## Midterms Disad

### OFF

#### Republicans winning now---only reviving popularity can save Dems.

Andrew Prokop 4/26/22. "Why Republicans are favored to win the Senate — and how Democrats could stop them". Vox. 4-26-2022. https://www.vox.com/23030164/senate-2022-midterm-elections-battlegrounds

Democrats’ control of the 50-50 Senate could well be washed away by a red wave in this fall’s midterm elections.

Republicans appear favored to win back the Senate for two simple reasons. First, the national environment has moved in their favor. Biden’s approval rating is low. The GOP has improved in generic ballot polls and won the governor’s seat in Virginia last November.

Second, the Senate is already split 50-50, so a net gain of even just one seat for Republicans would flip the chamber into their hands.

However, Democrats do still have a way to hold on. The main thing they have going for them is a decent map — they aren’t defending any seats in states Trump won in 2020, while Republicans are defending two states Biden narrowly won. If Democrats manage to hold their losses to a minimum, or make up for them by defeating Republicans elsewhere, they could keep Senate control. But if the national environment keeps looking so dire for the party and the president, that would be a tall order.

#### The plan flips the election---dems sink or swim on defending against Russian attacks on democracy.

Gregory Krieg and Eric Bradner 3/27/22. Writers @ CNN. "The 2022 campaign story was set. Then Russia invaded Ukraine.". CNN. 3-27-2022. https://www.cnn.com/2022/03/27/politics/2022-midterm-elections-russia-ukraine-invasion/index.html

(CNN)Russia's invasion of Ukraine opened up a new front in the 2022 US midterm cycle, with America's role in the conflict taking a place alongside the culture war clashes, economic worries and fights over pandemic policy that had driven the early stages of the election.

The global implications of the war in Europe has forced candidates in both parties to adjust their political playbooks to account for a rapidly evolving new issue that, at its core, has united voters in support of aiding the Ukrainian resistance to Russian President Vladimir Putin's aggression, but also underscored the rigid partisan divide that defines modern American politics.

For Democratic candidates who are likely to sink or swim on public perception of President Joe Biden's job performance, Russia's war on a fledgling democracy on its doorstep has presented a new opportunity to derail a despairing narrative that many believe ends with Democrats losing both chambers of Congress. It could also potentially advance Biden's climate agenda and revive his poll numbers.

#### Republicans are key to financial innovation--- they check overregulation.

Brendan Pedersen 3/9/22. Reporter. "Key Republican touts pro-business agenda for banks ahead of midterms". American Banker. 3-9-2022. https://www.proquest.com/docview/2637183380/37CC7151C6034A36PQ/82?accountid=10747

WASHINGTON — The top Republican on the House Financial Services Committee promised a reversal of Democratic financial-policy priorities should control of the House flip after the 2022 elections.

Speaking during the American Bankers Association’s annual Washington summit on Tuesday, Rep. Patrick McHenry, R-N.C., said that if Republicans win majority control of the House in the upcoming midterm elections, they would “unleash the free market” by pursuing innovation-friendly policies.

He also said that GOP lawmakers would seek “a lot more oversight of the financial regulators than what we've seen in this Congress.”

“What you'll see from Republicans on the Hill this year, and going into the next Congress, is we're going to continue to look for policy initiatives that unleash the free market and enable you to use new technology and new tools to reduce the cost of accessing credit and make it more available,” McHenry said in prepared remarks. “Artificial intelligence, bank and third-party partnerships, easier reporting requirements and more innovation will help everyone in this ecosystem — your customers as well as your shareholders.”

The North Carolina Republican also promised sharp scrutiny of the Biden administration’s banking regulators, arguing the GOP would be “the check and balance on the few of these regulators trying to run roughshod over a whole industry unchecked.”

In particular, McHenry accused Consumer Financial Protection Bureau Director Rohit Chopra of pursuing a “really scorched-earth approach” with “his adoption of regulation by enforcement or intimidation.”

Without mentioning specific names, he also accused the Biden administration’s nominees to the Federal Reserve of wanting to “manipulate the financial services industry” into combating climate change. Senate Banking Republicans have boycotted the confirmation process for the White House’s Fed nominees partly because of Sarah Bloom Raskin’s views on the role of climate-risk regulation in the financial system .

“It will be incumbent upon Republicans, next Congress, to lead the charge to expose these agencies and what they’re trying to do,” McHenry said.

House Financial Services Committee Chair Maxine Waters, D-Calif., also spoke during the summit on Tuesday, where she largely reviewed the recent policy focuses of the committee she has led since 2019, including the preservation of minority depository institutions.

But in a clear contrast to McHenry’s appeal to innovation, Waters told the audience that banks should be extremely cautious before working with the cryptocurrency sector and handling digital assets.

#### Financial innovation is key to growth---they multiply efficiencies through every industry.

Lauren Hill 20. Writer for Yodlee. "Financial Innovation Examples". No Publication. 12-3-2020. https://www.yodlee.com/financial-solutions/keeping-financial-innovation

Financial innovation is a broad term used to describe advances in financial technologies and systems. Innovation within the financial services industry allows consumers to have more ownership and control over their financial wellness, and empower financial institutions to improve products and services offered to customers.

Why Is Financial Innovation Important?

The improvement of financial instruments and financial products is beneficial to consumers, businesses, and financial institutions alike.

With better financial technologies, financial institutions can improve risk management when making lending decisions, or providing consumers investment advice backed by market data that’s updated in real time.

Businesses with stronger financial technologies can manage their corporate finances more efficiently and accurately, and use payment systems with built in fraud protection services to give them greater peace of mind their transactions are secure.

Consumers can take more control over their financial wellness when given access to superior financial technologies, and experience better ways to manage their finances than ever before.

This betterment of the financial services for all players in the financial industry is exactly the goal of FinTech companies. Using their expertise in application programming interface (API) development to create new financial tools for consumers, businesses, and financial institutions to take advantage of, they have spearheaded the influx in financial innovation.

What Drives Financial Innovation?

Financial innovation is driven by inadequacies or inefficiencies in the financial market. These are the problems that new technologies or systems seek to solve.

In the case of behavioural finance, the study of how investors behave and the subsequent effects on the market, human bias in investing was exposed and has led to increasing amounts of investors using Big Data to drive investment decisions.

AI and machine learning powered technologies use Big Data and natural language processing to automate processes and eliminate the human bias in Financial Innovation Examples

There have been countless improvements to financial technologies and systems in recent years. These examples of financial innovation showcase their wide reach in creating a better financial world for everyone.

Mobile Banking

When a gap was found in the Australian financial services market for a financial institution that provided consumers comprehensive mobile banking services and greater control over their money, the smartbank 86 400 was created. The bank gets its name from the number of seconds in a day to reiterate how customers can access all of their banking services on their phones anytime they need to.

By identifying a gap in the market, 86 400 was challenged to innovate beyond existing services for consumers, and become Australia’s first smartbank. While looking for data aggregators to partner with to enrich the platform with relevant financial data, 86 400 came to Envestnet | Yodlee for market leading data aggregation tools.

To learn more about how Envestnet | Yodlee and 86 400 delivered an innovative financial solution to consumers, read the full case study.

Lending Platforms

Online lenders are modernizing lending by using AI and machine learning technologies to automate and streamline the clunky processes of traditional lending platforms. Calculating interest rates, providing more tailored lending options, and more accurately identifying fraudulent borrowers to mitigate risk are all made possible thanks to financial innovation in APIs and natural language processing.

Accounting

To help make accounting for small business owners easier, Xero was created by providing a modernized way for small businesses to do all things accounting. As a cloud-based accounting solution, Xero enables small business owners with the ability to check balances, send invoices, or keep track of businesses expenses all from their phone.

Xero is a solution aimed at small businesses accustomed to using traditional solutions like Quickbooks for their accounting needs, and who would appreciate an accounting solution that plays nicely with mobile devices and tablets. Xero partnered with Envestnet | Yodlee, a leader in online and mobile personal finance management (PFM) solutions for data aggregation services.

To learn more about how Envestnet | Yodlee and Xero worked together to innovate accounting solutions for small businesses, read the full case study.

Payments Systems

Businesses looking for a better user experience while reducing the fraud and fees typically associated with online payments and credit cards can look into innovative payment solutions. Implementing the right payment system lets business owners focus on their customers first while letting their payment platform flag any potential fraud risks for them automatically.

Does Financial Innovation Help Economic Growth?

Financial innovation drives economic growth across industries because financial economics have such an impact on both businesses and consumers. As we move towards a more global economy, we see innovations in international finance impacting economies across the globe.

#### Crisis causes war---data proves.

Tania Lațici and Elena Lazarou 21. Tania Lațici is a Non-resident Fellow with the Transatlantic Leadership Program at the Center for European Policy Analysis. Elena Lazarou is the Head of the External Policies Unit of the European Parliamentary Research Service. “Peace and Security in 2021”. https://www.europarl.europa.eu/RegData/etudes/STUD/2021/690669/EPRS\_STU(2021)690669\_EN.pdf

The link between financial crises and a deterioration in democracy, peace and security has been highlighted by several studies. As noted by Matthias Goldmann, 'in recent years, more and more data has become available which reveals a correlation between sovereign debt crises and the outbreak of civil wars. 225 Thomas Piketty and Branko Milanović have stressed the link between financial crisis, inequality and social collapse. 226 In addition to economic recession and falling trade volumes, global economies are strongly affected by chronic deflation. Historically, there is a correlation between inflation-deflation cycles and the debt cycles: deflationary pressure increases during peace years, and inflationary, during war years. 227 Writing for The Economist, Qian Liu has warned that the next economic crisis could cause a 'global conflict'.228 This is concerning, particularly in the context of the current debate on a new 'cold war' brewing between the US and China, in the paradigm of a 'Thucydides's trap'.229

The combination of global social risks, increased international tensions due to rising protectionism and the Covid-19 pandemic, has raised some concerns regarding the risk of a repetition of the 1930s scenario, which eventually led to World War II. 230 The US 'America first' protectionist trade policy developed under former president Donald Trump could reignite under Joe Biden's stimulus package. Under the Biden administration, protectionism may be more targeted and subtle, but it is not going to disappear. Furthermore, high rates of unemployment, and unconventional monetary policy measures, including possible 'modernisation' of the main central banks' legal mandates and their impact on debt cycles and inequality, have all been cited as causes for concern. 231 The dangerous link between the state of the global economy and peace has, once more, come to the fore – this time as a result of the 21st century's gravest health crisis. Massive stimuli by central banks and governments, such as US$120billion in monthly bond purchases by the US Federal Reserve, or the $1.9 trillion stimulus bill adopted by US Congress (American Rescue Plan Act of 2021) awoke, in January 2021, not only hope of economic growth but also fears of rising inflation. The US Treasury yield curve has steepened to four-year high and, as noted by Standard & Poor's Global Market Intelligence Unit, 'A steep yield curve – when there is a large spread in interest rates between shorter-term Treasury bonds to longer-term bonds – often precedes a period of economic expansion, as investors bet that a central bank will be forced to raise rates in the future to tamp down higher inflation'.

