I affirm, “In a democracy, voting ought to be compulsory.” I value **morality** since “ought” is defined by Merriam-Webster as “to be bound in duty or moral obligation.” This is the correct value for the round because (1) context: the resolution speaks of a policy action and democracy, both of which are based on ideals and what is good as history has shown through the fight for democracy and value of freedoms. (2) Intrinsic value: voting enables people to make the choice they think is right or moral, also begging for a value of morality (3) compulsory: the word compulsory in the resolution requires a moral theory to prove the resolution true because absent morality, nothing is compulsory as morality guides people to take the right action. Utilitarianism (or util) is the standard.

**First, util is the best system to determine organizational moral obligations.**

Bowden, Ph.D, 09[[1]](#footnote-1)

The most significant reason for advocating utility theory however, is that it is useful and usable. The institutions in our society – the professional, industry and special interest groups, as well as organisations in business and government, plus the not for profit sector - are faced with many ethical decisions, often complex and difficult, requiring considerable thought, and eventually resolution. The moral issues that arise in these contexts are fundamental to the institutional functioning of our society. Yet very few people have training in moral philosophy. They need a relatively straightforward way of making these decisions – of telling right from wrong. Mill, it will be argued, provides that method. Many who have no training that are faced with these ethical choices will rely on intuition. Perhaps they will use a set of values learned at home, or from their schooling or their church. As we shall see for the more difficult ethical issues, however, intuition is an unreliable guide. If they have training, they may remember virtue ethics, or Kant’s deontology, but as I shall also argue later, these theories do not necessarily give straightforward and acceptable answers.

Thus, **prefer util:** **(1)** Accessibility: it does not require special training; just a concept of the good and basic math. **(2)** Deontology requires Governments to maximize utility as a matter of public policy. **(3)** Rights claims come from so many different areas that policy-makers must weigh the risks of costs and benefits. This can only be done through a utilitarian or consequentialist mindset.

**Fourth, util is required by the topic wording**: “Democracy” is a government by, of, and for the people.

Dahl, Ph.D ‘13: (Sterling Professor Emeritus of Political Science, Yale University. Author of Democracy and its Critics and others.) Robert A., Encyclopedia Britannica Democracy, literally, rule by the people. The term is derived from the Greek dēmokratiā, which was coined from dēmos (“people”) and kratos (“rule”) in the middle of the 5th century bc to denote the political systems then existing in some Greek city-states, notably Athens.

**And, democracy requires a moral theory of greater good for the greatest number of “the” people.**

Rees, Ph.D, ‘78[[2]](#footnote-2)

Only if the whole community can check government through a representative democracy will the general interest become the actual end of government. Mill states this as a self-evident, but, given the meaning which Benthamites attached to ‘the general interest’, it is by no means so. The conclusion might follow if ‘the greatest happiness of the greatest number’ was identical to ‘the greatest happiness of the majority.’ For, if the majority are rational egoists and the majority decides on the composition and direction of government, the government will attend to the interests of the majority.

So, I have three observations:

1. **Util must be the standard,** regardless of whether the topic is normative or descriptive. My definitions link util to ought, as an normative term, as contextualized by what a democracy actually is, in a descriptive sense.
2. **Decisional Framework:** The ballot shows I’m affirmative. Black’s Law Dictionary defines “affirm” as “to ratify, make firm, confirm,”[[3]](#footnote-3) The ballot also states that you should vote for who does the better debating. This means that your role as the judge is limited to voting for me if I prove the topic true and voting neg if I don’t. This also means that all punishment theory is irrelevant because it goes to some external considerations not contemplated by your role as the judge as per your judging or school’s contract with the tournament. If I am cheating or being unfair, you should raise this with the tournament director before voting. Prefer my interp because it is based on the actual known structures of debate, not theory.
3. **I must only affirm in only one way.** It would be an impossible burden for me justify every moral theory and every definition of every word of the topic and then to prove the topic true under all moral theories and definitions in a six-minute AC. This means that I only have to prove the topic true in one way in the AC to win the debate.

