I Affirm,

[In a democracy, voting ought to be compulsory]

# Part 1 is Analysis.

1. Compulsory Voting is a misnomer.

Justine **Lacroix 07** (Justine Lacroix is Professor in the Department of Politics at the Universitélibre de Bruxelles. She is the author of *Walzer. Le pluralisme et l’universel*(Michalon, 2001) ;*Communautarisme versus libéralisme* (ULB, 2003) ; *La penséefrançaise à l’épreuve de l’Europe* (Grasset, 2008). ) **2007**The Author. Journal compilation © 2007 Political Studies Association POLITICS: 2007 VOL 27(3). Accessed 9/18/13. url: <http://www.sciencespo.site.ulb.ac.be/dossiers_membres/lacroix-justine/fichiers/lacroix-justine-publication231.pdf>

# Part 2 is Meta-Ethics.

Cognitivism is the only logically consistent meta-ethic accessible to debate. Moral statements must be apt for truth or falsity – if not, then moral reasoning is impossible because each line of reason would be independent of each other line, creating eternal regression.

**Van Roojen**, Mark, "Moral Cognitivism vs. Non-Cognitivism", The Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy(Winter **2012** Edition), Edward N. Zalta (ed.), URL = <http://plato.stanford.edu/archives/win2012/entries/moral-cognitivism/>.

The task is difficult in virtue of two interrelated considerations (1). In many

AND

moral sentences so as not to commit a fallacy of equivocationin making arguments.

AND **Van Roojen 2**

A recent objection to non-cognitivism pays close attention to the distinction between explaining

AND

this strategy can be made to work is as yet an open question.

Thus, any non-cognitivist ethic must be rejected because it isn’t compatible with debate.

AND

Naturalism is false, because moral theories must be justified before existence. Else is a combination of two fallacies: ONE, is/ought fallacy because naturalism presupposes what is moral based off of what is, not necessarily off what ought; TWO, circular logic, because naturalism relies on a presupposition of naturalistic logic, to objectively show it would require non-naturalism.

AND

Normative moral theories face an epistemological fallacy – once taken out of the abstract, moral claims differ infinitely in the context of the situation.

**Stelzig 98**– B.A (Tim, March, “COMMENT: DEONTOLOGY, GOVERNMENTAL ACTION, AND THE DISTRIBUTIVE EXEMPTION: HOW THE TROLLEY PROBLEM SHAPES THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN RIGHTS AND POLICY”, 146 U. Pa. L. Rev. 901, Lexis Law, S) From <http://debate-central.ncpa.org/forum/viewtopic.php?f=70&t=35093>

Thus, moral subjectivity is contradictory, because it subjectively assumes an objective statement that morality cannot be objective. It would be nonsensical to make a law declaring there are no laws.

AND

For there to exist an obligation derivative from morality, it must motivate action.

**Rosati,** Connie S., "Moral Motivation", *The Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy*(Fall 20**08**Edition), Edward N. Zalta (ed.), URL = <http://plato.stanford.edu/archives/fall2008/entries/moral-motivation/>.

Motivational judgment internalism, hereafter “internalism,” holds that a person [one]

AND

motivation, at least in the “good and strong-willed person.”

If this is not true, then ONE, there is no link from action to morality, as people would simply shrug off morality because they have overriding desires. TWO, motivational externalism would render any attempt at normative descriptions which uses reason and logic useless and unjustifiable because any agent could act with arbitrary intentions with arbitrary reasons.

# Part 3 is the Original Position.

The Originial Position is the only theory that avoids the naturalistic fallacy while still being cognitively valid. People remove themselves from their vested interests and subjective claims.

**Freeman,** Samuel, "Original Position", *The Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy*(Spring**2012**Edition), Edward N. Zalta (ed.), URL = <http://plato.stanford.edu/archives/spr2012/entries/original-position/>.

In addition to expressing our autonomy, the original position is also objective (TJ

AND

also all temporal points of view” (TJ, 587/514).

AND

**Rawls**, John.(Professor of philosophy at Harvard) A Theory of Justice. 19**71**.

In justice as fairness, the original position of equality corresponds to the state of

AND

are autonomous and the obligations they recognize[d] self-imposed.

The veil of ignorance uniquely conforms.

**Piccard,** Dick (Professor at Ohio University) Published: 4/4/20**05** Accessed 8/18/13. url: <http://www.ohio.edu/people/piccard/entropy/rawls.html>

The Veil of Ignorance: Rawls supposes that a (virtual) committee of rational

AND

reasoning without personal biases Rawls refers to as "The Veil of Ignorance."

Thus the standard for the round is consistency with principles decided in the original position. All contentions must directly link into ethical decisions made under the veil of ignorance by rational actors.

Thus the Affirmative Burden is to show that rational actors under the veil of ignorance would make voting compulsory. The negative has the reciprocal burden.

