Overview: Coercion must be a last resort. (Voting lottery alternative)

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

Craig Biddle, “What is Objectivism,” The Objective Standard, <http://www.theobjectivestandard.com/ayn-rand/objectivism.asp>

In the realm of politics, Objectivism recognizes that in order to *take* life-promoting action, a person must be *free* to do so; he must be free to act on the judgment of his mind, his basic means of living. The only thing that can stop him from doing so is other people, and the only way they can stop him is by means of *physical force*. Thus, in order to live peacefully together in a society—in order to live together as civilized beings, rather than as barbarians—people must refrain from using physical force against one another. This fact gives rise to the principle of *individual rights*, which is the principle of egoism applied to politics. The principle of individual rights is the recognition of the fact that each person is morally an end in himself, not a means to the ends of others; therefore, he morally must be left free to act on his own judgment for his own sake, so long as he does not violate that same right of others. This principle is not a matter of personal opinion or social convention or “divine revelation”; it is a matter of the factual requirements of human life in a social context. A *moral* society—a *civilized* society—is one in which the initiation of physical force against human beings is prohibited by law

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 crimes that are punished because they initiate force meaning intuitively we reject force.

**Force is considered properly the last resort in Just War Theory. If force must be the last resort against other citizens, it should be the last resort against a countries own citizens.**

Yaron Brook & Alex Epstein, “Just War Theory vs American Self Defense,” The Objective Standard, Spring 2006

All forms of Just War Theory provide guidelines that fall into two categories: justice in entering a war, and justice in waging a war. (These two categories are known as jus ad bellum, and jus in bello, respectively.) Broadly speaking, Just War Theory holds that a nation can go to war only in response to the impetus of a “just cause,” with force as a “last resort,” after all other non-military options have been considered and tried—with its decision to go to war motivated by “good intentions,” with the aim of bringing about a “good outcome.” And it holds that a nation must wage war only by means that are “proportional” to the ends it seeks, and while practicing “discrimination” between combatants and non-combatants. Finally, in a requirement that applies to both categories, Just War Theory holds that the decision-making power for when, why, and how to wage war—including the declaration of war—must rest with a “legitimate authority.”

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.

 **An election lottery would incentivize voting and increase turnout.**

 Norman Ornstein, “The Mega Millions Solution,” The New York Times, April 23, 2012

The Mega Millions lottery last month with its whopping $656 million prize captured the intense interest of Americans across the country. Estimates suggest that as many as 100 million people participated. No matter that the odds of winning the jackpot were known to be much less than being struck by lightning twice. Investing a few bucks (or in the case of Washington Wizards forward Chris Singleton, ten thousand) for the chance to become a centa-millionaire was irresistible for nearly half of the adult population of the country. The overwhelming success of the Mega Millions enterprise makes it an irresistible target for something more — a way to transform American elections and along the way reduce our deep political dysfunction. Our take-no-prisoners tribal politics have at root the reality that the two parties’ narrow ideological bases have far more influence on the selection of candidates, the positions taken by the candidates and the pressures placed on elected officials than the rest of the population. With turnout in presidential elections hovering between 50 and 60 percent, 30 to 40 percent for mid-term congressional contests, and sometimes 10 to 20 percent for primaries, it is the bases who rule. At the same time, political consultants focus the bulk of their energies on a two-prong strategy for driving the base voters one way or the other — both making sure that your party’s base is energized and that the other party’s base is depressed. The obvious fallout is that the issues that dominate are the ones that excite or infuriate the bases — abortion, same-sex marriage, guns, immigration— and the language used to whip up the bases is harsh and extreme. All this does even more to turn off voters in the middle. Other countries like Australia have ameliorated this dynamic by implementing mandatory attendance at the polls — Down Under, if one does not show up, even to cast a ballot for “none of the above,” a fine of roughly $15 is imposed. The result has been turnout of 90 percent or more. High turnout is nice in and of itself. But Australian politicians of all stripes say that the main impact has been to turn the campaign, the issues and the discourse away from the extremes and toward the persuadable voters in the middle. After all, the pols know that both party bases will be there, with predictable results — and that what they need to do is persuade the persuadables. This means a sharper focus on the big issues that concern them and the country, from budgets to energy and climate change to education and jobs, and more moderate rhetoric, since fiery words will turn away moderate voters. I would love to implement the Australian model in America, but I recognize that mandatory voting — actually, mandatory anything — is a hard sell in this country. So here is another idea: a series of Mega Millions-like lotteries for primary and general elections, with awards that can range up to the hundreds of millions for a big general election — where your lottery ticket is your voting stub. It is a reasonable guess, given what we have seen with big lotteries in the states, that a billion dollars for all federal primary and general elections in a cycle (a small sum to enhance democracy and reduce dysfunction) would, by providing a very powerful incentive to get Americans registered and to actually turn up at the polls, result in a robust increase in turnout, perhaps to as much as 75 or 80 percent. The idea could be applied in states and localities with smaller prizes and not simply using public money; perhaps auto dealers could donate cars, for example. Another way to implement the plan would be to use a state’s voter registration rolls and pick five names at random as winners — with the names announced after the election, but the prizes given only to those who actually voted. All it would take to send a powerful message to other non-voters is one example in an election where an individual was picked but lost a Corvette or $100,000 because he or she did not vote.

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 advocate of compulsory voting who views this as a reasonable and practical alternative in the USA where citizens resist coercion.* This means that there is a reasonable and viable alternative to compulsory voting that will incentivize voting thus increasing voter turnout and solve with the net benefit of rejecting coercion and so you can negate.