**Think** • Vol 00 • No 00 • Winter 2025, 1–2

DOI: https://doi.org/10.1017/S1477175625100572

# Voting: For and Against – ERRATUM

*John Hyman*

DOI: https://doi.org/10.1017/S1477175624000034. Published by Cambridge University Press, 17 April 2025.

Cambridge University Press and Assessment would like to apologise for a publisher- introduced error in Voting: For and Against (Hyman, 2024). The first three sentences of the second paragraph were mistakenly altered after the author had corrected the proofs, so that it read:

> In referendums, we can vote positively or negatively: either for or against. But we are only allowed to vote for candidates. The proposal is to bring this restriction to an end, as it does at present, whereas a vote against a candidate would decrease their total number of votes by one. When we vote about propositions, in referendums for example, we can vote positively or negatively: either *for* or *against*. But at present, we are only allowed to vote *for* candidates. The proposal is to bring this restriction to an end. This might not be desirable in every election, but it would certainly be desirable in some. I shall mention a couple of specific cases shortly.

The paragraph should have read as follows, and the online version has been corrected accordingly:

> The idea is simply to permit voters to choose whether to cast a vote for a candidate or against a candidate: a vote for a candidate would increase their total number of votes by one, as it does at present, whereas a vote against a candidate would decrease their total number of votes by one. When we vote about propositions, in referendums for example, we can vote positively or negatively: either *for* or *against*. But at present, we are only allowed to vote *for* candidates. The proposal is to bring this restriction to an end. This might not be desirable in every election, but it would certainly be desirable in some. I shall mention a couple of specific cases shortly.

The Publisher apologises for this error. Some additional corrections are noted below.

Page 5, Paragraph 1, Line 2, 'Why shouldn't we be able to vote *against* them instead?' should read: 'Why shouldn't we be able to vote against them instead?'

Page 7, Paragraph 3, Line 6, '…voting as if they this was what we had done…' should read: '…voting as if this was what we had done…'



Downloaded from https://www.cambridge.org/core. UNIVERSIDAD AUTONOMA METROPOLITANA, on 12 Nov 2026 at 19:59:18, subject to the Cambridge Core terms of use, available at https://www.cambridge.org/core/terms. https://doi.org/10.1017/S1477175625100572

Page 7, Paragraph 3, Line 13, '…makes voters more or less likely to do this than another…' should read: '…makes voters more or less likely to think negatively than another…'

Page 9, Paragraph 4, Line 14, indent 'The' at the text start to form a fifth paragraph.

## Reference

Hyman J (2024). Voting: For and Against. *Think* 23 (68), 5–10. https://doi.org/10.1017/S1477175624000034

**Cite this article:** Hyman J (2025) Voting: For and Against – ERRATUM. *Think* 1–2. https://doi.org/10.1017/S1477175625100572

© The Author(s), 2025. Published by Cambridge University Press on behalf of The Royal Institute of Philosophy. This is an Open Access article, distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-NoDerivatives licence (https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/), which permits non-commercial re-use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is unaltered and is properly cited. The written permission of Cambridge University Press must be obtained for commercial re-use or in order to create a derivative work.



Downloaded from https://www.cambridge.org/core. UNIVERSIDAD AUTONOMA METROPOLITANA, on 12 Nov 2026 at 19:59:18, subject to the Cambridge Core terms of use, available at https://www.cambridge.org/core/terms. https://doi.org/10.1017/S1477175625100572