### UQ---Brink---2NC

#### GOP will win now but its not a sure thing.

Jordain Carney 4/12/22. "McConnell: ‘Actually possible’ for GOP to screw up midterms with ‘unacceptable’ candidates". Hill. 4-12-2022. https://thehill.com/news/senate/3265655-mcconnell-actually-possible-for-gop-to-screw-up-midterms-with-unacceptable-candidates/

Senate Minority Leader Mitch McConnell (R-Ky.) on Tuesday said the political atmosphere is good for Republicans heading into the midterms but warned that the party could bungle its chances if “unacceptable” candidates win their primaries but go on to lose in November.

Republicans are feeling optimistic about their chances to win back the Senate, but they face several messy primaries that could have ramifications for the general election map and the GOP’s chances of picking up, or holding on to, a seat.

McConnell, speaking at a chamber event in Kentucky, said that 1994 had been the best year for Republicans and that the atmosphere heading into November “is better than it was in 1994.”

“From an atmospheric point of view, it’s a perfect storm of problems for the Democrats,” McConnell said. “How could you screw this up? It’s actually possible. And we’ve had some experience with that in the past.”

“In the Senate, if you look at where we have to compete in order to get into a majority, there are places that are competitive in the general election. So you can’t nominate somebody who’s just sort of unacceptable to a broader group of people and win. We had that experience in 2010 and 2012,” McConnell added.

To win back the Senate in November, Republicans would need a net pickup of just one seat to tip the current 50-50 balance. Republicans are defending 21 seats, compared to Democrats’ 14, including two seats currently held by Republicans that are in states President Biden won in 2020.

Five seats are rated by The Cook Political Report as toss-ups. Three of those — Nevada, Georgia and Arizona — are currently held by Democrats, while two — Pennsylvania and Wisconsin — are currently held by Republicans. In Pennsylvania, GOP Sen. Pat Toomey is retiring.

Meanwhile, three of the seats currently held by Republicans are ranked as “lean” Republican: Florida, Ohio and North Carolina. In Florida, GOP Sen. Marco Rubio is running for reelection, while Ohio and North Carolina are open races because GOP Sens. Rob Portman and Richard Burr are retiring.

Only one seat currently held by Democrats is ranked “lean” Democrat: New Hampshire, where Democratic Sen. Maggie Hassan is running for reelection.

Despite having to play defense on a larger swath of seats, Republicans are increasingly confident about their chances of winning back the majority in November as Biden struggles to rebound in polling and Americans remain concerned about inflation and the economy more broadly.

### UQ---GOP Leading---2NC

#### Republicans winning now.

Ed Kilgore 5/18/22. "2022 Midterms: A Guide to the Races Worth Watching". Intelligencer. 5-18-2022. https://nymag.com/intelligencer/article/2022-midterms-guide.html

The primaries get into full swing in May, with 11 states holding elections to nominate candidates for November. The 2022 midterms will determine whether Democrats retain or lose their fragile control over the U.S. Senate and House, along with the balance of power in many states holding legislative and gubernatorial contests. Typically the president’s party loses ground in midterms, particularly if he’s as unpopular as Joe Biden and the economy is troubled. The odds are high that Republicans will take the House and make some state-level gains. Democrats may be able to hold onto the Senate thanks to a favorable landscape, though the size of the likely Republican “wave” will make a lot of difference up and down the ballot.

#### Republicans leading now.

Callie Patteson 4/29/22. New York Post. "Republicans have early edge going into midterms, new polling shows". New York Post. 4-29-2022. https://nypost.com/2022/04/29/republicans-set-to-lead-in-midterms-new-polling-shows/

With just over six months until the midterm elections, Republicans appear to have an edge over Democrats as just under 50 percent of Americans say they are more likely to vote for the GOP in a new poll released Friday.

The NPR/PBS NewsHour/Marist poll found that 47% of registered voters are more likely to vote for a Republican candidate in their district if the midterms were held today. Approximately 44% said they would vote Democratic.

Republicans also saw a key advantage among Independents, with 45% of registered independent voters saying they would vote for the GOP while 38% said they would vote for a Democratic candidate.

#### Republicans have lost clearer midterms before.

Russell Berman 4/25/22. "Mitch McConnell’s Nightmare Scenario". Atlantic. 4-25-2022. https://www.theatlantic.com/politics/archive/2022/04/republicans-senate-midterm-elections/629657/

On paper, Republicans have a prime opportunity to recapture the Senate majority this fall. They need to pick up just a single seat to break the current 50–50 tie, and the political environment is tilting heavily in their favor. President Joe Biden’s approval rating is mired in the low 40s, inflation is rampant, and the Democratic majority rests on a trio of vulnerable incumbents in states—Arizona, Georgia, and Nevada—that the president carried by fewer than 60,000 votes combined in 2020.

Yet the GOP may be stuck with candidates whose pockmarked, and in a few cases, scandal-filled, résumés could render them unelectable—or at least they would have in an earlier era. In Missouri, a state that should not be attainable for Democrats, the Republican nominee could be Eric Greitens, a former governor who resigned in disgrace over sexual-misconduct allegations and whose ex-wife has accused him in court filings of abusing her, as well as their son. The likely GOP nominee in Georgia, Herschel Walker, is a former NFL star with his own stormy past. Former President Donald Trump has endorsed celebrities making their first runs for office, J. D. Vance in Ohio and Dr. Mehmet Oz in Pennsylvania, whose reversals on key issues—including, in Vance’s case, Trump himself—offer ripe targets for critics on the left and the right. The lone vulnerable Republican incumbent, Senator Ron Johnson of Wisconsin, has campaigned against COVID-19 vaccines and has seen his popularity plummet in a state that Biden narrowly won two years ago.

McConnell is well aware of the GOP’s good fortunes this year—and how easily the party could blow it. “How could you screw this up?” the once and perhaps future majority leader mused recently in Kentucky. “It’s actually possible. And we’ve had some experience with that in the past.”

#### GOP will win---best polling.

Bob Carlstrom 5/12/22. President of AMAC Action. "Current Polling on 2022 Midterms: Could Republicans Take the House and Senate?". AMAC - The Association of Mature American Citizens. 5-12-2022. https://amac.us/current-polling-on-2022-midterms-could-republicans-take-the-house-and-senate/

Recent polling of the generic congressional ballot over the cycle shows a Real Clear Politics average of 45.8% support for Republicans compared to 42.3% for Democrats. One would expect the Republican congressional ballot poll average to be higher, especially with a President in office with an abysmal 51.7% unfavorable RCP average but even that small advantage translates to enough seats to take the House. Liberal pundits are seeming to sense something big is coming. MSNBC’s Chuck Todd referred to the upcoming midterm elections as being “bad or catastrophic” for Democrats. With inflation hitting 8.5% over the last year as of March 31st, and continuing to rise, who can blame Americans for not being on board with the Democratic agenda?

Two of the nation’s top political ratings forecasters, the Cook Political Report and the University of Virginia’s Crystal Ball, moved 8 and 11 competitive House races, respectively, all in favor of Republicans. Cook’s analysis summed up the mood most Americans are feeling today, stating “President Biden’s approval rating remains stuck at 42 percent, and if anything the political environment has deteriorated for Democrats since January as inflation concerns have soared and Build Back Better has stalled. That means no Democrat in a single-digit Biden (or Trump-won) district is secure, and even some seats Biden carried by double-digit margins in 2020 could come into play this fall, giving the GOP surprising ‘reach’ opportunities.”

Given all of these factors, political observers are now saying that the question is not if Republicans will take back Congress, but the question is by how much?

### UQ---AT: Abortion/Roe Thumps---2AC

#### Our uniqueness assumes Roe---it changes nothing.

Harry Enten 5/7/22. CNN. "Analysis: GOP still favored in midterms, despite possible overturning of Roe v. Wade". CNN. 5-7-2022. https://www.cnn.com/2022/05/07/politics/republicans-midterms-roe-v-wade/index.html

(CNN)The national political environment has favored Republicans since last fall. And it has only gotten worse for Democrats in the months since as inflation has skyrocketed and President Joe Biden's approval rating has dropped.

The recent leak of a draft US Supreme Court opinion that would overturn Roe v. Wade seemed to give Democrats a winning issue to rally base and swing voters in the midterm elections. After all, most Americans support the landmark 1973 high court decision that legalized abortion nationwide.

Our new CNN poll conducted by SSRS, however, shows that such hopes are likely unfounded. Republicans look like they remain in the driver's seat for November because voters don't trust Democrats on the all-important issue of the economy.

The May 3-5 CNN survey, conducted after the draft opinion became public, shows Republicans with a 49% to 42% advantage on the generic congressional ballot. If that 7-point lead held through the election, it would be as large a win for the GOP in the national House vote as it was in 2010 -- when Republicans regained the House majority and ended up with 242 seats out of 435.

More to the point, it's the widest edge for Republicans on the generic ballot in a CNN poll this entire cycle. Just before the draft opinion leaked, an April 28-May 1 CNN poll gave Republicans 45% and Democrats 44% on the generic ballot question. A CNN survey conducted from January to February put Republicans at 44% and Democrats at 43%.

It would be a mistake, at this point, to interpret these results as Republicans benefiting from a potential Supreme Court overturning of Roe v. Wade. Polls shift all the time for many reasons, and my guess is this is just statistical noise.

