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#### Democratic win will happen

Darragh Roche 22, 7-10-2022, "MSN," No Publication, https://www.msn.com/en-us/news/politics/democrats-best-case-scenario-for-the-midterms/ar-AAZpKjk

Democrats are widely seen as the underdogs in the 2022 midterm elections, with the party expected to suffer substantial losses and likely lose control of at least one chamber of Congress. In this combination image, Joe Biden (Inset) gestures after speaking during election night at the Chase Center in Wilmington, Delaware, early on November 4, 2020 and a stock photo of Patriotic crowds with the Flag of the USA, America In this combination image, Joe Biden (Inset) gestures after speaking during election night at the Chase Center in Wilmington, Delaware, early on November 4, 2020 and a stock photo of Patriotic crowds with the Flag of the USA, America The serving president's party usually performs poorly during midterms. However, that doesn't mean they always suffer a wipeout—and certain conditions could set the stage for a surprise comeback for President Joe Biden and the Democrats. Biden Admits Democrats Don't Have Votes To Bypass Filibuster To Codify Roe Perhaps the most obvious is the U.S. Supreme Court's decision to overturn the landmark abortion rulings Roe v. Wade and Planned Parenthood v. Casey, which found that a woman's right to abortion was constitutionally protected. It remains to be seen if the Court's ruling will affect turnout. However, if Democratic voters and women are motivated by a desire to protect abortion access, Biden's party might just beat the odds. The best-case scenario for Democrats would be retaining control of both the House of Representatives and the Senate—and perhaps making net gains in both chambers. Holding the Senate The U.S. Senate is currently divided between 50 Republicans, 48 Democrats and two independents who caucus with the Democrats. This has meant that Vice President Kamala Harris has had to use her casting vote on several occasions. Poll tracker FiveThirtyEight's 2022 election forecast rates the Senate as a toss-up **with Democrats defending 14 seats and Republicans 21, but there is some** room for Democratic gains. The Pennsylvania Senate race is a toss-up as Republican Senator Pat Toomey is retiring. If Democratic Lt. Governor John Fetterman can defeat Republican Dr. Mehmet Oz, that will go a long way to holding the Senate. Democrats could also make gains in potentially close races that FiveThirtyEight rates as leaning Republican—Wisconsin and North Carolina—and could even score an upset victory in Ohio. However, incumbent Democrats in close races will also have to win re-election if the party hopes to maintain control of the Senate. FiveThirtyEight rates the races in Georgia, Nevada and Arizona as toss-ups. All those seats are currently held by Democrats. If everything goes right for Democrats on election day, they could end up with 54 seats—still shy of the 60 votes needed to overcome the filibuster. This outcome seems unlikely, however. Keeping the House It's a different picture in the House of Representatives, where Republicans are favored to win, according to FiveThirtyEight's analysis. Democrats currently hold 220 seats to Republicans' 210, while five seats are vacant. The president's party will need 218 seats to keep the chamber. FiveThirtyEight argues that even if Democrats hold all their current seats and win all the toss-up races, it will not be enough to hand them the majority. A Democratic victory in the House appears to require a major shakeup in the dynamics of the midterm elections. That is possible—especially given likely ongoing controversy over abortion laws and investigations into the role some Republicans played in efforts to overturn the 2020 presidential election. The election could throw up a so-called "October surprise" that changes the course of the race in Democrats' favor, but right now that seems a distant prospect. It also seems unlikely that neither chamber will change hands. The last time that happened was in 1998, when Republicans held both the House and Senate despite modest Democratic gains in the House and some changes in the composition of the Senate. It's worth noting that at that time, Republicans' failure to make gains was seen as a major surprise. If Democrats can buck the trend and keep the House, it will be considered a significant victory and could see Speaker of the House Nancy Pelosi remain in the leadership amid recent speculation about her future. Biden's Agenda and 2024 The outcome of the November elections will have a major impact on two issues heading into 2023: whether President Biden can implement his agenda and the 2024 presidential race. If Republicans take control of either chamber of Congress, they will be able to stymie the president's agenda, preventing the passage of legislation and, if they control the Senate, stopping Biden from filling any vacancy that might arise on the Supreme Court. Even narrow Democratic majorities in the House and Senate would make matters easier for the administration, while surprise victories could give Biden the legislative firepower he needs to pass stalled measures such as the $1.75 trillion Build Back Better plan. Democrats keeping the House would also prevent Republicans launching a series of investigations into the administration - which they are reportedly already planning - and stop those potential investigations from dominating the political agenda in the run up to 2024. Threats of impeachment against Biden from some quarters of the Republican Party would also become meaningless if Democrats retain both houses of Congress, removing another potential headache for the president.

#### Plenty of competitive races that mean the dem’s can still come out on top

* Democracy warrants

John Harwood 22, 6-26-2022, "Democrats still have this glimmer of hope for the midterm elections," CNN, https://www.cnn.com/2022/06/26/politics/midterm-elections-democrats/index.html

President Joe Biden can't avoid a bad midterm election. But with a boost last week from the US Supreme Court, he still might avoid the worst. A bad election means losing the Democratic majority in the US House of Representatives, which his own party's strategists now consider virtually certain. A Republican-controlled House would roadblock his legislative agenda, investigate his administration and family, and perhaps even impeach him -- notwithstanding the absence of legitimate cause. The worst means losing the Senate, too. Returned to the job of majority leader, Mitch McConnell could deny Biden the ability to fill top administration jobs and judicial vacancies -- including any potential vacancy on the Supreme Court. Both outcomes will be shaped by the same atmospheric conditions, which for months have strongly favored the GOP. But fortunately for the beleaguered Biden, critical House and Senate contests sometimes move in different ways. Voters know less about individual House members and their challengers. That leaves competitive House races largely at the mercy of a national mood soured by inflation worries and disappointment with Biden. Though gerrymandering of House districts leaves only a few truly competitive ones, that pool of targets appears plenty large enough to place the speaker's gavel in GOP hands. Republicans need a net gain of only four seats -- a fraction of the average historical gain for the party not holding the White House -- to recapture the majority. In a Senate now split 50-50, Republicans need a net gain of only one seat. But that won't come as easily. More than House members, higher-profile senators and their challengers have some ability to create their own political weather. In competitive races, they invariably have plenty of cash for campaign advertising to burnish their own images and tar their opponents'. A higher profile can magnify the assets of strong candidates and the liabilities of weak ones. Republicans worry most about the latter, having watched inept nominees blow several winnable Senate races when their party was in the minority in 2010 and 2012. The 10 Senate seats most likely to flip in 2022 Since only one-third of Senate seats are up in any single election, partisan outcomes hinge largely on which seats those are. In 2018, even as the unpopularity of then-President Donald Trump helped Democrats recapture the House, Republicans netted two Senate seats because that campaign included battleground races in reliably red states such as Missouri, North Dakota and Indiana. In 2022, the political geography is decidedly blue. Democrats can hold the Senate merely by reelecting incumbents in Arizona, Georgia, Nevada and New Hampshire -- all states Biden won in 2020. If they can't keep them all, Pennsylvania and Wisconsin provide chances to flip Republican seats in two more states Biden won. "I've never seen a map this good" for an embattled majority party, observed Amy Walter, editor of the nonpartisan Cook Political Report. On that auspicious battlefield, Democrats have lately acquired fresh ammunition. On Capitol Hill, the House select committee investigating the January 6, 2021, insurrection has laid out in riveting detail the lengths to which Trump and his allies went in their attempt to overturn the American people's verdict in the 2020 election. And at the Supreme Court, new rulings have demonstrated the willingness of GOP-appointed conservative justices to defy majority opinion and its own precedents on the most volatile issues roiling the country. First, the court expanded the constitutional right to bear arms by striking down a century-old New York law limiting residents' right to carry concealed weapons. Then a 5-4 majority erased the constitutional right to abortion that women had for the last half-century as a result of its earlier Roe vs. Wade ruling. Taken together, those developments highlight Biden's warnings about the radicalism and extremism of Trump's "Make America Great Again" movement. Democratic candidates crave the chance to shift the electorate's attention from the economic concerns weighing down the White House to more fundamental questions about American democracy. "Is the disappointment in Biden a more powerful force than fear of MAGA?" asked Simon Rosenberg, president of the New Democratic Network, a think tank. "I just don't know that's the case." These lines of Democratic attack place particular pressure on untested GOP candidates who seem to match the portrait Democrats paint. In Georgia, a prime Senate Republican target, ex-football star Herschel Walker has favored a complete abortion ban that even bars exceptions for rape, incest or threats to the woman's life. Walker has also struggled with personal controversies and odd public pronouncements in his bid to oust Democratic Sen. Raphael Warnock. GOP strategists acknowledge that the abortion issue, in particular, adds a wild card for mobilizing Democratic voters. But the specter of MAGA governance, they insist, will ultimately get swamped by discontent with the economy and the nation's general direction. "It's not going to have nearly enough traction," said veteran GOP pollster Neil Newhouse. A few intraparty dissidents remain uncertain. Mike Madrid, a California-based Republican consultant who worked to defeat Trump in 2020, sees the outcome turning on the relative magnitude of two opposing trends: the drift of suburban White women toward Democrats and blue-collar Hispanic men toward Republicans. By cooperating with Democrats on gun safety legislation, McConnell told reporters last week, he hopes to reverse enough of those suburban defections. But "to believe that's a foregone conclusion," Madrid said, "is silly."

