



**Fall 2019**

**Middle School  
Advanced  
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:

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

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

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

**1<sup>st</sup> 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.

**2<sup>nd</sup> 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.

**2<sup>nd</sup> 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 ADVANCED DIVISION CORE FILES (AFFIRMATIVE)**

**INDEX**

**First Affirmative Speech (1AC) ..... 2**  
    First Affirmative Constructive Speech ..... 3

**Supporting Evidence & Answers to Negative Arguments ..... 8**  
    Early voting currently restricted ..... 9  
    US has low rates of voting ..... 10  
    Lack of voting locations harms voter participation ..... 11  
    Turnout particularly bad in Texas ..... 12  
    Lack of registration harms voter participation ..... 13  
    Lack of registration excludes poor and racial minorities ..... 14  
    Increased voter participation essential to democracy ..... 15  
    Democracy good – economy, public health ..... 16  
    Democracy good – prevents political violence ..... 17  
    US democracy encourages freedom in other countries ..... 18  
    Plan solves – early voting increases turnout ..... 19  
    Plan solves – simplifying registration increases turnout ..... 20  
    Answer to: “Voting restrictions don’t exclude minorities” ..... 22  
    Answer to: “Voter suppression isn’t a big problem” ..... 23  
    Answer to: “Plan doesn’t outline details to expand voting” ..... 24  
    Answer to: “Democracy is stable / won’t go away” ..... 25  
    Answer to: “Democracy doesn’t improve public health” ..... 26

**Answers to Negative’s “Election Security Disadvantage” ..... 27**  
    Lots of security measures already in place ..... 28  
    Security isn’t coordinated going into 2020 – tampering is inevitable ..... 29  
    Russia won’t manipulate the 2020 election ..... 30  
    States have received the funding they need already ..... 31  
    Public faith in our election system already low ..... 32

### 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.<sup>134</sup> 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.<sup>135</sup>

**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.<sup>200</sup> 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.<sup>1</sup> In the 2014 midterm elections, an estimated 143 million eligible Americans failed to vote, marking the lowest voter participation in 72 years.<sup>2</sup> 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.”<sup>23</sup> 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.<sup>24</sup>

**First Affirmative Constructive Speech**

**Registering more people would increase voter turnout significantly.**

**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)

Simply registering more people to vote would increase participation, as registered individuals are more likely to cast a ballot in elections. For example, in 2016, 61 percent of U.S. citizens reported voting, compared with 87 percent of people registered to vote.

**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.<sup>59</sup> 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.<sup>60</sup>

## 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.)

### **Cost of compiling with restrictions results in fewer polling locations – North Carolina proves**

**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)

A ProPublica analysis of polling locations shows that North Carolina’s 2018 midterm election will have nearly 20 percent fewer early voting locations than there were in 2014. Nearly half of North Carolina’s 100 counties are shutting down polling places, in part because of the new law. Poorer rural counties, often strapped for resources to begin with, are having a particularly difficult time adjusting to the new requirement.

## US has low rates of voting

**Multiple obstacles to voter turnout in the United States – means our turnout rates are at the bottom of developed world.**

**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)

Americans like to think of their political system as the gold standard of democratic governance. But a complicated registration process, the failure to make Election Day a national holiday, and political measures aimed at suppressing turnout—especially among African-Americans and other minorities—have combined to give the United States one of the lower voter participation rates in the developed world.

**Low turnout rates in comparison to other countries.**

**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)

In the 2016 presidential election, only 56 percent of the U.S. voting-age population cast ballots, a slight increase over 2012. In contrast, 87 percent of voting-age Belgians, 83 percent of Swedes, and 80 percent of Danes voted in their most recent national elections, according to a May study by the Pew Research Center.

**Lack of voting locations harms voter participation**

**Number of polling locations influences how far a polling place is – that directly influences early voting turnout.**

**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 according to Robert Stein, a professor of political science at Rice University, aggregate hours are not nearly as important a factor to voter access as the number of early voting locations offered by a county. “There is a lot of good research to suggest that when it comes to having a positive effect on early voting turnout, the important things are not the hours of operation but the location of the polling place and the distance and travel time it takes a voter to get there,” Stein said.

