continue to support policies that redistribute to the poor and collectivize social risk, while the Republicans represent the interest of those whose incomes are growing rapidly and hence support policies to cut taxes and privatize risk. (192)

#### He continues,

**James Avery 2015.** (James M. Avery, professor of political science at Stockton University. February 4, 2015. “Does Who Votes Matter? Income Bias in Voter Turnout and Economic Inequality in the American States from 1980 to 2010,” Richard Stockton College. DOA: April 13, 2017. <https://link.springer.com/epdf/10.1007/s11109-015-9302-z?shared_access_token=gdVgkyncC29HmcPd55fAQPe4RwlQNchNByi7wbcMAY4NrS19Wve9lweZ9AxP5IIhxFgq8LDTPADYyvGwQaT6HVbZdsSiVIdH9n9BpzP3pQ3SUc6cxH9kjNPkqAd_2Khw4sys6mWbvinQPsIDZcpkUWDZWYvQHn67bNxeaaDepno%3D> Page: 13) EL

I next turn to the long-term effect of income bias in turnout on income inequality. The long run multiplier represents the long-term effect and is calculated. The estimates for the long-term effects are 1.09 for the ﬁxed effects model and 2.42 for the random effects model. **To get some idea of the magnitude of these effects, I calculate the expected long-term effects of a two-standard deviation increase in income bias in turnout.** Such an increase is associated with an expected increase in the ﬁrst differenced Gini indexes of .61 for the ﬁxed effects model and 1.36 for the random effects model. **These expected changes represent about 7 and 16 %, respectively**, of the variation in ﬁrst differenced Gini indexes, **effects that are clearly substantively signiﬁcant.** These ﬁndings demonstrate that the effect of income bias in turnout on income inequality is not limited to a single lag. That is, income bias in turnout in 2000, for example, is not only expected to inﬂuence income inequality in 2003 and 2004, but is also expected to have an inﬂuence in 2005 and 2006
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#### 1. A national election would greatly reduce advertising costs

**Brett Gordon et al. 2016** (Brett R. Gordon joined Kellogg in 2014 as an Associate Professor of Marketing. His research interests include pricing, advertising, promotions, retailing, innovation, and competitive strategy.  Wesley R. Hartmann, Professor of Marketing Stanford Graduate School of Business. March 3, 2016. “Advertising Competition in Presidential Elections,” Northwestern University.<http://www.kellogg.northwestern.edu/faculty/gordon_b/files/poli.pdf>  PAGE:1 DOA: 4/5/17) CDY

**Presidential candidates purchase advertising based on each state’s potential to tip the election. The structure of the Electoral College concentrates spending in battleground states, such that a majority of voters are ignored.** We estimate an equilibrium model of multimarket advertising competition between candidates that allows for endogenously determined budgets. **In a Direct Vote counterfactual, we find advertising would be spread more evenly across states**, but total spending levels can either decrease or increase depending on the contestability of the popular vote. **Spending would** increase by 13 percent in the extremely narrow 2000 election, but would **decrease by 54 percent in 2004.** **These results suggest that the Electoral College greatly increases advertising spending in typical elections.**

#### 2. The spending increase isn’t even that big!

**Brett Gordon and Wesley Hartmann, 2013** (Brett Gordon, Associate Professor of Marketing in the Kellogg School of Management at Northwestern University, and Wesley Hartmann, professor of marketing at the Stanford Graduate School of Business. April 29th 2013. “Advertising Competition in Presidential Elections,” Hosted by *UCLA Economics*, <http://www.econ.ucla.edu/alumniconf/Hartmann.pdf>. Accessed 13 April 2017. Page 31-32) ESG

Table 5 summarizes the counterfactual equilibrium and compares various outcomes to those observed with the Electoral College. **All markets in the direct vote equilibrium receive positive advertising. Total spending increases by 25.2% to $146.7 million. Part of this increase is due to a shift in spending towards larger and more expensive markets that previously received little advertising: spending in the ten largest markets increases by 76% and their share of total spending rises from 26% to 37%.** Both candidates allocate similar amounts of advertising dollars to the largest markets. Bush, however, spends 70% more dollars in the 25 mid-sized markets relative to the Electoral College while Gore’s total spending in these markets is roughly the same. Thus, Gore primarily shifts spending in former battleground states to the newly relevant large and polarized markets, whereas Bush increases spending in both large- and medium-sized markets. This difference in strategies explains most of the increase in Bush’s overall spending gap over Gore.