#### Democratic voter’s are motivated to turn out now but any shift in the political environment means republican win congress

Nate Silver 22, 6-30-2022, Silver is the founder and editor in chief of FiveThirtyEight."Why Republicans Are Favored To Win The House, But Not The Senate," FiveThirtyEight, https://fivethirtyeight.com/features/why-republicans-are-favored-to-win-the-house-but-not-the-senate/

Republicans are substantial favorites to take over the U.S. House of Representatives following this November’s midterm elections, but the U.S. Senate is much more competitive, according to FiveThirtyEight’s 2022 midterm election forecast, which launched today. Democrats are also favored to hang on to the governorships in a trio of swing states in the Rust Belt — Pennsylvania, Wisconsin and Michigan — although they are significant underdogs to win high-profile gubernatorial races in Georgia and Texas against Republican incumbents. The split diagnosis reflects the difference between macro- and micro-level conditions. The national environment is quite poor for Democrats. Of course, this is typical for the president’s party, which has lost seats in the House in all but two of the past 21 midterm elections. But Democrats are also saddled with an unpopular President Biden and a series of challenges for the country, including inflation levels that haven’t been seen in decades, the lingering effects of the still-ongoing COVID-19 pandemic and fraying trust in civic institutions — caused, in part, by Republican efforts to overturn the results of the 2020 election. Democrats, as a predominantly urban party, also face a longstanding problem in the Senate, where every state has equal representation regardless of its population, resulting in a substantial built-in bias toward white, rural states. And although Democrats are very slightly better off following the redistricting process in the House than they were under the 2020 maps, there are still more Republican-leaning seats than Democratic-leaning ones. True, the political environment is dynamic. The Supreme Court’s decision last week to overturn Roe v. Wade is too recent to be fully reflected in polls, but there are reasons to think it will help Democrats. Roe, which granted the constitutional right to abortion, was a popular precedent, and Democratic voters are more likely than Republican ones to say the decision will encourage them to vote at the midterms. Moreover, in striking down Roe and other popular laws like restrictions against the concealed carry of firearms, the Supreme Court has in some ways undermined one of the traditional reasons that the president’s party tends to lose seats at the midterms. Typically, voters like some degree of balance: They do not want one party to have unfettered control of all levers of government. But the Supreme Court, with its 6-3 conservative majority, is a reminder of how much power Republicans have even if they don’t control the White House. The insurrection at the U.S. Capitol on Jan. 6 can also serve as a reminder to voters about what might happen if the Electoral College certification process takes place in 2024 amid Republican control of both chambers of Congress.1 Democrats have had trouble getting the public to treat threats to democracy as a high priority, but polls do show that the public is sympathetic to the Democrats’ case, especially after the recent congressional hearings on the events of Jan. 6. So, this is not a typical, low-stakes midterm election. On the contrary, there are strong forces tugging at each side of the rope, some of which are potentially of existential importance. But Democrats’ majorities in both chambers of Congress are narrow, the historical precedent toward the president’s party losing seats is strong, and polls so far — such as the generic congressional ballot, which asks voters which party they would support in an election — suggest that voters slightly prefer Republican control of Congress. Or at least that’s the story in the House, where there are dozens of competitive races and candidates are relatively anonymous. There, big-picture factors tend to prevail. An unusually weak Republican candidate in one district might be counteracted by a strong one in another, for example. In the Senate and gubernatorial races, by contrast, individual factors can matter more. And the GOP has nominated — or is poised to nominate — candidates who might significantly underperform a “generic” Republican based on some combination of inexperience, personal scandals or having articulated unpopular conservative positions. This is not a new problem for Republicans: underqualified or fringy candidates have cost them seats in the Senate in other recent cycles. So let’s briefly run through the model’s forecast for House, Senate and gubernatorial races. Then I’ll describe some changes to the model since 2020 — which are modest this year but reflect how congressional races are changing in an increasingly polarized political environment. The House Republicans have an 87 percent chance of taking over the House, according to the Deluxe version of our model. That’s far from certain, but Democrats are fighting the odds: Their 13 percent chances are equivalent to tossing a coin and having it come up tails three times in a row. Ball-swarm (or bee-swarm) chart showing which party wins control of the House in 100 sample outcomes from our Deluxe model’s 40,000 simulations, where Democrats have a 13 percent chance of winning the chamber and Republicans have a 87 percent chance. That’s not to say House control will be a matter of luck, exactly. A change in the political environment could have ripple effects. For instance, sometimes one party wins nearly all the toss-up races, as Republicans did in 2020. However, even if Democrats were to win all 13 races that our model currently designates as “toss-ups” (meaning that no party has more than a 60 percent chance of winning), plus hold on to all the seats in which they’re favored, they would still wind up with only 208 seats, 10 short of the number they need for a majority. Instead, Democrats will also have to win some seats where Republican candidates are currently favored, and that requires the national political environment in November to be more favorable for Democrats than our model is currently expecting. On the one hand, the task isn’t that daunting for Democrats. Our model calculates that Democrats would be favored to keep the House if they win the House popular vote — or lose it by less than 0.7 percentage points — something that Democrats did in both 2018 and 2020. Moreover, Democrats are down by only about 2 points in our current average of generic-ballot polls. Given the inherent error in polling, and how much time there is between now and November, it isn’t hard to turn a 2-point deficit in the polls into a 1-point win. However, in important ways, that 2-point deficit understates the degree of trouble that Democrats are in. One reason is because many of those polls are conducted among registered voters rather than likely voters, and the electorate that turns out in November is likely to be more Republican than the broader universe of all registered voters. Historically, the patterns in midterm elections are that: 1) Republicans turn out more than Democrats, and 2) voters for whichever party doesn’t control the presidency are more enthusiastic and turn out more. In 2018, those factors canceled one another out. Democrats, not controlling the presidency, were the more enthusiastic party, helping to neutralize the Republicans’ historical turnout advantage. This year, though, they both work in the favor of Republicans. Thus, the model adjusts those registered-voter polls based on its estimate of what likely-voter polls would show, and when it does that, the Republicans’ generic-ballot lead is really more like 4 points than 2 points. I should note that this adjustment is not rigid in the model. Although the model uses historical turnout patterns as its baseline assumption, it will override that based on polls. In other words, if polls come out showing Democrats holding their own among likely voters — such as because of increased Democratic enthusiasm in the wake of Roe being overturned — the model will adjust to reflect that. Put another way, a very strong turnout would give Democrats a fighting chance of keeping the House. But also, the generic ballot isn’t the only input that the model considers, and some of the other factors look worse for Democrats than the generic ballot does. Based on the historical tendency for the president’s party to lose seats in the midterms and Biden’s poor approval rating, for instance, the situation is more likely to get worse for Democrats than better. The model also evaluates factors such as polling and fundraising data in individual races. Overall, the Deluxe forecast expects Democrats to eventually lose the popular vote for the House by closer to 6 points, about the margin that they lost it by in 2014. And it expects Republicans to wind up with 237 seats in an average outcome, a gain of 24 seats from the 213 they had at the start of the current Congress.2 Histogram of each party’s seat count in scenarios where it wins the House in our Deluxe model’s 40,000 simulations, where Republicans have an 80 percent chance of holding between 215 and 259 seats. As I mentioned, this analysis is based on the Deluxe version of our model, which accounts for polling, “fundamentals” — or factors such as fundraising and incumbency — and expert race ratings such as those put out by the Cook Political Report. The Classic version of our model, which leaves out the expert ratings — sacrificing the additional accuracy they add but sticking to purely quantitative factors — tells a similar story, with Democrats also having a 12 percent chance of keeping the House. The Lite version of our model, meanwhile, which tries to forecast as much as it can based on polls alone, does paint a more optimistic picture for Democrats, giving them a 22 percent chance of keeping the House. But that version leaves out a lot of useful information, especially given that there isn’t much polling in a number of competitive House races. The Senate Democratic hopes of keeping the Senate are much more viable, however. Part of this, as I mentioned, is because they appear to have stronger candidates in a handful of key races. Pennsylvania, for instance — which is an open seat after the retirement of Republican Sen. Pat Toomey — is ordinarily the sort of seat that you’d expect Republicans to win since Pennsylvania is a purple state in a Republican year. However, the Democratic candidate, Lt. Gov. John Fetterman, is ahead of Republican Mehmet Oz, the doctor and TV personality, in every poll conducted so far. The model, though, is trained to be a bit skeptical given the fundamentals of the race, so it hedges against those polls and, at this point, has determined that Pennsylvania is best thought of as a toss-up. Still, that means Democrats have roughly a 50-50 chance of gaining a GOP-held Senate seat, offsetting potential losses elsewhere. Indeed, our forecast sees the overall Senate landscape to be about as competitive as it gets. The Deluxe forecast literally has Senate control as a 50-50 tossup. The Classic and Lite forecasts show Democrats as very slight favorites to keep the Senate, meanwhile, with a 59 and a 62 percent chance, respectively. Ball-swarm (or bee-swarm) chart showing which party wins control of the House in 100 sample outcomes from our Deluxe model’s 40,000 simulations, where Democrats have a 47 percent chance of winning the chamber and Republicans have a 53 percent chance. Part of this is because Senate terms last for six years, and so most of these seats were last contested in 2016,3 a mediocre year for Democrats in which they lost the popular vote for the House and also lost Senate races in swing states such as Pennsylvania, Wisconsin and Arizona. Of the 35 Senate seats up for grabs in November, 21 are currently held by Republicans. True, most of these are not competitive, but in addition to their chances to gain a GOP-held seat in Pennsylvania, Democrats also have credible chances in Wisconsin and North Carolina (and outside chances in Ohio and Florida, although those are a stretch given how GOP-leaning both states have become). Republicans don’t have any surefire pickups, meanwhile. Our model regards their best chances as being in Georgia, but that race is rated as a toss-up. And the races in Arizona and New Hampshire merely lean toward the Democratic incumbent, meaning they are still highly plausible GOP pickup opportunities. Still, the picture isn’t as bad as you might expect for Democrats. If the political environment really deteriorates for them, they’ll be in trouble, lose most of the competitive races and even blue states like Colorado could come into play. But if things are merely pretty bad for Democrats instead of catastrophic, the outcome of the Senate will remain uncertain enough that stronger candidates could make the difference for them.

