



Fall 2019

**Middle School
Beginner
Core Files**



Quick Reference: Speech Order & Times

Debate has very few restrictions in terms of what you can argue – but (like any sport) we do have rules that set how long you speak and what order you and your peers will speak in. Every debater will give two speeches (an **4 minute constructive** and a **2 minute rebuttal**), will be cross-examined once, and will cross-examine another student once.

While we will randomly decide when you are affirmative and negative, you and your partner get to pick which speeches you give – the first or the second set (1AC/1AR or 2AC/2AR, etc.).

Here are the speeches in order:

1st Affirmative Constructive (1AC) – the speaker introduces the affirmative’s case. This speech is already prepared and in your evidence packets.

1st Negative Constructive (1NC) – this speech will introduce the arguments that the negative team will use during the debate.

2nd Affirmative Constructive (2AC) – this speaker refutes all of the arguments made by the negative by reading new evidence & referencing evidence from the first affirmative speech.

“The Negative Block:” 2nd Negative Constructive (2NC) & 1st Negative Rebuttal (1NR) – the negative debaters split up the arguments from the first negative speech and flesh them out while answering affirmative arguments.

1st Affirmative Rebuttal (1AR) – this speaker has a limited amount of time to answer the arguments made in the block and to re-assert the affirmative case.

2nd Negative Rebuttal (2NR) – this is the last negative speech – this speaker’s job is to provide a clear set of reasons why the negative team should win the debate. Think of this speech like a conclusion to a paper.

2nd Affirmative Rebuttal (2AR) – this is the last speech in the debate – this speaker should quickly refute the negative’s best arguments and then refocus the debate on why the affirmative plan is best. This speech is also like a conclusion – it is about quickly summarizing why you should win.

Cross-Examination (CX) and Prep Time:

Cross-examination – is a 2-minute question and answer session after each constructive, when the opposing team asks the person who just spoke questions in order to clarify or point out the flaws of an argument.

Preparation time – each team is given 4 minutes of “prep-time” that they can take at any point before or after a speech to write notes, find evidence, organize their thoughts, etc. To use it, just announce that you want to take some prep time. Remember, you only get 4 minutes of time for the whole debate, so use it wisely!

High School Time Limits:

CONSTRUCTIVES

1AC – 4 minutes

CX’d by 2N - 2 minutes

1NC - 4 minutes

CX’d by 1A - 2 minutes

2AC - 4 minutes

CX’d by 1N - 2 minutes

2NC - 4 minutes

CX’d by 2A - 2 minutes

REBUTTALS

1NR - 2 minutes

1AR - 2 minutes

2NR - 2 minutes

2AR - 2 minutes

Each team gets 4 minutes of **prep time** to use between speeches.

FALL 2019 BEGINNER DIVISION CORE FILES (AFFIRMATIVE)

INDEX

First Affirmative Speech (1AC) 2
 First Affirmative Constructive Speech 3
 First Affirmative Constructive Speech 4
 First Affirmative Constructive Speech 5
 First Affirmative Constructive Speech 6

Supporting Evidence & answers to negative arguments 7
 Early voting currently restricted 8
 Lack of registration excludes poor and racial minorities 9
 Simplifying registration increases minority participation in elections 10
 Answer to: “Voting restrictions don’t exclude minorities” 11
 Increased voter participation essential to democracy 12
 Democracy good – economy, public health 13
 Democracy good – prevents political violence 14
 Answer to: “Democracy is stable / won’t go away” 15

Answers to Negative’s “Election Security Disadvantage” 16
 Lots of security measures already in place 17
 Security isn’t coordinated going into 2020 – tampering is inevitable 18
 Russia won’t manipulate the 2020 election 19
 States have received the funding they need already 20

First Affirmative Speech (1AC)

Note: you have **4 minutes** for the constructive speeches (including the First Affirmative Constructive, aka “1AC”) – you should practice reading it in time. If you can’t read it all, try **underlining or highlighting** the most **important parts of the evidence** – and re-reading the speech without the unimportant parts to save time.

Also try circling our **highlighting** words and phrases where you might add **emphasis** – you will give this speech a lot, and you should get good at making it sound exciting / like you care about the issue. If you want to get good speaker points from your judge, make the speech interesting!

First Affirmative Constructive Speech

Contention 1: Inherency

Many states that previously adopted early voting now are reducing early voting opportunities while also making registration more difficult. Ohio demonstrates this trend.

Lynch, senior diplomatic reporter at Foreign Policy, 2018

(Colum, "Why Is It So Hard to Vote in America? Voter turnout lags in the world's most powerful democracy." Foreign Policy November 5 2018

<https://foreignpolicy.com/2018/11/05/why-is-it-so-hard-to-vote-in-america/> accessed DUDA TM)

Some states have alleviated the issue by allowing early voting. But since 2010, seven states have scaled back early voting periods, according to the Brennan Center. In 2011, Ohio Republican lawmakers eliminated the so-called golden week—which allowed voters to register and vote on the same day for a six-day period. More than 80,000 people voted during the golden week in 2012.