But it definitely does seem, at this time, that the news of the draft abortion opinion hasn't shifted voters toward Democrats.

#### Pundits overemphasize Roe.

Charlie Cook 5/12/22. "Are We Overestimating Roe’s Impact on Politics?". Cook Political Report. 5-12-2022. https://www.cookpolitical.com/analysis/national/national-politics/are-we-overestimating-roes-impact-politics

Everyone has their own take on what impact a reversal of Roe v. Wade will have on November’s midterm elections. Here’s mine: To the extent that overturning the 49-year old decision benefits Democrats at all, it won’t be nearly enough to make up for the substantial headwinds they were already facing. In short, it will help out less than they hope and far less than they need.

Why would it not have quite the impact that Democrats pray it will have—and many in the media seem convinced it will have?

First, public opinion is considerably more nuanced than many seem to think. Obviously, the precise wording of questions asked is important, so it is good to look at more than one set of results.

### AT: UQ Overwhelms---Fundamentals---2NC

#### Uniqueness doesn’t overwhelm---GOP is favored, but dems can win.

Dean Obeidallah 3/8/22. Lawyer. "Democrats' chances in the 2022 midterm elections are better than doomsayers predict". MSNBC. 3-8-2022. https://www.msnbc.com/opinion/msnbc-opinion/democrats-chances-2022-midterm-elections-are-better-doomsayers-predict-n1290695

Anyone else sick and tired of hearing so-called political experts predict that Democrats are going to lose badly in this year's midterms? Apparently it doesn’t matter that in President Joe Biden’s first year, 6.6 million new jobs were reported, the strongest first year of job gains of any president since our government began collecting such data in 1939. Nor does it appear to matter that unemployment is down from 6.7 percent in former President Donald Trump’s last full month in office to 3.8 percent and that wages are up 5 percent over the past year.

Pundits tell us it’s an “ironclad” rule — as Fivethirtyeight.com put it — that the president’s party loses congressional seats in midterm elections. Hence, headlines that predict Democrats will lose this November in a “wipeout” and a “bloodbath.” If you listen to these people, you might be tempted to cancel the 2022 election and simply crown the GOP the winners of the House and the Senate.

Democrats should be concerned going into November. They hold only a nine-seat margin in the House, and the Senate is divided 50-50, with Vice President Kamala Harris serving as a tie-breaking vote. However, there are multiple signs that tell us Democrats could not only hold on to the House but even pick up a few Senate seats given that there is an open Senate seat in Pennsylvania and a vulnerable GOP incumbent in Wisconsin, both states Biden won in 2020.

For starters, while Biden won the White House in 2020, Democrats lost 13 seats in the House. That wasn’t good for the party, obviously, but for 2022 purposes, it means the most vulnerable Democrats are already gone. On the flip side, not a single Republican incumbent in the House lost in 2018. Good luck with GOP pulling that trick twice and not losing even one of the 213 House seats they currently hold in 2022. For example, in New York, the recently finalized congressional map that reflects the 2020 census data is expected to result in Democrats picking up three current Republican seats in November.

Plus, history tells us that there have been two times in the modern era that a president’s party gained seats during midterm elections —and the circumstances that led to those victories apply to 2022 in varying degrees. In 1998, with Bill Clinton in the White House, Democrats gained five House seats. How did Democrats buck history? GOP arrogance and overreach. The House GOP, led by then-Speaker Newt Gingrich, impeached Clinton for lying about his affair with an intern, Monica Lewinsky. But as midterm exit polls found, two thirds of voters didn’t think Clinton — who was leading a strong economy — should have been impeached, and they cast their votes accordingly.

Today’s GOP is even more arrogant and heavy-handed than Gingrich’s GOP was. Consider the Texas law that bans abortion after six weeks and forces a woman who is raped to carry her rapist’s fetus to term. That abomination of a law is being copied by numerous Republican-controlled states despite the fact that 65 percent of Americans believe the Supreme Court should uphold its landmark Roe v. Wade decision and only 29 percent support the Supreme Court striking down the constitutional right to abortion access. The Republicans don’t care what a majority of Americans think; they only care about imposing their extreme religious beliefs upon the rest of us.

Ditto for the party’s overreach by banning books and what they wrongly call critical race theory (CRT). Americans are becoming increasingly aware that so-called CRT bans are racist laws designed to prevent teachers from sharing the history of Black achievement and Black suffering at the hands of white bigots. Look at Virginia where Republican Glenn Youngkin won the governor’s race in 2021 based in part on his attacks on CRT. A recent poll found that 57 percent of Virginians oppose banning CRT and only 37 percent support it. That finding helps explain why Youngkin, who won in November with 51 percent of the vote, is already underwater with a 41 percent approval rating.

With only a few exceptions, these extreme abortion bans, bans on books and CRT, and voter suppression efforts in 19 states are embraced by Republicans nationwide. To animate their own voters, Democrats can and should use the GOP’s tyranny against them in 2022.

The second time in recent history that a president’s party picked up seats during a midterm election was 2002, the year after the 9/11 terrorist attacks, when President George W. Bush was in the White House with a sky-high approval rating and Republicans gained eight House seats and two in the Senate.

### AT: UQ Overwhelms---Already Decided/Ideology---2NC

#### People haven’t decided yet---16% undecided.

Mark Moore 4/19/22. "Voters split between Democrats, GOP in 2022 midterms, 1 in 6 undecided: poll". New York Post. 4-19-2022. https://nypost.com/2022/04/19/voters-split-between-democrats-gop-in-2022-midterms-poll/

A new poll out Tuesday indicates Americans are divided about which party they’ll support in this fall’s midterm election, while roughly one in six hasn’t yet made up their minds.

The Politico/Morning Consult poll of registered voters found that if the midterms were held today, 43% would back a Democratic candidate for Congress while 42% would support the Republican candidate.

Another 16% answered “don’t know” or had no opinion.

### Link---Election Interference---2NC

#### Americans fear Russian election interference---the plan wins over voters by being tough on Russia.

Madeline Fitzgeral 4/27/22. Reporter. "More Than Half of Americans Are Worried About Russian Interference in Midterm Elections". US News & World Report. 4-27-2022. https://www.usnews.com/news/national-news/articles/2022-04-27/more-than-half-of-americans-are-worried-about-russian-interference-in-midterm-elections

More than half of Americans are worried about Russian interference in the 2022 midterm elections, according to a new Reuters/Ipsos poll.

The poll released on Tuesday found that 52% of Americans were worried about Russian misinformation on the internet negatively affecting the 2022 midterm elections. The same percentage of Americans also fear that Russia will send illicit financial support to some American politicians.

American fear of Russian interference in elections has been elevated since the 2016 presidential elections, when the Russian organization, the Internet Research Agency, created thousands of fake social media accounts to promote Russian political aims in the elections. In a 2020 Pew survey, three-quarters of Americans said they thought it was somewhat or very likely that Russia or other foreign governments would attempt to influence the 2020 presidential election.

The Reuters/Ipsos poll delved into several other American concerns, regarding the Russian invasion of Ukraine and its impact on Americans. Sixty-nine percent of Americans said they were worried about fuel and gas prices but 8 in 10 said that the United States should not buy oil or gas from Russia during the conflict, even if it causes gas prices to increase. Additionally, more than three quarters of Americans said both that the United States should put further economic sanctions on Russia and send weapons to Ukraine.

American perceptions of how President Joe Biden is handling Russia remain virtually unchanged from last month – 38% of Americans approved of Biden’s handling of the crisis in March and 38% approve in April. A little over three-quarters of Americans said they were more likely to support a candidate who helped Ukraine with military aid. Seventy-eight percent said they were more likely to support a candidate who supports Ukrainian refugees. A similar percentage – 74% of Americans – said they favored the United States taking in refugees.

#### The public fears Russia hacking and will change votes.

Lexi Lonas 4/28/22. The Hill. "Majority concerned about Russia’s influence on midterms: poll". Hill. 4-28-2022. https://thehill.com/blogs/blog-briefing-room/3470066-majority-concerned-about-russias-influence-on-midterms-poll/

A majority of American voters in a new Reuters-Ipsos poll say they are concerned about Russia’s potential influence on the 2022 midterm elections.

The poll found that 52 percent of respondents are concerned about Russian misinformation and propaganda online and Moscow indirectly giving money to campaigns.

Russia is known for trying to interfere with the elections of Western countries, including the U.S.

Concerns of Russian interference spiked in the wake of its 2016 meddling, which included both misinformation efforts and the hacking of American political groups.

Relations between Washington and Moscow have soured significantly in recent months over Russian President Vladimir Putin’s unprovoked invasion of Ukraine.

The U.S. has provided billions of dollars in aid and weapons to Ukraine to help them fight off Russian forces.

Russia has condemned the U.S.’s actions and sanctioned more than 100 U.S. lawmakers and leaders as a result.

A vast majority of Americans in the poll said they are more likely to vote for a candidate who supports sanctions against Russia and aid to Ukraine and its refugees.

The poll was conducted between April 25 and April 26 among 1,005 adults. The margin of error is plus or minus 3.8 percentage points.

### Link---Tough on Russia---2NC

#### Response to Russia shapes down-ballot midterms---can flip the election.

Julia Manchester, Alex Gangitano and Hanna Trudo 2/28/22. The Hill. "Russia invasion of Ukraine could play unusual role in midterms". Hill. 2-28-2022. https://thehill.com/homenews/campaign/595941-russia-invasion-of-ukraine-could-play-unusual-role-in-midterms/

Russia’s deadly invasion of Ukraine could throw a wrench into the midterms as voters scrutinize President Biden’s efforts to counter aggression from a global superpower and U.S. adversary.

Foreign policy rarely touches down-ballot elections. But Russia’s moves in Europe, and the U.S.’s response, could have domestic implications that hit Americans’ pocketbooks and would come on top of already high gas prices and record inflation — issues voters rank among the most important.

Additionally, deep networks of immigrants from Eastern Europe reside in some of the nation’s most critical battleground states, and the president’s approval rating, a predictor of his party’s midterm performance, remains low.

“This is going to be a backdrop to a lot of the elections now,” said Dave Pepper, the former chair of the state Democratic Party in Ohio, a key swing state with the country’s fifth-highest population of Ukrainian residents.

