Definition: Democracy means more than popular sovereignty.

Hermanus Gradus Steijn (1) explains:

Hermanus Gradus Steijn, “Facilitating a Moral Compromise in Plural Liberal Democracies: Why a Policy of Compulsory Attendance During Elections Is Justifiable,” Leiden University, June 8, 2012

The latter half of the term “liberal democracy” implies that its citizens collectively come to shared decisions about a wide range of subjects concerning governmental policies and the laws to be made. This decision-making process in Western liberal democracies usually takes the form of parliamentary representation. Although democracy and liberalism are two different philosophical doctrines, in Western popular culture they are hardly separated when discussed. “Democracy” in the Western world is usually understood as more than popular sovereignty alone. That is, it is understood as more than a mere process to reach majority decisions. In the Western world “Democracy” became a theory also grounded upon substantive ideas and values about freedom and equality (Post, 2005: 23). Though democracy and liberalism are closely associated in the mind of the public, they are separate philosophical doctrines. Theoretically, the former does not imply the latter and vice versa. Nevertheless, the close association between ideas of popular sovereignty and liberal rights is hardly entirely philosophically unwarranted. If one takes the liberal values of autonomy and moral equality serious, democracy is a natural next step. Moreover, as we will see later on, democracy is also an instrument to preserve basic liberal values.

Overview: Coercion must be a last resort.

Because compulsion by definition violates individual rights and violating rights is immoral.

Leonard Peikoff, ‘The Philosophy of Objectivism: A Brief Summary,” The Ominous Parallels, 1982

Reason is an attribute of the individual. Thought is a process performed not by men, but by man—in the singular. No society, committee, or "organic" group can do it. What a group can do in this regard is only: to leave the individual free to function, or to stop him. The basic political requirement of Man's Life is freedom. "Freedom" in this context means the power to act without coercion by others. It means an individual's power to act according to his own judgment, while respecting the same right in others. In a free society, men renounce a lethal method of dealing with disagreements: the initiation of physical force. Force is the antonym and negation of thought. Understanding is not produced by a punch in the face; intellectual clarity does not flow from the muzzle of a gun; the weighing of evidence is not mediated by spasms of terror. The mind is a cognitive faculty; it cannot achieve knowledge or conviction apart from or against its perception of reality; it cannot be forced. The proper political system, in essence—the system which guards the freedom of man's mind—is the original American system, based on the concept of inalienable individual rights. "[T]he source of man's rights is not divine law or congressional law, but the law of identity. A is A—and Man is Man. Rights are conditions of existence required by man's nature for his proper survival." The Founding Fathers were right about the fact that rights are political, not economic, i.e., that they are sanctions to act and to keep the products of one's action, not unearned claims to the actions or products of others. And they were right about the fact that the proper function of government is the protection of man's rights. Man's rights, Ayn Rand observes, can be violated only by physical force (fraud is an indirect form of force). A political system based on the recognition of rights is one that guards man against violence. Men therefore deal with one another not as potential killers, but as sovereign traders, according to their own independent judgment and voluntary consent. This kind of system represents the methodical protection of man's mind and of his self-interest, i.e., of the function and purpose on which human life depends

*Prefer this evidence because it comes from a professor of Philosophy, an expert in normative philosophy, and because it is because it is obviously true, debate is not taught by punishing novices.* This means initiating compulsion is immoral and destructive and so should be rejected altogether or at least reserved as a very last resort. This is consistent with many schools of thought such as the Just War Theory where violence must be the last resort, and crimes that are punished because they initiate force meaning intuitively we reject force.

It is also consistent with the Universal Declaration of Human Rights where protections from coercion precede any initiation of coercive rights.

The nature of this distortion can be seen in the difference between the first two-thirds of the U.N. Declaration and its final third. The first 21 articles seek to protect the individual from government coercion. For example: “Everyone has a right to life, liberty, and security of person” (Article 3); “Everyone has the right to own property alone as well as in association with others” (Article 17); “Everyone has the right to freedom of opinion and expression” (Article 19). The common theme of these articles is the right to be left alone — to be protected from the initiation of physical force by the government. Thus, one must be free from persecution for one’s political views, from being arbitrarily imprisoned, or from having one’s property seized. Such rights are crucial to human life. Men cannot learn, make new discoveries, forge long-range plans, or enjoy the rewards of their effort, if they live under the constant threat of being looted, imprisoned, or murdered. The last section of the U.N. Declaration, however, attempts to destroy the concept of individual rights by redefining it. The right to be left alone, in this new approach, is rejected as “narrow” and “negative”; it doesn’t allow for “positive rights” to such things as: “protection against unemployment” (Article 23); “rest and leisure, including . . . periodic holidays with pay” (Article 24); “food, clothing, housing, and medical care and necessary social services” (Article 25); and even to art (Article 27). The question never asked is: Who is to provide all these goods?

Thus before we should even consider compulsory voting as a legitimate exercise of government, we must determine if there are any voluntary alternatives to compulsion that would respect rights while simultaneously achieving the stated goals of compulsory voting which are increasing voter turnout and thus meeting the duty to vote, encouraging civic education and participation. If I am winning my alternative at the end of the round than you can negate as this must come before the AC as the AC resorts to force and a standing alternative will solve without force meaning it is always preferable.

 There are multiple alternatives to compulsion that would increase turnout.

Anthony Morse explains how to increase turnout, “What Is The Best Way To Increase Voter Participation Rates In The United States?” Forbes, 10/16/2012

A few things we could do: 1. Same day registration. If you aren’t enrolled, but come in to vote on election day and have ID of where you live, then you are allowed to vote. States have seen a three to twelve percent increase in voting. 2. Move election day to Monday and make it a federal/bank holiday. Give everyone the day off and no other obligations for the day. People will have the time to vote, which is a big barrier to voting. 3. Better civics education, especially around voting. All too often, I hear that my voting doesn’t matter. Well it does, many local elections are determined by less than a thousand votes. Democracy is about figuring out who you like and who you don’t and then convincing people who to vote for. 4. Fix gerrymandering. Many districts are not competitive because both Democrats and Republicans screw around with congressional districts, state senate districts, and state house districts. This allows races to become non-competitive and discourages voting. 5. Early voting. Allow people to come in during the week and vote at town hall.

This is theoretically legitimate because 1) arguments against coercion is incredibly common 2) it comes from a nationally recognized election resource, the leading provider of electronic voting, easily accessed online 3) alternatives and counterplans are very common in debate and my intent is to defend this if at all possible 4) multiple alternatives in one card are functionally no different from multiple warrants in one card 5) prohibiting my strategy ensures debate is not an activity that can consider practical alternatives hindering education, we should learn if compulsory voting is really the best solution and 6) prohibiting this strategy limits my capacity to gain offense so you will not vote on theory against this. *Prefer my evidence because it comes from an expert with ten years of experience in the field who also has worked as a campaign manager for multiple campaigns, and works for a sitting Congressman.*