

We negate.

Contention one is increasing campaign spending.

Under the electoral college, spending is isolated to just a few swing states, keeping costs low. Thus, Max Galka of the University of Pennsylvania finds in 2016 that empirically, presidential spending decreased in 2016, and when controlling for inflation, income growth, and population growth, campaign spending has roughly flatlined for the past few decades.

However, under the popular vote, Ryan Beckwith of Time Magazine writes in 2016 that “candidates would need to raise a lot more money to air ads in more expensive media markets in the country’s top urban areas” to compete. Moreover, USA Today explains in 2016 that the popular vote would put the whole nation in play, forcing candidates to increase spending in areas that previously didn’t matter. Brett Gordon of Columbia University quantifies in 2013 that switching to the popular vote would increase campaign expenditures by 25%. Ultimately, USA Today writes in 2016 that the popular vote would “set off a scramble for even more campaign money, leaving candidates more beholden to special interests.”

The impact is distorted policy. Peter Enns of Cornell finds in a 2016 study that when campaigns become more reliant on contributions, they attract donors by tailoring their agendas to special interests. Lee Drutman of the Sunlight Foundation furthers in 2012 that when presidents take office, their campaign promises to the voters fade in favor of catering to donor interests.

Problematically, Sean McElwee of Demos explains in 2016 that donor influences impede all forms of equality such as affirmative action, abortion rights, and economic redistribution because the vast majority of donors are white males who oppose equality. Empirically, Adam Lioz of Demos writes in 2014 that campaign contributions created and perpetuate mass incarceration, deregulated markets, and low minimum wages.

Contention two is unleashing the constitutional convention.

The popular vote cannot be implemented through a regular constitutional amendment. Aaron Blake of the Washington Post writes in 2016 that Democrats don’t have enough seats to pass a popular vote amendment through the GOP controlled Congress, making it doomed to fail.

There is another option, however. If two thirds of the states agree, they can organize a constitutional convention and introduce amendments without congressional approval. This is the most likely implementation of the resolution for two reasons.

1. Common ground. While Republicans in Congress have nothing to gain from a popular vote amendment, Ashley Balcerzak of Slate reports in 2015 that because various members of both the left and the right are pushing for a convention to pass their desired amendments, it is rapidly becoming a real possibility. Law professor Lawrence Lessig

further in 2016 that it will be easier to mobilize the states to start a convention than it will be for Congress to pass new amendments.

2. Fewer votes to find. While a constitutional amendment would require support from two thirds of congress and three-quarters of the states, only two thirds of states need to support a convention to make it happen. Specifically, NTK Network reports in 2016 that only three more states need to sign on to start a convention to get rid of the electoral college.

Ultimately, Lawrence Lessig explains in 2016 that a constitutional convention is the one final plausible strategy for abolishing the Electoral College.

The impact is recessions. Jelani Cobb at the New Yorker explains 2017 that Republicans would use a convention to pass an amendment requiring the federal government to have a balanced budget, as such an amendment has remained a lodestar of GOP aspirations for decades. Problematically, law professor David Super finds in 2017 that a balanced budget amendment would force the government to cut spending and raise taxes during a recession, the opposite of sound economic policy. Thus, Super concludes that a balanced budget amendment would create a vicious spiral that would cause more recessions and make recessions longer and deeper. Richard Kogan at the Center for Budget and Policy Priorities quantifies in 2017 that if a constitutional balanced budget provision had been in place during 2012, unemployment would have doubled to 18% and the economy would have shrunk by 17% instead of growing 2%. Problematically, recessions in the US spill over, as David Caploe at the Center for Applied Liberal Arts explains in 2009 that because the US has deep economic connections with the entire world, recessions in the US turn into global economic crises, that can only end if the US recovers domestically. Ultimately, research professor Stein Tonnesson finds in 2015 that economic decline increases the chance that countries will ignore deterrence and initiate military conflict to gain credibility with the public, blaming other countries for their own decline.