


For all elections, national, state, and local, the best candidate is to be selected. The best candidate is, who the people believe, ~~to~~ to be the best for the position, for this selected politician is chosen to serve the people. Therefore the more people voting, the more the ^{individual} voice is heard. The people ^{who} choose to vote, do so because they feel more strongly one way or the other, and generally, ^{small fraction of} the people who vote, vote the same way, for the same candidate. However it is not in the Government's best interest to force people to vote. Why? The people who do not care, and do not have any interest in politics or how the country is run will ~~check~~ check the box next to any name, whether it be Bill Clinton or George Clooney.

Recently, in the U.S. there has been a large controversy amongst the people as to the legitimacy or the decisions made by the politicians elected to serve this country. The people who voted these politicians into office generally stand by their original vote; however the people who voted against them, or the larger proportion who did not vote at all are in upheaval. If people want to see a change, they need to get more involved themselves, or likewise if they want to stay out of it, they shouldn't have to be forced to vote.



Question #1

Write in the box the number of the question you are answering on this page as it is designated in the examination.

p. 2 of 3

Ancient Greeks established the first democracy, which is a widely known and accepted fact. However, a pure democracy proved not to be the best way to rule and govern a ^{thriving} society. Nevertheless there was something about this democracy that worked. People voted; they chose who they wanted to appoint them and agreed upon the rules that needed to be in place. Everyone was required to vote those thousands of years ago, however those rules and such things that were voted upon directly affected these people forcing them all to be knowledgeable and care about politics.

If ~~the~~ ^{the} people really want to take matters into their own hands, they will. In the French Revolution, the aristocrats were not governing the people, they were not serving them as they should. The people suffered too long and too hard. Finally: enough was enough. ~~So~~ Then, it was not a matter of voting, everybody did all they could to make life better. All the people of most modern societies need to do is become more politically aware and active. If change is to be seen, change must occur, first from the individual.

Making voting compulsory for all adults may seem like a grand idea in theory. In reality,

Write in the box the number of the question you are answering on this page as it is designated in the examination.

Question # 1

X


p. 3 of 3

however the people are only being "dictated" to vote for ~~something~~ ^{some} thing or somebody ~~who~~ who they don't give two hoots about. Nothing should be compulsory ~~unless~~ ^{unless} it challenges the morality of society or does harm (purposely or inadvertently) to others.

#

Voting has often been called the cornerstone of Democracy; its life and breath, the voice of the people. Without every person voicing an opinion on who runs the government and by what means, Democracy is not truly the opinion of the people but of those elite few who choose to exercise their Constitutional rights. Without voting, minorities can become majorities, and vice versa. Democracy cannot function unless every person has a say in who ~~is~~ represents the nation as a whole. Compulsory voting, then, is one solution to the ~~important~~ lack of interest in government functioning, and can alleviate the imminent danger of Democracy dying out forever as a result.

The Founding Fathers of America endowed the nation and its people with the right to voice an opinion and have it heard without fear of reproof. They also endowed the people with the power to ~~select~~ solely rule the nation. Irritated by the power of



7

Write in the box the number of the question you are answering on this page as it is designated in the examination.

p. 2 of 4

monarchs and ruling classes, Jefferson, Madison, and others created a nation "by the people, for the people," run by the supreme will of the people. Ironically, in the late 18th century, the only class of people who had the right to vote were landowning white males, hardly the majority of the people in America. Since 1776, however, America has truly expanded its voting rights to include all kinds of people, representing, indeed, the majority of America. In the 18th century, the people who voted were actually the minority, while the voice of the majority was silenced. Such a system ruled by the minority is little more than tyranny, which the founders of America wished to escape. Without every person exercising the Constitutional right to vote, America could again become a tyranny, and the will of the majority actually the will of the minority. The will of the people cannot be



Write in the box the number of the question you are answering on this page as it is designated in the examination.


1

P.3 of 4

accurately represented without all of the people representing themselves.

The right to vote is a duty as well as a privilege enjoyed by surprisingly few people around the world. In places where Democracy does not exist, the will of the people is never heard, or heard too late.

In Thomas Carlyle's history of The French Revolution, he illustrates the dangers of a nation run by an elite few who ignore the needs of the masses. The decadent French monarchs and nobility ruled as they saw fit, for their personal pleasures only. Eventually, however, the ~~the~~ voice of the people ~~was~~ was heard; it was shouted in ~~the~~ the booming of guns and cannons, screamed by the dying patriots and aristocrats, and brought home by a fury of blood and terror and death. In a democracy, it is difficult to imagine the voice of the people having to assert itself so violently, and yet if only the ~~the~~




minority of people voted, the will of ^{p. 4 of 4} the few could silence the will of the many, for a time. Unless the majority of the population expresses its voice in the governance of its country, ~~the~~ the voice has the danger of being expressed by more drastic means.

The majority of countries in the world today are not democracies. The people are very seldom asked for their opinion; on the contrary, they are usually forbade from expressing it. Unless ~~the~~ justice and ~~the~~ equality are insured ~~for~~ for all people in voting and governance, tyrannies and dictatorships will continue to thrive. Recently in Iraq, the ~~country's~~ ^{country's} first elections were ~~just~~ held. Despite the threats and fear of danger, a great number of people voted. They exercised their democratic right, a right they knew would prevent further terror and bloodshed. If all Americans did the same, the future of democracy would be assured well into the 21st century and beyond. #

~~Through~~ Through the course of time, men have been fighting for the rights of freedom and equality. While the right to vote is included in this list, so is the right of free will. No matter what laws are passed, a lack of voters is always going to happen. To mandate that everyone vote is not only an injustice of rights, but an illusion of success.

Americans speak adamantly about "free will" and the "freedom of speech". Yes, it is true that their voices have a right to be heard, but at the same time, they have a right not to be heard. We see people constantly arguing and even fighting to defend this right. However, to force them to use it is an infraction of the right itself; to force people to vote and voice their opinion is also removing the right not to vote; not to be heard. It is the "free will" of men which guides our actions. If not wanting to be heard is their choice, let it remain so. What if the voter has a difficult time choosing someone to be elected? Should they be forced to pick a name anyway? This would infringe on the basic rights America seeks so hard to defend.

In recent elections, we see how the outcome has invoked a sense of anger in the population. Attacks against George Bush are frequent; his approval rating has steadily declined, and complaints are common in every-day speech. The people voted for Bush, and while he does hold the office, many people chose not



1

Write in the box the number of the question you are answering on this page as it is designated in the examination.

p. 2 of 2

to vote. Talk was common during elections of "choosing the lesser ~~evil~~ of two evils". Perhaps it is a leap of faith, but is it not logical to assume that the ones who did not vote found it too hard to choose a "lesser evil"? To force them to choose could have disastrous results; perhaps worse than the current ones.

If people want to be heard, they will voice their opinion. If one election is bad enough, the people will make sure to make the next one better. After an occurrence of a bad election, it is logical to say that the population will voice their opinion louder to keep another occurrence from taking place; the non-voters will vote, the population will speak louder. To force an action only instills a sense of anger in the people; a society will have an easier time doing something if they see it fit, not if a law is passed to force them. Even if laws were laid down, some people would find a way to avoid the vote. ~~the~~ Some people ignore the vote because of their ~~to~~ political ignorance, others because of moral rights, and most because of their right not to be heard.

A forced action rarely has good resolve. By letting the common man decide for himself what is best, we allow a more stable, more productive, and more just course of action to take place.

#