#### Roe turned the elections predictions on their heads-- energized dems and flipped moderates while polarizing republican candidate’s alienate republicans

Peter Nicholas 22, 7-5-2022, "With pressures mounting, Biden thinks GOP will make his midterm case for him," NBC News, https://www.nbcnews.com/politics/2022-election/pressures-mounting-biden-thinks-gop-will-make-midterm-case-rcna36514

Little is going President Joe Biden’s way as the summer lull sets in before the crush of midterm elections. Gas prices are up; his approval rating is down. A conservative Supreme Court majority is hacking away at his agenda by abolishing federal abortion rights and undermining environmental protections meant to curb climate change. His own party is losing patience, fearing that any chance of consequential change while Democrats control Congress is vanishing. “There needs to be urgency and action,” said Rebecca Kirszner Katz, who was an aide to the late Senate Democratic leader Harry Reid. “Folks have been saying since the day Joe Biden was elected that we need to move fast. There are a lot of things we need to get done for the American people.” Biden has been rolling out plans to cope with the mounting crises. He has a three-part plan to reduce inflation. Another plan to suspend the gas tax in hopes of bringing prices down. Then there’s his long-shot plan to enshrine abortion rights into law by suspending the Senate filibuster rule requiring 60-vote supermajorities. Inside the White House, though, advisers grasp that what’s required aren’t just plans, but votes. The 50-50 split in the Senate between the parties has proved an insurmountable obstacle for Biden’s grandest ambitions — to expand the social safety net in ways that insulate the most vulnerable Americans from economic shocks. “He has to change course,” said a Democratic congressman, speaking on condition of anonymity for fear of upsetting the White House. “His numbers are in the toilet. Whatever he’s doing is not working.” A perennial complaint from Biden’s Democratic critics is that he hasn’t capitalized on the platform he commands as president. “There’s a benefit to having the president out there every day using his executive power to show the country you’re fighting for them,” the Democratic lawmaker said. “And it’s almost like he’s hiding. He has the bully pulpit, and he’s either hiding behind it or under it. I don’t know where he is.” Allies say that Biden, along with others in the administration, will take better advantage of their megaphone in the run-up to the midterms, portraying Republicans as out of touch. Biden, they said, is energized by the Roe v. Wade decision, which may be a prelude to future Supreme Court rulings rolling back rights to same-sex marriage and contraception. Unpopular presidents tend to fare poorly in midterm elections. But Biden-world sees an opening to defy the historical trends, springing from some of the same setbacks that have so angered the Democratic base. Republicans are overreaching in ways that will alienate voters, White House allies contend. “I can tell you that on the street, what you hear is a bubbling, seething cauldron of anger at the Republican Party for putting in these antediluvian judges who think they can take us back to the 18th century,” said Jay Inslee, the Democratic governor of Washington state. “My spidey sense and the polling indicate it’s going to help people decide not to vote for the red team.” Biden and other administration officials intend to draw a stark contrast between the parties in the coming months in hopes of awakening voters to how their personal rights will be imperiled if Republicans seize control of Congress. To the extent that Biden can drive home the message that the court’s conservative majority was built by former President Donald Trump and Senate Republican leader Mitch McConnell, he can demonstrate the enormous stakes in the upcoming elections. “You will see them [Biden administration officials] having a sharper message as we get close to the fall,” one Biden ally said. “That message will revolve around painting the Republican Party as extreme and doing things that are actively hurting peoples’ lives. Is there a strong enough message now? Probably not. But they know that.” Biden previewed the strategy last week in a virtual meeting with Democratic governors. He pledged to use the full weight of the federal government to prevent what he called “extremist” governors who may try to block women from traveling out of state to get an abortion. A Biden adviser pointed to former Vice President Mike Pence’s call for a national abortion ban — something that can only be stopped if Democrats have sufficient votes in Congress to block it. That’s the sort of issue that can mobilize voters who might otherwise be apathetic about coming out to vote. Abortion “is much more motivating for Democratic-leaning voters than it is for Republican-leaning voters,” the Biden adviser said, speaking on condition of anonymity to talk more freely. “A lot of that is due to the fact that Republicans have sought this outcome for many years and they just achieved it. But the opposite effect is taking place with Democrats and independents, who are deeply offended by this and who are afraid about what it means for their lives.” Most Democrats fret about a midterm wipeout, but recent polling shows grounds for optimism. Bryan Bennett, a pollster for Navigator Research, a coalition of progressive pollsters, noted that something “weird” is happening in this political moment. Biden’s approval rating is hovering around 40%, which suggests that Republican victories in the November midterms will be not so much a wave as a “tsunami,” he said. And yet in polls pitting generic Democrats against Republicans in congressional races, Democrats perform better than expected given the president’s low standing. Indeed, since the Supreme Court reversed Roe v. Wade, three polls came out showing Democrats leading Republicans by anywhere from 3 to 7 percentage points. “It’s a new election,” Democratic strategist Simon Rosenberg wrote in a blog. “The chances of the anti-MAGA majority showing up again — as it did in 2018 and 2020 — have increased dramatically.” And Republicans in some cases are putting forward candidates whom mainstream voters may find unpalatable. A video circulating on Twitter shows a recent debate among congressional Republican candidates in Wyoming, where some of Rep. Liz Cheney’s challengers struggle to form a coherent sentence. “People are going to be stunned when they see some of the nominees they [Republicans] put out there,” said Joe Trippi, a longtime Democratic strategist. Economics usually drive elections, though, and Republicans are working hard to remind voters that Biden is presiding over a period of $5 a gallon of gas and rising prices across the board. The White House describes inflation as a global problem for which Biden bears little direct responsibility. Still, Biden