

Proposition: ‘Currently, the two greatest threats to American democracy are (1) “a growing movement inside one of the country’s two major parties — the Republican Party — to refuse to accept defeat in an election”, and (2) “the power to set government policy is becoming increasingly disconnected from public opinion.” ’

GPT-4, with Michael L. Thompson

2024-03-04

## Contents

<b>Proposition: “Currently, the two greatest threats to American democracy are (1)”a growing movement inside one of the country’s two major parties the Republican Party to refuse to accept defeat in an election”, and (2) “the power to set government policy is becoming increasingly disconnected from public opinion.””</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>Summary</b>	<b>3</b>
1. Refusal to Accept Election Defeat within the Republican Party . . . . .	3
Evidence For: . . . . .	3
Evidence Against: . . . . .	3
2. Disconnection Between Government Policy and Public Opinion . . . . .	3
Evidence Against Supreme Court Decisions Aligning with Public Opinion: . . . . .	3
Evidence For Congress Not Reflecting Majority Wishes: . . . . .	3
Conclusion . . . . .	4
<b>Sub-Propositions</b>	<b>4</b>
There is a growing movement inside the Republican Party to refuse to accept defeat in an election	4
Evidence for sub-proposition 1 . . . . .	4
“The Jan. 6, 2021 attack on Congress attempting to prevent certification of the 2020 presidential election results” . . . . .	4
“Hundreds of elected Republican officials around the country falsely claim that the 2020 election was rigged” . . . . .	5
Conclusion . . . . .	5
Evidence against sub-proposition 1 . . . . .	6
“Search for recent statements or actions by Republican officials acknowledging the legitimacy of the 2020 election” . . . . .	6
Conclusion . . . . .	7
Conclusion . . . . .	8
Evidence For the Proposition . . . . .	8
Evidence Against the Proposition . . . . .	8
Conclusion . . . . .	8
The power to set government policy is becoming increasingly disconnected from public opinion . .	9
Evidence for sub-proposition 2 . . . . .	9
“Recent Supreme Court decisions, which are unpopular with the majority of Americans”	9

“Two of the past four presidents being elected despite losing the popular vote” . . . .	9
“Congress not representing the wishes of the majority of Americans because of fili- busters and gerrymandering” . . . . .	10
Gerrymandering . . . . .	10
Filibusters . . . . .	10
Conclusion . . . . .	10
Conclusion . . . . .	11
Gerrymandering . . . . .	11
Filibusters . . . . .	11
Conclusion . . . . .	11
Evidence against sub-proposition 2 . . . . .	11
“Search for recent policies or decisions that align with public opinion” . . . . .	11
Conclusion . . . . .	12
Conclusion . . . . .	13
Evidence Against Sub-Proposition 2: Supreme Court Decisions vs. Public Opinion . . . . .	13
Evidence For Sub-Proposition 2: Congress Representation and Majority Wishes . . . . .	13
Conclusion . . . . .	14
Critique of David Leonhardt’s argument . . . . .	14
“Assess the biases and reliability of David Leonhardt” . . . . .	14
Biases . . . . .	14
Reliability . . . . .	14
“Consider alternative propositions and evidence for and against them” . . . . .	15
Identified Threats to American Democracy . . . . .	15
Alternative Propositions . . . . .	15
Proposition 1: Strengthening Democratic Institutions . . . . .	15
Proposition 2: Electoral Reforms . . . . .	15
Proposition 3: Education and Civic Engagement . . . . .	15
Proposition 4: Addressing Economic and Social Inequalities . . . . .	15
Conclusion . . . . .	16
Conclusion . . . . .	16
Structure and Evidence . . . . .	16
Assumptions . . . . .	16
Potential Biases . . . . .	16
Conclusion . . . . .	17
<b>Search Results</b> . . . . .	<b>17</b>
“David Leonhardt ‘A Crisis Coming’: The Twin Threats to American Democracy” . . . . .	17
“recent statements by Republican officials acknowledging 2020 election legitimacy” . . . . .	17
“recent policies or decisions aligning with public opinion” . . . . .	18
“David Leonhardt biases and reliability” . . . . .	19
“alternative propositions to threats to American democracy” . . . . .	19
“evidence for alternative propositions” . . . . .	20
“evidence against alternative propositions” . . . . .	20
<b>How Was This Done?</b> . . . . .	<b>21</b>

1

---

<sup>1</sup>Proposition: ‘Currently, the two greatest threats to American democracy are (1) “a growing movement inside one of the country’s two major parties — the Republican Party — to refuse to accept defeat in an election”, and (2) “the power to set government policy is becoming increasingly disconnected from public opinion.”’ [threat\_democracy.pdf] © 2024 by Michael L. Thompson is licensed under CC BY-SA 4.0. To view a copy of this license, visit <http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-sa/4.0/>

**Proposition:** “Currently, the two greatest threats to American democracy are (1) “a growing movement inside one of the country’s two major parties the Republican Party to refuse to accept defeat in an election”, and (2) “the power to set government policy is becoming increasingly disconnected from public opinion.””

## Summary

The provided context outlines two significant threats to American democracy, as identified in the analysis: (1) a growing movement within the Republican Party to refuse to accept defeat in an election, and (2) the increasing disconnection between government policy and public opinion. This analysis synthesizes evidence from various sources to evaluate these claims.

### 1. Refusal to Accept Election Defeat within the Republican Party

#### Evidence For:

- **Origins of Claims:** The refusal to accept the 2020 election results began with allegations of election fraud by President Trump and his supporters, lacking substantial evidence.
- **Republican Officials’ Support:** A significant number of Republican officials supported these claims, through legal challenges and public statements.
- **Investigations and Audits:** Despite thorough investigations and audits, particularly in battleground states, no evidence of widespread fraud was found. The Cybersecurity and Infrastructure Security Agency (CISA) even declared the 2020 election as “the most secure in American history.”
- **Consequences:** These unfounded claims contributed to significant political and social consequences, including the January 6, 2021, Capitol attack.

#### Evidence Against:

- **Acknowledgment of Legitimacy:** Some Republican officials, including Whatley, have acknowledged Joe Biden as the legitimate president, indicating acceptance of the 2020 election results.
- **Rebuttals from Prominent Conservatives:** Reports indicate that prominent conservatives have rebutted Trump’s election claims, showing a faction within the party that respects the election outcomes.
- **Poll Findings:** A Forbes poll found that while many Republicans believe the election was stolen, a significant portion acknowledges the lack of evidence for election fraud.

### 2. Disconnection Between Government Policy and Public Opinion

#### Evidence Against Supreme Court Decisions Aligning with Public Opinion:

- **Roe v. Wade Overturn:** The decision to overturn Roe v. Wade went against the majority of Americans’ preference, showcasing a divergence between the Court’s ruling and public sentiment.
- **Gun Control and Death Penalty:** The Supreme Court’s decisions on gun control and the death penalty have often contradicted the majority’s preferences, indicating a misalignment with public sentiment.

#### Evidence For Congress Not Reflecting Majority Wishes:

- **Gerrymandering:** Manipulation of electoral district boundaries can result in a Congress that does not reflect the electorate’s actual political leanings.
- **Filibusters:** The use of filibusters in the Senate can block legislation supported by a majority, contributing to legislative gridlock and preventing the enactment of laws reflecting the majority’s wishes.

## Conclusion

The evidence presented supports the notion that there are significant threats to American democracy stemming from within the political and judicial systems. The refusal by a faction within the Republican Party to accept election defeat, based on unfounded claims of fraud, poses a threat to the democratic process. Additionally, the increasing disconnection between government policy and public opinion, as evidenced by Supreme Court decisions and Congressional actions not aligning with the majority's wishes, undermines democratic principles. These issues highlight the challenges facing American democracy and the importance of addressing them to ensure its integrity and responsiveness to the electorate.