The criterion to achieve morality under util is **decreasing political polarization.**

1. **Polarization is increasing.**

Strauss, PhD, Steven, “Six Reasons American Political Polarization is Only Going to Get Worse,” Huffington Post, October 14th, ‘12

1: We believe what we want to believe, and we selectively filter out information contradicting our preferences (this is called Confirmation Bias). Convincing us of something we don't want to [believe requires](https://kindle.amazon.com/post/YgWYmpm-SJ-RY-sk8fcGYA): (i) repeated challenge and reinforcement with contradictory information, or (ii) strong immediate feedback loops (e.g., 99.99% of Americans believe a green light means 'go' and a red light means 'stop' because acting contrary to that belief causes car crashes). Unfortunately, many issues about which citizens are most detached from reality have weak feedback loops. 2: Confirmation Bias was less of an issue in the 1960s, when Americans got their news from one of three TV networks, and local newspapers were often a monopoly. National TV was regulated and subject to licensing, and networks could lose their licenses for biased or inaccurate reporting. Under these conditions, news wasn't targeted to distinct Belief Communities. Instead, news providers tried to create a common narrative on current events. With the arrival of cable and the web, news media became more like the cereal business -- with different brands targeted at different segments. Through targeting and segmenting, people are told what they want to hear, about topics with non-immediate feedback loops (e.g., basic science and public policy). Fox News is the network of choice for the Right, and many smaller channels/websites are even more micro-targeted, all of which exacerbates the Confirmation Bias problem. 3: Google/Facebook know whether you're a liberal, conservative, birther, believer in ghosts or whatever -- and your information is tailored to reinforce what you already believe. 4: About [80%](http://elections.nytimes.com/2012/ratings/house)of all Congressional Districts are solidly Democratic or Republican. We have bipartisan agreement on one issue -- politicians prefer safe Congressional seats, which sometimes happens naturally, but also because politicians use redistricting to create them. Instead of engaging with challengers from the other party, most members of Congress now engage only with challengers within their own party -- Democrats with their Left, and Republicans with their Right. Bipartisan compromise becomes a dirty word, as a consequence. 5: Over the past generation, we've seen the rise of special interest groups, often narrowly focused on a single issue. The National Rifle Association, for example, spends [$250 million/year](http://www.guidestar.org/organizations/53-0116130/national-rifle-association-america.aspx) fighting gun control. These advocacy groups employ a small army of people at high wages (the head of the NRA is paid [$1 million/year](http://www.guidestar.org/organizations/53-0116130/national-rifle-association-america.aspx)). Institutionally, the NRA has every incentive to find new battlegrounds to justify its existence. Replicate this incentivized self-interest for all sorts of narrow issues, mix in even greater ability to raise funds due to [Citizen's United](http://topics.nytimes.com/top/reference/timestopics/subjects/c/campaign_finance/index.html) -- and you have a formula for polarization.

1. **Polarization will tank the US economy.**

El-Erian, CEO, (C.E.O. and co-CIO, PIMCO) Mohamed A., “The Political Polarization is Really Bad For America,” Huffington Post, December 28, ’12

Mr. Silver's conclusion is stark: "As partisanship continues to increase, a divided government may increasingly mean a dysfunctional one." It was once fashionable to argue that a divided government was good for the economy. The view then was that politicians would be too busy with political brinkmanship to get in the way of a dynamic private sector. As a result, unfettered by government interference, the private sector was more likely to invest, hire and prosper. It is hard -- very hard -- to make this argument today; and for at least three reasons. First, even diehard conservatives would admit that, since the 2008 global financial crisis, the country still has to overcome certain market failures. And for that, enlightened government policies are needed, including in clarifying property rights in segments still suffering from post financial bubble disorder. Second, it is hard to deny the extent to which America has experienced a worsening in the distribution of income, wealth and opportunities in recent years. If we are not careful, this will tear at the social fabric that underpins a dynamic and prospering private sector. Then there is the international evidence and related comparisons. America has fallen behind several other countries when it comes to enhancing our human and physical capital. In many cases this is not something that the private sector can (and will) -- remedy fully. In particular, some of the slippages in education and infrastructure need (and should be solved via) public-private partnerships; others involve (indeed, urgently require) more active government reform efforts. The bottom line is simple and consequential: Our self-inflicted fiscal cliff drama may be the most visible illustration of Congressional political dysfunction but it is unlikely to be the last one or the most challenging. Judging from Mr, Silver's analysis, we could well experience several iteration of the analytical equivalent of the fiscal cliff in the months ahead. And we would do so with declining policy flexibility. If left to fester, the related inability of Congress to step up to economic responsibilities would risk being associated with more than just sluggish growth, persistently high unemployment, and a growing sense of financial discomfort. It would also undermine the country's longer-term growth potential and, with that, the ability of many citizens to realize the American dream.