# Part 4 is the Advocacy.

I contend that rational policymakers in the original position would make voting compulsory for three reasons.

**FIRST,** Universal Voting is implied by the Original Position

Everyone votes and participates in the OP, by its very definition, so all should vote in real life.

Norman **Daniels 2002** Harvard Philosopher “ Democratic Equality: Rawls’s Complex Egalitarianism. Published2002 Accessed 9/19/13 url: <http://www.hsph.harvard.edu/benchmark/ndaniels/pdf/democratic_equality.pdf>

Because of their interest in recognitional equality, when contractors choose principles they must assure

AND

idea about the social bases of self respect, with its echo of Rousseau

**SECOND,**CV is needed to prevent inequalities

Jan **Rovensky**20**13**“Voting: A Citizen’s Right, or Duty? The Case against Compulsory Voting” Her Ph.D. thesis which got her Ph.D. in PoliSci. Published: 2007 – 2008. Last Modified: 07 Mar 2013 22:54 Accessed: 9/9/13. url: <http://eprints.luiss.it/40/1/rovensky-20080728.pdf>

AND

CV raises minority turnout.

**Harvard Law Review** **2007** (See Arend Lijphart, Unequal Participation: Democracy’s Unresolved Dilemma, 91 AM. POL.SCI REV. 1, 8–9 (1997) (providing a review of the empirical literature on the effects of compulsory voting laws on voter turnout); see also Hasen, supra note 6, at 2171.)) Accessed 9/19/13 url: <http://harvardlawreview.org/media/pdf/compulsory_voting.pdf>

One solution to the problem of low voter turnout is to require all eligible voters

AND

of voter turnout than many of the countries that have already adopted compulsory voting

AND

Every moment without CV worsens the problem

**Rovensky 2**

Apart from these consequences the proponents of compulsory voting point out that there are three

AND

Power Inquiry (2006: 42) dubbed it, a ‘quiet authoritarianism’

AND

John M. **Carey13**YusakuHoriuchi. [Professor in the Social Sciences, Department of Government, Dartmouth College, Associate Professor and Mitsui Chair in the Study of Japan, Department of Government, Dartmouth College] Compulsory Voting and Income Inequality. Last Updated: April 22, 2013.Accessed: 9/19/13.url: <http://sites.dartmouth.edu/jcarey/files/2013/04/HoriuchiCarey201304221.pdf>

What difference does it make if more, or fewer, people vote? What

AND

, in turn, contribute[s] to the equality of influence.

Thus, in the original position compulsory voting would be rendered morally valid because a rational actor would never decide to act in a method contrary to their interests. Absent the contextual information about inequalities, the privileged and the uneducated would both affirm their desire for enfranchisement – thus you affirm.

**THIRD,**

**FOURTH** CV prevents minority disenfranchisement

Voter ID Laws disenfranchise minorities

Matt A. **Barreto 07** University of Washington Stephen A. Nuño University of California, Irvine Gabriel R. Sanchez University of New Mexico. “VOTER ID REQUIREMENTS AND THE DISENFRANCHISEMENTS OF LATINO, BLACK AND ASIAN VOTERS” Prepared for presentation at: 2007 American Political Science Association Annual Conference September 1, 2007. Accessed: 9/19/13.url: <http://faculty.washington.edu/mbarreto/research/Voter_ID_APSA.pdf>

Specifically, through the use of a unique dataset from the 2006 elections, we

AND

access to multiple forms of identification are significantly more likely to vote Democrat….

**Kriz 13** continues

Ellen Kriz(northeast ohio coalition for the homeless)“[NEW VOTING LAWS DISENFRANCHISE MINORITIES AND HOMELESS”](http://www.neoch.org/chronicle193-articles/2013/5/23/new-voting-laws-disenfranchise-minorities-and-homeless.html)Thursday, May 23, 2013 at 2:48PM. Accessed 9/19/13. url:<http://www.neoch.org/chronicle193-articles/2013/5/23/new-voting-laws-disenfranchise-minorities-and-homeless.html>

The homeless populations in particular will experience more difficulty voting than ever if these laws

AND

that minorities and the poor deserve to be fairly represented in a true democracy

AND

Empirically verified. **Lee 2012** reports

Trymaine Lee 2012 (huffingtonpost. Study = Black Youth Project, nonpartisan, nonprofit). “Voter ID Laws Could Disenfranchise 1 Million Young Minority Voters: Study“Posted: 09/12/2012 7:57 pm EDT Updated: 09/13/2012 Accessed: 9/19/13 url: <http://www.huffingtonpost.com/2012/09/12/voter-id-laws-minorities_n_1878893.html>

An estimated 700,000 [Seven hundred thousand] young minority voters could be

AND

organization that aims to increase civic engagement and voter participation among minority youth.

Disenfranchised voters and citizens with current suffrage would both reach the same conclusion in the original position because no voter would act against their interests by rejecting suffrage.