## Sub-Propositions

**There is a growing movement inside the Republican Party to refuse to accept defeat in an election**

### Evidence for sub-proposition 1

**“The Jan. 6, 2021 attack on Congress attempting to prevent certification of the 2020 presidential election results”** The January 6, 2021, attack on the United States Capitol was a significant event in American history, marked by a violent breach of the Capitol building in Washington, D.C. This attack was perpetrated by a mob of supporters of then-President Donald Trump. The primary motivation behind the attack was to overturn the results of the 2020 presidential election, in which Joe Biden was elected president. The attackers sought to prevent the formal certification of the election results by Congress, a process that was taking place in the Capitol at the time.

Here is a step-by-step logical breakdown of the events and motivations surrounding the attack:

1. **Background of the 2020 Presidential Election:** The 2020 United States presidential election took place on November 3, 2020. The main contenders were the incumbent president, Donald Trump, a Republican, and former Vice President Joe Biden, a Democrat. After a contentious election marked by a high volume of mail-in ballots due to the COVID-19 pandemic, Joe Biden was declared the winner based on electoral college votes and popular vote.
2. **Claims of Election Fraud:** Following the election, President Trump and many of his supporters claimed that the election was stolen through widespread voter fraud and irregularities. These claims were widely disseminated through social media and some news outlets, despite a lack of substantial evidence. Numerous lawsuits filed by the Trump campaign and its allies challenging the election results were dismissed by courts across the country, including the Supreme Court, due to lack of evidence.
3. **Rally and Incitement:** On January 6, 2021, President Trump held a rally near the White House, where he reiterated his claims of a stolen election and encouraged his supporters to march to the Capitol to protest the certification of the election results. Trump's speech, along with similar rhetoric from some of his allies, is widely regarded as having incited the subsequent attack.
4. **The Attack on the Capitol:** Following the rally, thousands of Trump supporters marched to the Capitol, where a joint session of Congress was underway to certify the Electoral College results. The mob breached security perimeters and violently entered the Capitol, causing lawmakers and Vice President Mike Pence to be evacuated or shelter in place. The rioters vandalized offices, clashed with law enforcement, and caused widespread damage. The attack resulted in several deaths and numerous injuries.
5. **Aftermath and Certification:** The attack was quelled after several hours, and law enforcement regained control of the Capitol. Congress reconvened the same evening to complete the certification of the Electoral College results, officially affirming Joe Biden's victory. In the days and months following, hundreds of individuals involved in the attack were arrested and charged with various crimes.
6. **Impeachment and Accountability:** The House of Representatives impeached President Trump for a second time on January 13, 2021, charging him with “incitement of insurrection” related to his role

in the events of January 6. He was acquitted by the Senate on February 13, 2021.

The January 6 attack highlighted deep divisions within the United States and raised significant concerns about the strength of democratic institutions and the potential for political violence. It also prompted widespread discussions about the role of political leaders, social media, and misinformation in fueling such events.

For further detailed information, official sources such as the U.S. Department of Justice website (<https://www.justice.gov/>) and reputable news outlets provide ongoing updates and analyses related to the attack and its aftermath.

**“Hundreds of elected Republican officials around the country falsely claim that the 2020 election was rigged”** The claim that hundreds of elected Republican officials around the country have falsely stated that the 2020 election was rigged is rooted in the broader context of the aftermath of the 2020 United States presidential election. After the election, in which Democrat Joe Biden was declared the winner over incumbent Republican Donald Trump, there were widespread allegations of electoral fraud, primarily propagated by President Trump and his supporters.

1. **Claims of Election Fraud:** Following the November 2020 election, President Trump and many of his supporters claimed that the election was stolen through various forms of fraud. These claims were made despite a lack of evidence that could substantiate widespread fraud that would have affected the election’s outcome. Trump’s legal team and supporters filed numerous lawsuits in key battleground states, most of which were dismissed by courts due to lack of evidence.
2. **Response from Republican Officials:** In the wake of these allegations, a significant number of Republican officials, ranging from members of Congress to state legislators and local officials, echoed or supported claims questioning the integrity of the election. The exact number of Republican officials who made such claims might vary, but it is documented that several did, either by supporting legal challenges, making public statements, or objecting to the certification of the election results.
3. **Fact-Checking and Investigations:** Numerous investigations, audits, and recounts were conducted in several states, including battleground states where the election results were closely contested. These efforts, undertaken by both Republican and Democratic officials, found no evidence of widespread fraud that could have influenced the outcome of the election. For example, the Cybersecurity and Infrastructure Security Agency (CISA) called the 2020 election “the most secure in American history.”
4. **Impact and Consequences:** The propagation of claims about election fraud has had significant political and social consequences, including the January 6, 2021, attack on the United States Capitol. It has also led to a deepening of political polarization and has sown doubt among a significant portion of the American public regarding the integrity of the electoral process.

In conclusion, while it is accurate to state that numerous elected Republican officials have supported or propagated claims that the 2020 election was rigged, it is also important to note that extensive investigations and audits have found no evidence of widespread fraud that would have affected the election’s outcome. The narrative around the 2020 election’s legitimacy has been highly polarized, with significant implications for American democracy and public trust in the electoral system.

## Conclusion

The evidence provided for sub-proposition 1, which concerns the false claims made by hundreds of elected Republican officials that the 2020 election was rigged, can be logically analyzed and summarized through the following points:

1. **Origins of the Claims:** The claims of election fraud originated in the immediate aftermath of the 2020 United States presidential election, where Democrat Joe Biden was declared the winner over incumbent Republican Donald Trump. President Trump and many of his supporters propagated these claims, alleging that the election was stolen through various forms of fraud.

2. **Lack of Evidence:** Despite the widespread dissemination of these claims, there was a notable lack of evidence to substantiate allegations of widespread fraud that could have affected the election’s outcome. This is highlighted by the fact that numerous lawsuits filed by Trump’s legal team and supporters in key battleground states were dismissed by courts due to lack of evidence.
3. **Republican Officials’ Response:** A significant number of Republican officials, including members of Congress, state legislators, and local officials, echoed or supported the claims questioning the integrity of the election. This support was manifested through various actions, such as supporting legal challenges, making public statements, or objecting to the certification of the election results.
4. **Investigations and Audits:** In response to the allegations, numerous investigations, audits, and recounts were conducted in several states, particularly in battleground states where the election results were closely contested. These efforts, undertaken by officials from both political parties, found no evidence of widespread fraud that could have influenced the outcome of the election. The Cybersecurity and Infrastructure Security Agency (CISA) even called the 2020 election “the most secure in American history.”
5. **Consequences of the Claims:** The propagation of false claims about election fraud had significant political and social consequences, including contributing to the events leading up to the January 6, 2021, attack on the United States Capitol. This attack aimed to prevent the formal certification of the election results by Congress. The claims also contributed to a deepening of political polarization and sowed doubt among a significant portion of the American public regarding the integrity of the electoral process.
6. **Conclusion:** While it is accurate that numerous elected Republican officials supported or propagated claims that the 2020 election was rigged, extensive investigations and audits have found no evidence of widespread fraud that would have affected the election’s outcome. The narrative around the 2020 election’s legitimacy has been highly polarized, with significant implications for American democracy and public trust in the electoral system.

This analysis is based on the information provided in the context of the aftermath of the 2020 United States presidential election and the January 6, 2021, attack on the United States Capitol. It highlights the lack of evidence for the claims of widespread election fraud and the broad support for these claims among some Republican officials, alongside the significant consequences of these claims for American democracy.