**Turnout particularly bad in Texas**

**Low turnout rates in Texas specifically – ranks near the bottom of the states.**

**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)

Not so much, according to a report released this week from Nonprofit VOTE and the U.S. Elections Project. Despite 3.6 million more people casting ballots in 2018 than 2014, an increase that raised turnout from just more than 28 percent to more than 46 percent, Texas remained in the bottom fifth of states ranked by turnout percentage, according to the study, finishing 41st.

**Lack of registration harms voter participation**

**Low registration rates undermine 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)

One of the most effective ways to improve voter participation is to increase the number of people who are registered to vote by making the process more convenient. Every state except North Dakota requires that people register to vote before casting their ballot.<sup>44</sup> Yet there are still millions of Americans who are unregistered; according to the U.S. Census Bureau, in 2016, approximately 1 in 7 American citizens who were of voting age self-reported that they were not registered to vote.<sup>45</sup> In 2012, Pew estimated that nearly 1 in 4 eligible Americans were unregistered.<sup>46</sup>

**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.<sup>50</sup> In 2016, 69 percent of black and 57 percent of Hispanic Americans were registered to vote, compared with 72 percent of whites.<sup>51</sup> Asian Americans were 16 percent less likely to be registered to vote than whites.<sup>52</sup> Furthermore, in 2012, only 66 percent of American Indians and Alaska Natives were registered—7 percentage points lower than their white counterparts.<sup>53</sup> 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.<sup>54</sup> Eligible Americans with disabilities are also less likely to be registered to vote—by about 2 percentage points—than people without disabilities.<sup>55</sup> 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.<sup>56</sup>

**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.<sup>136</sup> 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.<sup>137</sup>

**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.

**US democracy encourages freedom in other countries**

**US must lead on democracy to signal to other countries that democracy is better than authoritarian governments**

**Freedom House**, respected international organization that rates democracies, **2019**

(“Freedom in the World: 2019”, published 2019

[https://freedomhouse.org/sites/default/files/Feb2019\\_FH\\_FITW\\_2019\\_Report\\_ForWeb-compressed.pdf](https://freedomhouse.org/sites/default/files/Feb2019_FH_FITW_2019_Report_ForWeb-compressed.pdf) accessed DUDA-TM)

There should be no illusions about what the deterioration of established democracies could mean for the cause of freedom globally. Neither America nor its most powerful allies have ever been perfect models—the United States ranks behind 51 of the 87 Free countries in Freedom in the World—and their commitment to democratic governance overseas has always competed with other priorities. But the post-Soviet wave of democratization did produce lasting gains and came in no small part because of support and encouragement from the United States and other leading democratic nations. Despite the regression in many newly democratized countries described above, two-thirds of the countries whose freedom status improved between 1988 and 2005 have maintained their new status to date.

That major democracies are now flagging in their efforts, or even working in the opposite direction, is cause for real alarm. The truth is that democracy needs defending, and as traditional champions like the United States stumble, core democratic norms meant to ensure peace, prosperity, and freedom for all people are under serious threat around the world.

**Plan solves – early voting increases turnout**

**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.<sup>16</sup> Eliminating early voting has also been found to decrease turnout in communities of color.<sup>17</sup> 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.

**Early voting adds flexibility and opportunities 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)

Early voting aims to make voting more convenient for eligible voters by providing them with greater flexibility and opportunities to cast ballots. If implemented correctly and with sufficient resources, early voting has the potential to facilitate shorter lines on Election Day—particularly among communities of color—and to improve the voter experience.<sup>127</sup> At least 42 million people voted early in the 2016 elections.<sup>128</sup> Early voting that takes places on Sundays and “Souls to the Polls” events is particularly popular among communities of color.<sup>129</sup> In 2016, at least 52,000 voters took advantage of Georgia’s Sunday voting hours.<sup>130</sup>

**Plan solves – simplifying registration increases turnout**

**Combining early voting and easier registration could increase 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)

Although some research suggests that, by simply making the task more convenient, early voting mostly benefits people who would already vote, one study found that early voting can increase participation by about 2 to 4 percent.<sup>131</sup> When combined with SDR [Same Day Registration] and Election Day registration, early voting can increase voter participation by 4.2 to 11 percent.<sup>132</sup> In a 2018 survey of more than 900 voters in New York, 79 percent of respondents said that they would be more likely to vote if the state offered early voting.<sup>133</sup>

