

We negate.

Contention one is increasing voting restrictions.

Attorney Sean Rosenthal explains in 2015 that under the electoral college, states that are tilted heavily to the left or right have no incentive to restrict voting rights since the outcome of their vote is known, while swing states are unable to restrict voting because their legislatures are divided. Thus, Bradley Jones of Pew writes in 2016 that only 10 states have the strictest level of voter ID laws.

However, Sean Rosenthal explains that because each state's vote total would affect the national total instead of just the state's electoral votes, the popular vote would cause the party in power to systemically tilt the election in its favor and solidify its political power using partisan voter ID laws that target the other party.

The impact is disenfranchising racial minorities. Because racial minorities are statistically less likely to have ID, Wendy Weiser at the American Prospect explains in 2014 that voting restrictions such as voter ID, cutbacks to early voting and same day registration primarily prevent African Americans and Latinos from voting, causing millions of votes to be lost per year. Empirically, Chris Ingraham at the Washington Post finds in 2016 that strict voter ID laws double the participation gap between whites and minorities, ultimately skewing democracy towards white interests.

Contention two is increasing extremism.

The electoral college forces candidates to appeal to moderate voters. Benjamin Zycher of the LA Times writes in 2004 that the electoral college pushes candidates to the political center in order to win politically diverse swing states. Peter Brodnitz of the Progressive Policy Institute confirms in 2016 that 57% of swing state voters consider themselves moderate. Thus, Stanford political scientist Morris Fiorina finds in 2014 that surveys of partisanship and ideology show that "the country as a whole is no more polarized than it was a generation ago."

The popular vote will reverse this. Daniel Butler of Yale University writes in 2009 that candidates face a trade-off between taking a moderate position that appeals to swing voters and an extreme position that appeals to base voters. They will choose to turn out their base, as a 2015 Gallup poll found that moderates make up only 34% of Americans nationwide. Eliana Johnson of the National Review furthers in 2016 that since 1972 a vast majority of candidates could have won the popular vote by only appealing to their base. Thus, Trent England of US News in 2012 writes that under the popular vote, candidates can "simply go where they are already popular and fan the flames of political radicalism."

The impact is economic uncertainty. Because polarization increases the difference in economic policy between administrations, economics professor Marina Azzimonti finds September 2013

that polarization increases economic uncertainty which reduces investment, with a 64-point increase in political polarization index resulting in “a peak loss of 1.75 million jobs after six quarters” and 2% lower economic output. Economics professor Kenneth Couch furthers in 2010 that empirically, as the business cycle weakens, black workers are the first to be fired.

Contention three is increasing donor influence.

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

The popular vote will increase campaign expenditures for two reasons.

1. A bigger market. USA Today writes in 2016 that popular vote puts the whole nation in play, setting off “a scramble for even more campaign money, leaving candidates more beholden to special interests.”
2. A more expensive market. Ryan Beckwith of Time Magazine writes in 2016 that “candidates would need... a lot more money to air ads [and rent campaign offices] in more expensive... [urban] markets.” For this reason, Brett Gordon of Columbia University quantifies in 2013 that switching to the popular vote would increase campaign expenditures by 25%.

The impact is distorted policy. Peter Enns of Cornell finds in 2016 that when campaigns become more reliant on contributions, they attract donors by tailoring their agendas to special interests. This corrupts the presidency, as Lee Drutman of the Sunlight Foundation finds in 2012 that when presidents take office, their campaign promises to the voters disappear, and they cater to their donor interests instead.

Ultimately, corrupt donors harm the most vulnerable groups, as Sean McElwee of Demos explains in 2016 that donor influence ends policies 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.