## Evidence against sub-proposition 1

**“Search for recent statements or actions by Republican officials acknowledging the legitimacy of the 2020 election”** Based on the search results provided, there are several instances where Republican officials have acknowledged the legitimacy of the 2020 election or have made statements that indirectly support its legitimacy. Here are some key examples derived from the search results:

1. **Whatley’s Acknowledgment:** A CNN article from February 9, 2024, mentions that Whatley, who was a likely frontrunner for the RNC chair, had parroted Trump’s 2020 election lies but has since acknowledged Joe Biden as the country’s legitimate president. This acknowledgment implies a recognition of the legitimacy of the 2020 election results ([CNN, Feb 9, 2024](#)).
2. **Prominent Conservatives Rebut Trump’s Claims:** On July 14, 2022, CNN reported that prominent conservatives issued a report rebutting Trump’s election claims, stating, There is absolutely no evidence of fraud in the 2020 Presidential Election on the magnitude necessary to shift the result in any state. This statement from conservative figures and groups is a clear acknowledgment of the election’s legitimacy ([CNN, Jul 14, 2022](#)).
3. **Officials Declare 2020 Election ‘Most Secure’:** An AP News article from November 13, 2020, highlighted that top officials declared the 2020 election as the “most secure” in American history, insisting there was no fraud significant enough to affect the outcome. This statement, coming from officials who may include Republicans given the bipartisan nature of election security efforts, supports the legitimacy of the election results ([AP News, Nov 13, 2020](#)).

4. **Forbes Poll Findings:** Although not a direct acknowledgment, a Forbes article from March 14, 2023, discusses a poll finding that a significant portion of Republicans increasingly realize there's no evidence of election fraud in the 2020 election. This realization among the Republican base, even if not universally accepted, suggests a growing acknowledgment of the election's legitimacy within the party ([Forbes, Mar 14, 2023](#)).

These examples indicate a trend among some Republican officials and conservative figures toward acknowledging the legitimacy of the 2020 presidential election, despite the widespread claims of fraud and irregularities that have been promoted by some within the party.

## Conclusion

To construct evidence against sub-proposition 1, which concerns the acknowledgment of the legitimacy of the 2020 election by Republican officials, we must identify information or statements that contradict or challenge the instances of acknowledgment listed in the provided context. The sub-proposition 1 in question seems to be the acknowledgment by Republican officials of the legitimacy of the 2020 election. Evidence against this would involve instances where Republican officials either directly dispute the legitimacy of the 2020 election or support claims undermining its integrity.

Given the context provided, let's analyze each point for potential counter-evidence:

1. **Whatley's Acknowledgment:** The acknowledgment by Whatley, as reported by CNN on February 9, 2024, is a direct statement of acceptance of Joe Biden as the legitimate president. Evidence against this specific acknowledgment would involve finding subsequent or prior statements by Whatley or similar officials retracting this acknowledgment or continuing to promote election fraud narratives despite such acknowledgments.
2. **Prominent Conservatives Rebut Trump's Claims:** The report from July 14, 2022, by CNN, where prominent conservatives rebut Trump's election claims, is a clear stance against the narrative of a fraudulent election. Counter-evidence would involve identifying prominent conservatives or the same individuals involved in the report who either contradicted the report's findings at a later date or who have a history of fluctuating between acknowledging and denying the election's legitimacy.
3. **Officials Declare 2020 Election 'Most Secure':** The statement from top officials on November 13, 2020, as reported by AP News, declaring the 2020 election as the "most secure" in American history, is a strong endorsement of its legitimacy. Evidence against this would involve statements or actions by these or other officials that cast doubt on the security and integrity of the election, especially if such statements were made after the declaration of security.
4. **Forbes Poll Findings:** The Forbes article from March 14, 2023, discusses a poll finding a significant portion of Republicans acknowledging the lack of evidence for election fraud, yet many still believe the election was stolen. Evidence against this would be more recent polls or studies showing an increase in the belief in election fraud among Republicans or a significant public campaign by Republican officials to revive or endorse election fraud narratives.

To effectively argue against sub-proposition 1, one would need to gather and present evidence such as:

- Recent statements or actions by Republican officials that directly challenge the legitimacy of the 2020 election.
- Public opinion data showing a resurgence or persistence of belief in election fraud among Republicans, especially if encouraged by party officials.
- Any documented instances where officials have retracted previous acknowledgments of the election's legitimacy.

It's important to note that the search for evidence against the acknowledgment of the 2020 election's legitimacy by Republican officials would need to be conducted within reputable news sources, official statements, and credible polling data to ensure the accuracy and reliability of the counter-evidence presented.

## Conclusion

The context provided outlines a complex situation regarding the acceptance of the 2020 United States presidential election results within the Republican Party. The analysis of evidence for and against the proposition that there is a growing movement inside the Republican Party to refuse to accept defeat in an election can be synthesized as follows:

### Evidence For the Proposition

1. **Origins of the Claims:** The claims of election fraud began immediately after the 2020 election, with President Trump and many of his supporters alleging that the election was stolen through various forms of fraud.
2. **Lack of Evidence:** Despite these widespread claims, there was a notable absence of evidence to substantiate allegations of widespread fraud that could have affected the election's outcome. Courts dismissed numerous lawsuits filed by Trump's legal team and supporters due to this lack of evidence.
3. **Republican Officials' Response:** A significant number of Republican officials, including members of Congress, state legislators, and local officials, supported the claims questioning the integrity of the election. This support was manifested through actions such as supporting legal challenges and making public statements.
4. **Investigations and Audits:** Investigations, audits, and recounts conducted in several states, particularly battleground states, found no evidence of widespread fraud that could have influenced the election's outcome. The Cybersecurity and Infrastructure Security Agency (CISA) even called the 2020 election "the most secure in American history."
5. **Consequences of the Claims:** The propagation of false claims about election fraud had significant political and social consequences, including contributing to the events leading up to the January 6, 2021, attack on the United States Capitol.

### Evidence Against the Proposition

1. **Whatley's Acknowledgment:** The acknowledgment by Whatley, as reported by CNN on February 9, 2024, of Joe Biden as the legitimate president, represents a direct statement of acceptance of the 2020 election results.
2. **Prominent Conservatives Rebut Trump's Claims:** A report from July 14, 2022, by CNN, where prominent conservatives rebut Trump's election claims, indicates a clear stance against the narrative of a fraudulent election.
3. **Officials Declare 2020 Election 'Most Secure':** The statement from top officials on November 13, 2020, declaring the 2020 election as the "most secure" in American history, endorses its legitimacy.
4. **Forbes Poll Findings:** A Forbes article from March 14, 2023, discusses a poll finding a significant portion of Republicans acknowledging the lack of evidence for election fraud, though many still believe the election was stolen.

## Conclusion

The evidence suggests a complex picture within the Republican Party regarding the acceptance of the 2020 election results. While there is significant evidence of a movement within the party to question the legitimacy of the election, based on claims of fraud that have been widely debunked, there are also clear instances of Republican officials acknowledging the legitimacy of the election and the lack of evidence for widespread fraud. This indicates that while a faction within the party refuses to accept defeat, there is also a notable segment of the party that has accepted the election results and has publicly acknowledged the legitimacy of the 2020 election.



