

These Truths We Hold

Election Integrity, The Save Act & “Political Sensitivity”

Down to earth politics are the best politics.

Analysis of Brennan Center for Justice Article

The issue is **political sensitivity**. It is the abandonment of ordinary citizen responsibilities that everyone should reasonably be expected to fulfill. When these type of attitudes become widespread, they weaken the institutions and processes upon which the nation depends. In other words, this level of sensitivity weakens the security of the USA.

Citizenship carries both rights and responsibilities. Maintaining basic identifying records, complying with lawful administrative requirements, and participating in civic processes are among the most fundamental **obligations** of citizenship. These requirements are neither extraordinary nor burdensome. They are routine expectations in countless aspects of modern life.

The requirement to possess and present documents such as a birth certificate or other lawful identification is not an unreasonable demand. Americans routinely provide identification when obtaining employment, opening financial accounts, accessing government services, traveling, and completing numerous other legal transactions. **Election integrity deserves the same level of seriousness and accountability.**

Policies that discourage or excuse the maintenance of basic documentation do little to strengthen public confidence in elections. Rather, they contribute to public skepticism and **unnecessary controversy**. A healthy democracy depends not only upon access to the ballot, but also upon confidence that the electoral process is being administered fairly, consistently, and lawfully. We depend on citizens to make the right choices, the honest truth is, **we want voters to be dependable and responsible also.**

At a minimum, voters should be prepared to verify their identity and residence through reasonable documentation requirements. Proof of identity and proof of residence are longstanding and widely understood administrative safeguards. Likewise, **requiring an application for mail voting is a modest procedural step** that helps ensure the integrity and accuracy of the electoral process.

The maintenance of basic records and compliance with reasonable voting requirements should not be viewed as extraordinary burdens. They are among the **ordinary responsibilities of citizenship**. Americans are capable of meeting these obligations, and the preservation of election integrity warrants nothing less.

A nation cannot function solely on rights while disregarding responsibilities. Our participation requires both. The integrity of the ballot box depends upon citizens, institutions, and public

officials fulfilling their respective duties with diligence, accountability, integrity, and respect for the rule of law.

Public confidence in the electoral process is strengthened when lawful safeguards are upheld and when all participants meet these obligations. Election integrity and voter responsibility are essential pillars of a healthy constitutional republic. Summary: We seek integrity, safety and responsibility in our elections.

Source: <https://www.brennancenter.org/our-work/analysis-opinion/new-save-act-bills-would-still-block-millions-americans-voting>

Who, What, When, Where, Why & “*The Motive*” Non-Citizen Voting

Source: https://ballotpedia.org/Laws_permitting_noncitizens_to_vote_in_the_United_States

Who

The article was written by Eliza Sweren-Becker and Owen Bacskai for the Brennan Center for Justice.

What

The article argues that proposed SAVE Act legislation would make voter registration and voting more difficult for millions of Americans and should be rejected.

When

Published February 2, 2026, and updated April 19, 2026.

Where

Published by the Brennan Center for Justice, a legal and public policy organization affiliated with New York University School of Law.

Why

The stated purpose is to oppose the SAVE Act and warn readers about potential consequences for voter access and election administration.

Potential Biases

1. Advocacy Bias

The article is not written as a neutral news report.

Examples:

- "attack on the freedom to vote"
- "anti-voter provisions"
- "undermine Americans' freedom to vote"
- "antidemocratic and ill-conceived"

These phrases communicate a conclusion before presenting evidence.

Effect

Readers are guided toward a specific interpretation rather than being presented competing viewpoints.

2. Confirmation Bias

The article primarily presents evidence supporting opposition to the SAVE Act.

Missing discussion includes:

- Arguments made by supporters.
- Concerns about election security.
- Arguments regarding citizenship verification.
- Public trust arguments offered by proponents.

Effect

Readers receive one side of the debate.

3. Selection Bias

The article highlights evidence and examples that support its conclusion.