**Plan solves – simplifying registration increases turnout**

**Same day registration, during early voting or on Election Day, boosts voter turnout**

**Brennan Center, 2018**

(“Related Advancements in Voter Registration”. Brennan Center for Justice, July 24, 2018 <https://www.brennancenter.org/analysis/related-advancements-voter-registration>)

Election Day registration enables individuals to register to vote or update their registration on Election Day, either at the polls or at another location designated by election officials. This reform helps boost turnout by ensuring that all eligible voters are able to cast ballots, and it is no surprise that all six states with the highest turnout in 2016 had implemented the policy. Sixteen states plus DC currently or will soon offer Election Day registration. In addition, Maryland and North Carolina allow voters to register or update their existing registration during the early voting period, but not on Election Day.

**Same day registration would improve rates – studies support the relationship between same day registration and turnout**

**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)

According to the researchers behind the new report, the state's continued lack of participation likely stems from its failure to enact policies that make it easier for people to vote.

In order to truly change the state's fortunes, the report suggests, it needs to do one big thing and a couple of smaller things. First, Texas must allow same-day voter registration. Every state ranked 35th or lower in the new report does not have same-day registration. In Texas, prospective voters have to register a full month before the first election in which they'd like to cast a ballot, in addition to having an appropriate photo ID.

“If I could implement only one election reform to increase voter participation, it would be same-day registration,” Michael McDonald, associate professor of political science at the University of Florida, said in announcing the results of the new report. “Year after year, states with same-day registration have a turnout advantage over states without the policy, including a 7-point advantage in the 2018 elections.”

**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.

**Answer to: “Voter suppression isn’t a big problem”**

**While there may be some debate about how much voter suppression there is, there is no question it impacts minority voters more than white voters**

**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)

The real extent of voter suppression in the United States is contested. As was the case for poll taxes and literacy tests long ago, restrictive election laws are often, on their face, racially neutral, giving them a sheen of legitimacy. But the new data from PRRI and The Atlantic suggest that the outcomes of these laws are in no way racially neutral. The poll, conducted in June, surveyed Americans about their experiences with voting, their assessments of the country’s political system, and their interfaces with civics. The results, especially when analyzed by race, are troublesome. They indicate that voter suppression is commonplace, and that voting is routinely harder for people of color than for their white counterparts.

**Answer to: “Plan doesn’t outline details to expand voting”**

**Recommendations for expanding early voting focus on the dates and time and locations of the polling places.**

**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)

In implementing this policy, states should ensure that there is an adequate number of early voting locations conveniently located near public transportation. Early voting should be available on Saturdays and Sundays and should begin at least 14 days prior to Election Day, as research suggests that early voting is most commonly utilized by infrequent voters and nearer to an election.<sup>138</sup> Furthermore, states that already have early voting should not reduce or eliminate the policy since reductions of early voting have been shown to decrease participation in communities of color. When adopting early voting, states should avoid reducing the number of Election Day polling places, as doing so may result in long lines and may nullify some of early voting’s benefits.<sup>139</sup> Relatedly, states must ensure sufficient polling place hours in order to allow people opportunities to vote.<sup>140</sup> Today, most states require voting locations to be open for at least 12 hours. However, hours of operation vary significantly depending on the jurisdiction. Limited polling place hours can be problematic for voters whose workdays begin especially early and end late in the evening and for those who are unable to take time away from work.

**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.

**Answer to: “Democracy doesn’t improve public health”**

**Methods used in a comprehensive study shows significant relationship between democracy and life expectancy**

**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)

The study concludes that, as far as health is concerned, it is. Thomas Bollyky, the lead author, from the US Council on Foreign Relations, said: “This is good news at a time when the news around democracy has been fairly depressing. Health and elections are inevitably linked.” Researchers used existing measures of democratic experience compiled in the V-Dem database and plotted them against a range of metrics such as government health spending and disease outcomes. They then compared trends in countries that had transitioned from autocracy to democracy since 1970 with 55 states that had not. The impact of HIV was factored out, because the huge amount of foreign aid devoted to the virus would have skewed the findings. The conclusions were stark. Life expectancy at age 15 was 3% higher in countries 10 years after their transition to democracy than in counterparts that had not changed government type. Cardiovascular disease, tuberculosis, transport injuries and non-communicable diseases also fell as democracy bedded in.