## The power to set government policy is becoming increasingly disconnected from public opinion

### Evidence for sub-proposition 2

**“Recent Supreme Court decisions, which are unpopular with the majority of Americans”** As of my last update in April 2023, there have been several recent U.S. Supreme Court decisions that have been controversial and, according to various polls, unpopular with a majority of Americans. It’s important to note that public opinion on Supreme Court decisions can vary widely depending on the issue, the wording of survey questions, and the timing of the poll. Here are a couple of notable decisions:

1. **Dobbs v. Jackson Women’s Health Organization (2022):** This decision overturned *Roe v. Wade*, effectively eliminating the federal constitutional right to an abortion and allowing individual states to set their own abortion laws. According to a Pew Research Center survey conducted shortly after the decision, about 57% of Americans disapproved of the Supreme Court’s decision to overturn *Roe v. Wade*, indicating that it was unpopular with the majority of Americans. [Pew Research Center](#)
2. **Brnovich v. Democratic National Committee (2021):** This decision upheld Arizona’s voting restrictions, which included out-of-precinct policy and a ban on ballot collection by third parties. Critics argued that these laws disproportionately affected minority voters. A poll by Monmouth University found that a majority of Americans supported laws making it easier to vote, suggesting that decisions upholding voting restrictions could be unpopular. However, the specific popularity of the *Brnovich* decision among Americans is harder to quantify without direct polling on the case. [Monmouth University Polling](#)

It’s crucial to understand that the Supreme Court does not make decisions based on public opinion but rather on its interpretation of the U.S. Constitution and precedent. However, the Court’s decisions can significantly impact public policy and societal norms, and they often reflect or influence the political and social debates of their time.

For the most current and specific data on public opinion regarding Supreme Court decisions, it’s advisable to consult recent polls and research from reputable sources such as Pew Research Center, Gallup, or specific academic studies focused on public opinion and the judiciary.

**“Two of the past four presidents being elected despite losing the popular vote”** The statement refers to the phenomenon in the United States where a presidential candidate can win the Electoral College and thus the presidency, despite receiving fewer popular votes than their opponent. This is possible due to the structure of the Electoral College system, which allocates a certain number of electors to each state, roughly based on its population. However, because most states award all their electoral votes to the winner of the state’s popular vote (a system known as “winner-takes-all”), it’s possible for a candidate to win the presidency by securing a majority of electoral votes while losing the national popular vote.

In the context of the past four presidential elections (as of my last update in 2023), the two instances where a president was elected despite losing the popular vote are:

1. **2000 Presidential Election:** George W. Bush vs. Al Gore. In this election, Republican candidate George W. Bush won the presidency with 271 electoral votes to Democratic candidate Al Gore’s 266 (one elector abstained). However, Al Gore received approximately 500,000 more popular votes than George W. Bush. This discrepancy was largely due to the controversial results in Florida, where Bush’s margin of victory was extremely slim, leading to a recount and a Supreme Court decision (*Bush v. Gore*) that ultimately awarded the state’s electoral votes to Bush.
2. **2016 Presidential Election:** Donald Trump vs. Hillary Clinton. In this election, Republican candidate Donald Trump won the presidency with 304 electoral votes to Democratic candidate Hillary Clinton’s 227. However, Hillary Clinton received nearly 2.9 million more popular votes than Donald Trump. Trump’s victory was attributed to narrow wins in several key battleground states, which gave him the edge in the Electoral College.

These instances highlight the unique aspects of the U.S. presidential election system, where the Electoral College plays a critical role in determining the outcome, sometimes leading to a divergence between the popular vote and the electoral vote. This system has been the subject of much debate and criticism, especially following elections where the popular vote and the Electoral College vote have diverged.

**“Congress not representing the wishes of the majority of Americans because of filibusters and gerrymandering”** The assertion that Congress does not represent the wishes of the majority of Americans due to filibusters and gerrymandering involves understanding how these mechanisms work and their impact on representation and legislation. Let’s break down the issue step by step.

### Gerrymandering

1. **Definition:** Gerrymandering is the practice of drawing electoral district boundaries in a way that gives one political party an unfair advantage over others. This can result in electoral districts that look bizarrely shaped and are designed to concentrate or dilute the voting power of particular demographic groups.
2. **Impact on Representation:** When districts are gerrymandered, the resulting representation in Congress can disproportionately favor the party that controlled the redistricting process, rather than reflecting the actual distribution of voter preferences across the state or the country. This can lead to a situation where the majority of seats are held by a party that did not receive a majority of the votes, undermining the principle of proportional representation.
3. **Data and Examples:** The Brennan Center for Justice provides extensive analysis and examples of gerrymandering and its impact on representation. Their reports highlight how gerrymandering can lead to less competitive districts and reduce the incentive for elected officials to be responsive to the majority of their constituents (<https://www.brennancenter.org/issues/gerrymandering-fair-representation/redistricting>).

### Filibusters

1. **Definition:** A filibuster is a procedural tactic used in the United States Senate to delay or block legislative action on a bill or nomination. It involves extending debate on the matter to the point where a vote cannot take place. Under current Senate rules, it typically requires a supermajority of 60 out of 100 senators to invoke cloture and end a filibuster, allowing the Senate to proceed to a vote.
2. **Impact on Legislation:** The filibuster can be used by a minority of senators to prevent the Senate from passing legislation or confirming appointments, even if those actions have the support of a majority of senators. This means that a small group of senators representing a minority of the American population can effectively block policies supported by the majority.
3. **Data and Examples:** The use of the filibuster has increased significantly over the past few decades, leading to gridlock and delays in the legislative process. The Brookings Institution provides analysis on the history and impact of the filibuster, including how it has been used to block legislation on issues ranging from civil rights to gun control (<https://www.brookings.edu/blog/fixgov/2020/01/21/the-filibuster-explained/>).

### Conclusion

Both gerrymandering and filibusters can contribute to a situation where Congress does not accurately represent the wishes of the majority of Americans. Gerrymandering affects the composition of Congress by manipulating district boundaries, while filibusters can block the legislative process even when there is majority support for certain policies. These mechanisms can undermine democratic principles by allowing minority rule and reducing accountability and responsiveness to the electorate. Addressing these issues would likely require significant reforms to electoral and legislative processes.

## Conclusion

To provide evidence for the sub-proposition that Congress does not represent the wishes of the majority of Americans due to filibusters and gerrymandering, we can analyze the information provided in the context of how these mechanisms impact legislative and electoral processes.

## Gerrymandering

1. **Mechanism and Impact:** Gerrymandering manipulates electoral district boundaries to favor one party, potentially leading to a Congress that does not reflect the actual political leanings of the electorate. This can result in a majority of seats being held by a party that did not receive a majority of votes, undermining the principle of proportional representation.
2. **Evidence:** The Brennan Center for Justice highlights the impact of gerrymandering on representation, showing how it can lead to less competitive districts and reduce elected officials' incentive to be responsive to their constituents. This is a direct link to the assertion that Congress may not represent the majority's wishes, as gerrymandered districts can secure seats for representatives even if their policies do not align with the majority of voters within their state or the nation ([Brennan Center for Justice](#)).

## Filibusters

1. **Mechanism and Impact:** The filibuster allows a minority in the Senate to block legislation or nominations, even if those actions have the support of a majority of senators. This means that policies supported by the majority of Americans can be stalled or completely blocked by a smaller group of senators, which can lead to legislative gridlock and prevent Congress from enacting laws that reflect the majority's wishes.
2. **Evidence:** The Brookings Institution discusses the increase in filibuster use over the past decades, leading to delays and gridlock in the legislative process. This supports the assertion that filibusters contribute to Congress not representing the majority's wishes, as they allow a minority to block policies supported by the majority ([Brookings Institution](#)).

## Conclusion

Both gerrymandering and filibusters contribute to a situation where Congress may not accurately represent the wishes of the majority of Americans. Gerrymandering affects the composition of Congress by manipulating district boundaries to favor one party, while filibusters can block the legislative process even when there is majority support for certain policies. These mechanisms undermine democratic principles by allowing minority rule and reducing accountability and responsiveness to the electorate. The evidence provided by the Brennan Center for Justice and the Brookings Institution supports the sub-proposition by demonstrating how these practices can distort representation and hinder the legislative process, leading to a Congress that does not fully reflect the wishes of the majority of Americans.

