

Pro Case:

We affirm,

Before we begin, we would like to make one observation.

Observation 1: The electoral college's winner takes all system favors Republicans, despite democratic are the clear winner of the popular vote. [Millhiser19](#) even finds that "Republicans should be expected to win 65% of Presidential contests in which they narrowly lose the popular vote."

Contention one is Political equality

Sub point A is Swing states

With electoral college candidates only campaigns in swing states and ignoring other states in our country. This is why [Kleske16](#) explained that "Since 2000 both candidates spent more time in Florida, Ohio and Pennsylvania than in the other 47 states combined." [Lessig16](#) also finds that "99% of spending in 2016 was in those 14 battleground states." Shows that candidates only care about swing states. This leads to our impact on people protesting because the system is undemocratic and their voices are not hurt. This impact will happen because people want their vote and their voice. The electoral college is not democracy. The direct result of only campaigning in the swing states is that the president that got chosen in the electoral college is only representing the swing states and only makes policies that benefit swing states instead of the whole country. Making our country become undemocracy and is very likely causing turbulence and even insurrection appear in the US.

Subpoint B is votes were ignored

With the electoral college voting system [Lessig16](#) finds that "Over 52 million votes were ignored in the 2016 election because of winner-take-all." With the winner take all system almost one sixth of the population in the US were ignored which means the election is no longer democracy and ought to be replaced by a simple popular vote that has no winner take all system.

Contention 2 is Anti-democratic.

The Electoral College does not show true representation. According to [Antil'19](#) "The Electoral College has failed to represent the American public five times throughout United States history, all five of presidential candidates have won the election, [despite losing the popular vote](#) and it is being more frequently happening throughout history. Most importantly, all the presidents that won the election are Republicans. " It is becoming more frequently happening in our country

That's why [USA'17](#) said "The Electoral College is anti-democratic. Democratic presidential nominee Hillary Clinton has so far received over 2.8 million more votes nationwide than Trump — the largest divergence between the popular and electoral votes in history. This is unfair to democrats and has led to our impact on Climate Change.

Through the study by professor [Rober Sharp](#) in 2014 climate change is the greatest threat to the survival of humanity and will cause natural disasters rising, sea level decimate including water resources forcing countries into source war backed by nuclear weapons. [Neuhouser 15](#) explained that the tip point of climate change is as soon as 2036 while as the Republican is dismissed climate change the democratic candidates all want to cut CO2 and greenhouse gas emission to slow climate change which they could achieve by signing international agreement. An example found by [Whitehouse.org](#) would be Obama signing "The final Clean Power Plan sets flexible and achievable standards to reduce carbon dioxide emissions by 32 percent from 2005 levels by 2030, 9 percent more ambitious than the proposal." Even though climate change might not be stopped [Sullivan 19](#) still finds "If greenhouse gas is not getting reduced, soon there will be 9,300 extreme-temperature-related deaths per year across the whole nation under a higher emissions pathway." Right now we are having an unfair system which favors Republican so it is very hard for a democratic candidate to become a president and that means climate change will very likely be managed improperly and even being ignored "

Thus, we affirm

Con Case:

We negate, Resolved: The United States ought to replace the Electoral College with a direct national popular vote.

Contention 1: Popular vote is disastrous.

Subpoint A Prevents recounts

[Ross'14](#) writes “A direct election system would be more likely to result in post-election disputes, uncertainty, and even litigation. Worse, fraud would be more difficult to prevent. The Electoral College creates these quick and undisputed election outcomes for two reasons: First, the state-by-state nature of the election, combined with the winner-take-all allocation of votes, tends to magnify margins of victory. Over the years, these margins have given winning candidates certain and demonstrable victories. Such certainty can't be provided in a direct popular election system. Popular vote totals tend to be closer, and these narrow margins can easily result in election challenges and recounts.”

[Williams'19](#) furthers “To raise just a few practical questions, how would a nationwide recount be ordered or conducted if the national popular vote is close? And, if a nationwide recount were not conducted—if only some states conducted a recount in that situation—would not that violate the Equal Protection Clause for the same reason that the lack of uniformity in Florida's county-by-county recount in Bush v. Gore did?”