was quick to claim credit a year ago for low grocery prices. In the days before July 4, 2021, the White House tweeted that the cost of a family barbecue had dropped. “Hot dog, the Biden economic plan is working,” the White House tweeted at the time. This year, the cost of a cookout including hamburgers, potato salad and ice cream was 17% higher, according to the American Farm Bureau Federation. There was no White House tweet drawing attention to that unhappy reality. The summer figures to be a tricky one for Biden. Next week he will visit the Middle East for meetings in Israel and Saudi Arabia. Normally, a foreign trip is a chance for the president to show voters back home the respect he’s accorded worldwide. He steps off of Air Force One and onto red carpets. Troops line up for his inspection. Bands play. Toasts are made. But Biden is already facing backlash over the plan to stop in Saudi Arabia, having vowed during his 2020 campaign to make the kingdom a “pariah” in part because of the killing of the journalist Jamal Khashoggi. As for Israel, Biden will be meeting with a government that is effectively leaderless, having dissolved its parliament and scheduled its fifth election in the last four years. “I don’t envy Biden,” Katz said. “There’s a lot of pressure. But that’s the job.”

#### **Dems are in the lead now, but that could change**

Leonhardt and Hounshell 7/5 – David Leonhardt is a senior writer for The New York Times. Blake Hounshell is the editor of the On Politics newsletter. He previously was managing editor for Washington and politics at Politico. 07-05-2022, “A Bluer Picture,” The New York Times, https://www.nytimes.com/2022/07/05/briefing/midterms-senate-democrats-hopeful.html

There are 10 potentially competitive Senate races this year, according to the Cook Political Report, and Democrats need to win at least five of them to keep Senate control. Democrats are favored in two of those 10 races (New Hampshire and Colorado) and Cook rates another five (Arizona, Georgia, Nevada, Pennsylvania and Wisconsin) as tossups. If Democrats keep the Senate without the House, they still would not be able to pass legislation without Republican support. But Senate control nonetheless matters. It would allow President Biden to appoint judges, Cabinet secretaries and other top officials without any Republican support, because only the Senate needs to confirm nominees. I’m turning over the rest of today’s lead item to Blake, who will preview the campaign for Senate control. When asked to share their candid thoughts about the Democrats’ chances of hanging onto their House majority in the coming election, party strategists often use words that cannot be printed in a family newsletter. But a brighter picture is coming together for Democrats on the Senate side. There, Republicans are assembling what one top strategist laughingly described as an “island of misfit toys” — a motley collection of candidates the Democratic Party hopes to portray as out of the mainstream on policy, personally compromised and too cozy with Donald Trump. These vulnerabilities have led to a rough few weeks for Republican Senate candidates in several of the most competitive races: Arizona: Blake Masters, a venture capitalist who secured Trump’s endorsement and is leading the polls in the Republican primary, has been criticized for saying that “Black people, frankly” are responsible for most of the gun violence in the U.S. Other Republicans have attacked him for past comments supporting “unrestricted immigration.” Georgia: Herschel Walker, the G.O.P. nominee facing Senator Raphael Warnock, acknowledged being the parent of three previously undisclosed children. Walker regularly inveighs against absentee fathers. Pennsylvania: Dr. Mehmet Oz, who lived in New Jersey before announcing his Senate run, risks looking inauthentic. Oz recently misspelled the name of his new hometown on an official document. Nevada: Adam Laxalt, a former state attorney general, said at a pancake breakfast last month that “Roe v. Wade was always a joke.” That’s an unpopular stance in socially liberal Nevada, where 63 percent of adults say abortion should be mostly legal. Wisconsin: Senator Ron Johnson made a cameo in the Jan. 6 hearings when it emerged that, on the day of the attack, he wanted to hand-deliver a fraudulent list of electors to former Vice President Mike Pence. Republicans counter with some politically potent arguments of their own, blaming Democrats for rising prices and saying that they have veered too far left for mainstream voters. In Pennsylvania, for instance, Lt. Gov. John Fetterman, the Democratic Senate nominee, supports universal health care, federal marijuana legalization and criminal justice reform. Republicans have been combing through his record and his past comments to depict him as similar to Bernie Sanders, the self-described Democratic socialist. Candidate vs. candidate One factor working in the Democrats’ favor is the fact that only a third of the Senate is up for re-election, and many races are in states that favor Democrats. Another is the fact that Senate races can be more distinct than House races, influenced less by national trends and more by candidates’ personalities. The ad budgets in Senate races can reach into the hundreds of millions of dollars, giving candidates a chance to define themselves and their opponents. Democrats are leaning heavily on personality-driven campaigns, promoting Senator Mark Kelly in Arizona as a moderate, friendly former astronaut and Senator Catherine Cortez Masto of Nevada as a fighter for abortion rights, retail workers and families. “Senate campaigns are candidate-versus-candidate battles,” said David Bergstein, a spokesman for the Democrats’ Senate campaign arm. “And while Democratic incumbents and candidates have developed their own brands, Republicans have put forward deeply, deeply flawed candidates.” Bergstein isn’t objective, but that analysis has some truth to it. There are about four months until Election Day, an eternity in modern American politics. As we’ve seen from the Supreme Court’s abortion ruling and from the explosive allegations that emerged in the latest testimony against Trump, the political environment can shift quickly. If the election were held today, polls suggests that Democrats would be narrowly favored to retain Senate control. Republican elites are also terrified that voters might nominate Eric Greitens, the scandal-ridden former governor, for Missouri’s open Senate seat, jeopardizing a seat that would otherwise be safe. But the election, of course, is not being held today, and polls are fallible, as we saw in 2020. So there’s still a great deal of uncertainty about the outcome. Biden’s approval rating remains low, and inflation is the top issue on voters’ minds — not the foibles of individual candidates. For now, Democrats are pretty pleased with themselves for making lemonade out of a decidedly sour political environment.