## Evidence against sub-proposition 2

**“Search for recent policies or decisions that align with public opinion”** Based on the search results provided, there are several instances where recent policies or decisions have aligned with public opinion:

1. **Supreme Court Decisions:** The New York Times article from June 15, 2020, suggests that the Supreme Court confronted a mix of political and social issues that were potent in the context of a presidential election year and a global pandemic. This implies that some of the Supreme Court's decisions during this period may have aligned with public opinion on major cases. The specific cases or decisions were not detailed in the snippet, but the context suggests a responsiveness to contemporary societal issues ([source](#)).
2. **Supreme Court and Public Opinion:** A Harvard Kennedy School article from July 13, 2020, discusses research showing that the nation's highest court's decisions on major issues closely align with

the views of the American public. This indicates a broader trend of the Supreme Court's decisions reflecting public sentiment on significant matters ([source](#)).

3. **Roe v. Wade Decision:** An AP News article from June 26, 2022, discusses the Supreme Court's decision to overturn its 1973 Roe v. Wade decision, noting that this was unpopular with a majority of Americans. This example is a bit different as it highlights a complex relationship between the court and public opinion, where a significant decision did not align with the majority's views ([source](#)).
4. **COVID-19 and Public Opinion:** The Institute for Policy Research at Northwestern University conducted a national survey that revealed a mental health crisis among America's young adults during the COVID-19 pandemic. While not a policy decision, this research could influence future policy decisions related to mental health and pandemic response, reflecting public concern over these issues ([source](#)).
5. **Public Opinion and Policy Changes:** An article from Katie Couric Media discusses the disconnect between what the American people want and the policies lawmakers pass. This suggests that while there is public opinion on various issues, it does not always result in policy changes, highlighting the complexity of translating public sentiment into legislative action ([source](#)).
6. **Supreme Court Decisions and Public Opinion:** A Gallup News article from July 7, 2023, discusses public opinion on recent Supreme Court decisions, including the decision on race as a factor in college admissions. This suggests ongoing interest and analysis of how Supreme Court decisions align or misalign with public opinion ([source](#)).

These examples illustrate the complex relationship between policy decisions, including those by the Supreme Court, and public opinion. While some decisions align with the majority's views, others may not, reflecting the multifaceted nature of governance and law in responding to societal issues.

## Conclusion

To provide evidence against sub-proposition 2, which suggests that the Supreme Court's decisions on major issues closely align with the views of the American public, we need to identify instances or data points where the Supreme Court's decisions did not reflect public opinion. Sub-proposition 2 is supported by a Harvard Kennedy School article, indicating a general trend of alignment between the Supreme Court's decisions and public sentiment on significant matters. However, to counter this, we can examine specific cases or broader trends where the Court's decisions diverged from public opinion.

1. **Roe v. Wade Overturn (2022):** The most prominent recent example against sub-proposition 2 is the Supreme Court's decision to overturn Roe v. Wade in 2022. This decision, as noted in the AP News article from June 26, 2022, was unpopular with a majority of Americans, indicating a clear divergence between the Court's decision and public opinion. Public opinion polls leading up to the decision showed that a majority of Americans supported maintaining Roe v. Wade, which had legalized abortion nationwide since 1973. The decision to overturn it, therefore, stands as a significant instance where the Supreme Court's ruling did not align with the views of the American public ([source](#)).
2. **Public Opinion on Gun Control vs. Supreme Court Decisions:** Another area where there appears to be a disconnect between public opinion and Supreme Court decisions is gun control. While specific cases were not mentioned in the provided context, it's widely reported that a significant portion of the American public supports stricter gun control measures. However, the Supreme Court has historically been protective of Second Amendment rights, often ruling in favor of expanding gun rights, which can be seen as not aligning with the majority public opinion favoring more restrictive gun laws.
3. **Death Penalty Cases:** Public opinion on the death penalty in the United States has fluctuated over time, with a general trend towards decreasing support for capital punishment. Despite this, the Supreme Court has upheld the legality of the death penalty in various decisions, maintaining that it does not constitute cruel and unusual punishment under the Eighth Amendment. This stance can be seen as not fully aligning with the shifting public sentiment against the death penalty.

4. **Public Opinion and Policy Changes Article:** The Katie Couric Media article discusses the broader disconnect between what the American people want and the policies lawmakers pass, suggesting that while there is public opinion on various issues, it does not always result in policy changes. This highlights the complexity of translating public sentiment into legislative and judicial action, further supporting the argument that there are instances where Supreme Court decisions do not align with public opinion ([source](#)).

These examples illustrate that while there may be a general trend of the Supreme Court's decisions aligning with public opinion on major issues, there are notable exceptions. These exceptions are significant because they involve fundamental rights and societal values, indicating that the relationship between the Supreme Court's decisions and public opinion is complex and not always aligned.

## Conclusion

The provided context discusses the disconnection between government policy and public opinion, focusing on two main areas: the decisions of the Supreme Court and the representation of the majority's wishes in Congress. The evidence presented against and for specific sub-propositions sheds light on the complex relationship between public sentiment and governmental action in the United States.

### Evidence Against Sub-Proposition 2: Supreme Court Decisions vs. Public Opinion

The evidence against sub-proposition 2 highlights instances where the Supreme Court's decisions did not align with the majority of public opinion. Key examples include:

1. **Roe v. Wade Overturn (2022):** The decision to overturn *Roe v. Wade*, legalizing abortion nationwide since 1973, was against the preference of the majority of Americans, showcasing a significant divergence between the Court's ruling and public sentiment ([AP News](#)).
2. **Public Opinion on Gun Control vs. Supreme Court Decisions:** There is a notable gap between the public's support for stricter gun control measures and the Supreme Court's decisions, which have historically protected Second Amendment rights, often expanding gun rights contrary to the majority's preference for more restrictive laws.
3. **Death Penalty Cases:** Despite a general trend towards decreasing support for the death penalty among the American public, the Supreme Court has upheld its legality, indicating a misalignment with shifting public sentiment.
4. **Public Opinion and Policy Changes:** An article from Katie Couric Media discusses the broader disconnect between public desires and the policies enacted by lawmakers, highlighting the complexity of translating public sentiment into legislative and judicial action ([Katie Couric Media](#)).

These examples illustrate that while there may be a general trend of the Supreme Court's decisions aligning with public opinion on major issues, there are notable exceptions, especially in cases involving fundamental rights and societal values.

### Evidence For Sub-Proposition 2: Congress Representation and Majority Wishes

The evidence for the sub-proposition that Congress does not represent the wishes of the majority of Americans due to filibusters and gerrymandering includes:

1. **Gerrymandering:** This practice manipulates electoral district boundaries to favor one party, potentially leading to a Congress that does not reflect the actual political leanings of the electorate, as highlighted by the Brennan Center for Justice ([Brennan Center for Justice](#)).
2. **Filibusters:** The filibuster allows a minority in the Senate to block legislation or nominations supported by a majority, contributing to legislative gridlock and preventing Congress from enacting laws reflecting the majority's wishes. The Brookings Institution discusses the increase in filibuster use, supporting this assertion ([Brookings Institution](#)).

Both gerrymandering and filibusters distort representation and hinder the legislative process, leading to a Congress that may not fully reflect the wishes of the majority of Americans. These mechanisms undermine democratic principles by allowing minority rule and reducing accountability and responsiveness to the electorate.

## Conclusion

The evidence presented against and for the sub-propositions illustrates the nuanced and often complex relationship between public opinion and government policy in the United States. While there are instances where the Supreme Court's decisions and Congress's actions do not align with the majority's wishes, these examples also highlight the challenges in translating public sentiment into policy, affected by practices like gerrymandering and filibusters.

## Critique of David Leonhardt's argument

### "Assess the biases and reliability of David Leonhardt"

To assess the biases and reliability of David Leonhardt, we can draw upon the information provided in the search results, focusing on sources that directly address these aspects.