First Affirmative Constructive Speech

Contention 2 – Democracy Advantage

Multiple studies show that states that have had cuts to early voting had lower voter turnout and participation in elections

Root, Associate Director, Voting Rights **AND Kennedy**, Senior Fellow Increasing Voter Participation in America, **2018**

(Danielle and Liz “ Policies to Drive Participation and Make Voting More Convenient” Center for American Progress July 11, 2018,
<https://www.americanprogress.org/issues/democracy/reports/2018/07/11/453319/increasing-voter-participation-america/> accessed DUDA-TM)

It is also worth noting that cuts to early voting can have a detrimental impact on voter participation. A 2016 study by The Atlantic found that, in North Carolina counties with polling place closures and reductions in voting hours, during the first week of early voting, black voter participation reached only 60 percent of the cumulative participation at the same point in 2012. And while participation increased some in the weeks leading up to the election, black participation never reached more than 90 percent of the cumulative participation in 2012.¹³⁴ At the same time, in 2012, after the Florida Legislature cut the state’s early voting period from 14 days to 8 days and eliminated voting on the last Sunday before Election Day, early voting participation for African Americans dropped by 4.1 percent relative to 2008, while participation for Latinos dropped by 4.6 percent.¹³⁵

And, obstacles to voting and low turnout rates are the real problem in US democracy

Lynch, senior diplomatic reporter at Foreign Policy, **2018**

(Colum, “Why Is It So Hard to Vote in America? Voter turnout lags in the world’s most powerful democracy.” Foreign Policy November 5 2018
<https://foreignpolicy.com/2018/11/05/why-is-it-so-hard-to-vote-in-america/> accessed DUDA TM)

“If we are really going to address problems of voting, we would really try to expand participation by making it easier to vote and increasing our turnout,” said the ACLU’s Ebenstein. “But a lot of states are looking to do the opposite, to narrow and restrict the electorate. The real problem with our democracy is turnout.”

First Affirmative Constructive Speech

Additionally, these anti-voter policies specifically have impacted people of color – and only adopting pro-voter reforms can reverse this trend.

Root, Associate Director, Voting Rights **AND Kennedy**, Senior Fellow Increasing Voter Participation in America, **2018**

(Danielle and Liz “ Policies to Drive Participation and Make Voting More Convenient” Center for American Progress July 11, 2018,
<https://www.americanprogress.org/issues/democracy/reports/2018/07/11/453319/increasing-voter-participation-america/> accessed DUDA-TM)

Beyond this, studies have found that a negative relationship exists between voter disenfranchisement and black participation, even among those not directly involved in the criminal justice system. For example, in communities with high percentages of disenfranchised black voters, eligible black voters are less likely to vote.²⁰⁰ This negative relationship exists even when there are pro-voter reforms such as early voting and same-day registration.

For the US’s democracy to work correctly, all eligible Americans must have a chance to vote.

Root, Associate Director, Voting Rights **AND Kennedy**, Senior Fellow Increasing Voter Participation in America, **2018**

(Danielle and Liz “ Policies to Drive Participation and Make Voting More Convenient” Center for American Progress July 11, 2018,
<https://www.americanprogress.org/issues/democracy/reports/2018/07/11/453319/increasing-voter-participation-america/> accessed DUDA-TM)

Almost 92 million eligible Americans did not vote in the 2016 presidential elections.¹ In the 2014 midterm elections, an estimated 143 million eligible Americans failed to vote, marking the lowest voter participation in 72 years.² For the nation’s democracy to function properly and for government to provide fair representation, all eligible Americans must have the opportunity to vote—and be encouraged to do so. Our collective self-rule is established and fostered through free, fair, accessible, and secure elections through which the voice of every eligible American is heard.

First Affirmative Constructive Speech

Thus, we offer the following plan:

The United States should adopt same day registration and expand early voting across the country.

Contention 3 – Solvency:

Early voting and easier registration in combination will allow both programs to reinforce the other for better voter turnout.

Root, Associate Director, Voting Rights **AND Kennedy**, Senior Fellow Increasing Voter Participation in America, **2018**

(Danielle and Liz “ Policies to Drive Participation and Make Voting More Convenient” Center for American Progress July 11, 2018, <https://www.americanprogress.org/issues/democracy/reports/2018/07/11/453319/increasing-voter-participation-america/> accessed DUDA-TM)

These pro-voter policies are mutually dependent and reinforcing. For example, the effectiveness of more convenient voting options—including early voting, vote-at-home, and no-excuse absentee voting—depends on eligible voters being registered. As aptly described in a report by the director of the Elections Research Center at the University of Wisconsin, Barry C. Burden, and others, “The additional convenience of early voting is worthless to a potential voter who finds that she is actually not registered, and therefore unqualified to vote.”²³ At the same time, the benefits of registration modernization cannot be fully realized if voters do not have opportunities to exercise their civic duty. Moreover, these policies often complement each other. Whereas early voting on its own has been shown to increase participation by about 2 to 4 percent, early voting combined with same-day voter registration has increased voter participation by 4.2 to 11 percent where it has been implemented.²⁴

Supporting Evidence & answers to negative arguments

Please note: the following pages **may** be useful for affirmative speeches after the *First Affirmative Constructive*.