Some Democrats believe Biden is well-positioned to explain his decisions on Ukraine and defend the increasingly severe sanctions he is levying against Moscow. The president this week called Russia’s invasion a “brutal assault on the people of Ukraine” and a “premeditated attack.” He placed new economic and technology sanctions on the country on Thursday, and officials said they still have options on the table.

Pepper speculated that Biden’s posture on the crisis — and the isolationist response from some GOP candidates — could create an opening for down-ballot Democrats in November’s elections.

Ohio Republican Senate candidates Josh Mandel and J.D. Vance have questioned why the U.S. is focused on the foreign conflict while domestic issues mount. Vance went as far to say on a right-wing podcast that he doesn’t “really care what happens to Ukraine one way or another,” before walking back the statement.

Other Ohio GOP contenders, including Jane Timken, Mike Gibbons and Matt Dolan, have called for economic retaliation against Russia. All the candidates have condemned Biden’s handling of the situation.

“I wasn’t really thinking about the race in this way, but all of a sudden my own heritage is relevant in how I vote,” Pepper said, referring to how Midwest residents who have a connection to Eastern Europe may perceive the crisis.

He added, “It does add a wrinkle.”

Biden and aligned Democrats are desperate to avoid a repeat of the chaotic U.S. pullout from Afghanistan last year, for which the president still receives criticism — and which Republicans have claimed gave Russian President Vladimir Putin the green light to move on Ukraine.

While Democrats denounce the conservatives aligned with former President Trump, who praised Putin during his term in office and in statements last week, many are fretting about how the geopolitical realities of the invasion could hit working populations in the U.S. over the next eight months.

Recent polling shows Americans’ faith in Biden’s ability to handle the situation is low. A Harvard CAPS-Harris Poll survey obtained by The Hill on Friday found 37 percent of Americans said they were confident in the administration’s ability to effectively counter Russia, while 63 percent said they were not confident. The same poll found Biden’s approval rating at a record low 38 percent.

“Voters believe the Biden administration can and should do more to protect Ukraine,” said Dritan Nesho, co-director of the poll. “They see the sanctions so far as too weak and ultimately ineffective, and a majority say the United States should defend Ukraine in case of a full Russian invasion — including a majority of Democrats. A stronger posture appears to be both the right policy and good politics for the administration.”

### Link---AT: Won’t Campaign on Plan---2NC

#### Dems will make the plan front and center---they want a Russia narrative.

Seung Min Kim, Sean Sullivan and Tyler Pager 3/12/22. Washington Post. "Biden, Democrats infuse Ukraine crisis into a recast election-year pitch to voters". Washington Post. 3-12-2022. https://www.washingtonpost.com/politics/2022/03/12/biden-ukraine-russia-midterms/

PHILADELPHIA — President Biden and his party have moved in recent days to reorient their election-year pitch to voters around Russia’s invasion of Ukraine — seeking to shift blame for struggles to tame rising prices onto Vladimir Putin and promoting the White House strategy to punish the Kremlin as a muscular response to a geopolitical threat.

Democrats said they hope the message, which they honed in political meetings over the past week, will help address some of their biggest liabilities ahead of the November midterm elections. Chief among them are Biden’s low approval ratings and a widespread perception that Democrats are at fault for a sharp increase in inflation.

Now, Biden is repeatedly bringing up “Putin’s price hike” at the pump. White House officials have distributed talking points to allies urging them to echo this line. And Democrats are touting the economic sanctions Biden has leveled on Russia, contrasting them with former president Donald Trump’s praise for Putin.

### Link---AT: FoPo Irrelevant/COVID & Inflation Thumpers---2NC

#### It’s a Russia election---outweighs Thumpers in key swing states.

David Lauter 3/11/22. Senior Editor. "Essential Politics: War in Ukraine scrambles GOP and Democratic strategies for midterms". Los Angeles Times. 3-11-2022. https://www.latimes.com/politics/newsletter/2022-03-11/politics-war-ukraine-scrambles-plans-2022-midterm-election-essential-politics

The domestic political impact of the war in Ukraine — now in its third week — has scrambled the two parties’ strategies going into this year’s midterm elections. Both have started to maneuver for advantage.

No one knows whether either side will benefit come November — a lot depends on how voters end up perceiving the war’s course.

But for President Biden and the Democrats, who have been tracking toward a significant defeat, attention to a foreign crisis could provide a badly needed shakeup of the campaign debate.

An overwhelming issue

“As a general rule, Americans don’t vote on foreign policy unless American men and women are dying in a war, but we’ve rarely had an international event not involving the United States directly that has so totally consumed our news and attention as the Russian invasion of Ukraine,” said Republican pollster and strategist Whit Ayres.

“This war has become symbolic for the survival of democratic regimes against authoritarian dictatorships,” Ayres added. “That symbolism has given it a much broader meaning.”

A poll this week by Navigator Research, a Democratic firm, found that 37% of American voters said they were “very closely” following news from Ukraine, and nearly 8 in 10 said they were following it at least somewhat closely — high numbers for a foreign issue.

National security and foreign policy had jumped to the top of American concerns, tied with jobs and the economy, displacing worries about the coronavirus and inflation, the poll found.

Amid that intense focus, Americans have clearly picked a side — overwhelmingly favoring the Ukrainians. That could be seen in Wednesday’s House vote to suspend oil imports from Russia, which passed 414-17 with just two of the chamber’s most left-wing Democrats, Reps. Cori Bush of Missouri and Ilhan Omar of Minnesota, and 15 right-wing Republicans voting no.

That level of attention makes the Ukraine war the kind of event that could significantly shift U.S. politics.

“Politics isn’t the most important thing right now,” said Democratic strategist Steve Schale, chief executive of the pro-Biden super-pac Unite the Country.

But, he added, since 1992, “the only two midterm elections that were not absolute debacles for the incumbent president’s party were held during a window where there was something significant in the country that reshaped the conversation.”

Those two were 1998, when voters rejected Republican efforts to impeach President Clinton and Democrats gained four seats, and 2002, when Republicans under President George W. Bush gained seats in the aftermath of the Sept. 11, 2001, terror attacks.

Biden and the Democrats have a long way to go to emulate the midterm successes those two presidents enjoyed. A new Wall Street Journal poll released Friday continues to show Democrats trailing the GOP as the party voters say they expect to back in November.

But polls have also shown an uptick in voters’ assessments of how Biden is doing his job. The change is just a few percentage points, but after nine months of nearly steady decline, it’s a welcome sign for the president.

Ukraine has clearly contributed to the boost in Biden’s ratings. A poll by Morning Consult for Politico found this week, for example, that by 46% to 42%, voters approved of Biden’s response to the crisis.

Voters’ assessments of how Biden has dealt with Ukraine have improved notably since last month and are also significantly higher than how they assess his presidency overall.

The shift comes primarily from Democrats and independents; Republicans mostly remain highly critical of Biden. The Navigator poll, however, did identify a slice of Republicans, mostly moderately conservative men, who approve of Biden on Ukraine even as they disapprove of his performance otherwise.

In any case, winning back wavering partisans and independent voters is a key task for Biden right now, one that could be critical in the small number of swing House districts and Senate elections in which the midterms will be most intensely contested.

If voters continue to approve of Biden’s response, it could help with one of his key problems — the perception by many Americans that he’s not a strong leader.

#### Foreign affairs will determine vote.

Business Standard 5/19/22. "Sagging global economy burdens Biden ahead of US midterm elections". https://www.business-standard.com/article/international/sagging-global-economy-burdens-biden-ahead-of-us-midterm-elections-122051900013\_1.html

What's clear is that foreign affairs and geopolitics have returned as issues that could shape the opinions of U.S. voters.

Even as the midterm races intensify, Biden is devoting his time to other world leaders and not just Russian President Vladimir Putin and his attack on Ukraine. Biden's trip to South Korea and Japan follows recent meetings with the heads of Italy, Greece and the members of the Association of Southeast Asian Nations. He is also meeting with the leaders of Finland and Sweden, who are seeking NATO membership, before he departs for Asia.

Yes, geopolitics will matter for U.S. elections again, said Doug Elmendorf, dean of Harvard University's Kennedy School of Government and a former director of the Congressional Budget Office. Terrorists and terrorist states have been potent, China is not becoming that much like us, and Putin has gone to war.

### Internal Link---Financial Regulation Bad---2NC

#### Overregulation collapses the economy and innovation.

Thomas Pollack 18. Partner in the capital markets practice at Paul Hastings, an international law firm. "US risks losing market leadership thanks to overregulation". Hill. 5-13-2018. https://thehill.com/opinion/finance/387467-us-risks-losing-market-leadership-due-to-overregulation/

But another critical reason is that U.S. regulation that was intended to improve and stabilize the capital markets has had the opposite effect.

{mosads}It has caused a dramatic decline in the number of U.S. public companies and the number of U.S. companies going public, and a dramatic increase in the average time between formation and an IPO (from seven to 10 years). Simply put, the U.S. risks losing market leadership through overregulation and a lack of innovation.

Thirty years ago, a company could do a cost-effective IPO for $6-8 million. Today, unless a company is raising at least $100 million with a market cap of around $300 million, an IPO generally does not make sense. The reasons for this include the continued institutionalization of the investor base, growing regulation of public companies and the increased litigation and administrative costs for issuers.

Good regulation should be driven by the need to fix poor practice or systemic flaws — and be clear and proportionate. In the case of Sarbanes-Oxley, regulations that sought to improve internal accounting and disclosure controls post-Enron were clearly warranted.

In other cases, regulations directed at social engineering, such as “say on pay,” are not essential to a financial understanding of, and investment decision in, a business. In addition, Dodd-Frank, with its thousands of pages of initial law, and an equivalent amount of regulation, is a perfect example of the reverse.

Many have argued that all that was needed was the reinstatement of Glass-Steagall and to ensure greater diversity among banks by building a system where no bank was too big to fail.

The consequence of ill-considered regulation is that there are only about 5,000 U.S. public companies today, down from over 10,000 in 1980. Not coincidently, there are less than 5,000 banks today, down from over 13,000 in 1980.

In fact, the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation (FDIC) has issued only seven new bank charters since 2009; in four of those years, no bank charters at all were issued. Vibrant local economies need locally knowledgeable banks.