### Biases

1. **Lean Left Bias:** According to AllSides, David Leonhardt has a media bias rating of "Lean Left" ([AllSides](#)). This suggests that his work may exhibit a slight preference towards liberal viewpoints or perspectives. The "Lean Left" rating indicates a subtle bias, rather than a strong partisan stance.
2. **Critique of Bad-News Bias:** Leonhardt has been described as seeing his role as an implicit corrective to the "bad-news bias" prevalent among his journalistic colleagues ([New York Magazine](#)). This suggests he may strive for a more balanced or optimistic perspective in his reporting, which could influence the selection and framing of topics.
3. **Good News Bias:** A review in the New Republic criticized Leonhardt for having a "good news bias," arguing that his optimistic outlook might be poorly calibrated for the reality of significant global threats ([New Republic](#)). This critique implies a potential bias towards positive news or interpretations, which could affect the comprehensiveness and balance of his reporting.

### Reliability

While the search results do not directly address Leonhardt's reliability in a quantitative or qualitative manner, several indirect indicators can be considered:

1. **Affiliation with Reputable Outlets:** Leonhardt's work is primarily associated with The New York Times, a publication that, despite criticisms of bias, is generally regarded as a reputable source of news and analysis. His position and the editorial standards of the outlet may lend credibility to his work.
2. **Recognition and Awards:** Although not explicitly mentioned in the search results, it's relevant to note that journalists associated with top-tier publications like The New York Times often adhere to rigorous journalistic standards. Awards and recognitions can serve as indicators of quality and reliability, though specific accolades for Leonhardt were not detailed in the provided information.
3. **Critiques and Controversies:** The critiques mentioned (e.g., good news bias, interpretation of pandemic data) suggest that while Leonhardt aims for a corrective to pervasive negativity, his approach and conclusions may not always align with all readers' expectations or interpretations of balance and reliability. These critiques do not directly undermine his reliability but highlight areas where reader discretion and critical engagement with his work are advisable.

In conclusion, David Leonhardt is perceived to have a lean-left bias and has been both praised and criticized for his approach to news interpretation, particularly regarding his optimism and focus on counteracting

bad-news bias. While direct assessments of his reliability are not provided, his affiliation with The New York Times and the nature of critiques suggest a level of professionalism and adherence to journalistic standards, albeit with a need for readers to be mindful of his acknowledged biases.

### **“Consider alternative propositions and evidence for and against them”**

To address the question of alternative propositions to threats to American democracy and the evidence for and against them, we need to first identify the primary threats to American democracy as discussed in the provided context. Then, we can explore alternative propositions that either mitigate these threats or offer different perspectives on the state of American democracy.

### **Identified Threats to American Democracy**

1. **Political Polarization and Partisanship:** A faction of politicians attempting to gain control over government to maintain power, as mentioned in the Carnegie Endowment article.
2. **Voter Suppression:** Laws that put minorities and other vulnerable populations at risk, contributing to the erosion of democratic institutions through disenfranchisement.
3. **Misinformation and Disinformation:** The online ecosystem rife with false information sows distrust among citizens and threatens democratic institutions.
4. **Political Violence:** Rising threats of political violence and increases in the number of local election officials facing harassment.

### **Alternative Propositions**

**Proposition 1: Strengthening Democratic Institutions Evidence For:** Strengthening democratic institutions could involve implementing more robust checks and balances, enhancing the transparency and accountability of political processes, and ensuring the independence of the judiciary. This approach is supported by the idea that a strong institutional framework can resist attempts at authoritarian control and maintain democratic norms.

**Evidence Against:** Critics might argue that focusing solely on institutional reforms may not address the underlying social and economic issues that lead to political polarization and disenfranchisement. Without addressing these root causes, strengthening institutions alone may not be sufficient to protect democracy.

**Proposition 2: Electoral Reforms Evidence For:** Electoral reforms such as ranked-choice voting, redistricting reforms to eliminate gerrymandering, and expanding access to voting through mail-in ballots and early voting can address issues of voter suppression and political polarization. These reforms can make the electoral process more inclusive and representative.

**Evidence Against:** Opponents of electoral reforms might argue that changes like ranked-choice voting could confuse voters or that expanding access to voting could lead to increased opportunities for electoral fraud, although evidence for widespread fraud is minimal.

**Proposition 3: Education and Civic Engagement Evidence For:** Enhancing education on civic responsibility, critical thinking, and media literacy can help combat misinformation and disinformation. Encouraging civic engagement can empower citizens to participate actively in democracy, fostering a more informed and engaged electorate.

**Evidence Against:** Skeptics might point out that educational reforms and efforts to boost civic engagement are long-term solutions that may not address immediate threats to democracy. Additionally, there may be disagreements on the curriculum or the approach to teaching media literacy.

**Proposition 4: Addressing Economic and Social Inequalities Evidence For:** Addressing economic and social inequalities can reduce political polarization by alleviating some of the grievances that fuel populist and anti-democratic movements. Policies aimed at reducing inequality can help create a more equitable society where democracy can thrive.



**Evidence Against:** Critics might argue that focusing on economic and social inequalities diverts attention from more direct threats to democracy, such as electoral interference or authoritarian tendencies among political leaders. Additionally, there may be significant disagreement on the best ways to address these inequalities.

## Conclusion

The alternative propositions to threats to American democracy involve a multifaceted approach that includes strengthening democratic institutions, implementing electoral reforms, enhancing education and civic engagement, and addressing economic and social inequalities. Each proposition has its evidence for and against, highlighting the complexity of protecting and promoting democracy in the contemporary United States.

## Conclusion

Critiquing David Leonhardt’s argument, or any argument, involves examining the structure, evidence, assumptions, and potential biases of the argument. Given the context provided, we do not have a specific argument from David Leonhardt to critique directly. However, we can apply general principles of critique based on the information about his biases and reliability, as well as the alternative propositions to threats to American democracy that were outlined.

## Structure and Evidence

A well-structured argument presents a clear thesis, supports it with evidence, addresses counterarguments, and concludes logically. Leonhardt’s work, as described, seems to aim for a balanced perspective by attempting to correct a “bad-news bias” with a more optimistic outlook. This approach can be both a strength and a weakness:

- **Strength:** It can provide a refreshing perspective that highlights progress and solutions, which might be overlooked in a predominantly negative news landscape.
- **Weakness:** An overly optimistic perspective, or a “good news bias,” might downplay or overlook significant threats and challenges. This could lead to underestimating the severity of issues like those threatening American democracy.

## Assumptions

Every argument is based on certain assumptions. In the case of Leonhardt’s work, one might infer that he assumes an optimistic perspective can counterbalance the prevalent negative biases in news reporting. This assumption is both valuable and risky:

- **Valuable:** It challenges readers to consider positive developments and solutions, potentially fostering a more constructive public discourse.
- **Risky:** If the optimism is not well-calibrated to reality, it might lead to complacency or a lack of urgency in addressing critical issues.

## Potential Biases

The biases attributed to Leonhardt, including a lean-left bias and a tendency towards optimism, are crucial in critiquing his arguments:

- **Lean-Left Bias:** This might influence which issues he considers most pressing or how he interprets certain policies’ effectiveness. For instance, in discussing threats to American democracy, he might focus more on voter suppression and misinformation, which are often emphasized in liberal discourse, while potentially giving less attention to issues like political violence or economic inequalities that do not fit as neatly into a left-leaning narrative.
- **Optimism Bias:** While optimism can be beneficial, it’s important to critically assess whether it leads to underrepresenting or misunderstanding the severity and complexity of threats to democracy. For



example, emphasizing solutions without fully acknowledging the depth of polarization or the resilience of misinformation could mislead readers about the ease of overcoming these challenges.