Subpoint B: High Budget Spendings.

Without the Electoral College, campaign financing would be more expensive.

Which is why [Schneider'19](#) writes “Advertising Analytics, a political ad-tracking firm, expects the total cost of TV and digital ads for the next election to hit over \$6 billion.” When with a national popular vote, candidates need to campaign in the whole country instead of the swing states. Which makes the total cost for the campaign increased by more than 3 times .

Our impact is small candidates will not be able to afford campaigns, which causes them to quit the election and at that time. All the people left will be the rich. This is terrifying because this means that the whitehouse will always be controlled by certain people leaving no space for unrich and normal candidates. Causing America turning into an aristocracy country. Even if some candidates can still campaign but with the popular vote system elections would still be a huge disadvantage for them, the disadvantage is so huge that [Koreth'18](#) even finds “More than 90 percent of candidates who spend the most win.” making the election based on who has the most money instead of who can really make our nation better.

Contention 2 is Small States

[Edwards'19](#) finds that “Under direct election of the president, big states would select the president, no matter which candidate those living in the other states preferred.” Proving that with popular vote all candidates will focus on large populated states like California, New York or Texas. Ignoring small states like Wyoming and Iowa. Furthermore, [Hans'19](#) finds “The **nine most populous states contain 51%** of America's population. Under the National Popular Vote compact, a candidate could spend her entire campaign in big cities in California, Texas, Florida, and New York, and cares only 80% of the whole population in america. Make small states like Maine and Nevada wouldn't even make the list of campaign stops. Which causes small states resentful and will very likely create instability in those states.

But with the Electoral college, it diminishes big states' power and increases small states' power which makes every state involved in election. Giving small states power to be heard. And that is why [Hassell16](#) said "The Electoral College really provides an option for small states like Iowa to make a difference." With the electoral college it provides every state an opportunity to be heard. But with popular vote all the small states will be ignored and never be heard.

Our second impact is Social media. Right now, Social media can influence the elections because the people are voting for their president. [Guardian'20](#) explains "This joke has often come to mind since 2016 when reading explanations – especially media explanations – of the Brexit vote and Trump's election. The general tenor is that it was all down to social media, Facebook, Twitter and YouTube in particular."

Thus we negate.

Popular vote would choose demagogues.

Definition: "A demagogue is a political leader who seeks support by appealing to the desires and prejudices of ordinary people rather than by using rational argument."

And that is why [The Hill](#) confirms "However, one idea, known as the national popular vote, could have catastrophic consequences for our government in the future. That will change if the national popular vote plan actually goes into effect. In that system, the person who gets the most popular votes, no matter the percentage of the total popular vote, will be elected president because he or she will automatically receive the necessary 270 electoral votes of the participating states. Therefore, a person with as little as a quarter of the popular vote could win the presidency and could also be the candidate for any of the new political parties that will be formed to run candidates."

Leon Pro:

Contention 1: Hijacking the election. (Faithless Electors)

- 530 electors
- 30 states have electors punished if they vote against their state.

Contention 2: Winner takes all system

- 40% republican lose, votes don't matter
- Many states can be written off

Impact: voter turnout won't vote cause votes don't matter.

Rebuttal For Against Pro

In their soul contention sub point one is extremely weak because through history there are only nine times there are faithless electors and none of them changed the final decision which means it doesn't matter if there will be faithless electors or not.

Then let's go to their sub point B of winner take all system, well we will say that this contention does not stand at all because winner take all system is good because it prevents recounts and shows the true need of the state.

Well judge even if you don't but this, we still win on magnitude because according to new york time [Newyorktime.com](https://www.nytimes.com)

Leon Con:

Observation: Constitution amendment to be a change.

Observation: 2/3 of congress to agree

Observation: Lose nationwide, win in electoral college

Ratified 3/4 states.

This is unsuccessful and impossible to do. Very improbable and not likely.

Sole Contention: Preventing Bad Presidents.