The declining number of public companies increases securities litigation risks. With a declining number of companies to pursue, the plaintiffs’ bar has filed complaints against ever smaller securities law infractions, even if not material. More plaintiffs’ lawyers focused on fewer companies is never a good result for shareholders.

Today’s economy is being reshaped by technology and digitization, but current securities regulation is not aligned with it, nor does it support the robust capital markets that underpin innovation and capital formation.

To date, the SEC has responded to changes in the economy by introducing more and more amending regulations, carving out niches from the overall monolith of the Securities Act of 1933. This has made the act overly complex because companies must understand when regulations apply to them and when they do not.

The securities laws need to be rewritten from scratch to reflect the reality of today’s investment world. U.S. markets should not only compete with other international capital markets, they should promote U.S. innovation and business growth.

Disclosures should focus on information that is material to today’s investors, avoid social engineering and be available through different media, including webcasts. Investors today do not focus on three years’ worth of comparative financial results — business is moving too fast for that.

They want to know what is happening now and in the future, and they want the disclosures to be made to them through streaming media. There should be a simple set of regulations for companies whose market capitalization is under $100 million and another set for larger companies.

Ultimately, the securities laws that underpin processes like IPOs should prime the economy for the benefit of all stakeholders — including the issuers themselves, institutional and retail investors, the broader market and the national economy.

Greater innovation and access to capital energizes the economy and allows more companies to succeed. This in turn provides more employment opportunities for American workers. This is critical in an age where labor is being curtailed through automation. It is time for the Securities Law of 2020 to make this happen.

#### Financial regulations wreck innovation and the economy---every crisis in history proves.

George Selgin 16. Senior Fellow and Director Emeritus, Center for Monetary and Financial Alternatives. "The Perils of Financial Over-Regulation". Cato Institute. 10-25-2016. https://www.cato.org/blog/perils-financial-over-regulation

For some reason Rogoff doesn’t seem to mind this. Yet surely it ought to be obvious that, when governments “win‐​out” by suppressing “much better ways of doing things,” the public as a whole — and not just or mainly drug dealers and tax evaders — looses.

But the more serious consequences of a “Whac‐​a‐​mole” approach to financial innovation consist, not of its immediate costs to consumers, but to the downstream innovations that it prevents.

As economist Israel Kirzner puts it in an excellent essay, “The Perils of Regulation,” while regulations of the sort Rogoff favors are only supposed to block particular innovations that may have some undesirable features, those regulations also end up blocking desirable innovations that haven’t been foreseen by anyone, including the regulators. What’s more, the same regulatory interference is instead likely to “set in motion a series of entrepreneurial actions that … may well lead to wholly unexpected and even undesirable final outcomes.”

In any event, Rogoff is surely mistaken in claiming that governments are bound to prevent financial innovations from taking place even when they are desirable. Whether they do so or not depends on public opinion.

It’s true that the public has mixed feelings about financial innovation; it has seen both good and bad consequences of such. But there are good reasons for believing that unhindered financial innovation, whatever its risks, is ultimately a lot safer than heavy‐​handed government interference in the financial sector. Those reasons are necessarily based on the historical record, since no one, except perhaps some of you, can know just what sorts of financial innovations the future may offer.

Consider U.S. experience. Contrary to conventional wisdom, unwise regulations have been responsible for most if not all of the 19th-century woes of the U.S. financial sector, from wildcat banking and counterfeiting prior to the Civil War to recurring banking crises afterwards. I would regale, or more likely bore you, with the details if I had time. But instead I must settle for pointing out that Canada, with its then‐​identical gold dollar, avoided practically all of them. Yet Canadian banks were less, not more, heavily regulated than their U.S. counterparts. Nor did Canada establish a central bank until 1935. (Can anyone guess how many of its banks failed during the 1930s?)

#### Overregulation crushes small banks and customers---markets are best.

Herald-Times 15. "Overregulation hurts bank customers, destroys incentives to engage in banking". https://www.heraldtimesonline.com/story/opinion/2015/04/27/overregulation-hurts-bank-customers-destroys-incentives-to-engage-in-banking/117487452/

A recent Wall Street Journal story noted that in the three decades before the Dodd-Frank bank regulation law passed in 2010, an average of more than 100 new banks opened each year. In the five years since 2010, exactly one new bank has opened — a small bank in Bird-in-Hand, Pennsylvania, serving the Amish community.

Going from more than 100 new banks each year to only one new bank in five years is an amazing decline. The article notes: “Bankers say the drought is a sign of new regulatory requirements in the wake of the financial crisis, which are boosting expenses and discouraging potential startups from even trying.”

Certainly, low interest rates and a struggling economy are also factors. But from my experience, onerous federal regulations are playing a large role in destroying incentives to engage in the banking business. The small staff at the new Bank of Bird-in-Hand includes one officer whose full-time duty is to deal with regulatory affairs. In addition, the bank must hire consultants to help it comply with regulations.

In March, a representative of the banking industry testified before the House Financial Services Committee, saying that “an avalanche of new rules, guidance and seemingly ever-changing expectations of the regulators” is hindering hometown banks in their efforts to serve customers.

Community banks have been the backbone of hometowns across America. But, according to the American Bankers Association (ABA), some 1,200 fewer community banks exist in the United States today than just five years ago. “That trend will continue until some rational changes are made that will provide some relief to America’s hometown banks.”

Examples of regulatory overkill abound. The ABA testimony before Congress cited a Texas bank that was forced to use a computerized underwriting model to avoid inadvertent fair lending violations, eliminating lending discretion by loan officers. But the one-size-fits-all system rejected applications from loyal bank customers of many decades, some of whom had never made late loan payments.

Over-regulation often reduces bank flexibility to meet the unique circumstances of customers. Common sense is replaced by complex rules. Fear of violating regulations and potential lawsuits leads to fewer loans, hurting customers and their communities.

Some members of Congress are proposing legislation to improve the regulatory environment for banks. The ABA is specifically asking Congress for four things:

1. Remove impediments to serving customers.

2. Improve access to home loans.

3. Ensure proper oversight of the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau, which is the source of many byzantine regulations.

4. Redefine a “systemically important financial institution” to make the designation more practical and apply to the largest banks.

The ABA noted in its testimony that unnecessary regulatory requirements distort the marketplace and constrict the natural cycle of facilitating credit, job growth and economic expansion — “leading to inefficiencies and higher expenses which reduce resources devoted to lending and investment.”

It makes no sense to treat all banks as if they were the largest and most complex institutions. In trying to prevent excesses that occurred before the 2008 financial crisis, federal regulators swept up smaller banks in regulatory regimes better suited for the gigantic Wall Street institutions.

I’m not suggesting that banks be deregulated. Reasonable regulations are absolutely needed to ensure the safety and soundness of the banking system. But the natural constraints and incentives of the free market system also play an important role. Banks obviously won’t be successful if they don’t treat customers fairly and if they aren’t careful and wise in loan and investment policies and decisions.

### Internal Link---AT: Financial Deregulation Bad---2NC

#### Deregulation doesn’t cause crisis---their evidence is myth.

Norbert Michel 16. Forbes Contributor. "Time To Fix The Overregulation Problem In Financial Markets". Forbes. 5-3-2016. https://www.forbes.com/sites/norbertmichel/2016/05/03/time-to-fix-the-overregulation-problem-in-financial-markets/?sh=4bcb6de63db8

Today I’m unabashedly promoting three new policy publications, all related to the causes and the misguided cleanup of the 2008 financial crisis. They’re available here, here and here. Free of charge.

The first paper examines an unrelenting myth: that the crisis was caused by financial market deregulation. This notion is demonstrably wrong. The U.S. has not substantially reduced financial regulations at any time during the last 100+ years.

A deregulated market is one where no government agency regulates the types of products and services people are allowed to produce and purchase. That sort of financial market did not exist prior to the 2008 crisis. For at least three-quarters of a century, federal regulators have increasingly micromanaged financial firms’ activities, despite the fact that this approach has repeatedly failed to prevent market turmoil.

It is true that U.S. regulators have sometimes allowed financial institutions to engage in activities from which they were previously restricted. But it’s a giant leap to call these changes deregulation because virtually all financial market activity has increasingly taken place under the watchful eye of federal regulators. That’s been the trend since at least the 1930s, and it didn’t slow down during the Reagan, Bush I, Clinton or Bush II years.

The paper presents a comprehensive collection of examples (mostly from the last 35 years) frequently cited to support the financial deregulation hypothesis, and it details what the new rules and regulations actually did.

For instance, a 2004 amendment to the Securities and Exchange Commission (SEC) net capital rule is often cited as deregulatory. This amendment, as the story goes, allowed companies such as Lehman and Goldman to take on so much debt that they became too risky.

There are several problems with this story. First of all, the numbers show that the major investment banks were actually more highly leveraged (more debt relative to equity) in 1998 than in 2006, after the rule was changed (and just prior to the 2008 crisis).

### Internal Link---Dems Cause Inflation---2NC

#### Dems cause inflation---decks the economy.

Byron York 5/19/22. Chief political correspondent for The Washington Examiner. "What if Democrats had made the economy even worse?". https://www.times-news.com/opinion/columns/what-if-democrats-had-made-the-economy-even-worse/article\_eaa46cd4-d791-11ec-8a1a-9b8c0411710c.html

President Biden likes to blame inflation on the COVID pandemic and the war in Ukraine — or, as he says, “Putin’s price hike.” But the fact is, Biden’s own actions, and those of his party, have also contributed significantly to the rise in the cost of living that is making it harder and harder for many Americans to make ends meet. And that rise, in turn, is feeding a terrible pessimism among Americans about the state of the country.

Even some liberal commentators are admitting that Biden and Capitol Democrats fed inflation by passing enormous spending bills, measures that provided far more stimulus to the economy that it needed. That was certainly true of the giant $1.9 “COVID relief” bill called the American Rescue Plan, signed into law by Biden on March 11, 2021. The left-leaning website Vox recently published a story with the headline, “Biden’s American Rescue Plan worsened inflation. The question is how much.”