Examples:

- Citizens lacking passports.
- Married women with name changes.
- Younger voters.
- Voters of color.

Less attention is given to:

- Citizens who already possess qualifying documents.
- States that already require similar verification procedures.
- Arguments that administrative burdens could be reduced through implementation.

Effect

Focus remains on projected harms rather than possible benefits.

Potential Logical Fallacies

1. Appeal to Fear

Examples:

- "block millions"
- "wreak havoc"
- "chaos"
- "massive burden"
- "significant legal risk"

These statements may be accurate concerns, but they also invoke fear of severe consequences.

Why It May Be Considered a Fallacy

If catastrophic outcomes are asserted without proving they are likely, the argument moves toward emotional persuasion.

2. Slippery Slope

Example:

The article suggests the SAVE Act could:

- undermine elections,
- create chaos,
- discourage voting,
- create voter purges,
- expose officials to penalties,
- allow federal meddling.

Potential Issue

Multiple negative outcomes are linked together without fully demonstrating that each outcome necessarily follows from the legislation.

3. Loaded Language

Examples:

- "show your papers"
- "anti-voter"
- "freedom to vote"
- "meddle in elections"

These phrases carry emotional weight.

Effect

Readers may react emotionally before evaluating the underlying policy details.

4. Straw Man (Potential)

The article largely characterizes the legislation as:

an effort to stop citizens from voting

Supporters of the bill generally argue that its purpose is:

verifying citizenship and protecting election integrity.

If an opponent's argument is simplified or reframed into a weaker version, that may approach a straw-man argument.

5. Hasty Generalization

Example:

The article cites specific concerns about voter roll requests and federal actions, then implies broader election interference risks.

A critic might argue that isolated incidents do not necessarily prove future widespread abuse.

Persuasive Techniques

Framing

The title itself frames the debate:

"Would Still Block Millions of Americans From Voting"

Alternative framings could be:

- "Would Require Citizenship Verification"
- "Would Change Voter Registration Rules"

The chosen framing focuses on voter exclusion.

Emotional Appeals

References include:

- married women
- younger voters
- voters of color
- citizens lacking documents

These examples personalize potential harms and create emotional connection.

Repetition

The article repeatedly uses phrases such as:

- "millions of Americans"
- "block millions"
- "freedom to vote"

Repeated messaging reinforces the central theme.

Potential Omissions

A balanced analysis might also discuss:

Supporters' Arguments

- Preventing noncitizen registration.
- Increasing public confidence in elections.
- Standardizing citizenship verification.
- Existing identification requirements in other contexts.

Counter-Evidence

The article states:

"only American citizens vote"

A critic might argue the article should also examine:

- documented cases of noncitizen voting,
- registration errors,
- disagreements among election officials,
- competing studies.

Overall Assessment

The article is best understood as an **advocacy piece rather than a neutral news report**. Its persuasive tools are:

1. Framing the issue as voter suppression.
2. Emphasizing potential harms to large populations.
3. Using emotionally charged language.
4. Focusing heavily on projected consequences.
5. Giving limited attention to the arguments of SAVE Act supporters.

The article is written from a particular viewpoint and employs several common advocacy techniques, including **framing**, **emotional appeals**, selective evidence, and predictive arguments about future outcomes.

Union of Saints Opinion

We support election integrity and believe that elections should be safeguarded to protect the American people from fraud, abuse, and unlawful interference. Public confidence in the electoral process depends upon the consistent application of laws, accurate voter rolls, and reasonable verification procedures.

Concerns regarding voter fraud, illegal immigration, and the misuse of taxpayer resources have become significant subjects of public debate in recent years. Many Americans believe that stronger safeguards are necessary to ensure that elections remain secure, transparent, and accountable.

Americans deserve confidence that election laws are being faithfully enforced and that the electoral process is protected from abuse. For these reasons, we support the SAVE Act and its stated objective of strengthening citizenship verification and election integrity measures.

Let's keep the corruption out.