- Candidates will have to campaign in the whole country if there was a national popular vote
- Campaign in media markets because it would be too expensive.
- Risk of election a random celebrity
- Donald Trump is only celebrity, 1/47 chance, very low with the EC
- 3rd party candidates would also come if there was a national popular vote.
- 3rd party candidates cause protests
- History proves 3rd party candidates are not important with big consequences.

Impact: America being destroyed

- Donald Trump is an example
- Donald trump handled coronavirus badly

- Saving lives
- Russian ex., chemical weapons
- Trump sided with Pdutin instead of his intelligence
- The celebrities/bad presidents will not know what to do with the power

Rebuttal For Against Con

Attack on sole contention which is Preventing bad presidents: “It is very unlikely that celebrities will run for president in a direct election because they have a better way to gain influence. And this is why [Nives16](#) finds that right now candidates are actually backed up by celebrities and their supporters and example would be at the 2016 campaign Both Hillary Clinton and Donald Trump have been endorsed by an army of celebrity supporters.” Proving that celebrities are already involved in politics and elections and will have no interest in becoming president. **My opponents contradict themselves because they say that Donald is a celebrity who has bad and does bad things. But the electoral college made Donald Trump president. Thus, they are contradicting themselves.**

For third party [Skelley19](#) finds that “88 percent of Americans identify with one of the two major parties, and Pew Research puts [that figure](#) even higher, at 92 percent.” This means a third party has no chance of winning the white house.

We clearly win on severity and magnitude because our impact of climate change is going to happen in 2036 and will even cause a source war to begin backed by nuclear weapons. We outweigh our climate change impact because 250,000 Americans are dying each year from climate change. Climate change is irreversible so we outweigh on urgency. We outweigh on timeframe because climate change is happening right now.

We outweigh on magnitude on our democracy impact because people are protesting for democracy. People are getting killed from protesting for democracy. [Voanews](#) explains “The deaths have at times been overshadowed by the shocking images of chaos engulfing cities across America, from heavy-handed riot police tactics to violence, vandalism and arson. Tens of thousands have marched peacefully in demonstrations against police brutality and racism.” We outweigh on probability because protests are happening right now and climate change has already happened and it is continuing to happen. We link in because without democracy, there would be bad presidents that would harm our country.

Frontlines:

Blocks

frontline for two party system

[Fairvote.org](#) finds that “Multiple party systems are actually good at ensuring that the plurality of voters are represented and that all local geographical areas have a voice in the legislature.”

Blocks for Leon's con case:

For celebrities, Celebrities can be famous but when coming into election everyone knows that they need a guy who can help their life become better.

Celebrities know what they are doing if they won the election.

Trump is a business man rather than celebrities, and he only does things that benefit his own interest instead of don't knowing what he is doing. [Bookbinger'19](#) and [citizensforethics.org](#) supports that trump's policies are benefitting his own business.

Blocks for climate change

[Rott19](#)

Climate change not only poses a risk to human health and life, but it could cost the U.S. economy [hundreds of billions of dollars](#).

[Herring14](#) finds that "Climate change could be reversed by returning the abundance of heat-trapping gases in the atmosphere to pre-industrial levels." So in order to stop climate change the key part is to slow it until it is technically possible for us to reverse it.

Blocks for swing states changes(Pro)

1. Blocks for if they say swing states will change, we say that it will change but most stay the same and most of the colored states don't easily change side. "The states that are considered swing states, or states where no party has overwhelming support, can differ from election to election. This year, most political scientists and polling institutes identify nine of them: North Carolina, Florida, Ohio, Iowa, New Hampshire, Colorado, Wisconsin, Virginia and Nevada.

"They can change from time to time. But Florida and Ohio have always been considered swing states," Newport noted."

2 Block for votes were ignored

Even if candidates are not focusing on them but now they have the right to the heard, their vote will be counted in the election rather than ignored.

[Signer'16](#) explains "The Electoral College was designed to prevent demagogues. It serves two purposes. One of them is to give small states power as well as big states and the cities. The other is to provide a mechanism where intelligent, thoughtful and statesmanlike leaders could deliberate on the winner of the popular vote. In other words, the electors are not supposed to rubber-stamp the popular vote."