The answer that Vox gave was — a lot. “Inflation has been happening across the world, caused by pandemic-related disruptions and exacerbated this year by Russia’s invasion of Ukraine and China’s COVID-19 lockdowns,” Vox said. “But regarding the exact amount of inflation, the U.S. stands out. And it started to stand out shortly after President Biden took office. The U.S. did a lot more stimulus than these other countries, and now it’s seeing a lot more core inflation.”

“We put gasoline on the fire,” Marc Goldwein of the Committee for a Responsible Federal Budget told Vox. “That’s basically what the American Rescue Plan did.” Democrats simply did not take the prospect of inflation seriously enough. “The American Rescue Plan wasn’t the primary cause of today’s inflation,” Vox concluded. “But if inflation was always going to be a problem, then it’s important to avoid policies that could make it a much worse problem.”

The inflation that Biden and his Democratic colleagues have worsened is taking a terrible toll both on the American household budget and the American sense of optimism. In a new NBC News poll, answering the classic right track-wrong track question, 75% of respondents said they believe the country is on the wrong track. Just 16% said the country is headed in the right direction. That 75% is the highest number since the terrible days of the economic collapse in 2008. And the 16% is the lowest since the same time.

The situation has sent Biden’s job approval rating even lower — 39% among all Americans, and 42% among registered voters. And there is one big reason why. When NBC asked respondents the most important issue facing the country, a full 40% named inflation and jobs and the economy — far and away at the top of the voters’ priority list. To give you a comparison, the war in Ukraine placed seventh on the list, and COVID was barely on the list at all. A full 65% said their income is not keeping up with rising costs. How could they not be worried?

So there’s no doubt things are bad. But it’s important to remember that last year Democrats tried very, very hard — indeed, made it the party’s top priority — to make things worse. Remember Build Back Better? It was the massive social spending scheme that Biden and the Democratic Party made the centerpiece of their agenda. At times, the proposal was about $3.5 trillion — dwarfing the $1.9 trillion of the American Rescue Plan — even though progressive Democrats wanted it to be much more, closer to $6 trillion. Then it shrank to $2.5 trillion, and then, perhaps, less than that.

In November of last year, the House passed a bill that would spend roughly $2.2 trillion. All but one House Democrat voted for the bill, and no Republicans were in favor of it. GOP lawmakers were emphatic that passing another huge spending measure, on top of the American Rescue Plan and the $1 trillion bipartisan infrastructure bill, which a minority of Republicans in the Senate and House had signed on to, would worsen inflation. They were, of course, correct.

Then Build Back Better got bogged down in the Senate, thanks to the stand taken by one man — Democratic Sen. Joe Manchin of West Virginia. Like Republicans, Manchin expressed fear that the spending would create what he called “inflation taxes that are real and harmful to every hardworking American at the gasoline pumps, grocery stores and utility bills with no end in sight.”

Manchin took a beating in the liberal press, but he was right. And now recognition of that is coming from unexpected places. Over the weekend, Jeff Bezos, the Amazon founder, world’s second-richest man and owner of the Washington Post, reminded the world of what Democrats had hoped to do. “In fact, the administration tried hard to inject even more stimulus into an already overheated, inflationary economy and only Manchin saved them from themselves,” Bezos tweeted. “Inflation is a regressive tax that most hurts the least affluent.”

It’s true. Now, with inflation raging, many hope Democrats will stop pushing for more trillion-dollar bills. But in midterm campaigning, do not be surprised to hear Republican candidates charge Democrats not only with making the economy worse, but with planning to do even more damage, if only they had the chance.

### Internal Link---US K2 Global Economy---2NC

#### US recovery is key to the global economy---shocks spillover.

M. Ayhan Kose et al. 17. 27 February 2017 M. Ayhan Kose, Chief Economist of EFI and Director of Prospects Group, World Bank. Csilla Lakatos, Senior Economist, World Bank. Franziska Ohnsorge, Lead Economist in the Development Economics (DEC) Vice Presidency, World Bank. Marc Stocker, Senior Economist, Development Prospects Group, World Bank. “Understanding the global role of the US economy”. https://voxeu.org/article/understanding-global-role-us-economy

Because of its size and interconnectedness, developments in the US economy are bound to have important effects around the world. The US has the world’s single largest economy, accounting for almost a quarter of global GDP (at market exchange rates), one-fifth of global FDI, and more than a third of stock market capitalisation. It is the most important export destination for one-fifth of countries around the world. The US dollar is the most widely used currency in global trade and financial transactions, and changes in US monetary policy and investor sentiment play a major role in driving global financing conditions (World Bank 2016).

At the same time, the global economy is important for the US as well. Affiliates of US multinationals operating abroad, and affiliates of foreign companies located in the US account for a large share of US output, employment, cross-border trade and financial flows, and stock market capitalisation. Recent studies have examined the importance of global growth for the US economy (Shambaugh 2016), the global impact of changes in US monetary policy (Rey 2013), or the global effect of changing US trade policies (Furman et al. 2017, Crowley et al. 2017).

It is likely that there will be shifts in US growth, monetary and fiscal policies, as well as uncertainty in US financial markets. What will be the global spillovers? Our recent work (Kose et al. 2017) attempts to answer these questions:

* How synchronised are US and global business cycles?
* How large are global spillovers from US growth and policy shocks?
* How important is the global economy for the US?
* How synchronised are US and global business cycles?

Business cycles in the US, other advanced economies (AEs), and emerging market and developing economies (EMDEs) have been highly synchronous (Figure 1.A). This partly reflects the strength of global trade and financial linkages of the US economy with the rest of the world, but also that global shocks drive common cyclical fluctuations. This was particularly the case at the time of the 2008-09 Global Crisis. It is not a new phenomenon, however. Although the four recessions the global economy experienced since 1960 (1975, 1982, 1991, and 2009) were driven by many problems in many places, they all overlapped with severe recessions in the US (Kose and Terrones 2015).

Other countries tend to be in the same business cycle phase as the US roughly 80% of the time (Figure 1.B). The degree of synchronisation with US financial cycles is slightly lower, but still significant – credit, housing, and equity price cycles are in the same phase about 60% of the time. Although it is difficult to establish empirically whether the US economy leads business and financial cycle turning points in other economies, recent research indicates that the US appears to influence the timing and duration of recessions in many major economies (Francis et al. 2015).

Figure 1 Synchronisation of business cycles

A. Correlations with US business cycles

[FIGURE OMITTED]

Sources: Haver Analytics; World Bank; Kose and Terrones (2015); IMF.

Notes: Contemporaneous correlations between cyclical component of US real GDP and cyclical component of real GDP of advanced economies and EMDEs.

B. Concordance with US business and financial cycles

[FIGURE OMITTED]

Sources: Haver Analytics; World Bank; Kose and Terrones (2015); IMF.

Notes: Average share of years in which business cycles in the US and all economies were in the same phase. A higher share suggests more synchronization between two countries.

How large are global spillovers from US growth and policy shocks?

A surge in US growth – whether due to expansionary fiscal policies or other reasons – could provide a significant boost to the global economy. Shocks to the US economy transmit to the rest of the world through three main channels.

An acceleration in US activity can lift growth in trading partners directly through an increase in import demand, and indirectly by strengthening productivity spillovers embedded in trade.

Financial market developments in the US may have even wider global implications. US bond and equity markets are the largest and most liquid in the world and the US dollar is the currency mostly widely used in trade and financial transactions. This makes US monetary policy and investor confidence important drivers of global financial conditions (Arteta et al. 2015, IMF2015).

Given its role in global commodity markets (the US is both the world’s largest gas and oil consumer and producer), changes in US growth prospects can affect global commodity prices. This affects activity, fiscal and balance of payment developments in commodity exporters.

Estimates indicate that a percentage-point increase in US growth could boost growth in advanced economies by 0.8 of a percentage point, and in emerging market and developing economies by 0.6 of a percentage point after one year (Figure 2.A). Investment could respond even more strongly. A boost to investment could come for instance from fiscal stimulus measures – but the effect would largely depend on the circumstances of the implementation of these measures, including the amount of remaining economic slack, the response of monetary policy, and the adjustment of household and business expectations to the prospect of higher deficit and debt levels. A faster tightening of US monetary policy than previously expected could, for instance, lead to sudden increases in borrowing costs, currency pressures, financial market volatility, and capital outflows for more vulnerable emerging market and developing economies.

### XT---Economy Terminal Impact---2NC

#### Slower growth increases populist conflict---140 years of data proves.

James Pethokoukis 6/4/21. The DeWitt Wallace Fellow at the American Enterprise Institute where he runs the AEIdeas blog. "Biden's budget predicts the Roaring Twenties will end in 2022. Uh oh.". https://theweek.com/politics/1001118/the-populist-political-warning-in-the-biden-budget

But there's a big non-economic reason to hope for growth faster than the pace predicted in the Biden budget. The historically slow recovery out of the Great Recession coincided with a rise of nativist populism, both here and in other rich countries. When economic growth falters, bad things often happen. In the study "Going to extremes: Politics after financial crises, 1870 – 2014," researchers found after a severe financial crisis, "voters seem to be particularly attracted to the political rhetoric of the extreme right, which often attributes blame to minorities or foreigners." This reaction equates to a 30 percent increase, on average, in the vote share going to far-right parties. A similar cause-and-effect is suggested in "Populist psychology: economics, culture, and emotions," which finds that economic crises "cause emotional reactions that activate cultural discontent. This, in turn, activates populist attitudes."

#### Economic crisis causes war---history proves.

Deborah Haynes 20. Security and Defence Editor. "Risk of new world war is real, head of UK armed forces warns". Sky News. 11-8-2020. https://news.sky.com/story/risk-of-new-world-war-is-real-head-of-uk-armed-forces-warns-12126389

Economic crises in the past have led to security crises and General Carter said he was worried this could happen again given the blow inflicted on the world economy by the pandemic.

"I think we are living at a moment in time where the world is a very uncertain and anxious place," he said.

"I think the real risk we have, with quite a lot of regional conflicts that are going on at the moment, is you could see escalation lead to miscalculation and that is a thing I think we have to guard against."

Explaining what he meant by miscalculation, the military chief said: "The protagonists, either because they don't realise the implications of their actions, lead to an escalation, which means that more people perhaps get involved, more weaponry gets involved and before you can contain it, it leads the sides ending up in a full-blown war.