Thus, A & B mean that political polarization makes the government unable to prevent economic collapse.

1. **The economy will collapse in 2013, destroying hegemony**.

Farid A. Khavari, Ph.D., “The Final Crash—The End of U.S. Dominance in 2013,” Investment Watch Blog, April 11, ’12

The dimension and gravity of this economic crash would be so gigantic that rising from it would be practically impossible, or it would take a relatively very long time and a couple of decades of hard work before a pre-collapse economy could be restored. An economic meltdown would affect everybody! Already it is on its way to destroy the poor people and devastate middle-class Americans, but if it is not stopped very soon, the rich and the super-rich would be powerless and could do nothing but follow suit. To understand why an economic meltdown would destroy the super-rich, one needs to know that an economic meltdown is similar to the melting of an ice block. Starting from the corners, the ice melts all around until it reaches the middle and eventually the core. At that point, the entire ice block collapses and disappears for good! In other words, the outer parts of the ice block are the poor and the middle-class, and the center part resembles the rich people. As the ice block melts away completely, the rich and the super-rich would disappear along with it, maybe later but for sure! There are three powerful forces simultaneously at work on the national level, and only one of which could be enough to cause the economic devastation in the United States. On the international level, again, there are three other main factors that are working in concert action against the United States. These will be described below. THE FORCES AGAINST THE UNITED STATES ON THE NATIONAL LEVEL The three national factors that are working against the U.S. are the following: 1. The Internal Factors This destructive factor, which is at work since early 1990, is chipping away the economic foundation of this country. It started with outsourcing, enhanced through the subprime drive of the financial institutions and the final inept and imprudent economic and business decisions and activities of politicians, financial institutions and big businesses. To this category belongs bailouts, stimulus packages, lack of availability of loans and mortgages, escalating and expanding outrageous and baseless fees of all kinds, abuse and violation of rules and laws, be it by the government agencies, financial institutions, and even big companies such as AT&T! Since we all have been generally enjoying good economic times in the past few decades without any major experience of an economic hardship, it is very difficult for the average American to realize and comprehend clearly the symptoms of an economic meltdown. Even though Americans feel its growing pain and hurting squeeze, they blame it on other phenomenon. If lasting high unemployment rates continue to exist, they fault the world economy for this malaise. If there are growing foreclosures, they blame it on people’s greed and irresponsibility stemming from lack of realization of their financial limitations. And when the food prices keep rising with no stop in sight, they find the root in rising oil and energy prices and fault the oil companies and the oil-exporting nations! This all may be true and nobody disputes it. However, it does not deny the fact that all these and other events are contributing to an escalating and accelerating speed to worldwide economic collapse—the United States is unfortunately among the most vulnerable ones! The most worrisome part of it is that if the “giant” collapses, there is no easy and pain-free way of getting up—the “midgets,” the rest of the world, would suffer the same destiny one after another. To understand what exactly an economic meltdown would look like, here are some of its symptoms that would keep growing until the total collapse becomes imminent. • Persisting high or rising unemployment rates • Continuing home foreclosures with no resolution in sight • Continuing lack of availability of credit and capital by the banks, let alone the low-cost loans and mortgages • Shrinking credit card limits or credit card holders unable to reduce their debt • Fleecing of people by the government, financial institutions and big businesses • Declining number of people being creditworthy • Growing number of defaults • Continuing rise of food prices • Shrinking governmental services • Growing number of people without healthcare coverage • Increasing numbers of crimes • Escalating social costs • Declining social benefits and social profits because of outsourcing and insourcing • Increasing fees of all kinds used by the banks and governmental agencies as survival strategy • Growing budget deficit without the capability of balancing it the right way unless the budgets are cut arbitrarily, compounding the problems even more • Rising cost of energy and gasoline • Spike of vehicle repossession • Runaway healthcare cost The unchecked rise of energy and gasoline cost would be the last straw that would break peoples’ backs and the government itself. As mobility and transport start to decrease and eventually come to a standstill, business and government functions are reduced, leading to the decrease of economic activities, declining revenues and income, contributing to an imminent collapse of the economy. There is no need to describe as to how an economy would look like under these circumstances. It would be simply terrible and devastating. These are the symptoms of the economy when a state or a country is described as failed state or a failed economy. We have plenty of places all over the U.S. that belong to the categories of a failed economy. We should not make the mistake to