This evidence is provided to help you challenge the negative's arguments, mainly in the Second Affirmative Constructive speech. Only **some** of this evidence will need to be read in your debate, depending on what arguments your opponent makes.

We **discourage** you from reading evidence in the final Rebuttal speeches (1AR, 2NR, 2AR). This is **not** a rule – you can do it if you like – but your rebuttals will be better and score you more speaker points if you use your speech time to analyze and compare your arguments to the ones your opponent has made – rather than just reading more of the following pages. Most judges want to watch you engage your opponent's arguments directly, rather than watching you read page after page of evidence every speech.

One more piece of advice: you should actively **listen** to your opponents' speeches, and track the specific arguments they are making by taking notes ("flowing" the debate). In your rebuttals, aim to make reference to their arguments and respond to them directly as time allows – don't rely entirely on pre-written speeches that aren't unique to the situation of your debate round.

Early voting currently restricted

Multiple states increasing requirements for voting or shrinking early voting time frames

Lynch, senior diplomatic reporter at Foreign Policy, **2018**

(Colum, "Why Is It So Hard to Vote in America? Voter turnout lags in the world's most powerful democracy." Foreign Policy November 5 2018

<https://foreignpolicy.com/2018/11/05/why-is-it-so-hard-to-vote-in-america/> accessed DUDA TM)

Since 2010, 22 states have passed laws requiring photo IDs or curtailing early voting, according to the Brennan Center for Justice, a nonprofit public policy institute at New York University Law School that promotes democracy and justice. (Some of the most controversial laws have been challenged in lawsuits or struck down by courts.)

Lack of registration excludes poor and racial minorities

Communities of color, poor and disabled population disproportionately less likely to be registered to vote.

Root, Associate Director, Voting Rights **AND Kennedy**, Senior Fellow Increasing Voter Participation in America, **2018**

(Danielle and Liz “ Policies to Drive Participation and Make Voting More Convenient” Center for American Progress July 11, 2018, <https://www.americanprogress.org/issues/democracy/reports/2018/07/11/453319/increasing-voter-participation-america/> accessed DUDA-TM)

Certain groups are less likely to be registered to vote; these include communities of color, low-income Americans, those with disabilities, and young people.⁵⁰ In 2016, 69 percent of black and 57 percent of Hispanic Americans were registered to vote, compared with 72 percent of whites.⁵¹ Asian Americans were 16 percent less likely to be registered to vote than whites.⁵² Furthermore, in 2012, only 66 percent of American Indians and Alaska Natives were registered—7 percentage points lower than their white counterparts.⁵³ A shocking 20-point gap exists in registration rates between Americans making less than \$25,000 per year and individuals making \$100,000 or more per year.⁵⁴ Eligible Americans with disabilities are also less likely to be registered to vote—by about 2 percentage points—than people without disabilities.⁵⁵ And in 2012, 735,000 potential voters were prevented from having their names added to the voter rolls because of language barriers in the registration process.⁵⁶

Simplifying registration increases minority participation in elections

And, improving voter registration rates closes the gaps in voter participation amongst white and minority voters.

Root, Associate Director, Voting Rights AND Kennedy, Senior Fellow Increasing Voter Participation in America, 2018

(Danielle and Liz “ Policies to Drive Participation and Make Voting More Convenient” Center for American Progress July 11, 2018,
<https://www.americanprogress.org/issues/democracy/reports/2018/07/11/453319/increasing-voter-participation-america/> accessed DUDA-TM)

Improving the voter registration process can decrease gaps in voter participation between demographic groups. For example, in 2016, white voting-age citizens participated at a 63 percent rate, while voting-age citizens of color participated at a 53 percent rate.⁵⁹ However, the participation gap decreases significantly between registered whites and registered people of color: 87.78 percent versus 84.91 percent, respectively. Therefore, while the participation gap between eligible white citizens and eligible citizens of color is 10 percentage points, among registered citizens, the gap is only 2.87 percentage points.

If all states had early voting, studies modeled an increase of nearly a million voters in the 2016 elections

Root, Associate Director, Voting Rights AND Kennedy, Senior Fellow Increasing Voter Participation in America, 2018

(Danielle and Liz “ Policies to Drive Participation and Make Voting More Convenient” Center for American Progress July 11, 2018,
<https://www.americanprogress.org/issues/democracy/reports/2018/07/11/453319/increasing-voter-participation-america/> accessed DUDA-TM)

Early voting: One study found that early voting can increase participation by about 2 to 4 percent.¹⁶ Eliminating early voting has also been found to decrease turnout in communities of color.¹⁷ According to the authors’ calculations, if all states had early voting in place during the 2016 elections, there could have been at least 789,500 more voters.