"We have to remember history might not repeat itself but it has a rhythm and if you look back at the last century, before both world wars, I think it was unarguable that there was escalation that led to the miscalculation which ultimately led to war at a scale we would hopefully never see again."

Asked whether he was saying the threat of another world war was real, General Carter said: "I am saying it's a risk and I think we need to be conscious of those risks and that's why Remembrance matters because if you look back at history, hopefully you learn from their experience, and you make sure you're very cautious about how you manage the sorts of regional conflicts that we see playing out in the world today."

#### Causes populism---08 proves.

Mathew Burrows and Robert A. Manning 20. Mathew Burrows Director Of Foresight, Scowcroft Strategy Initiative and Robert A. Manning Senior Fellow. "The top ten risks and opportunities for 2021". Atlantic Council. 12-16-2020. https://www.atlanticcouncil.org/blogs/new-atlanticist/the-top-ten-risks-and-opportunities-for-2021/

The International Monetary Fund (IMF) and Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD) recently reduced their original estimates for 2020 of downside economic damage to the United States and other countries from COVID, but most of the world won’t get back to pre-2020 GDP even by the end of 2021. Only one major economy—China—will experience significant growth (almost 2 percent) in 2020, ending up 10 percent larger by the end of 2021. The situation could become worse for the West if there’s inadequate fiscal stimulus. Many economists believe the slow US recovery from the 2008 financial crisis was partly due to the premature withdrawal of stimulus and an emphasis on deficit-reduction starting in 2010. In Europe, post-2008 austerity measures exacerbated the problem of slow growth. Keep in mind as well that the 2008 financial crisis spawned the ongoing populist surge in the United States and Europe. Once again, the darkening financial prospects of millions of citizens, pushed down just when they started to get back on their feet, could lead to even worse longer-term political repercussions.

### AT: Democracy Impact Turn---2NC

#### Democracy impact turn is all partisanship---if people want the GOP in 2022, it is democratic. Their evidence is dem propaganda.

Zaid Jilani 22. Freelance journalist who has previously worked for UC Berkeley’s Greater Good Science Center. He is a graduate of the University of Georgia and received his master’s from Syracuse University. "It’s Coups All the Way Down". Tablet Magazine. 1-11-2022. https://www.tabletmag.com/sections/news/articles/coups-all-the-way-down

The Democratic Party’s message ahead of the 2022 midterms appears to be simple: Vote for us or democracy gets it.

“I’m worried that if Republicans win in the midterm elections, that voting as we know it in this country will be gone,” warned California Democratic Rep. Eric Swalwell during a recent MSNBC appearance. “This is not only the most important election. If we don’t get it right, it could be the last election.”

Across the progressive Democratic messaging infrastructure, the party and movement have rebranded themselves as the protectors of the democratic ideal, which, in their telling, is on the verge of extinction.

President Biden has warned that GOP election laws that would, among other things, require voters to write down their state ID number on absentee ballots, are the equivalent of “Jim Crow on steroids,” while more or less comparing Virginia’s Republican Governor-elect Glenn Youngkin to a Capitol rioter.

Heads of influential progressive political action committees worry aloud that we will see a swing of “power to Republican politicians, which ends American democracy.” Liberal opinion columnists lament that the GOP is plotting to “take control of more and more of the apparatus of voting to ensure that Republicans can never lose.”

But if you sincerely value liberal democracy—not just majority rule but open debate and the protection of individual and minority rights—it can be hard not to notice the irony: A political movement that has worked so hard to censor and marginalize its opponents in virtually all institutions is claiming that it now represents the vanguard of democracy.

I’m not pointing this out to prove to progressives that they are just a bunch of hypocrites who don’t really value liberal democracy.

I’m writing this because I am worried about democracy in the United States. I won’t validate Biden or Swalwell’s outlandish claims about democracy ending in the next election or Jim Crow reasserting itself in GOP-run states, but I do think it’s deeply unhealthy that so many people in our country distrust the news media, public institutions, and their elected representatives.

Take Swalwell, who ominously predicted that a GOP victory in the midterm elections—leaving the Democrats in control of the executive branch, of course—would mark the extinction of American democracy.

When Twitter decided to ban Georgia Republican Congresswoman Marjorie Taylor Greene because she espoused skepticism toward COVID vaccines, genuine advocates for free speech and open debate were outraged. How can a private company that runs the modern public square, the equivalent of a public utility, unilaterally decide to silence an official elected by the people?

Even House Minority Leader Kevin McCarthy, who has been skeptical of bipartisan congressional oversight of Silicon Valley, criticized Twitter for shutting down what he called “constitutionally protected speech.” But Swalwell was unsympathetic to Greene losing her right to speak on the platform. “Kevin McCarthy hates free markets. He wants government to have absolute control over private businesses,” he thundered. “Is there a word for this?”

Suddenly, the defender of democracy transformed into an advocate for corporate control of public debate, using an argument that wouldn’t be out of place in a Milton Friedman tract. As hypocritical as it was, it was hardly surprising.

Last year we saw Twitter work with Facebook to suppress the spread of a New York Post story about Joe Biden’s son Hunter. The announcement that the story would be throttled on Facebook came from Andy Stone, a Facebook communications staffer who previously worked for the Democratic Congressional Campaign Committee.

No prominent Democratic elected official protested the suppression of the story, which quickly became a bigger story than the content of the Post article itself. And why would they? It was clear that, in this case, the Democrats weren’t after democratic legitimacy but political hegemony. They stood to benefit more from having the world’s most powerful digital communications companies actively suppress speech that could assist their political opponents than from standing by the principle of freedom of expression.

#### [CROSS APPLY OR READ IF NOT ON CASE] No democracy impact---democratic peace theory is wrong

Daniel Larison 12. PhD in history from the University of Chicago Democratic Peace Theory Is False http://www.theamericanconservative.com/larison/democratic-peace-theory-is-false/

Rojas’ claim depends entirely on the meaning of “genuine democracy.” Even though there are numerous examples of wars between states with universal male suffrage and elected governments (including that little dust-up known as WWI), the states in question probably don’t qualify as “genuine” democracies and so can’t be used as counter-examples. Regardless, democratic peace theory draws broad conclusions from a short period in modern history with very few cases before the 20th century. The core of democratic peace theory as I understand it is that democratic governments are more accountable to their populations, and because the people will bear the costs of the war they are going to be less willing to support a war policy. This supposedly keeps democratic states from waging wars against one another because of the built-in electoral and institutional checks on government power. One small problem with this is that it is rubbish.

Democracies in antiquity fought against one another. Political equality and voting do not abolish conflicts of interest between competing states. Democratic peace theory doesn’t account for the effects of nationalist and imperialist ideologies on the way democratic nations think about war. Democratic nations that have professional armies to do the fighting for them are often enthusiastic about overseas wars. The Conservative-Unionist government that waged the South African War (against two states with elected governments, I might add) enjoyed great popular support and won a huge majority in the “Khaki” election that followed.

As long as it goes well and doesn’t have too many costs, war can be quite popular, and even if the war is costly it may still be popular if it is fought for nationalist reasons that appeal to a majority of the public. If the public is whipped into thinking that there is an intolerable foreign threat or if they believe that their country can gain something at relatively low cost by going to war, the type of government they have really is irrelevant. Unless a democratic public believes that a military conflict will go badly for their military, they may be ready to welcome the outbreak of a war that they expect to win. Setting aside the flaws and failures of U.S.-led democracy promotion for a moment, the idea that reducing the number of non-democracies makes war less likely is just fantasy. Clashing interests between states aren’t going away, and the more democratic states there are in the world the more likely it is that two or more of them will eventually fight one another.

### AT: Trump 2024 Impact Turn---2NC

#### 2022 doesn’t impact 2024 AND its too soon.

Geoffrey Skelley and Jean Yi 2/25/22. FiveThirtyEight. "Stop Using The Midterms To Predict Presidential Elections". FiveThirtyEight. 2-25-2022. https://fivethirtyeight.com/features/stop-using-the-midterms-to-predict-presidential-elections/

The 2022 midterm election hasn’t even happened yet, but speculation about the 2024 presidential race is already underway, with many potential candidates positioning themselves for a possible run — and in the case of former President Donald Trump, doing so quite publicly. Early general election polls are already testing Trump against President Biden, too, with many questioning whether Biden will even run again in 2024, when he’d be 81 years old. Some Democrats have even gone as far as to venture that a rough midterm election for their party — which seems quite possible — might discourage Biden from running again, opening the door for Vice President Kamala Harris or another Democrat to win the party’s nomination.

But while a strong Republican performance in 2022 might influence Biden’s thinking on 2024, it’s a mistake to expect the midterm result to predict how the country will vote in the ensuing presidential election. As the chart below shows, there’s little relationship between the margin in the national popular vote for the U.S. House in a midterm election and the national popular vote margin in the next presidential contest.1 So whatever happens in the House this November, don’t expect it to forecast the results of the next presidential race.

More often than not, midterm and presidential results have been miles apart. For instance, in 1994, the GOP captured Congress in the midterm “Republican Revolution” amidst then-President Bill Clinton’s poor approval ratings, winning the House popular vote by about 7 percentage points. But in 1996, Clinton ended up claiming a sleepy reelection victory by 8.5 points over Bob Dole — a swing of more than 15 points. In fact, on average, there’s been a swing of about 12 points from the midterm to the subsequent presidential contest.

That said, midterm elections and their following presidential races have sometimes run close together: Democrats swept back into power in the 2006 midterm election with an 8-point edge in the House vote, for instance, and then-President Barack Obama won by a similar 7-point margin nationally in 2008. In fact, midterm and presidential elections have run closer together in recent years — but importantly, there is still not much of a relationship despite this. Rather, this seems to be happening because landslide presidential wins are increasingly a thing of the past. Instead, lopsided midterm results for the party not in the White House are increasingly becoming the norm, then followed by highly competitive presidential races.

One big reason midterm and presidential elections have such different outcomes is that they are fundamentally different kinds of contests. Midterm elections, for instance, tend to have much lower turnout than presidential elections, and what’s more, voters from the party that’s not in the White House are often much more likely to turn out. Additionally, some voters switch from the president’s party because of dissatisfaction with the status quo. And because the president’s party usually loses ground in a midterm, you still often see narratives that suggest a president’s reelection chances may now be in peril just after a midterm election.