believe that slumps are created by nature—they are simply products of failed economic policies in those areas. And if failed economic policy continues to prevail, it would not be too long before we would be seeing nice and fancy places crumbling down in front of our eyes and become modern slums like those we see in Overtown, Miami-Dade County, and elsewhere in the nation—long rows of empty but fancy high-rises, elegant shopping malls, and beautiful houses are the phenomenon of modern slums. In other words, we are in midst of total economic collapse from this end. 2. The Natural Factors To this category belong hurricanes, earthquakes, floods, tornadoes, tsunamis, wildfires, and the like. Sadly, the U.S. is prone to these natural disasters every year. These not only destroy many lives and families everywhere all over the different states, but also cause enormous economical and environmental devastation. Even if we as a nation can deal with it, and have done thus far successfully, the fact remains that the growing numbers of these natural disasters certainly do not strengthen us economically and would exhaust our resources for other urgencies if we keep getting pounded with natural disasters. Unfortunately, most people and politicians think that the natural catastrophes cannot be averted as we have seen during the nuclear power plant meltdown in Fukushima, Japan. This and similar incidents are simply accepted because of the power of nature and the impotency of mankind toward nature. However, it does not need to be like that. In other words, though human beings are not able to stop or prevent natural disasters, we are, however, capable of minimizing the damages and their consequences that may occur because of a natural disaster. For instance, if we go on erecting nuclear plants near the ocean where they would be prone to tsunamis, hurricanes, tornadoes or any other natural catastrophes, it would be just a matter of time that a disaster like in Japan could strike and happen anywhere in the world. In order to protect our energy-delivery systems from all natural or man-made disasters, we should consider following factors: a) The energy delivery system should be environmentally safe; b) The source that provides energy should be unlimited and available for free to all consumers; c) The delivery system should be decentralized, which would lead to free energy; d) The implementation of this source and/or technology should create endless jobs throughout that area; e) We should avoid all questionable sources and technologies unless alternative sources cannot be implemented. Considering these factors, we would never have the devastation of that magnitude that we faced in Japan. Furthermore, we should be very concerned and ask ourselves whether the nuclear plants as the source of energy is the right choice. For instance, is the Turkey Point Nuclear Plant in Miami-Dade County, Florida, safe? Should ever this plant get hit by a severe hurricane or tsunami, what would happen to Miami-Dade County and few other counties which are powered by this plant? No doubt that if that would ever happen, Miami-Dade County and part of Broward County would be heading toward a stone age. It would be more than total economic collapse; it would bring the end of civilization for an unforeseeable time in the affected areas! Frustrating is the lack of knowledge of our politicians! For instance, the new mayor of Miami-Dade County, Carlos Gimenez, said in a forum that no tsunami could strike Florida, and if ever there were a nuclear meltdown in Turkey Point Nuclear Plant, we could learn from it as we do from plane crashes and prevent them the next time! With politicians like him, our expectations for a better and secured future are limited. The fact is that a nuclear power plant meltdown is no way to comparable to an airplane crash; the people living in that surrounding area would never get a second chance to learn from it. Those people would be all dead or maimed and disabled to the point of becoming like vegetable. A tsunami could also happen in Florida because tsunamis are nothing other than the underwater explosion or earthquake. The penetration of gas throughout the Florida plateau because of offshore drillings for oil and gas with growing fracking elsewhere in the United States could trigger earthquakes and cause tsunamis anytime, anywhere on U.S. shores. Another example: one of the big issues in Florida and Miami-Dade County is transportation. Whatever method of transportation we chose, whether it be public transportation, such as bus, train or other means, the very first and the most important factor should be to look at alternative energy sources such as equipping these modes of transportation on “decentralized” solar and wind energy for reasons stated above—it would be environmentally safe, and the energy would be practically free and not subject to destruction and devastation through natural disasters. Most likely, most of our transportation system would be intact even after a severe natural disaster. 