Answer to: “Voting restrictions don’t exclude minorities”

The changes occur in a context of larger racial bias making the effect of the changes much larger on people of color

Newkirk, writer for the Atlantic Magazine, 2018

(Vann, “Voter Suppression Is Warping Democracy” The Atlantic, JUL 17, 2018
<https://www.theatlantic.com/politics/archive/2018/07/poll-prri-voter-suppression/565355/> accessed DUDA-TM)

These results add credence to what many critics of restrictive voting laws have long suspected. First, voter-ID laws and other, similar statutes aren’t passed in a vacuum, but rather in a country where people of color are significantly less likely to be able to meet the new requirements. Whether intended to discriminate or not, these laws discriminate in effect, and while there is no evidence that they’ve averted any kind of fraud, there is plenty of data detailing just how they’ve created Republican advantages. In that way, Trump’s chances in 2016 may have turned not only on the approval or disapproval of white voters, but also on how effectively state laws, access issues, and social penalties conspired to keep black and Hispanic voters away from polling places.

Increased voter participation essential to democracy

Early voting and mobilization will increase turnout and turnout matters in very close elections in the United States

Root, Associate Director, Voting Rights **AND Kennedy**, Senior Fellow Increasing Voter Participation in America, **2018**

(Danielle and Liz “ Policies to Drive Participation and Make Voting More Convenient” Center for American Progress July 11, 2018,
<https://www.americanprogress.org/issues/democracy/reports/2018/07/11/453319/increasing-voter-participation-america/> accessed DUDA-TM)

According to the National Conference of State Legislatures, early voting is permitted in 33 states and the District of Columbia, though early voting opportunities vary in terms of timing and location.¹³⁶ And, although more research is needed on its overall effectiveness at increasing participation, early voting could prove powerful when combined with active mobilization efforts. Even if the policy’s impact on participation is relatively small, during a time when margins of victory are so close that elections are decided by lot, every vote counts.¹³⁷

Democracy good – economy, public health

Democracy is good because provides multiple benefits including stronger economy and better health outcomes for people living in democracies

Rice-Oxley, writer for the Guardian Newspaper, **2019**

(Mark “Democracy is good for your health and heart, major study find”. The Guardian. March 13 2019 <https://www.theguardian.com/world/2019/mar/13/democracy-is-good-for-your-health-and-heart-major-study-finds> DUDA TM)

Democracy is good for your heart, health and longevity, a major study of 170 countries has concluded, in a boost to a form of government that has faced significant setbacks around the world in recent years. Life expectancy improved more quickly in countries that switched to democracy over the past 50 years, the researchers discovered, and there were fewer deaths from cardiovascular disease, diseases such as cancer and cirrhosis, and even road traffic accidents. The study, published in the Lancet, said it was not just that democracies tended to be richer: the “democracy effect” was far stronger than any GDP effect. “Free and fair elections appear important for improving adult health ... most likely by increasing government accountability and responsiveness,” the study said. “Democracies are more likely than autocracies to lead to health gains.”

Democracy good – prevents political violence

Democracy provides nonviolent ways to express opinions – and elect a new leaders if they make a bad choice

Inglehart, professor of political science University of Michigan, **2018**

(Ronald “The age of insecurity: Can democracy save itself” Foreign Affairs, 97(3), May June 2018 <https://www.foreignaffairs.com/articles/2018-04-16/age-insecurity> accessed DUDA-TM)

Moreover, democracy has a major advantage over other political systems: it provides a nonviolent way to replace a country's leaders. Democratic institutions do not guarantee that the people will elect wise and benevolent rulers, but they do provide a regular and nonviolent way to replace unwise and malevolent ones. Nondemocratic leadership successions can be costly and bloody. And since democracy enables people to choose their leaders, it reduces the need for repressive rule. Both these advantages have helped democracy survive and spread.

Answer to: “Democracy is stable / won’t go away”

Democracy not inevitable – a slide to authoritarianism is possible

Inglehart, professor of political science University of Michigan, **2018**

(Ronald “The age of insecurity: Can democracy save itself” Foreign Affairs, 97(3), May June 2018 <https://www.foreignaffairs.com/articles/2018-04-16/age-insecurity> accessed DUDA-TM)

But there is nothing inevitable about democratic decline. Rising prosperity continues to move most developing countries toward democracy-although, as always, the trajectory is not a linear one. And in the developed world, the current wave of authoritarianism will persist only if societies and governments fail to address the underlying drivers.

If new political coalitions emerge to reverse the trend toward inequality and ensure that the benefits of automation are widely shared, they can put democracy back on track. But if the developed world continues on its current course, democracy could wither away. If there is nothing inevitable about democratic decline, there is also nothing inevitable about democratic resurgence.