#### **The Dems are ahead in the Senate, but it’s close**

Silver 6/30 – Nate Silver is the founder and editor in chief of FiveThirtyEight and the author of “The Signal and the Noise: Why So Many Predictions Fail — But Some Don’t.”, 6-30-2022, "Why Republicans Are Favored To Win The House, But Not The Senate," FiveThirtyEight, https://fivethirtyeight.com/features/why-republicans-are-favored-to-win-the-house-but-not-the-senate/

Democratic hopes of keeping the Senate are much more viable, however. Part of this, as I mentioned, is because they appear to have stronger candidates in a handful of key races. Pennsylvania, for instance — which is an open seat after the retirement of Republican Sen. Pat Toomey — is ordinarily the sort of seat that you’d expect Republicans to win since Pennsylvania is a purple state in a Republican year. However, the Democratic candidate, Lt. Gov. John Fetterman, is ahead of Republican Mehmet Oz, the doctor and TV personality, in every poll conducted so far. The model, though, is trained to be a bit skeptical given the fundamentals of the race, so it hedges against those polls and, at this point, has determined that Pennsylvania is best thought of as a toss-up. Still, that means Democrats have roughly a 50-50 chance of gaining a GOP-held Senate seat, offsetting potential losses elsewhere. Indeed, our forecast sees the overall Senate landscape to be about as competitive as it gets. The Deluxe forecast literally has Senate control as a 50-50 tossup. The Classic and Lite forecasts show Democrats as very slight favorites to keep the Senate, meanwhile, with a 59 and a 62 percent chance, respectively. Ball-swarm (or bee-swarm) chart showing which party wins control of the House in 100 sample outcomes from our Deluxe model’s 40,000 simulations, where Democrats have a 47 percent chance of winning the chamber and Republicans have a 53 percent chance. Part of this is because Senate terms last for six years, and so most of these seats were last contested in 2016,3 a mediocre year for Democrats in which they lost the popular vote for the House and also lost Senate races in swing states such as Pennsylvania, Wisconsin and Arizona. Of the 35 Senate seats up for grabs in November, 21 are currently held by Republicans. True, most of these are not competitive, but in addition to their chances to gain a GOP-held seat in Pennsylvania, Democrats also have credible chances in Wisconsin and North Carolina (and outside chances in Ohio and Florida, although those are a stretch given how GOP-leaning both states have become). Republicans don’t have any surefire pickups, meanwhile. Our model regards their best chances as being in Georgia, but that race is rated as a toss-up. And the races in Arizona and New Hampshire merely lean toward the Democratic incumbent, meaning they are still highly plausible GOP pickup opportunities. Still, the picture isn’t as bad as you might expect for Democrats. If the political environment really deteriorates for them, they’ll be in trouble, lose most of the competitive races and even blue states like Colorado could come into play. But if things are merely pretty bad for Democrats instead of catastrophic, the outcome of the Senate will remain uncertain enough that stronger candidates could make the difference for them.

#### Democrats achieve a slim victory now

Budowsky 5/25 [Brent Budowsky, Budowsky is an American political opinion writer and columnist for The Hill, “Budowsky: How Dems can win an epic midterm election,” The Hill, June 25 2022, https://thehill.com/opinion/3500318-budowsky-how-dems-can-win-an-epic-midterm-election/]//RA

On Nov. 8, 2022, the American people will make a decision that will change the course of history, send shock waves across the globe, and be written about by historians a century from now. It may literally be the most important midterm election in a century. Here’s why:

Today democracy is fighting back fiercely against attacks by foreign dictators abroad and Republican partisans at home who still try to reverse the 2020 election, elect state Republicans who would corrupt the 2024 election, and practice aggressive voter suppression reminiscent of the dark days of segregation.

It is often suggested, in my view incorrectly, that because President Biden’s favorable numbers are low, Democrats are doomed to defeat in the midterms. This results from a misunderstanding of the political situation today.

If we review the RealClearPolitics 10 most recent 2022 generic congressional vote polls as of yesterday morning, Democrats were leading in five, Republicans in four, and the other was tied.

How can this be? If we review the RealClearPolitics favorable ratings of political leaders, as of yesterday morning, Biden’s rating was 43.6 percent, House Minority Leader [Kevin McCarthy](https://thehill.com/people/kevin-mccarthy/) (R-Calif.) was much lower, at 28 percent, and Senate Minority Leader [Mitch McConnell](https://thehill.com/people/mitch-mcconnell/) (R-Ky.) was even lower, at 26.3 percent!

Voters are not dissatisfied with Biden, they are dissatisfied with ALL leaders of BOTH parties in Washington, with Biden’s approval significantly higher than McCarthy’s or McConnell’s!

Given this season of discontent in our democracy, with more than a 90 percent probability, on the morning of Nov. 9, the nation and world will wake up to one of two potential midterm outcomes.

The first possibility is that Republicans gain control of the House, the Senate or both. This result would be armageddon for the [Biden](https://thehill.com/people/biden/) presidency. The legislative branch would be unable to pass any major proposal from President Biden or Democrats in Congress. Congressional Republicans would be unable to enact any legislation without President Biden’s signature.

In this scenario, a Republican House or Senate would degenerate into little more than permanent partisan Republican investigations of Democrats and partisan Republican gridlock in Washington — provoking widespread anger and rage from a majority of Americans, while Republicans compete with each other to be more extreme, in the party of Trump, not Lincoln.

The second possibility, which is less likely than I wish but more likely than most pundits believe, is that Democrats retain control of the Senate and House, and gain one or two Senate seats.

In this scenario, Biden and Democrats would be able to enact a substantial program of economic, health care, crime, climate change and voting rights legislation, which a majority of Americans would applaud.

Let’s be clear, blunt and honest. Biden and Democrats do not control a 50-50 Senate in which one or two Democratic senators alone can overrule the Democratic president, 48 Democratic senators, and all Democratic House members before they host fundraisers with grateful Republican donors and special interests.

With only one or two more Democratic senators, Democrats and democracy would flourish!