3. The External Factors Although wars, currency fluctuations (devaluation), blockades, outsourcing and, to some extent, insourcing, financial manipulations, weapon sales and the like could enrich those involved groups of people and companies and contribute to their growing welfare and power, in the long term, it would weaken a nation as whole and would lead to the economic collapse of that nation if these activities continued unabated. The economic problems could compound and grow for that economy even though those groups would be making record profits! However, it would be a grave mistake and failure for these groups of people and corporations to believe that their accumulated wealth is protected in a devaluing currency and in a declining economy, especially, when the cost and social costs keep rising. It may give rise to speculations that the reasons why multinational corporations strive toward creating one-currency system are to run away from taxes and park their monies in those countries where they are considered as tax havens and protected. Whether that could be a long-term prospect is anybody’s guess. Certainly for anyone to maintain their accumulated wealth requires two uncompromised conditions to be met: (1) the currency in which they have accumulated their wealth must remain strong, and (2) a vibrant economy is the prerequisite for a strong currency. Without meeting these, every approach would be of a short-term nature and could not last for too long and would lead to failure. Unfortunately, at present, these three factors are chipping away our economy at full speed and without any mercy. FORCES WORKING AGAINST THE UNITED STATES ON THE INTERNATIONAL LEVEL As these three factors mentioned above are in full operation inside the United States, there are three other international factors in concert action contributing to an economic collapse in the U.S. These factors are as follows: 1. Nations, predominantly China and India, strive to increase their economic growth in the world. Just think about the almost 3 billion Chinese, Indians, and others competing actively and with full power for economic gain against the 350 million Americans. Add to this mix those over one billion Muslims who want to seal the words of Allah in the United States, and you get the picture! 2. Countries with long-declared intention to become the world superpower. To this group belongs the Islamic Republic of Iran, and even though it is not officially declared, China is vying with for this too. Considering a potential military clash between the U.S. and the forces of the Islamic Republic of Iran in the Persian Gulf, the dire situation becomes apparent. 3. Certainly no other nation or groups have the needed abilities to become a superpower, but they would keep creating growing problems and escalating economic and social costs for the United States. These groups are the restive oil-exporting nations of the Middle East and Africa. Of course, the radical Islamic and other terrorist groups could not be discounted; they are always capable to complicate and compound the problems that the United States is facing, which would lead again to growing economic and social costs. In addition, there are multinational oil companies and corporations that seek to influence and turn U.S. policy to their favor through their lobbying activities and by financing politicians’ campaign! These all lead to escalating social costs that the American people carry. The reason why the United States could endure so long on the international level is because of its strong position over the other nations of the world, especially in two areas: (1) strong military power and (2) the worldwide acceptance of the U.S. dollar as the reserve currency. That’s why the future struggle between the nations mentioned above would be the drive to replace the U.S. dollar as the reserve currency of the world with the currency of their own. Once this power is achieved, practically the carte blanche to monetary power would be transferred to that nation. The struggle will be on until 2013, until the defining moment kicks in. WHY THE U.S. ECONOMY COULD CRASH IN 2013 No matter what the outcome of a military clash in the Middle East between the United States and the Islamic Republic of Iran, there is no doubt that the U.S. economy along with its European allies will crash soon thereafter even if the West end up winning the war and controlling the Middle East and North Africa. The fact that this could happen is obvious, simply as a result of rising crude oil prices. Imagine the consequences for the U.S. economy of gasoline at $5, $6 or $7 per gallon. At $10 per gallon the collapse of the U.S. economy would be guaranteed. Now, should the Islamic Republic of Iran become the victor of the war and become the next world superpower by making the Iranian rial the world reserve currency, oil prices may not make too much fluctuation as opposed to the former case, but the economy will hardly ever witness another major recovery and be like the good old days. WHAT COULD HAPPEN TO THE EXISTING U.S. DOLLARS HOARDED AS RESERVE CURRENCY? In case the rial become the dominant reserve currency, the U.S. dollar, British pound and European euro would take another major hit and would suffer further devaluation as countries with major reserves of these currencies would try to dump them on the world market or probably buy real estate and companies in the countries of these currencies. The result would be an enhanced runaway inflation, suffering from the devaluing dollar, pound and euro because of increased price for the imported crude oil on one hand and further loss of purchasing power through the rising of the general prices on the other! This would be bad news for a nation such as China with huge U.S. dollar reserve currency! The Chinese quest of becoming a superpower would be put to rest because (1) they would not be able to control the oil reserves of the Middle East and North Africa and (2) the accumulated U.S. dollars by them would be practically worthless in other countries with the exception of in the United States, which would be suffering an increased loss of value as the inflation keeps rising. With all the events described here, the U.S. economy would crash dramatically, bringing the economical, political and military hegemony of the United States to an end some time during the year 2013! A more exact date cannot be mentioned because of the uncertain timetable of the events.