Answers to Negative's "Election Security Disadvantage"

Lots of security measures already in place

Multiple non-governmental efforts to assist in election security efforts

Sanger, et al, 2019

(David E. “States Rush to Make Voting Systems More Secure as New Threats Emerge” NYTimes July 26, 2019

<https://www.nytimes.com/2019/07/26/us/politics/states-voting-systems.html> accessed DUDA-TM)

Figuring out where to start is not hard. There are a flurry of studies and reports, including the National Academies of Sciences, Engineering and Medicine, Harvard’s “Defending Digital Democracy” program that trains campaign workers and state officials, and a new Microsoft program, Election Guard, that the company is providing free to states and election-machine manufacturers so that voters can track their ballots from casting to counting.

Security isn't coordinated going into 2020 – tampering is inevitable

Trump prevents full coordination of security efforts – means that the impact of hacking is inevitable

Sanger, et al, 2019

(David E. “States Rush to Make Voting Systems More Secure as New Threats Emerge” NYTimes July 26, 2019

<https://www.nytimes.com/2019/07/26/us/politics/states-voting-systems.html> accessed DUDA-TM)

And despite a flurry of activity across the federal government, coordination is a major challenge — chiefly because President Trump, who has only episodically acknowledged the Russian interference in 2016, reacts badly whenever aides bring up the topic, which he interprets as questioning the legitimacy of his election.

He has never overseen detailed meetings about hardening the American system, and he undermined a White House briefing for reporters about actions it was taking when he joked with President Vladimir V. Putin of Russia, mockingly warning him not to interfere in elections again. Because the administration eliminated the post of White House cybersecurity coordinator last year, interagency meetings on the issue are often held elsewhere, or are convened by House and Senate oversight committees.

Russia won't manipulate the 2020 election

US creates threats when it comes to Russia – no Russia master plan

Topol, 2019

(Sarah "What Does Putin Really Want?", New York Times Magazine, June 25, 2019, <https://www.nytimes.com/2019/06/25/magazine/russia-united-states-world-politics.html>)

Russia has long been a canvas on which Americans project their thoughts or fears — of the Red menace, and of Putin's quest for world domination. This tradition only accelerated after the 2016 election, when it seemed as if everyone were an expert on Putin's agenda. There wasn't an election he didn't hack, a border he wouldn't violate or an American ally he couldn't manipulate. The very word "Putin" has come to symbolize a coherent, systematic destruction of the post-Cold War international order. But no one I spoke with who had an intimate knowledge of Russia saw that as anything but fiction. Instead, they talked about Russia's strides back onto the world stage as improvised reactions, tactics, gambles that were at times more worrisome than masterful.

States have received the funding they need already

Every state already received funds for election security already – should have fixed the problem

Lynch and Underhill, National Conference of State Legislatures, 2019

(Dylan and Wendy, “Election Security | Cybersecurity: What Legislators (and Others) Need to Know” National Conference of State Legislatures February 4 2019

<http://www.ncsl.org/research/elections-and-campaigns/election-security.aspx> accessed DUDA-TM)

Every state received a base of \$3 million, with the remaining funds distributed based on voting age population. Small states received just the base amount, and the largest state, California, received \$34 million (see this chart for state-by-state details).

FALL 2019 BEGINNER DIVISION CORE FILES (NEGATIVE)

INDEX

Negative Answers to the Affirmative’s Case Arguments..... 2

First Negative Speech 3

 First Negative Speech (1NC) – Answers to Affirmative’s Advantage..... 4

 First Negative Speech (1NC) – Answers to Affirmative’s Advantage..... 5

 First Negative Speech (1NC) – Answers to Affirmative’s Solvency 6

Supporting Evidence 7

 Early voting creates political division..... 8

 Early voting won’t increase voter turnout 9

Negative Disadvantage – Affirmative Makes Elections Insecure..... 10

First Negative Speech 11

 First Negative Speech (1NC) – Voting Security Disadvantage 12

Supporting evidence & answers to affirmative arguments 13

 Early voting undermines election security 14

 Same day registration undermines election security..... 15

 Funding is low – expanded voting rights trade off with security 16

 Must put security over expanded rights – 2020 elections 17

 Election security is essential to democracy..... 18

 Other countries will see and exploit our insecurity 19

 Answer to: “states have already secured elections” 20

Negative Answers to the Affirmative's Case Arguments

First Negative Speech

Note: this evidence is a suggested **starting point** for your **First Negative Constructive** speech.

- While you **cannot** reference research from outside these files (for example, you cannot quote a piece of evidence from tomorrow's newspaper) – you **can** reference current events or make “analytic arguments”: common sense assertions that point out flaws in your opponent's position.
- You **can** use evidence from **anywhere within this file** to build your First Negative Constructive – you are not restricted to what is labeled “First Negative Constructive,” we are only giving you some ideas for how to start.