### Uq–– tipping point now

#### Right now key ­– if the dem’s can shift public perception now they can get ahead

David Siders 22, 6-29-2022, "Roe jolts the midterms: 5 takeaways from the 2022 election midpoint," POLITICO, https://www.politico.com/news/2022/06/29/roe-jolts-the-midterms-5-takeaways-from-the-2022-election-midpoint-00043082

Donald Trump’s legacy was on trial in Washington on Tuesday. But it was his future as the leader of the Republican Party that was being tested elsewhere in the country in the first primaries of the post-Roe v. Wade world. More than half the states have now held primaries, and we’re beginning to see just how important Trump may be to the GOP — and how important Roe may be to the Democrats. They are desperate to stave off disaster in November, and from the Democrats’ messaging on Roe to their interventions in Republican primaries in Colorado and Illinois on Tuesday, the latest big round of multi-state primaries offered the first test of Democrats’ new outlook on the midterms. As Trump labors to hold onto the GOP and Democrats labor to limit their losses in the midterms, here are five takeaways from a big primary night — and a midterm report card on the state of the race: Trump is worse off than ever Donald Trump’s preferred candidate in a contested House race, Rep. Mary Miller, won her member-on-member primary in Illinois on Tuesday. But that’s not likely to be the talk of the town, not after the testimony heard Tuesday about his culpability in the riot at the Capitol on Jan. 6. Even on good nights for the former president these days, he keeps taking hits. Halfway through the midterms, Trump’s candidates have won competitive primaries in Ohio and Pennsylvania, among other states. And there have been scores of Republicans who faced minimal or no opposition who Trump endorsed to pad his resume. By the end of the primaries, he’ll be crowing about his designed-to-be-favorable scorecard in the midterms. But there’s a reason that every time one of his endorsed candidates wins, Republicans point back to Trump’s collapse in Georgia, or to polls like the one in New Hampshire last week that had Florida Gov. Ron DeSantis statistically tied with Trump among Republican primary voters in the first-in-the-nation primary state. The primaries have been mixed for Trump. He may not be beaten, but he’s beatable — and that wasn’t so clear when the primary season began. What’s more, while primaries drag on around the country, Trump is getting mauled in Washington, where the Jan. 6 committee hearings appear to be having at least some effect. Fifty-eight percent of Americans now think Trump should be prosecuted for his role in the riot at the Capitol on Jan. 6, 2021, according to a recent ABC News/Ipsos poll, up slightly from previous measures. And that was before Tuesday’s jaw-dropping testimony about Trump’s behavior on Jan. 6. Between Trump’s mixed midterm record, DeSantis’s rise and the testimony on Tuesday, said John Thomas, a Republican strategist, the party is “starting to see a crack here” in Trump’s grip on the party. Dick Wadhams, a former Colorado Republican Party chair and longtime party strategist, said, “There are a lot of signs the party is starting to move ever so slightly away from Trump.” SCOTUS is the new Trump The testimony on Tuesday — that Trump was told supporters in Washington on Jan. 6 were armed — gave Democrats yet another Trump-related outrage to pin on the GOP. But electorally, the effectiveness of yoking Republican candidates to Trump has always been in question. It didn’t work for Terry McAuliffe in last year’s gubernatorial race in Virginia. It hasn’t moved polling at all this year. And by November, Trump will have been out of office for nearly two years. The better foil for Democrats is almost certain to be the Supreme Court’s overturning on Friday of Roe v. Wade. And Democrats know it. Judging by Tuesday’s primaries, the party in power in Washington will be running against the court in the fall. The messaging began even before the decision came down. Dems prepare for showdown in state legislatures post-Roe | The Midterm View The Democratic Legislative Campaign Committee has now become one of the most important arms of the Democratic party post-Roe. Eugene Daniels talks to Jessica Post, of the DLCC on how abortion rights will be used in the 2022 midterm elections. Democratic Rep. Sean Casten, who beat Rep. Marie Newman in a member-on-member primary in a Chicago-based district, ran ads pledging to defend abortion rights from “extreme Republicans and right-wing judges.” (Newman had put the matter to voters in personal terms, describing her own decision, at 19, to have an abortion.) In the race to fill the seat now held by retiring Rep. Bobby Rush, an outside group promoting Karin Norington-Reaves aired TV spots with black-and-white images of conservative justices, saying Norington-Reaves would “fight against the tyranny of the good old boys.” Norington-Reaves was running behind in that primary late Tuesday. But the ad will likely endure. It’s the kind of framing an incumbent party uses when it needs to run against something – and Democrats aren’t pleasing voters enough in Washington to be running on what they’ve done. “You can run against the Supreme Court,” said Craig Hughes, a Democratic strategist in Colorado. “I do think Roe will absolutely matter.” Alexandria Ocasio-Cortez speaks to abortion-rights activists in front of the U.S. Supreme Court after the Court announced a ruling in the Dobbs v Jackson Women's Health Organization case on June 24, 2022, in Washington, DC. ROE V. WADE OVERTURNED There are reasons to think Hughes may be right — not enough to keep Democrats from losing the House, probably, but at least enough to limit their losses. The ruling was unpopular, and in three polls released since the Roe decision, the generic ballot has shifted in Democrats’ favor — with voters favoring Democratic candidates over Republicans in November by as much as 7 percentage points. “Hoping it’s the start of a trend,” said Kelly Dietrich, a former Democratic fundraiser who is based in Illinois and founded the National Democratic Training Committee, which trains candidates across the country. “We’ll see.” Democratic voters aren’t turning out — yet Primary turnout has historically been a poor indicator of general election turnout, but in a year in which Democrats are desperate for younger, lower-propensity voters to find their way to the polls, the early turnout numbers in Illinois and New York on Tuesday were another bad sign. In Illinois, early vote totals were lagging 2018 totals both statewide and in Chicago, the kind of big, Democratic city where an outpouring of voters due to Roe, if one were to come, would have been expected. It was the same story in New York, where turnout was expected to be lackluster. Democrats may be furious about Trump’s behavior on Jan. 6 or about the Supreme Court’s behavior last week. But it’s not translating into voting — at least not yet. “Nobody’s turning out,” said one Democratic strategist in Illinois who requested anonymity to speak freely. “I mean nobody. Nobody is voting … The early vote numbers are abysmally bad.” The strategist said voters are “pissed off” but that between Roe and voting, “I don’t think people are connecting the dots.” Democrats came into the midterm election cycle facing historic headwinds, widely expected to lose the House in November. And things haven’t been going their way since. President Joe Biden’s public approval rating has dropped below 40 percent. Inflation does not appear to be going anywhere, and a recession may be near. There is still a path for Democrats to blunt Republicans’ gains. If Democrats can prosecute the case on Roe effectively, their voters could have reason to turn out in November. And the Jan. 6 committee may get what James Carville, the former Bill Clinton strategist, called a “head of steam.” It certainly looked like it might on Tuesday. “The path is not impossible,” Carville said. Still, early voting in the general election isn’t far off. “If this needle doesn’t move by the end of July,” Carville said, “it’s probably not going to move.” Democrats’ savvy, sad ‘choose your own adventure’ It tells you everything you need to know about how bad things are for Democrats this year that they spent heavily in Illinois and Colorado on Republicans, meddling in the opposition’s primaries in a bid to guarantee win-able elections in the fall. Joe Biden carried those states by about 17 percentage points and 14 percentage points, respectively, in 2020. They aren’t exactly states a confident party would expect to swing to the GOP. Yet in a difficult midterm year, even Democrats acknowledge the map for Republicans could expand. Call the spending ahead of Tuesday’s primaries an insurance policy. In Illinois, where Democrats sought to tear down Richard Irvin in the gubernatorial primary, the intervention worked, elevating a Republican state senator, Darren Bailey, who is widely viewed as less electable than Irvin in the fall. Republican gubernatorial candidate Darren Bailey, right, laughs with his wife Cindy Stortzum. Republican gubernatorial candidate Darren Bailey, right, laughs with his wife Cindy Stortzum while responding to reporters questions after winning the Republican primary Tuesday, June 28, 2022, in Effingham, Ill. | Charles Rex Arbogast/AP Photo But in Colorado, the strategy was a bust. Outside groups poured millions of dollars down the drain in an effort to keep businessman Joe O’Dea from winning the Republican U.S. Senate nomination, and he won, anyway. So did Republicans running in two other Colorado races Democrats tried unsuccessfully to sway. It’s hard to argue with the politics of Democrats trying to set up the best race they can. Still, as one Colorado-based Democratic strategist put it, “This choose-your-own-adventure thing is a little bit of risk-reward.” Money is always scarce in general elections, and Democrats may be groaning about the Colorado investment in November. The ‘Big Lie’ takes a hit It was a big night for pro-democracy Republicans in Colorado, where a threesome of election deniers appeared headed to defeat. Ron Hanks, a Colorado state representative who was in Washington on Jan. 6, 2021 and maintains, falsely, that Trump won, lost to O’Dea, a more moderate Republican, in the U.S. Senate primary. Tina Peters, a county clerk who was indicted on charges she was part of voting system technology breach scheme, went down in her primary for secretary of state, as did Greg Lopez, who also believes Trump won, in the gubernatorial race. Pair those with the big night election defenders had in Georgia’s gubernatorial and secretary of state races last month, and the Big Lie is taking some hits. But it’s nowhere near close to fading out of the GOP. In Illinois, Miller, who campaigned with Trump recently, won despite voting against certifying the 2020 election, and hitting her opponent, Rep. Rodney Davis, for his votes to certify Biden’s election. That’s on top of the dozens of election deniers who have already won primaries in states across the country, many of them relatively young-for-politics Republicans who, win or lose, will maintain a presence in the party for years. There’s Doug Mastriano, the far-right election conspiracy pusher who won the Republican primary for governor of Pennsylvania. In Nevada, Republican Jim Marchant, a leader of a circle of MAGA-aligned election deniers running to become secretaries of state, easily won his primary earlier this month. The Michigan Republican Party’s nominee for state attorney general, Matthew DePerno, is a Kalamazoo lawyer who was a major figure in Trump’s failed bid to overturn the election in Michigan. More are likely to be nominated in the second half of the year. Right after a break in the multi-state primaries, in August, comes Arizona, where Kari Lake, the former TV anchor who insists Trump carried the state, is among leading candidates for governor. Also on the ballot in that state: state Rep. Mark Finchem, one of the chief proponents of his state’s farcical ballot review, is running for secretary of state. Regardless of Trump’s fortunes, large majorities of Republicans still believe his lie that the election was rigged. If the primaries have taught us anything, it’s that that lie may outlast him. “I think a lot of Americans have just lost faith in American institutions,” said Sean Walsh, a Republican strategist who worked in the Reagan and George H.W. Bush White Houses. For many Republicans, he said, “I think the lack of faith in the electoral system does outlast Trump. Sadly, I think it does.”