Our impact is that elections will go into a disaster.

Blocks for con

Blocks for contention 1 sub point C.

[opensecrets.org](https://www.opensecrets.org) finds that the main money for candidates are from the Political Action Committee (PAC), and individual donations, but if we change to a popular vote then the money supported by PAC donations will not be enough and at that time the only way to campaign is to have the money yourself and that means the only way to campaign is to be rich.

Popular vote is bad because they only focus on big states.

Speeches:

Case: Read it

Rebuttal: Weigh, Attack opponent contentions, (frontline if second speaker)

Summary: Extend (Say the things in rebuttal), Frontline (if first speaker), Weigh, Defend what they attack in rebuttal.

Final Focus: explain why we win the round.

Weighing Mechanisms:

Pro Side:

We outweigh on our climate change impact because 250,000 Americans are dying each year from climate change. Climate change is irreversible so we outweigh on urgency. We outweigh on timeframe because climate change is happening right now.

We outweigh on magnitude on our democracy impact because people are protesting for democracy. People are getting killed from protesting for democracy. [Voanews](https://www.voanews.com) explains "The deaths have at times been overshadowed by the shocking images of chaos engulfing cities across America, from heavy-handed riot police tactics to violence, vandalism and arson. Tens of thousands have marched peacefully in demonstrations against police brutality and racism." We outweigh on probability because protests are happening right now and climate change has already happened and it is continuing to happen. We link in because without democracy, there would be bad presidents that would harm our country.

Con Side:

We outweigh on our messed up elections impact because the people could choose the wrong president from getting influenced on the internet. Then the president will hurt America and do bad things that would hurt our country."

Rebuttal:

Con version:

Offtime Road Map: Down their case, weighing, Frontline (if second speaker)

Against their first contention: Hijacking the Election (Faithless electors)

Against their second contention: Winner takes all system.

Weighing: We outweigh on our climate change impact because 250,000 Americans are dying each year from climate change. Climate change is irreversible so we outweigh on urgency. We outweigh on timeframe because climate change is happening right now. We outweigh on magnitude on our democracy impact because people are protesting for democracy. People are getting killed from protesting for democracy. [Voanews](#) explains “The deaths have at times been overshadowed by the shocking images of chaos engulfing cities across America, from heavy-handed riot police tactics to violence, vandalism and arson. Tens of thousands have marched peacefully in demonstrations against police brutality and racism.” We outweigh on probability because protests are happening right now and climate change has already happened and it is continuing to happen. We link in because without democracy, there would be bad presidents that would harm our country.

Frontlines:

Pro version:

Offtime Road Map: Down their case, weighing, Frontline (if second speaker)

Sole Contention: Preventing bad presidents:

Weighing: We outweigh on our climate change impact because 250,000 Americans are dying each year from climate change. Climate change is irreversible so we outweigh on urgency. We outweigh on timeframe because climate change is happening right now. We outweigh on magnitude on our democracy impact because people are protesting for democracy. People are getting killed from protesting for democracy. [Voanews](#) explains “The deaths have at times been overshadowed by the shocking images of chaos engulfing cities across America, from heavy-handed riot police tactics to violence, vandalism and arson. Tens of thousands have marched peacefully in demonstrations against police brutality and racism.” We outweigh on probability because protests are happening right now and climate change has already happened and it is continuing to happen. We link in because without democracy, there would be bad presidents that would harm our country.

Frontlines:

Summary:

Offtime Road Map: Extending, Collapsing, weighing.

Contradicts:

Thought co explains that there have 19 republican presidents and 13 democrats.

Extend:

Collapse: Second contention: Anti- Democratic.

Weighing: We outweigh on magnitude on our democracy impact because people are protesting for democracy. People are getting killed from protesting for democracy. [Voanews](#) explains “The deaths have at times been overshadowed by the shocking images of chaos engulfing cities across America, from heavy-handed riot police tactics to violence, vandalism and arson. Tens of thousands have marched peacefully in demonstrations against police brutality and racism.” We outweigh on probability because protests are happening right now and climate change has already happened and it is continuing to happen. We link in because without democracy, there would be bad presidents that would harm our country.