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).

**Public faith in our election system already low**

**People's belief in the legitimacy of our elections has been eroded by social media not hacking**

**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)

If malicious actors want to impact public confidence in the American election system, they don't have to gain access to a voter registration system or manipulate vote tallies. Instead, they can sow confusion and discord with a tweet or social media post, or a full-on influence campaign.

**FALL 2019 ADVANCED 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 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

    Lack of election security causes foreign interference ..... 17

    Must put security over expanded rights – 2020 elections ..... 18

    Election security is essential to democracy..... 19

    Other countries will see and exploit our insecurity ..... 20

    Answer to: “States can’t eliminate all hacking threats” ..... 21

    Answer to: “history proves election tampering won’t cause conflict” ..... 22

    Answer to: “Congress will fund election security if states can’t pay” ..... 23

    Answer to: “states are getting money to improve their security” ..... 24

    Answer to: “election tampering is inevitable” ..... 25

    Answer to: “states have already secured elections” ..... 26

**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.<sup>39</sup> Distributing sample ballots can also help to improve the voting experience and reduce wait times at polling places.<sup>40</sup> 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.<sup>41</sup> The effects were especially notable for voters with little education and for young people.<sup>42</sup> 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.<sup>43</sup>

**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.

**Lack of election security causes foreign interference**

**Lack of security investment means 2016 vulnerabilities laid out in the Mueller Report remain**

**Andriole, Villanova University, 2019**

(Steve, "Mueller Was Right: Read The New Senate Report On Russian Technology Meddling In U.S. Elections" Forbes, August 1, 2019

<https://www.forbes.com/sites/steveandriole/2019/08/01/mueller-was-right-read-the-new-senate-report-on-russian-technology-meddling-in-us-elections/#31202e841ff2>  
accessed DUDA-TM)

The report also states that "in 2016, cybersecurity for electoral infrastructure at the state and local level was sorely lacking; for example, voter registration databases were not as secure as they could have been. Aging voting equipment, particularly voting machines that had no paper record of votes, were vulnerable to exploitation by a committed adversary. Despite the focus on this issue since 2016, some of these vulnerabilities remain." (Italics mine.)

**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.

**Russian hacking proves our systems can be exploited – the outcome of insecure elections is a weak democracy**

**Piore, writer for Newsweek, 2019**

(Adam, "Russia Is Using Cold War Strategy to Undermine the Faith of Americans in the 2020 Election—Will It Work?" Newsweek July 23 2019,

<https://www.newsweek.com/2019/08/02/elections-2020-will-take-place-cyber-battleground-that-puts-us-disadvantage-says-expert-1450351.html> accessed DUDA-TM)

Three years later, as the U.S. gears up for a new presidential election, Mook and other experts expect the Russians to strike again. They'll continue using their modern version of "agitprop" (a mashup of agitation and propaganda) that KGB officers—including a young recruit posing as a translator in Dresden, East Germany named Vladimir Putin—perfected during the Cold War. The overall intent of the Russians, most intelligence officials and Russia experts agree, has always been to "to spin us up, pit us against each other, sow divisiveness and discord, undermine Americans' faith in democracy," in the words of FBI Director Christopher Wray. Or as Richard Clarke, a former member of the State Department and the National Security Council and a seasoned Cold Warrior, puts it: what the Russians really want is for "the American people to give up on our system."

**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 can’t eliminate all hacking threats”**

**Need to take steps to assure integrity by getting rid of as many opportunities as we can**

**Biddle, 2018**

(Sam, “ARE WE MAKING ELECTIONS LESS SECURE JUST TO SAVE TIME?” The Intercept, September 4 2018 <https://theintercept.com/2018/09/04/election-results-voting-system/> accessed DUDA-TM)

To White and many of his peers, there’s one simple takeaway: Get rid of as many of those screw-up opportunities as possible. “Do we want to assure the integrity of our votes or not? If we do, and we want it at scale, then paper-verifiable, electronic voting systems [are] our best path forward,” White said. “The less complex and connected we can make those systems, the more faith we can have that every citizen’s vote cast is recorded.”