## Conclusion

In critiquing David Leonhardt's argument, or the approach he takes in his work, it's essential to consider the balance he strives for against the biases he may hold. While aiming to counteract a pervasive negative bias in news reporting is commendable, it's crucial to ensure that this does not lead to an underestimation of serious issues. A critical reader should weigh his optimistic perspectives against the evidence and consider alternative viewpoints, especially on complex issues like the threats to American democracy. This balanced approach to critique allows for a more nuanced understanding of the issues at hand and the potential biases in their presentation.

## Search Results

### “David Leonhardt ‘A Crisis Coming’: The Twin Threats to American Democracy”

- [‘A Crisis Coming’: The Twin Threats to American Democracy](#): The Great Depression caused Americans to doubt the country's economic system. World War II and the Cold War presented threats from global ...
- [Anderson Quoted in ‘NYT’ Piece on the ‘Twin Threats’ to American ...](#): ... Crisis Coming’: The Twin Threats to American Democracy.” Leonhardt describes these threats as: first, the growing movement within the ...
- [\[Solved\] In regards to “A Crisis Coming; the twin threats to american...: ... Democracy,” David Leonhardt identifies two main categories of threats to American democracy: A growing movement inside the Republican Party ...](#)
- [\[PDF\] ‘A Crisis Coming’: The Twin Threats to American Democracy: ‘A Crisis Coming’: The Twin Threats to American Democracy. David Leonhardt New York Times](#) <https://news.yahoo.com/crisis-coming-twin-threats-american> ...
- [‘A Crisis Coming’: The Twin Threats to American Democracy](#): Must-Read David Leonhardt NYT: ‘A Crisis Coming’: The Twin Threats to American Democracy. September 17, 2022, 3:51 pm election subversion riskRick Hasen.
- [Politics of the United States - Wikipedia](#): ... Leonhardt, David (September 17, 2022). “DEMOCRACY CHALLENGED ‘A Crisis Coming’: The Twin Threats to American Democracy”. The New York Times. Retrieved ...
- [Democracy Challenged - The New York Times](#): Representative government faces its most serious threats in decades.
- [Neither Democrats nor democrats - Inside Story](#): ... America Great Again movement as an existential threat to ... David Leonhardt has identified twin threats facing the nation's democratic status.
- [\[PDF\] STEVEN LEVITSKY & DANIEL ZIBLATT - European University Institute](#): In our view, this scenario represents the great- est danger facing American democracy today. ... Colombia's democratic institutions did not come under threat. In ...
- [‘A crisis coming’: the twin threats to American democracy - ParlInfo](#): ‘A crisis coming’: the twin threats to American democracy. Database. Press Clippings ... Author. LEONHARDT, David. Citation Id. 8801102. Cover date. 21 September, ...

### “recent statements by Republican officials acknowledging 2020 election legitimacy”

- [What GOP Members of Congress think of Trump's election fraud claims](#): ... statement days after the election calling for investigations into fraud. ... He has also called on the country to acknowledge Biden's legitimacy. We cannot ...

- [Why do millions of Americans believe the 2020 presidential election ...](#): One reason may be that Donald Trump is not really a non-incumbent. More importantly, he is seen by a majority of his base as the only legitimate ...
- [Likely frontrunner for RNC chair parroted Trump's 2020 election lies](#): Whatley, who has since acknowledged Joe Biden is the country's legitimate ... voter fraud claims on multiple occasions following the 2020 election ...
- [Republican reactions to Donald Trump's claims of 2020 election fraud](#): and Eric Trump, rebuked other Republicans for staying silent and not supporting the President's allegations of electoral fraud. According to a Reuters/Ipsos ...
- [Lying about 2020 fraud was just 'a political game' to one Republican](#): In a general election debate in October, Bolduc suggested that there was, in fact, rampant fraud in his state. We need to make sure that school ...
- [These Republican Candidates Questioned the 2020 Election. Many ...](#): ... legitimacy of the 2020 election. And they are the new normal of the Republican Party. About the data Karen Yourish and Danielle Ivory ...
- [Prominent conservatives issue report rebutting Trump election claims](#): There is absolutely no evidence of fraud in the 2020 Presidential Election on the magnitude necessary to shift the result in any state, let ...
- [Repudiating Trump, officials say election 'most secure' | AP News](#): He insisted there was no fraud in his state, which Biden easily carried. \_\_\_\_\_. <https://www.cisa.gov/news/2020/11/12/joint-statement-elections-> ...
- [Republicans Increasingly Realize There's No Evidence Of Election ...](#): ... Election FraudBut Most Still Think 2020 Election Was Stolen Anyway, Poll Finds ... Republicans believing there's evidence of fraud: 61% thought ...
- [A timeline of Donald Trump's election denial claims ... - ABC News](#): Trump also warned of voter fraud ahead of the 2018 midterms, when Democrats ultimately won back control of the House of Representatives. "Law ... Show results with:acknowledging

### **“recent policies or decisions aligning with public opinion”**

- [The Supreme Court Aligned With Public Opinion in Most Major ...](#): The justices confronted an unusually potent mix of political and social issues in the middle of both a presidential election year and a ...
  - [U.S. Supreme Court v. American public opinion: the verdict is in](#): Q&A with Maya Sen: Research survey shows nation's highest court to be closely aligned to views of American public on major issues decided ...
  - [Roe ruling shows complex relationship between court, public](#): The Supreme Court ruling to overturn its 1973 Roe v. Wade decision is unpopular with a majority of Americans but did that matter?
  - [COVID-19 and Public Opinion - Institute for Policy Research](#): Yet a mental health crisis among America's young adults persists, according to a recent national survey by IPR political scientist James Druckman. The survey ...
  - [Why Does Popular Support Not Result in Policy Changes? | KCM](#): If you feel like there's a disconnect between what the American people want and the policies that lawmakers pass, you're not alone.
  - [Does public opinion polling about issues still work?](#): Pre-election polls in both years struggled to capture the strength of support for former President Donald Trump and other Republican candidates.
  - [How Public Opinion Constrains the U.S. Supreme Court - jstor](#): Does public opinion directly influence decisions or do justices simply respond to the same social forces that simultaneously shape the public mood? To answer ...
  - [Public Opinion and Recent Supreme Court Decisions - Gallup News](#):
- v. President and Fellows of Harvard College decision, which struck down the use of race as an explicit factor in college admissions decisions; ...
- [Public opinion can play a positive role in policy making - The Guardian](#): Public opinion can have various effects on how policy is made or viewed. Marcus Hobley sifts through the sometimes troubled

relationship.

- [Research: Public Opinion Is Not Enough to Hold Companies . . .](#): While the court of public opinion can be an effective tool to push companies to avoid involvement with human rights abuses, new research . . .

## “David Leonhardt biases and reliability”

- [David Leonhardt Media Bias | AllSides](#): David Leonhardt is a author source with an AllSides Media Bias Rating™ of Lean Left. What a “Lean Left” Rating Means. Sources with an AllSides Media Bias Rating . . .
- [David Leonhardt, the Pandemic Interpreter - New York Magazine](#): Leonhardt, who has described his journalistic colleagues as having a bad-news bias, sees his role as being an implicit corrective to some . . .
- [Opinion | The Six Forms of Media Bias - The New York Times](#): Affluent bias. The media isn’t just biased toward the center. It often confuses the center with views that are actually those of the affluent.
- [Why Is David Leonhardt So Happy?: A Review of The Morning](#): And Leonhardt’s own good news bias is terrifyingly poorly calibrated for the reality of a possible conflict between nuclear superpowers, a . . .
- [The Media Is Biased, But Not in the Way You Think - GEN - Medium](#): The mainstream media is biased. It is not a political bias, though, no liberal or conservative slant, but something even more insidious: a bad- . . .
- [Bad News Bias - The New York Times](#): David Leonhardt and Times journalists guide you through what’s happening and why it matters. Sign up for the Morning newsletter. Republicans . . .
- [This chart will tell you how biased your favorite news source is: The Ad Fontes’ Media Bias Chart](#) maps out the biases and reliability . . . New York Times columnist David Leonhardt identifies six forms of media . . .
- [A history of the American Dream asks whether it still exists](#): Given Leonhardt’s support for what he calls democratic capitalism, it’s strange that he never explores the model of worker-owned cooperatives, . . .
- [New York Times - Opinion Media Bias - AllSides](#): Learn the media bias rating of the New York Times Opinion section. AllSides rates the media bias of hundreds of media outlets, journalists and sources.
- [The NYT’s polarizing pandemic pundit - Politico](#): The critics fault Leonhardt for drawing too sharp a line between the at risk 65 and up population and the low risk 65 and under group. . . . Show results with:reliability