First Negative Speech (1NC) – Answers to Affirmative’s Advantage

The plan won’t help promote democracy – early voters will vote with incomplete information means their votes may not reflect their opinion if they had more information

von Spakovsky, Election Law Reform Initiative and Senior Legal Fellow at Heritage, 2017

(Hans A. “Early Voting Disadvantages Seem to Outweigh Benefits”. Heritage Foundation, Oct 18th, 2017 <https://www.heritage.org/election-integrity/commentary/early-voting-disadvantages-seem-weigh-benefits> accessed DUDA-TM)

There are other problems. Voters who cast their ballots early are doing so without knowledge of events that may occur later in a campaign or just before Election Day that could be important to their choice of candidates. Last year, the early voting period started in some states before Hillary Clinton and Donald Trump had even completed their three debates.

Turnout rates have been very consistent in the US over time, proves recent changes in early voting and registration isn’t responsible

DeSilver, Pew Research, 2018

(Drew, “U.S. trails most developed countries in voter turnout” Pew Research, May 21 2018 <https://www.pewresearch.org/fact-tank/2018/05/21/u-s-voter-turnout-trails-most-developed-countries/> Accessed DUDA-TM)

No matter how they’re measured, U.S. turnout rates have been fairly consistent over the past several decades, despite some election-to-election variation. Since 1976, voting-age turnout has remained within an 8.5-percentage-point range – from just under 50% in 1996, when Bill Clinton was re-elected, to just over 58% in 2008, when Barack Obama won the White House. However, turnout varies considerably among different racial, ethnic and age groups.

First Negative Speech (1NC) – Answers to Affirmative’s Advantage

States are fixing some of the problems – some states already passing pro-voter reforms

Brennan Center, 2019

(“Voting Laws Roundup 2019”, July 10 2019

<https://www.brennancenter.org/analysis/voting-laws-roundup-2019> accessed DUDA-TM)

The massive burst of pro-voter bills introduced this session – 688 bills in 46 states – translated into significant reform across the country. As a group, states with new, Democratic trifectas led the way in terms of expansive laws this year – and, within that group, New York, Colorado, and Nevada enacted multiple, high-impact reforms. In addition, Delaware and Virginia enacted early in person voting. And a number of other states – under Democratic, GOP, and mixed control – enacted reforms that are either more incremental or alleviate past voter suppression. A couple of other trends emerged as well. States enacted a number of bills providing notice and cure opportunities for absentee ballots and voter registrations. In addition, despite Florida’s decision to cut back on Amendment 4, rights restoration continues to gain momentum.

First Negative Speech (1NC) – Answers to Affirmative’s Solvency

The Affirmative will have the opposite effect that they want because early voting actually decreases voter turnout – studies prove

von Spakovsky, Election Law Reform Initiative and Senior Legal Fellow at Heritage, **2017**

(Hans A. “Early Voting Disadvantages Seem to Outweigh Benefits”. Heritage Foundation, Oct 18th, 2017 <https://www.heritage.org/election-integrity/commentary/early-voting-disadvantages-seem-outweigh-benefits> accessed DUDA-TM)

While early voting may seem more convenient, it appears to have the opposite effect of what its proponents sought: It actually decreases turnout. A number of studies, including one by American University and another by professors from the University of Wisconsin, conclude that states that have adopted early voting have lower voter turnout than states without early voting.

The Affirmative can’t solve the other factors that influence turnout rates – Texas proves

Young, writer for Dallas Observer, **2019**

(Stephen, “Voting in Texas Still Broken, New Report Says”. Dallas Observer, MARCH 21, 2019 <https://www.dallasobserver.com/news/how-to-fix-texas-voter-turnout-11613360> accessed DUDA-TM)

In the past, when the Observer has looked at Texas' abysmal voter turnout, the experts we've talked to have cited the lack of competitive races in the state, leading to a less-than-robust voting culture. "Texas isn't really a competitive state," Victoria DeFrancesco Soto, a political scientist at the University of Texas, told us in March 2016. "So we don't have that culture of voting that you have in swing states where you're always in the political eye. Texas doesn't have that. It doesn't have this exciting national political scene."

Supporting Evidence

Please note: the following pages **may** be useful for affirmative speeches after the *First Negative Constructive*.

This evidence is provided to help you challenge the negative's arguments, mainly in the Second Affirmative Constructive speech. Only **some** of this evidence will need to be read in your debate, depending on what arguments your opponent makes.

We **discourage** you from reading evidence in the final Rebuttal speeches (1AR, 2NR, 2AR). This is **not** a rule – you can do it if you like – but your rebuttals will be better and score you more speaker points if you use your speech time to analyze and compare your arguments to the ones your opponent has made – rather than just reading more of the following pages. Most judges want to watch you engage your opponent's arguments directly, rather than watching you read page after page of evidence every speech.

One more piece of advice: you should actively **listen** to your opponents' speeches, and track the specific arguments they are making by taking notes ("flowing" the debate). In your rebuttals, aim to make reference to their arguments and respond to them directly as time allows – don't rely entirely on pre-written speeches that aren't unique to the situation of your debate round.