Yet presidents can, of course, change their approach following a difficult midterm and/or their opponents in Congress can overstep after winning power, both of which can help improve the president’s public standing. And perhaps most importantly, two years is a lifetime in politics, leaving plenty of time for important factors like the state of the economy or war and peace to change in meaningful ways that will influence the electorate. For instance, a struggling economy, mediocre approval ratings, and a bad midterm can become a roaring economy, “Morning Again In America,” and a landslide victory in that narrow span of time, as was the case for former President Ronald Reagan’s 1984 reelection bid.

Given all this, Biden and Democrats who are uncertain about the party’s standing probably shouldn’t look to the 2022 election result as a sign of whether the president can win in 2024. It’s true that the midterm outcome could alter the public’s perception of Washington if Biden is facing off with a GOP-controlled Congress. But the actual midterm results won’t really tell us whether Biden is doomed or can win reelection. After all, we have no idea where things will stand in a couple years when it comes to the COVID-19 pandemic, inflation and the overall economy, much less sudden developments like the U.S.’s potential role in the conflict in Ukraine.

Of course, with all this said, it is indeed fun to take a look at the early polling of the 2024 race — trust me, it’s like catnip. Nevertheless, we need to take those early polls with many grains of salt. After all, even polls taken six months out from the general election are only moderately predictive of the final result — and at that point, we usually know who the nominees are.

The 2024 election is likely to be pretty competitive considering how divided our politics are, but the candidates do matter at the margins. So regardless of how many polls test Biden against Trump, time will tell whether we will really see the first general election rematch since 1956 — or if one or both parties end up nominating someone else entirely. But one thing is for certain: The result this November will not guarantee any result for November 2024.

#### No uniqueness for the impact turn---Trump wins now.

Max Greenwood, 3/29/2022, "Poll: Trump leads Biden, Harris in 2024 match-ups," TheHill, https://thehill.com/homenews/campaign/600146-poll-trump-leads-biden-harris-in-2024-matchups

Former President Trump is leading President Biden in a hypothetical 2024 match-up, according to a new Harvard CAPS-Harris Poll survey released exclusively to The Hill on Monday.

If the 2024 presidential election were held right now, the poll finds Trump getting 47 percent support compared to 41 percent for Biden. Twelve percent of voters are undecided.

Vice President Harris performs even worse in a hypothetical match-up with Trump. Forty-nine percent said they would choose Trump, while 38 percent said they would support Harris.

The poll, while very early, portends trouble for Democrats in their 2024 effort to maintain control of the White House after taking it back less than two years ago. Trump has repeatedly hinted that he’s considering another bid for the presidency and remains deeply popular among the GOP’s conservative base.

#### Turn---GOP win solves Trumpism---reduces polarization by impeaching Biden and Harris.

Grady Means 5/16/22. Opinion Contributor "We need a reset with the midterms — and then Biden’s impeachment". Hill. 5-16-2022. https://thehill.com/opinion/white-house/3487514-we-need-a-reset-with-the-midterms-and-then-bidens-impeachment/

The upcoming midterm elections could represent the most complex political calculus in history. The question is whether a potential Republican majority in the House and Senate, combined with a bloc of pragmatic Democratic senators, might decide to impeach President Biden and Vice President Kamala Harris. Doing so could be the one key to reducing the polarization of American politics and salvaging American civil society.

Joe Biden has set the stage for his demise. The American economy is in a death spiral. Inflation is skyrocketing, and most of the voting public understands that the disaster is because of Biden’s policies. His lame attempts to blame everyone but himself (“conspiracies” among energy companies, auto companies, food companies, irrational consumers, etc.) are falling on deaf ears. The polls are clear: the majority of voters feel Biden is mishandling the economy. His tone-deaf message that more government spending will heal the problem is not resonating with voters.

Pension plans — yes, those plans that provide pensions for teachers, firefighters, police, other public employees, union members and all other private sector workers — are in serious jeopardy. IRA and 401(k) savings are collapsing. Inflation is eating up the incomes and wage gains of all middle-class and low-income workers. The Fed’s rising interest rates will crush the market and further raise the net cost of financing business, houses, cars, etc.

Biden’s energy policies have been a disaster. Every American, every day, sees the results of his policies when they fill up their cars with gas or pay their utility bills. Prices have skyrocketed under Biden and some Americans may be forced to travel less, live more in the dark, have colder homes in the winter and hotter homes in the summer, and suffer more regular blackouts. Biden’s progressive utopia: The New and Primitive Dark Ages.

Additionally, Biden’s Transportation and Treasury leadership have been abject failures at stemming supply chain problems, trade issues, and economic collapse.

Many Black and Hispanic American citizens reportedly are leaving the Democratic Party as they realize that Biden’s illegal and criminal open-border policies have led to millions of illegal immigrants flooding the country, taking away lower-wage jobs and diluting the voting power of minorities. American citizens also realize that these policies are bringing in criminals with illegal drugs, spiking urban crime and drug-related deaths.

The Biden administration’s COVID policies and lockdowns were abject failures and led to accelerated deaths, mental illness, and economic contraction.

Biden’s notion that teachers “own” America’s children, and have as much or more rights than parents in teaching children values and beliefs, is straight from the communist playbook. The Justice Department’s reported branding of upset American parents as “domestic terrorists,” if true, is beyond appalling.

And Biden’s fully incompetent, politically motivated defense and foreign policies and leadership have invited aggression and adventurism by our enemies — which will only get worse.

Most importantly, Biden’s politics and rhetoric, and his weaponization of the Justice Department against ordinary Americans, has been unprecedented in its divisiveness, corrosive to American civil society. His overt support for progressive street riots, burning cities, and physical intimidation of his opponents represents a new low in American democracy.

Biden and Harris need to go now, and the 2022 elections provide a unique opportunity for a desperately needed reset.

Without such a reset, the future is clear. Donald Trump almost assuredly will return as president. Americans will choose the devil they know, rather than the devil they no longer can stand. It is time for aggressive, “radical moderation,” and the first step is for the next House and Senate to impeach, convict and remove Biden and Harris.

How would that work?

If Republicans take control of the House, they can move quickly on Articles of Impeachment. The Biden administration has been breaking the law to a level that dramatically exceeds the threshold of “high crimes.” The immigration policies alone qualify for summary judgment. The weaponization of the Justice Department follows close behind. Various Republican groups are assembling a list of investigations into rampant law-breaking by the Biden administration.

Harris, with her portfolio covering illegal immigration and her overt support for urban violence, is an equally guilty target.

Of course, the indication on Hunter Biden’s laptop that Joe Biden likely was involved in potential criminal activity involving payoffs from foreign enemies could become additional evidence of high crimes.

The Senate should convict and remove Biden and Harris before the end of January 2023. The House Speaker would then succeed Biden — most Americans would agree that anyone would be a vast improvement — and, in the spirit of national reconciliation, a hard-as-nails moderate Democrat should be chosen as vice president. Two obvious candidates would be Sen. Joe Manchin (D-W.Va.) or Sen. Kyrsten Sinema (D-Ariz.), with Manchin getting the nod because he’d be one-term.

Moderate Democratic senators should leap at this opportunity. If they don’t, they almost certainly will get Trump in 2024, along with another red wave in the House and Senate.

Such a reset would pay huge dividends for America and both political parties. It would reverse Biden’s destructive economic and energy policies and stop his and Harris’s divisive rhetoric. It would lead to open, competitive presidential primaries for both parties, and provide some hope for stopping the next Trump train wreck. It would moderate and, perhaps, return some civility to American politics. It would save America.

### XT---Trump Now---2NR

#### Trump is the favorite

Todd Dewey 10/14/21. "Donald Trump now betting favorite to win 2024 presidential election". Las Vegas Review-Journal. https://www.reviewjournal.com/sports/betting/donald-trump-now-betting-favorite-to-win-2024-presidential-election-2459354/

For the first time since Donald Trump left office, he has surpassed Joe Biden as the betting favorite to win the 2024 presidential election.

Trump emerged as the favorite Monday at multiple offshore sportsbooks to return to the White House in 2024. On Wednesday, he became the top choice over President Biden at Smarkets, a London-based betting exchange. Trump also is now the favorite at Ladbrokes sportsbook in London.

According to Smarkets, the former president has a 20 percent chance, which equates to odds of 4-1, of winning the 2024 election after having fallen as low as 3 percent, or 32-1, in the wake of the U.S. Capitol attack in January.

Biden’s odds dropped to 19 percent (+426), and Vice President Kamala Harris’ odds dropped to 13 percent (+669).

“It’s a pretty staggering development to find a defeated one-term president taking over as favorite from the incumbent who beat him, but we know by now that Donald Trump is no ordinary politician,” Smarkets head of political markets Matthew Shaddick said. “It’s early days, but the latest market signals suggest there is every chance we could be heading for a Biden vs. Trump rematch in 2024 with Trump currently having a very slight edge, according to the betting.”

At Ladbrokes, Trump is a +350 favorite over Biden (4-1) and Harris (5-1).

All betting odds can be converted into an implied chance, or percentage, of something happening, and that is how Smarkets presents its odds.

Trump is the heavy favorite at Smarkets to be the 2024 Republican nominee with a 45 percent chance (+122).

“Trump’s odds have been improving all year and in particular since Biden’s poll ratings began declining this summer,” Shaddick said. “There is absolutely no sign of Republican voters deserting him, and he leads every primary poll by a distance.

#### Trump will win.

Independent 10/15/21. "Donald Trump favourite to win 2024 presidential election". . 10-15-2021. https://www.independent.co.uk/news/world/americas/us-politics/donald-trump-2024-election-biden-b1938985.html

Donald Trump has become the favourite to win the election in 2024, as Joe Biden falls behind the former US president and faces challenges with his domestic agenda.

Mr Trump, according to betting odds, had been ahead in the race for the Republican nomination in 2024 but had not been on odds for a win in the election.

However, recent odds byBetfair Exchange found Mr Trump is now 4.8 to win in 2024. Mr Biden, meanwhile, was at 5.1 after falling behind his own vice president, Kamala Harris, in the presidential tie-up.