Final Focus:

Their Case, Our case:

Judge we view this round in two worlds, the pro world and con world. Their don't extend the winner take all system attacks, so you can't buy that. We win on our contentions because. We win on our contentions.

Weighing: We outweigh on magnitude on our democracy impact because people are protesting for democracy. People are getting killed from protesting for democracy. [Voanews](#) explains “The deaths have at times been overshadowed by the shocking images of chaos engulfing cities across America, from heavy-handed riot police tactics to violence, vandalism and arson. Tens of thousands have marched peacefully in demonstrations against police brutality and racism.” We outweigh on probability because protests are happening right now and climate change has already happened and it is continuing to happen. We link in because without democracy, there would be bad presidents that would harm our country.

Cards:

Anti'19 Card

Turn: Does not show the true representation of people

Our Founding Fathers believed the general public lacked the capacity to efficiently and effectively elect the president of the U.S., which is why they established the Electoral College as the mode of electing the president. The fear of “the mob” or “the tyranny of the majority” is evident in Alexander Hamilton’s Federalist Paper 68 where he writes **“The immediate election should be made by men most capable of analyzing the qualities adapted to the station ... A small number of persons, selected by their fellow-citizens from the general**

mass, will be most likely to possess the information and discernment requisite to such complicated investigations.” However, in 2019, this is no longer a valid argument in favor of the Electoral College. With access to a multitude of news and media platforms as well as access to education for all Americans, it is safe to say that citizens are very capable of possessing “the information and discernment requisite to such complicated investigations,” which is what Hamilton was most concerned about. **The Electoral College has failed to represent the American public five times throughout United States history. In the elections of 1824, 1876, 1888, 2000 and 2016, a presidential candidate has won the election, despite losing the popular vote. In 2000, Al Gore won the popular vote by 540,520, yet lost the electoral college by five votes. George W. Bush was sworn in as President. In 2016, Hillary Clinton received 2,868,686 more votes than Donald Trump, but lost the electoral college vote 227 to 304. This is not democracy.**

Richie’16 Card

Turn: Undemocratic

American democracy today is working more poorly than it has in generations. Even as the toxic 2016 presidential campaign featured the two most unpopular major party candidates in modern history and Congress has historic lows in approval, minor party presidential challengers were marginalized, and nearly 98% of congressional incumbents won re-election. New voices are demeaned as spoilers, which suppresses debate about innovative ideas and shoehorns our diverse political views into two fiercely partisan camps. **With the overwhelming majority of elections predictably going to a district or state’s partisan majority, most voters lack meaningful choice even among two candidates. In conflict with the spirit of the Constitution, our electoral rules punish representatives who seek to govern outside their party boxes, blocking sensible changes that have majority support. Absent reform, it is a near certainty that these problems will continue.** No single change can unlock voters and spark a democracy where the best ideas rise to the surface and policymakers are able to implement the will of the people with respect for all. But this year we saw a true glimmer of hope for change: with 52% of the vote, Maine voters adopted ranked choice voting (RCV) for all their elections for governor, U.S. Senate, U.S. House, and state legislature in a campaign endorsed by the Libertarian Party, the Green Party, and hundreds of major party elected officials from across the spectrum. **Starting in 2018, Mainers will be able to vote for the candidates they like the most without helping elect the candidates they like the least. They will earn what we all deserve: a fair vote and a truce in the battle over whether minor party and independent candidates can have an enduring seat at the electoral table.**