## “alternative propositions to threats to American democracy”

- [Five Strategies to Support U.S. Democracy](#): An acute threat is emanating from a faction of Republican politicians who are trying to gain control over government to maintain power by . . .
- [10 Ideas to Fix Democracy - Foreign Policy](#): And in light of the growing conflict between democratic and autocratic powers, it’s no surprise that better defenses against external threats . . .
- [8 Ways To Protect American Democracy](#): These anti-democratic sentiments can be seen in rising threats of political violence,<sup>3</sup> increases in the number of local election officials . . .
- [PRRI’s 2023 American Values Survey](#): Threats to American Democracy Ahead of an Unprecedented Presidential Election. 10.25.2023. Topics: Politics & Elections Religion & Culture. Introduction.
- [Four threats to American democracy | University of California](#): Four threats to American democracy In a democracy, one can propose and discuss virtually any idea, even if it is initially unpalatable to the . . .
- [What’s Next for American Democracy?:](#) For all these reasons, we believe Americans who yearn to sustain and enhance effective democratic government must be alert to three possible threat scenarios . . .
- [From Crisis to Reform: A Call to Strengthen America’s Battered . . .](#): . . . in US democracy, fortifying it against emerging threats, and enabling it to serve as an attractive model and a source of effective leadership for the world.

- [Democracy Hypocrisy: Examining America's Fragile Democratic ...](#): ... American democracy while defending against new threats. Democracy Fund has invested more than \$275 million in support of those working to ...
- [Democratic Threats and Resilience | Einaudi Center](#): The political criticism and meaningful dissent that democracies encourage is an existential threat to any authoritarian regime. Researchers across the Einaudi ...
- [Three Harvard scholars on threats to democracy](#): Q&A. Theda Skocpol, Archon Fung, Erica Chenoweth. GAZETTE: What are the biggest threats to U.S. democracy as we head into the midterm elections? Show results with:propositions

## “evidence for alternative propositions”

- [Alternative hypothesis - Wikipedia](#): In statistical hypothesis testing, to prove the alternative hypothesis is true, it should be shown that the data is contradictory to the null hypothesis. ...
- [Prop: Propositions and Evidence - Software Foundations](#): PropPropositions and Evidence. Require Export Logic. Inductively Defined ... Another alternative is to define the concept of evenness directly. Instead ...
- [Evaluation of biological traces considering activity level propositions](#): Propositions are short summaries of the facts under dispute. The undisputed additional relevant information will however be disclosed in the statement. 4. The ...
- [Evaluation of Forensic DNA Traces When Propositions of Interest ...](#): The aim of this paper is twofoldfirstly, to discuss recurrent concerns and reservations about, and sometimes fear of, evaluations of probative ...
- [Prop: Propositions and Evidence](#): In previous chapters, we have seen many examples of factual claims (propositions) and ways of presenting evidence of their truth (proofs).
- [When Evaluating DNA Evidence within a Likelihood Ratio ...](#): This article reports on a project to develop a rational approach to forming propositions when little information is available from the outset, ...
- [\[PDF\] Questions, propositions and assessing different levels of evidence](#): taken by many experts is to assess the strength of evidence based on the alternative proposition that the shoemark must have been left by a trainer of a similar ...
- [Disjunctive \(or alternative\) propositions. - APA PsycNet](#): Propositions of the form Either X or Y is true are ordinarily called disjunctive. It has been pointed out, however, that two propositions are really ...
- [THEORETICAL ALTERNATIVES TO PROPOSITIONS - ProQuest](#): This paper defends the view that propositions—that is, what are picked about by complement clauses and the range of quantifiers like that in 'Sanna ...
- [Null and Alternative Hypotheses | Definitions & Examples](#): The null and alternative hypotheses are two competing claims that researchers weigh evidence for and against using a statistical test:.

## “evidence against alternative propositions”

- [Proposition 1 Arguments and Rebuttals](#): REBUTTAL TO ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION 1 ... Opponents of Proposition 1 want to ignore the crisis of homelessness, mental illness and substance abuse plaguing ...
- [Evaluation of Forensic DNA Traces When Propositions of Interest ...](#): So-called source level propositions deal with the origin of traces, for example, The bloodstain on the broken window comes from Mr. A vs. The ...
- [Evaluation of biological traces considering activity level propositions](#): The scientist assigns the probability of the evidence, if each of the alternate propositions is true, to derive a likelihood ratio. To do this, the scientist ...
- [Alternative hypothesis - Wikipedia](#): In statistical hypothesis testing, to prove the alternative hypothesis is true, it should be shown that the data is contradictory to the null hypothesis. ...
- [\[PDF\] Questions, propositions and assessing different levels of evidence](#): taken by many experts is to

assess the strength of evidence based on the alternative proposition that the shoemark must have been left by a trainer of a similar ...

- [Exposing the evidence gap for complementary and alternative ...](#): The bottom line is that, for results from open pragmatic trials to be trusted, research is required to measure the clinical importance of true placebo effects, ...
- [Is Spending More Potent for or against a Proposition? Evidence from ...](#): The recent academic literature suggests that pressure from special interest groups has little or no influence on whether initiatives and ...
- [Prop: Propositions and Evidence](#): In previous chapters, we have seen many examples of factual claims (propositions) and ways of presenting evidence of their truth (proofs).
- [Prop: Propositions and Evidence - Software Foundations](#): This isn't a fundamentally new kind of proposition; it is still just an equality. Another alternative is to define the concept of evenness directly. Instead of ...
- [Reasonable Doubt from Unconceived Alternatives - SpringerLink](#): In criminal trials, judges or jurors have to decide whether the facts described in the indictment are proven beyond a reasonable doubt.

## How Was This Done?

Generated by [Michael L. Thompson](#) with OpenAI's GPT-4 (gpt-4-turbo-preview).

- **Python-based Jupyter Lab Notebook**: The contents of this document were generated through coded prompting of **OpenAI's GPT-4** using the Python package [instructor](#) by Jason Liu.
  - Input: the text string “Currently, the two greatest threats to American democracy are (1)”a growing movement inside one of the country’s two major parties the Republican Party to refuse to accept defeat in an election”, and (2) “the power to set government policy is becoming increasingly disconnected from public opinion.”“.
  - Output: this report as an R Markdown text file.
- **GPT-4 Plan Generation**: GPT-4 autonomously generated the query plan (using code based off of an [instructor](#) example).
- **GPT-4 Plan Execution**: GPT-4 then autonomously executed the plan, which involved the following:
  - writing search queries and initiating calls to [Serper \(Google Search API\)](#) for searching,
  - generating responses to the questions in the plan using the searches as context, and
  - creating all text in the Outline, Summary, and Sub-Propositions sections.
- **Python Report Generation**: The Python code then consolidated GPT-4 responses into an R Markdown text file.
- **Manual Rendering**: Manually, this section was written, the Query Plan Outline was re-formatted, and, via **RStudio**, the PDF document was rendered. A few miscellaneous manual formatting corrections were also done. No other content was manually generated or edited.