### Uq–roe k2 dems win

#### **Reversal of Roe v Wade could flip midterms towards the democrats**

Scher 7/5 – Bill Scher is a political writer at the Washington Monthly. He is the host of the history podcast When America Worked and the cohost of the bipartisan online show and podcast The DMZ., 7-5-2022, "The End of Roe v. Wade Could Help Democrats in These Midterm Races," Washington Monthly, https://washingtonmonthly.com/2022/07/05/the-end-of-roe-v-wade-could-help-democrats-in-these-midterm-races/

Here are some vulnerable Republicans. GOVERNORS: Brian Kemp (Georgia), Ron DeSantis (Florida), and Greg Abbott (Texas) These Republican governors signed abortion bans that are unpopular in their states. Just this week, a Quinnipiac poll showed the Georgia gubernatorial race between incumbent Republican Brian Kemp and former House Minority Leader Stacey Abrams in a dead heat, with Abrams closing a two-point gap since January. However, a smattering of prior polls from other outfits suggests that Kemp may still hold a slight lead. Kemp signed a 2019 law effectively banning abortion after six weeks of pregnancy, with exceptions for risking the mother’s death, “medically futile” pregnancies, and—if a police report is filed—rape and incest. The law has not been enacted because of a federal court injunction, but now that Roe is gone, the injunction should be soon lifted. Most Georgians won’t celebrate. A January Atlanta Journal-Constitution poll found that 54 percent of Georgia voters opposed the law, and 68 percent did not want Roe overturned. The Democratic gubernatorial nominee in Texas, former Representative Beto O’Rourke, might face a tougher battle as he trails Governor Gregg Abbott by five points in the most recent Quinnipiac poll and eight points in the most recent CBS/YouGov poll. But regarding abortion policy, Quinnipiac found that Texas voters preferred O’Rourke over Abbott by two points. And 59 percent of Texans in the CBS/YouGov poll disapprove of Abbott’s handling of abortion. (The Quinnipiac poll was taken before, and the CBS/YouGov poll was partially taken before, the Dobbs ruling.) Perhaps O’Rourke can widen that margin. Abbott has already enacted a six-week abortion ban and a ban on most distribution of abortion pills. He also signed a trigger law, which will soon detonate, banning all abortions except to save the mother’s life, with a maximum sentence of 99 years for abortion providers. Yet, according to the June Quinnipiac poll, 59 percent of Texas voters support legal abortion in all or most cases. A December Spectrum News/Ipsos poll found that 55 percent opposed the six-week ban. As I wrote last month, Abbott’s unpopular abortion position hadn’t weakened his overall standing, because the impact of his policies hadn’t been widely felt. Most Texans seeking abortions were still getting them, either by illegally obtaining pills or by crossing state lines. But with an even more draconian law about to go into effect and disappearing abortion access in three of its four neighboring states, the loss of reproductive freedom may soon be more painfully noticeable. In Florida, DeSantis signed a law in April banning abortion after 15 weeks of pregnancy, a rare example of the right-wing firebrand not going to the farthest possible extreme. He is being pressured by the right to go further in the wake of Dobbs, even though most Florida voters didn’t want him to go as far as he did. In a February poll from the University of North Florida, 57 percent opposed the 15-week ban, which went up to 62 percent when informed that the legislation had no exceptions for rape and incest. Florida’s support for abortion rights is long-standing, and the state constitution includes a right to privacy that has been interpreted by state courts to cover reproductive freedom. A 2012 attempt to supersede court rulings with an anti-abortion ballot initiative failed, with 55 percent of the electorate voting against it. In fact, on June 30, a county circuit judge placed a temporary injunction on the 15-week ban because it runs afoul of the state constitution. But the Florida Supreme Court is stocked with Republican appointees—who serve six-year terms—and may follow the U.S. Supreme Court’s example, disregard precedent, and overrule the lower court. If it upholds the ban, that will give the Democratic nominee—to be chosen in an August primary—an even stronger argument for replacing DeSantis. Other 2022 governor’s races to keep an eye on: Arizona, Iowa, Ohio, South Carolina, and South Dakota: According to the data from Grumbach and Warshaw, these states have pro-choice majorities. (South Dakota just barely, though its voters in 2006 and 2008 defeated proposed abortion bans in referenda.) Yet Ohio’s Mike DeWine, Iowa’s Kim Reynolds, and South Carolina’s Henry McMaster all signed effective six-week bans (injunctions have been lifted in Ohio and South Carolina). South Dakota’s 2005 trigger law lacks rape and incest exceptions—and defies the voters’ will in subsequent referenda. Nevertheless, it’s kicking in with Governor Kristi Noem’s enthusiastic support. Also, in Arizona, where the incumbent Republican is not running for reelection, a 1901 law banning abortions enacted when Arizona was a territory might be resurrected. The four incumbents are viewed as having easy paths to reelection in November; The Cook Report with Amy Walter rates McMaster, Noem, and Reynolds as “Solid,” with DeWine as “Likely.” But it’s worth watching to see if their unpopular abortion stances give their Democratic challengers a fresh foothold.