Early voting creates political division

Early voting undermines democratic cohesion that voting on the same day would provide

von Spakovsky, Election Law Reform Initiative and Senior Legal Fellow at Heritage, 2017

(Hans A. “Early Voting Disadvantages Seem to Outweigh Benefits”. Heritage Foundation, Oct 18th, 2017 <https://www.heritage.org/election-integrity/commentary/early-voting-disadvantages-seem-outweigh-benefits> accessed DUDA-TM)

Early voting seems to damage the civic cohesiveness inherent in having voters throughout the nation turn out on a single day to choose our president and our legislative representatives. Given the costs, particularly its tendency to lower turnout, early voting is a “reform” that states should consider undoing.

Early voting won't increase voter turnout

Plan won't result in an increase in turnout – new and unengaged voters won't know about the expansion in voting rights

Root, Associate Director, Voting Rights **AND Kennedy**, Senior Fellow Increasing Voter Participation in America, **2018**

(Danielle and Liz “ Policies to Drive Participation and Make Voting More Convenient” Center for American Progress July 11, 2018,
<https://www.americanprogress.org/issues/democracy/reports/2018/07/11/453319/increasing-voter-participation-america/> accessed DUDA-TM)

Infrequent or first-time voters are especially unlikely to know about the availability of things such as same-day voter registration and early voting. This obligation falls largely on states and localities, both of which should send eligible voters notifications regarding voting registration deadlines and information about eligibility as well as where and how to register. Well in advance of Election Day, eligible voters should receive notifications that remind them to vote and include information about their respective polling place and voting hours. This would help cut down on improperly cast ballots.³⁹ Distributing sample ballots can also help to improve the voting experience and reduce wait times at polling places.⁴⁰ One study found that, during the 2000 elections, participation was 2.5 percent higher in states that mailed information about polling places to voters in advance and 2 percentage points higher in states that mailed sample ballots.⁴¹ The effects were especially notable for voters with little education and for young people.⁴² In the seven states that mailed sample ballots, voter participation for registered youths was 73 percent, compared with 67.3 percent in states that did not distribute sample ballots.⁴³

Negative Disadvantage – Affirmative Makes Elections Insecure

First Negative Speech

First Negative Speech (1NC) – Voting Security Disadvantage

Election security in the United States is failing and underfunded – by expanding elections, the affirmative increases the risk that foreign countries can exploit these weaknesses.

Sanger, et al, 2019

(David E. “States Rush to Make Voting Systems More Secure as New Threats Emerge” NYTimes July 26, 2019

<https://www.nytimes.com/2019/07/26/us/politics/states-voting-systems.html> accessed DUDA-TM)

But money is scarce. Much of the \$380 million that Congress allocated two years ago has been spent and Senator Mitch McConnell, Republican of Kentucky, blocked a Democratic effort on Thursday to provide more money to the states for election security.

Many localities say they do not have the funds to spend on gear they will use once a year, at most. In Texas, 106 of its 254 counties have bought new voting equipment since the 2016 elections, said Stephen Chang, the communications director for the Texas secretary of state’s office.

Exposure to political manipulation by foreign actors increases the risk of international conflict.

Bender, writer for Politico, 2019

(Bryan, “Russia beating U.S. in race for global influence, Pentagon study says”. Politico, June 30 2019 DUDA-TM)

"In this environment, economic competition, influence campaigns, paramilitary actions, cyber intrusions, and political warfare will likely become more prevalent," writes Navy Rear Adm. Jeffrey Czerewko, the Joint Chiefs' deputy director for global operations, in the preface to the report. "Such confrontations increase the risk of misperception and miscalculation, between powers with significant military strength, which may then increase the risk of armed conflict."

Supporting evidence & answers to affirmative arguments

Early voting undermines election security

States have saved money to fund election security by shutting down early voting – the plan reverses this and weakens our protections

Paterson, 2018

(Blake “Bipartisan Furor as North Carolina Election Law Shrinks Early Voting Locations by Almost 20 Percent”. Propublica Sept. 24, 2018

<https://www.propublica.org/article/bipartisan-furor-as-north-carolina-election-law-shrinks-early-voting-locations-by-almost-20-percent> accessed DUDA -TM)

But with the start of early voting only weeks away, county election officials across the state — who previously had control over setting polling hours in their jurisdictions — say the new law has hamstrung their ability to best serve voters. Some officials in rural counties say they’ve had to shrink the number of early voting locations to accommodate the law’s longer hour requirements and stay within their budgets.

Same day registration undermines election security

Same day voting registration is expensive – it will trade of with funding for election security.

NCSL, 2019

(National Conference of States Legislatures, June 28 2019

<http://www.ncsl.org/research/elections-and-campaigns/same-day-registration.aspx>
accessed DUDA TM)

Same day registration procedures vary within states, and so costs vary as well. Some states indicate there is little to no additional cost in implementing same day registration, especially those that have had this option available for a long time. Some costs that may be associated with implementing same day registration include:

The purchase of additional equipment, which could include e-poll books or ballot-on-demand printers. Additional technology is not a requirement to implement same day registration, however, and Connecticut, Hawaii, Idaho, Maine, Montana, New Hampshire and Vermont all report that they are not currently using e-poll books for this process.