Atlantic’19 Card

Turn: Racial Bias

Is a color-blind political system possible under our Constitution? If it is, the Supreme Court’s evisceration of the Voting Rights Act in 2013 did little to help matters. While black people in America today are not experiencing 1950s levels of voter suppression, efforts to keep them and other citizens from participating in elections began within 24 hours of the Shelby County v. Holder ruling and have only increased since then. In Shelby County’s oral argument, Justice Antonin Scalia cautioned, “Whenever a society adopts racial entitlements, it is very difficult to get them out through the normal political processes.” **Ironically enough, there is some truth**

to an otherwise frighteningly numb claim. American elections have an acute history of racial entitlements—only they don't privilege black Americans. For centuries, white votes have gotten undue weight, as a result of innovations such as poll taxes and voter-ID laws and outright violence to discourage racial minorities from voting. (The point was obvious to anyone paying attention: As William F. Buckley argued in his essay "Why the South Must Prevail," white Americans are "entitled to take such measures as are necessary to prevail, politically and culturally," anywhere they are outnumbered because they are part of "the advanced race.") But America's institutions boosted white political power in less obvious ways, too, and the nation's oldest structural racial entitlement program is one of its most consequential: the Electoral College.

Milhiser'19 Card

In 2016, Donald Trump won the presidency despite receiving nearly 3 million fewer votes than Democratic candidate Hillary Clinton. In 2000, George W. Bush pulled off a similar trick. According to a new study, these are not flukes.

They are the kind of results we should expect from the Electoral College. The [study](#), by three economics researchers at the University of Texas, quantifies just how often the Electoral College will produce an "inversion" — that is, an election where one candidate [wins the popular vote but the other walks away with the presidency](#). The numbers are simply astonishing. In modern elections where one party prevails by just 2 points in the two-party popular vote, "inversions are expected in more than 30% of elections." **That number rises to 40 percent in elections with a 1 percentage-point margin. Republicans, moreover, are far more likely to benefit from an inversion than Democrats. "In the modern period," the study suggests, "Republicans should be expected to win 65% of Presidential contests in which they narrowly lose the popular vote."**

This Republican advantage can shift elections where the Democrat was a fairly clear winner in the popular vote. "A 3.0 point margin favoring the Democrat," the study concludes, "is associated with a 16% inversion probability." In other words, Republicans will win nearly one in six presidential races where they lose the popular vote by 3 points.

Kleske16

Impact: Republicans are using the system to pander to certain states and gerrymandering districts, which delegitimizes the Electoral College, 2000 and 2016 prove.

Juliegrace Brufke, Capital Hill Reporter for the Daily Caller, February 9, 2017, "Raskin: Republicans are clinging to the electoral college , gerrymandering," The Daily Caller, <http://dailycaller.com/2017/02/09/raskin-republicans-are-clinging-to-the-electoral-college-gerrymandering/> In the wake of former Democratic presidential nominee Hillary Clinton losing the election to President Donald Trump, a number of Democrats are calling for changes to the system. Rep. Jamie Raskin of Maryland alleged the electoral college isn't reflective of the county's views, arguing Republicans have been taking advantage of the system by pandering to certain states. "In a partisan sense, I believe that the Republicans are hiding behind a wall of gerrymandered districts and clinging to the electoral college, which they have used to win in two of the last five elections despite the fact that

Democrats won big popular victories both in 2000 and especially in 2016 with Hillary Clinton getting 2.9 million votes more,” he told reporters at the Democratic policy retreat Wednesday.

Against C3: We non-unique because Candidates rely on wealthy donors and donations with the EC. Forbes confirms “How times have changed. Now in the midst of his reelection campaign, President Trump has accepted donations from 80 billionaires and their spouses, according to a review of Federal Election Commission filings. Fifty-one moguls donated in their own names. Seven others are married to people who did. In other words, 9% of America’s billionaires, who together are worth a combined \$210 billion—either directly or through their spouse—have pitched in to cover the costs of Trump’s 2020 campaign. Forbes mined more than 2.5 million entries in the Federal Election Commission database to identify Trump’s richest donors. We searched for contributions made to the president’s campaign committee, Donald J. Trump For President. Our analysis begins on inauguration day, 2017, when Trump officially filed papers for his reelection effort, and ends on February 29, 2020, the latest date for which the campaign has submitted federal filings. (By contrast, Barack Obama didn’t begin seeking contributions to his election campaign until the third year of his presidency.)”