1. **This causes terrorism, disease spread, and nuclear war.**

Ferguson, PhD, (Herzog professor of history at New York University's Stern School of Business and senior fellow at the Hoover Institution at Stanford University), “A World Without Power,” Foreign Policy, July 1, 2004

The worst effects of the new Dark Age would be felt on the edges of the waning great powers.The wealthiest ports of the global economy -- from New York to Rotterdam to Shanghai -- would become the targets of plunderers and pirates. With ease, terrorists could disrupt the freedom of the seas, targeting oil tankers, aircraft carriers, and cruise liners, while Western nations frantically concentrated on making their airports secure. Meanwhile, limited nuclear wars could devastate numerous regions, beginning in the Korean peninsula and Kashmir, perhaps ending catastrophically in the Middle East. In Latin America, wretchedly poor citizens would seek solace in Evangelical Christianity imported by U.S. religious orders. In Africa, the great plagues of AIDS and malaria would continue their deadly work.

1. Disease spread and bioterrorism causes extinction.

Steinbruner 97. (John, Senior Fellow – Brookings, Foreign Policy, 12-22-1997, Lexis)

Although human pathogens are often lumped with nuclear explosives and lethal chemicals as potential weapons of mass destruction, there is an obvious, fundamentally important difference: Pathogens are alive, weapons are not. Nuclear and chemical weapons do not reproduce themselves and do not independently engage in adaptive behavior; pathogens do both of these things. That deceptively simple observation has immense implications. The use of a manufactured weapon is a singular event. Most of the damage occurs immediately. The aftereffects, whatever they may be, decay rapidly over time and distance in a reasonably predictable manner. Even before a nuclear warhead is detonated, for instance, it is possible to estimate the extent of the subsequent damage and the likely level of radioactive fallout. Such predictability is an essential component for tactical military planning. The use of a pathogen, by contrast, is an extended process whose scope and timing cannot be precisely controlled. For most potential biological agents, the predominant drawback is that they would not act swiftly or decisively enough to be an effective weapon. But for a few pathogens - ones most likely to have a decisive effect and therefore the ones most likely to be contemplated for deliberately hostile use - the risk runs in the other direction. A lethal pathogen that could efficiently spread from one victim to another would be capable of initiating an intensifying cascade of disease that might ultimately threaten the entire world population.

This means you prefer my criterion for Magnitude, Probability and Timeframe: I access multiple scenarios for war and extinction. Khavari tells you that economic collapse and loss of hegemony is certain to occur by 2014*.*

My contention is that compulsory voting decreases political polarization and is consistent with democratic utilitarianism.

Ebb 1, M.S., ‘13: Samuel James, “Government of the People: A Case for Compulsory Voting,” Wesleyan University, April ’13:

