

We affirm.

Contention one is split elections.

In the status quo, elections where one candidate wins the popular vote but loses the electoral college will become extremely frequent. Alex Seitz-Wald at NBC explains in 2017 that liberals are rapidly becoming densely packed into deep blue urban areas that don't net them many electoral votes, meaning Democrats will win the popular vote but lose the electoral college. Mark Siegel of NYU confirms in 2016 that demographic shifts make elections where one candidate wins the popular vote but loses the presidency the new normal.

There are two impacts

1. Global human rights. Global research professor Ian Bremmer explains in December 2016 that because losing the popular vote but winning the electoral college produces polarization and a questionable mandate to govern, these split outcomes harm US international leadership and political legitimacy. The Freedom House reports in 2012 that because the US plays a prominent role in multilateral institutions, US leadership is critical to ensure that international responses to human rights violations have the greatest impact.
2. Climate change. Alan Neuhauser at US News explains in 2015 that while the GOP has dismissed climate change, the Democratic presidential candidates all want to cut CO2 emissions, which presidents can do by signing international agreements. Climate change exacerbates structural violence, as environmental studies professor David Pellow explains in 2014 that oppressed groups will suffer the most from droughts, natural disasters, diseases, and higher energy costs, making "the struggle for racial, gender, and economic justice... inseparable from" efforts to combat climate change.

Contention two is helping racial minorities.

Subpoint A is abolishing swing states. Swing states harm minorities in three ways.

1. First, electoral gerrymandering. Government professor Anthony McGann explains in 2017 that four swing state governments are entirely controlled by Republicans who want to split their state's electoral votes into gerrymandered congressional districts. This harms minorities, as Garance Rute at The Atlantic explains in 2013 that partisan gerrymandering effectively purges millions of minority votes by packing them into safe districts where their votes don't matter. Under the popular vote, however, this couldn't happen because there wouldn't be electoral college votes to distribute.
2. Second, they are disproportionately white. Milo Beckman at FiveThirtyEight explains in 2017 that the swing states which have disproportionate power under the electoral college are on average 80% white, far more than the national average. Beckman furthers that swing states will always be disproportionately white because white voters

migrate between the two parties, so states with high white populations are more swingable.

3. Third, harsh voter ID. Jon Perloe at Connecticut News explains in 2017 that Republicans have implemented major voting restrictions to suppress racial minorities in 8 of the 12 swing states, disenfranchising far more voters than the small margins of victory in those states. Fortunately, Christopher Keelty explains in 2016 that unlike the electoral college, popular vote margins of victory are too large to be swung by voting restrictions.

Subpoint B is ending the rural tilt. This occurs in two ways.

1. First, ending small state bias. Bob Wing explains in 2016 that because every state is guaranteed three electoral votes, small, white states have more voting power per person than large, racially diverse states. Because of this skew, data reporter John Templon quantifies in 2016 that because of geographical distribution differences, white voters have 15% more power in the electoral college than African Americans and Latinos and almost twice as much voting power as Asian Americans.
2. Second, shifting the focus to urban centers. Emily Dreyfuss explains that most urban centers are majority non-white and minority population growth in cities is outpacing the rest of the country. Fortunately, Ryan Beckwith at Time explains in 2016 that the popular vote would push candidates to urban centers where the most votes reside, thereby forcing them to pay more attention to racial minorities.

The impact is reducing racist policies.

Because whites make up only 60% of the population and tend to split their votes between Republicans and Democrats, former senator Russ Feingold explains in 2017 that “minorities will decide any election determined by the national popular vote,” forcing Democrats and Republicans to focus on minority issues. Theodore Johnson at the Washington Post corroborates in 2015 that while there is no political will to fight racism in the status quo, giving racial minorities more political power would force politicians to compete for minority votes and prioritize race-related policy to fight structural discrimination in housing, education, criminal justice and employment. Empirically, history professor Gavin Wright finds in 2013 that when black voters received more political representation through the Voting Rights Act, it resulted in higher black employment, income, and living standards.