**Answer to: “history proves election tampering won’t cause conflict”**

**2016 wasn’t an example of election tampering – but it showed how our system COULD be exploited**

**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)

While the 2016 election brought election security to the forefront, there is no evidence or reason to believe that any voting equipment or vote tallies were tampered with. The election results are not in question.

The adversaries were successful at getting inside the system of at least one state: Illinois. This intrusion was detected by Illinois’ existing security measures, and there is no evidence that data was changed or altered. While the fact that bad actors were probing registration systems is disturbing, the discovery of this effort was good. It shown light on the already-strong cyber defenses in many states, and raised the commitment of federal, state and local officials to defend against these threats.

**State and local officials need to improve security for elections for 2020 specifically**

**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)

There is every reason to believe that election systems in the states will continue to be targets—and thus state and local officials need to improve their ability to detect, defend and respond to cyber incidents for what may come in the future.

**Answer to: “Congress will fund election security if states can’t pay”**

**Senate leader Mitch McConnell won’t let election security funding come to a vote – doesn’t want to pay out to help**

**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 Senate Intelligence Committee’s findings were bipartisan, they came on a day when Senator Mitch McConnell, Republican of Kentucky and the majority leader, moved again to block consideration of election security legislation put forward by Democrats.

Mr. McConnell has long opposed giving the federal government a greater hand in an institution of American democracy typically run by the states.

And despite the warnings about the Russia threat, he argues that Congress has already done enough — passing \$380 million worth of grants for states to update their election systems and supporting executive branch agencies as they make their own changes. Some administration officials have suggested that the issue is not getting enough high-level attention because President Trump equates any public discussion of malign Russian election activity with questions about the legitimacy of his victory.

**Answer to: “states are getting money to improve their security”**

**All the money from 2018 has been spent – there is a need for more going into 2020**

**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)

Through the Department of Homeland Security, elections have been designated a “critical infrastructure,” which gives states access to many kinds of voluntary support. And, on March 23, 2018, President Donald Trump signed the Consolidated Appropriations Act of 2018 into law, which included \$380 million in Help America Vote Act (HAVA) grants for states to make election security improvements. States were required to provide at least a 5 percent match within two years of receiving the federal funds and to submit a state plan detailing how the funds are to be used. States responded quickly, and the funds have already been distributed.

**Answer to: “election tampering is inevitable”**

**Hackers can't interfere with voting machines – only with voter registration, which is what the affirmative expands – they overstretch our registration system and put it at risk**

**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)

The Senate report was less concerned about election machines, which are off-line and usually hard to hack from afar, than the voter registration systems, which are online. Elections officials across the country said there were innumerable attempts from hackers abroad and inside the United States to breach their voter rolls and elections data — most of them amateurish, some skilled. The vast majority of them are turned back with basic firewall technology.

**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.

**Answer to: “states have already secured elections”**

**The states need significant upgrades to avoid hacking and election results insecurity – reliance on wireless as a part of the voting process proves the need**

**Biddle, 2018**

(Sam, “ARE WE MAKING ELECTIONS LESS SECURE JUST TO SAVE TIME?” The Intercept, September 4 2018 <https://theintercept.com/2018/09/04/election-results-voting-system/> accessed DUDA-TM)

According to one former federal election official who spoke to The Intercept on the condition of anonymity because he was not permitted to speak to the press, many states already employ wireless connections in one form or another and are loath to give them up now, even in the name of making the vote harder to hack. “Election officials do understand that it’s a security issue,” this person told The Intercept, “but this capability is already embedded into their election process and they rely upon it. Making that sort of logistical change to their process – during an election year – is arduous. This is especially true for results transmission on election night.” Some voting machines allow preliminary results to be beamed to a county office using the same kind of modem found in smartphones, rather than being physically carried from each polling station. This means early results can be shared instantly — but it also means that the data is only as secure as the cellular company carrying it. Such connections, which not only transmit data but also receive it, provide yet another potential weak point that hackers could use to pry into a machine and compromise it. Wi-Fi skeptics like George Washington University computer science professor Poorvi Vora have argued that such vulnerabilities must be eliminated. “We have to reduce all opportunities for interference. Our systems are only as secure as their weakest links,” Vora wrote earlier this year on an election security email list maintained by NIST, the National Institute for Standards and Technology.