While some may point out that compulsory voting does not solve the problem of money in politics and could possibly lead to an even greater disparity in the candidates supported in primaries, it can help in both areas. First, the marginal dollar spent would be spread across a much greater electorate. Second, those spending the money would have to do so knowing that low-income voters would vote and that the politicians that their money would go towards supporting would have to be ones that would be electorally viable in the new system. In a similar manner, primary voters would be faced with the reality that the candidate they elect must be acceptable to the more moderate voting populace. Even taking into account that primary voters are likely to be more partisan, they would be constrained by thinking backwards from a candidate’s electability in the general election to inform their decisions in the primary. If this did not happen, the primary voters would risk electoral infeasibility within their own party. What compulsory voting does is shift the realm of debate. It establishes a median voter that is indistinguishable (or very nearly so) from the median citizen. This is not a partisan thesis claiming normatively that we must have more economic redistribution or that the Democrats need more seats in Congress. Rather, I believe any shift in the number of people from each party in Congress would be temporary, as each party would adjust to the new conditions that arise from the newly expanded electorate. The establishment of the vote by the founders limited enfranchisement to white males. From there, each group has struggled to gain access to the political system, as access forces a change to the status quo. Compulsory voting removes part of that initial bias that was built in to the earliest voters and earliest representatives. It expands on the guarantee of the right to vote to ensure the use of the franchise by all, creating a more representative government commensurate with the virtuous republican ideal, an ideal that has been under attack throughout the course of American history. While compulsory voting will not stop the drive of special interests or discrepancies in campaign donations, which have significant effects on decision making of politicians once they are in office, it will set up the mechanism to hold those politicians more responsible to all constituents. It will lay the foundation on which future reforms can further increase and improve the democratic nature of government. Without a fully participatory citizenry, at this most basic level, other actions to attempt to create political equality such as campaign finance reform will see only muted effects, as inequality at its most basic level will have been allowed to persist. Currently, members of the lower socio-economic class do not vote as often as members of higher socio-economic classes. These non-voters have significantly different preferences on certain (namely economic) issues, and exhibit different party preferences than the voting populace. Congress enacts policy changes supported by members of higher socio-economic classes at significantly higher rates than they do for lower socio-economic classes. The policies, once enacted are not universally beneficial. Rather, the policies disproportionately benefit members of higher socio-economic classes, whose incomes have grown at a significantly higher rate than citizens of low socioeconomic class, especially over the past 30 years. The structure of the current representative and electoral system makes it easier for members of higher socio-economic classes to get their individual voices heard. An individual voter of low socio-economic class has little to no significance to a politician running for office, especially in comparison to a voter of relatively higher socio-economic class. Thus, the only mechanism through which the members of the lower socio-economic classes can ensure their voices are heard is through collective action, and, more specifically, collective action in a manner that affects politician’s ability to maintain their elected positions, namely voting. Individual voters, though, are still insignificant compared to the total number of people who do vote on Election Day. Furthermore, one-time surges in turnout are unlikely to recur and, thus, convince politicians to appeal to their constituents who do not typically vote. A one-shot collective action success would, then, be unlikely to create immediate political change. The key lies in the adaptation to new turnout expectations. It is in this difficulty to see immediate, tangible results that the collective action problem is especially pertinent and the vicious cycle of non-voting and nonrepresentation is allowed to continue. Compulsory voting gives a solution to this problem by ensuring knowledge on the part of politicians that turnout will be universal. This knowledge will lead to greater immediate effects due to restructured expectations in addition to the long-term effects of a complete electoral voice of “we the people” that includes the formerly voiceless, nonvoting members of lower socio-economic classes.

**And, compulsory voting does away with political polarization,**

Galston, Ph.D, William A., “Telling Americans to Vote, Or Else,” Brookings, November 5th, ’11, adds

Our low turnout rate pushes American politics toward increased polarization. The reason is that hard-core partisans are more likely to dominate lower-turnout elections, while those who are less fervent about specific issues and less attached to political organizations tend not to participate at levels proportional to their share of the electorate. A distinctive feature of our constitutional system — elections that are quadrennial for president but biennial for the House of Representatives — magnifies these effects. It’s bad enough that only three-fifths of the electorate turns out to determine the next president, but much worse that only two-fifths of our citizens vote in House elections two years later. If events combine to energize one part of the political spectrum and dishearten the other, a relatively small portion of the electorate can shift the system out of all proportion to its numbers. Some observers are comfortable with this asymmetry. But if you think that today’s intensely polarized politics impedes governance and exacerbates mistrust — and that is what most Americans firmly (and in my view rightly) believe — then you should be willing to consider reforms that would strengthen the forces of conciliation. Imagine our politics with laws and civic norms that yield near-universal voting. Campaigns could devote far less money to costly, labor-intensive get-out-the-vote efforts. Media gurus wouldn’t have the same incentive to drive down turnout with negative advertising. Candidates would know that they must do more than mobilize their bases with red-meat rhetoric on hot-button issues. Such a system would improve not only electoral politics but also the legislative process. Rather than focusing on symbolic gestures whose major purpose is to agitate partisans, Congress might actually roll up its sleeves and tackle the serious, complex issues it ignores.

This means that compulsory voting solves political polarization in five ways: It means (1) moderate politicians are elected; (2) it solves the confirmation bias; (3) it increases voter education; (4) it solves for biased media spin; and (5) it means congress acts faster directly solving for extinction now. So, you can affirm.