If e-poll books are used, an additional cost may be associated with connecting to a network, either within the polling place or connecting to the statewide voter registration database. This may also be difficult in more rural areas.

Updates of the existing statewide voter registration system to accommodate same day registration.

Increased election staff or poll workers to process same day registrations. This extra administrative task can be time consuming at the same day registration site and verifying registration information after the election. Many states report this is more a reallocation of costs and resources, though, rather than an additional cost.

Funding is low – expanded voting rights trade off with security

Limited resources exist for states to run elections – any expansion in voting rights will trade off with efforts to improve security by doing things like updating ballot machines.

Sanger and Edmondson, 2019

(David and Catie, “Russia Targeted Election Systems in All 50 States, Report Finds”. NY Times, July 25 2019 <https://www.nytimes.com/2019/07/25/us/politics/russian-hacking-elections.html?module=inline> accessed DUDA TM)

While the report praised the steps the agencies have since taken to assist in securing elections, the committee found that concerns about aging voting equipment remain. “As states look to replace machines that are now out of date, they should purchase more secure voting machines. At a minimum, any machine purchased going forward should have a voter-verified paper trail,” a summary of the report said, while adding that “states should remain firmly in the lead on running elections.” The states say they do not have the money to conduct a replacement program by November 2020.

Must put security over expanded rights – 2020 elections

There is lots of evidence hacking will go on in 2020 elections – security must come first

Lynch and Underhill, National Conference of State Legislatures, 2019

(Dylan and Wendy, “Election Security | Cybersecurity: What Legislators (and Others) Need to Know” National Conference of State Legislatures February 4 2019

<http://www.ncsl.org/research/elections-and-campaigns/election-security.aspx> accessed DUDA-TM)

Prior to the 2016 presidential election, malicious actors connected to the Russian government sought to gain access to at least 21 state voter registration systems; some say voter registration systems in all 50 states may have been probed for entry. These were not “breaches” or “hacks” per se, but rather akin to a burglar checking locks and rattling windows to see if there’s an easy way into a house.

Election security is essential to democracy

Voter confidence is key to democracy – without election security, people won't trust the results of elections – means the affirmative makes the problem worse

Lynch and Underhill, National Conference of State Legislatures, 2019

(Dylan and Wendy, "Election Security | Cybersecurity: What Legislators (and Others) Need to Know" National Conference of State Legislatures February 4 2019

<http://www.ncsl.org/research/elections-and-campaigns/election-security.aspx> accessed DUDA-TM)

Since cybersecurity in elections thrust itself into the public eye prior to the 2016 presidential election, many state, local and federal officials saw that the greatest threat to the process was not that votes would be changed or that an election would be influenced by bad information. It was that voters would not have enough confidence in the system to get out and vote. The foundation of our democracy is based on voters being confident that when they vote, their ballots are counted as cast.

Other countries will see and exploit our insecurity

Inaction for 2020 election will send a signal to other countries they can hack our democracy

Senator Mark Warner, 2019

(“Russia is going to up its game for the 2020 elections” Matt Laslo interviewing Senator WarnerWired Magazine July 31 2019 <https://www.wired.com/story/russia-2020-election-security-mark-warner/> DUDA -TM).

So I think there are a couple of new threats. One, Russia in 2016 was surprised at how vulnerable our systems were, our electoral systems. And how easy Facebook and Twitter and YouTube were to be manipulated. So I think that playbook is now out there, they've used the same tactics in the Brexit vote [and] the French presidential elections. So my fear is we may not only see Russia, we can see Iran, we could potentially see China, who has a great deal of control over a number of their Chinese tech companies, start to use these tools because they're cheap and effective. I like to point out that if you add up all Russia spent in the Brexit vote, the French presidential elections, and the 2016 American elections, it's less than the cost of one new F-35 airplane. So Russia and our adversaries, I think, have decided the way to engage with us in conflict is not through straight up old-school military but through cyber activities, misinformation and disinformation, increasingly trying to weaken and interfere, for example with our space communications, and I think Russia will up their game ... and others ... [It] means there will be more adversaries in 2020.

Answer to: “states have already secured elections”

Some states are possibly set up with effective security measures – but the Senate Intelligence Committee says most states are at risk of being unprepared.

Sanger, et al, 2019

(David E. “States Rush to Make Voting Systems More Secure as New Threats Emerge” NYTimes July 26, 2019

<https://www.nytimes.com/2019/07/26/us/politics/states-voting-systems.html> accessed DUDA-TM)

Less than 16 months from the next Election Day, the picture of American preparedness is mixed. The report issued Thursday by the Senate Intelligence Committee found that “some states were highly focused on building a culture of cybersecurity; others were severely underresourced and relying on part-time help.”

Federal officials say they are particularly worried about states like New Jersey, where only three counties are making the first experiments that create a paper trail for balloting. Pennsylvania and Texas also remain major concerns, the officials said.