**Compulsory Voting—Reading**

 Voting is key to civic participation in a democratic society. Elections are a vital way for people to express their views and promote change. Elections also are seen as affirming a country’s commitment to democracy. For a nation to be a democracy, every eligible adult citizen should have the right to vote. Governments that do not offer their citizens a choice to vote for more than one candidate are not generally viewed as real democracies. Evidence indicates that people around the world place great value on their right to vote.

 In democracies where open elections are relatively new, voter turnout is usually very high. But in other democracies, many adults choose not to vote. For example, in the 2004 American national elections, fewer than 60 percent of eligible voters cast ballots. Things are not much better in other democracies. When the first open elections were held in Lithuania in 1993, more than 78 percent of registered voters participated, compared with about 50 percent in the 2004 elections.

 In the 2006 election in the Czech Republic, about 65 percent of eligible voters cast ballots, a substantial drop from the 1992 election, when 85 percent of people voted. Estonia has seen participation fall from 78 percent in 1990 to 58 percent in 2003.

**Worries about Low Voter Participation in Elections**

Many experts and ordinary people in democratic countries are concerned about low voter participation in elections. Democratic societies have tried numerous ways to increase voter turnout.

Laws and practices that seem to increase voting include:

* Advertising or advocating voting.
* Mailing sample ballots and polling information in advance.
* Early voting before Election Day at convenient locations.
* Electronic systems or mail-in ballots, where citizens can vote from home.
* Election Day registration.
* Longer hours at polling places on Election Day.

Because of the importance attached to voting, some people who are concerned about low turnout have proposed requiring people to vote. This practice is called compulsory voting.

 **Civic Participation and Compulsory Voting**

 In several democratic countries—including Argentina, Australia, Belgium, Italy, and Mexico—citizens are required to vote in national elections. In these countries, voting is seen not only as a right but also as a civic responsibility. Compulsory voting also has a history in the United States. Simon Jackman of Stanford University notes that North Dakota (1898) and Massachusetts (1918) amended their constitutions to allow compulsory voting, but their legislatures never passed laws to make voting compulsory.

In countries with compulsory voting laws, each citizen must register and show up at the polls to vote. They are not required to vote for any particular candidate. Sometimes people deliberately spoil their ballots to show their disapproval of the listed candidates or just vote randomly for any candidate. Those who choose not to vote and do not have a valid reason must pay a small fine.

 According to the Australian Legal Information Institute, Australians who do not vote, lack a “valid and sufficient reason” for not voting, and refuse to pay the fine may be jailed, although this punishment is rare. In other countries with compulsory voting, the penalties for persons who choose not to vote are often not enforced.

 Generally, countries that have compulsory voting also have strong, nationally centralized voting systems. In Peru, for example, the voter registration system is coordinated by an official organization that maintains the national voting database. People are given a national voter identification card—with a photograph and thumbprint—when they reach voting age. Registration is transferred whenever a person moves.

 **Compulsory Voting: Advocates and Opponents**

 Advocates for compulsory voting make several arguments for why the practice should be adopted by democratic societies. First, compulsory voting laws do increase voter turnout. Political scientists Louis Massicotte, Andre Blais, and Antoine Yoshinaka, who study countries that mandate voting, estimate that compulsory voting increases voter turnout by 8 to 15 percent. The increase is most often seen among people who normally do not vote, particularly the poor and less educated. As Simon Jackman notes, “to the extent that compulsory voting increases turnout, compulsory voting also removes socioeconomic differences in electoral participation.” In other words, say advocates, the higher the rate of voter participation in democratic elections, the more those elections can be said to represent legitimately the will of the people.

Supporters also see important civic outcomes in compulsory voting. In their view, voting is a necessary part of a citizen’s work. While they acknowledge that this responsibility might compel people to vote against their will, as American legal commentator John Dean notes, “so is the compulsion to drive only on the right side of the road. Requiring citizens to vote is no more restrictive than requiring them to register for the draft. And it is far less restrictive than requiring us, for example, to attend school; to serve on juries, possibly for weeks or months at a time; to pay taxes; or to serve in the military when drafted…. Voting is the least a citizen can do for his or her country.” Furthermore, advocates claim an element of civic education through voting: if people know they must vote, they will pay closer attention to the issues and go to the polls more informed.

Compulsory voting laws will reinforce the idea that voting is a vital part of democratic citizenship. Opponents of compulsory voting argue that, at least in the United States, citizens do not want compulsory voting, a fact supported by a 2004 survey conducted by ABC News. In fact, opponents argue that low voter turnout may well be a sign of overall voter satisfaction, not disappointment, with the current system.

 Because voting is an expression of faith in the political system, opponents of compulsory voting also argue that deciding not to vote is one of the few tools citizens have to challenge corruption or fraud. When the people have reason to believe that their votes will not be counted, will be tampered with by election officials, or will be otherwise misrepresented, forcing them to vote compels them to endorse a false outcome. Canadian academic Filip Palda agrees: “The less legitimate politicians feel, the more they try to pass laws that build around their regimes a Potemkin façade of citizen involvement. This is why Soviet Bloc countries forced their citizens to vote.” Forcing people to vote in a corrupt or meaningless election actually weakens citizen power in a democratic society.

 In addition, opponents of compulsory voting worry about the central government’s control of the information that compulsory voting requires. Today, when computers and information databases can reveal so much about a person, decentralized control of election information is an important way to protect citizens from an increasingly powerful national government. More fundamentally, opponents argue that voting is not an obligation but a privilege. If the goal is to foster citizen participation, then there are easier—and better—ways than compulsory voting to foster civic engagement. By increasing the level of education people receive, countries can help their citizens better understand public issues and how to address them meaningfully. Reminding people that they must choose to vote fosters the personal responsibility necessary for every democracy. Finally, critics of compulsory voting say that forcing participation of millions of people who neither know nor care about an election is counterproductive. Is making voting compulsory a step toward greater participation by better informed voters, or a counterproductive strategy that will weaken citizen power? As democracies seek to engage more citizens in the vital act of voting, citizens must be prepared to deliberate this and other proposals aimed at making elections truly representative