**Compulsory voting will help solve the problem with extreme polarization.**

Badger, Emily, “Mandatory Voting as a Cure for Extreme Partisanship?” Pacific Standard, July ‘10

If the people who turn up voluntarily at the polls reinforce our worst political instincts toward conflict and obstruction, we could dilute their influence by roping absolutely everyone into the process. Research, after all, has shown that the American population eligible to vote is considerably more moderate than the subset of people who actually do vote. “Non-voters look like the classic bell curve,” Galston said, if we rate them on an ideological spectrum from left to right (see Emory political scientist [Alan Abramowitz](http://www.polisci.emory.edu/faculty%20pages/abramowitz.htm)‘s new book [*The Disappearing Center*](http://yalepress.yale.edu/yupbooks/book.asp?isbn=9780300141627)).“That’s not what the electorate looks like,” he added.

Galston’s proposal is, at this stage, more an intriguing thought experiment than anything else. He knows — “America being the kind of viscerally libertarian place that it is” — that the idea would be greeted by many as a gross government invasion of individual liberties. (It’s an equally fun thought experiment to ponder how Tea Party patriots would react to a government mandate requiring them to fulfill what is an arguably patriotic duty.)

Galston, though, is convinced the evidence is on his side. Congress has become measurably [more polarized](http://www.psmag.com/politics/there-is-no-common-ground-anymore-3412/) over the years, a crisis that consumes countless think-thank hours in Washington. And a significant increase in voter participation would statistically bump up the percentage of self-described moderates in the electorate. “There’s just no question there,” Galston said.

**Also, polarization undermines democracy; compulsory voting is the best utilitarian decision-making process.**

Ebb(2), Samuel James, “Government of the People: A Case for Compulsory Voting,” Wesleyan University, April ’13

Over the span of about thirty years, between the mid-1960s and 1990s, survey responses on perceived accountability of government have worsened substantially. In this time, “the proportion of Americans who felt that ‘the government is run by a few big interests looking out only for themselves’ more than doubled to reach 76%, while the number who believed that ‘public officials don’t care about what people think’ grew from 36% to 66%.” Low and middle-income respondents agreed with the statement that, “public officials don’t much care what people like me think” around 60% of the time. The percentage for high-income respondents, though, was closer to 35%.These opinions are grounded in reality, as a policy change that is favored by well over 75% of the population still has only a 50% chance of being enacted, according to a recent study by Martin Gilens.

**Ebb(3) concludes**: It is through this reanimation of “we the people” to truly create a system of deliberation and (informed by) full representation that compulsory voting provides some hope for a realization of the ideal of government “of, for and by the people.”

This means that Ebb2 & 3 are sufficient to affirm under observations 1 & 3. Compulsory voting directly results in a better utilitarian voting process because more people are involved in voting, increasing government by, of, and for the people. This directly links to the utilitarian standard. Thus, even if I lose turns on polarization, or a normative interp, you can affirm based on a descriptive interp of the topic because I only have to prove the topic true in one way. Second, even if the neg wins that compulsory voting is bad, the majority could vote to get rid of it; so I access all neg normative impacts.

**Underview:** **Vote aff because I raise awareness of political polarization.** High schoolers must be aware of concepts of confirmation bias, media spin, and the lies resulting from polarization, thus I solve in round for a utilitarian democracy.

Bachner(1), PhD, ’10[[4]](#footnote-4)

In a March 2010 op-ed piece for the Wall Street Journal, renowned historian and policy analyst Diane Ravitch expressed frustration with current education reform, noting, “Most significantly, we are not producing a generation of students who are more knowledgeable, and better prepared for the responsibilities of citizenship." The conception of citizenship as a learned behavior has existed since ancient times, and it persists as a primary rationale for the public school system in the United States. Bachner(2) continues: Civic education also has the potential to increase a student's store of civic skills. Civic skills are the communications and organizational abilities that allow citizens to use time and money effectively in political life” (Verba, Schlozman and Brady, 1995, 304). These skills make participation easier and thus more likely. Even the simple act of voting requires citizens to, at the very least, determine how to register to vote and locate their polling place. Further, the probability that citizens will vote is increased if they are able to discuss politics with friends and persuade others of their political beliefs.

Two Impacts: (1) Thus, you affirm because I access BOTH the try- or die scenario for a normative approach and for improving representative a utilitarian democracy in the descriptive approach. (2) This operates on the same level as theory, which purports to have out of round impacts for voting me down to discourage in round arguments. Thus, my real world education outweighs any theory concept of fairness or education AND THE NC. Thus, you should affirm.
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