#### Abortion right’s mobilizes voters now but the plan weakens the signal

Josh Marshall 22, 6-6-2022, Joshua Marshall is an American journalist and blogger writing about elections for 25 years "Opinion," No Publication, https://www.nytimes.com/2022/06/06/opinion/democrats-midterms-abortion-roe.html

Democrats hope to make November’s midterm elections a referendum on Roe v. Wade, the linchpin decision upholding abortion rights, which the Supreme Court is almost certain to strike down this summer. That strategy makes sense. Polls show that roughly two in three Americans oppose overturning Roe and almost 60 percent support passing a bill to set Roe’s protections in a federal law. What’s more, polls showed a rising number of voters listing abortion as their top midterm issue after news of Roe’s imminent demise leaked in the form of a draft court opinion published by Politico. Unfortunately, their current plan is almost sure to fail. After the Democrats came up with just 49 votes to bring a Roe-protecting bill before the Senate on May 11, they promised to keep fighting and, in the words of Senator Amy Klobuchar, “take that fight right to the ballot box” in November. But you can’t make an election into a referendum on an issue if you can’t point to anything winning the election would accomplish. To make the 2022 elections a referendum on Roe, Democrats have to put protecting Roe and abortion rights on the table. Here’s one way to do that: get clear public commitments from every Senate Democrat (and candidate for Senate) not only to vote for the Roe bill in January 2023 but also to change the filibuster rules to ensure that a majority vote would actually pass the bill and send it to the White House for the president’s signature. At present, there are likely 48 Senate Democrats who can make that pledge. Senators Joe Manchin and Kyrsten Sinema are dead set against any changes to the filibuster — a fact you likely know because most of President Biden’s agenda has been bottled up behind their refusal for the past year. Some claim that Senators Manchin and Sinema are just taking the public heat for a number of other Senate Democrats who are also unwilling to change the filibuster rules. That’s highly unlikely. But if any do have misgivings, that’s why the public commitments are so important. Getting a list of holdouts down to a publicly named handful is the first step to persuading them to fall in line. If my math is right and there are 48 Senate Democrats ready to make that pledge, they need two additional Democratic senators in the next Congress. And that is the party’s message that makes the 2022 midterms a referendum on Roe: “Give us the House and two more senators, and we will make Roe law in January 2023.” The End of Roe v. Wade Commentary by Times Opinion writers and columnists on the Supreme Court’s decision to end ​​the constitutional right to abortion. Michelle Goldberg: “The end of Roe v. Wade was foreseen, but in wide swaths of the country, it has still created wrenching and potentially tragic uncertainties.” Spencer Bokat-Lindell: “What exactly does it mean for the Supreme Court to experience a crisis of legitimacy, and is it really in one?” Bonnie Kristian, journalist: “For many backers of former President Donald Trump, Friday’s Supreme Court decision was a long-awaited vindication.” It might also mark the end of his political career. Erika Bachiochi, legal scholar: “It is precisely the unborn child’s state of existential dependence upon its mother, not its autonomy, that makes it especially entitled to care, nurture and legal protection.” No ambiguity, no haggling, no living in Senator Manchin’s head for a year. You give us this, and we’ll give you that. That tells voters exactly what will be delivered with a Democratic win. It also defines what constitutes a win: control of the House and two more Senate seats. Dig deeper into the moment. Special offer: Subscribe for $1 a week. The campaign message is clear: If you want to protect Roe, give us those majorities. If this is your passion, here’s where to channel that passion. These are the Senate seats we need to hold (in New Hampshire, Arizona, Georgia and Nevada) and here are the ones we need to win (in Pennsylvania and Wisconsin and possibly in Ohio, Florida and North Carolina). With those commitments in hand, one question should be on the lips of every Democratic candidate. Will you make a firm commitment to never vote for a federal law banning abortion nationwide? Few, if any, Republicans would be able to make that pledge. And their evasions wouldn’t just make them look ridiculous; that would put squarely on the table the very real threat that Republicans would enact a nationwide abortion ban as soon as January 2025. That could prove enough to win Senate races in Pennsylvania, Wisconsin and Ohio. In a way, though, this strategy isn’t so much about winning the 2022 midterms or even making Roe into a federal law, although it’s the best way to accomplish both. It’s just an example of how you win elections. Effective campaigns are built on connecting the intense beliefs of the electorate — their hopes and fears — directly to the hard mechanics of political power. You’ve got to connect those wires. If you were testing some new electrical contraption, that’s the first thing you’d do: make sure the energy supply is wired to the engine that makes it run. This is no different. Without tying a specific electoral result to a clear commitment to a specific legislative action after the elections, you’re not connecting those wires. What Democrats would be proposing is a classic small-c conservative solution in the best sense of the word. Codifying Roe would preserve the set of rights and protections that the vast majority of Americans have lived their entire adult lives with and that the overwhelming majority of Americans do not want to change. The threat that the court will strike down such a law is real but overstated. And in any case, refusing to act because of what opponents might do is the definition of political paralysis. So how do Democrats get from here to there? They likely can’t rely on the party’s leaders, at least not at first. But they’re not essential. It’s really up to voters and activists and particularly committed members of Congress. Probably half the Democrats in the Senate would be happy to sign on this dotted line by the end of the day. Those who are up for re-election, even in safe races, will come around quickly. Some senators may resist at first. And that wouldn’t be surprising. Politicians seldom see any advantage to committing themselves in advance or reducing their room for maneuver. It’s always safer to keep your options open and be as general as possible until the final moment. That’s why assembling a clear public list of commitments is critical. Once the list gets down to a handful of hesitaters, the pressure from Democrats nationwide, focused on those members, will be overwhelming. If there are real holdouts, they’ll fold in short order. You don’t need to wait on Nancy Pelosi or Chuck Schumer or President Biden. You can get the ball rolling by calling up your Democratic senator today.

#### Roe overturning increases voter turn out

Hulse and Lerer 21 [Carl Hulse is chief Washington correspondent and a veteran of more than three decades of reporting in the capital Lisa Lerer is a national political correspondent, covering campaigns, elections and political power https://www.nytimes.com/2021/05/20/us/politics/abortion-2022-midterm-elections.html]//LP

With the Supreme Court ruling likely to come next year — less than six months before midterm elections that will determine control of Congress and the future of President Biden’s agenda — the court’s expanded conservative majority has injected new volatility into an already turbulent political atmosphere, leaving both parties to game out the potential consequences. Republicans had already shown that they intended to take aim at Democrats over social issues, and abortion will only amplify the culture wars. Nearly all agree that the latest fight over Roe, which has been building for years, is certain to have significant political repercussions. Conservative voters are traditionally more energized than liberals about the abortion debate, and for many of them it has been the single issue spurring voter turnout. But Democrats, likely to be on the defensive given their current hold on the White House and Congress, say a ruling broadly restricting abortion rights by a court whose ideological makeup has been altered by three Trump-era appointees could backfire on Republicans and galvanize women. “Outlawing Roe would create a backlash that would have critical unintended consequences for those who would like to repeal it,” said Senator Jeanne Shaheen, Democrat of New Hampshire and a leading voice in Congress for abortion rights. “The women of the country would be very upset, particularly young women, that there would be such a deliberate effort to limit women’s access to reproductive choices.” Those on the right, already anticipating a favorable ruling given the conservative tilt of the 6-3 court, say they expect liberals to seize on the issue to try to “scare” voters. But they believe they can make a case for “reasonable” abortion limits. “This is clearly going to invigorate people on both sides of the debate, but this is a winning issue for pro-life candidates,” said Mallory Quigley, a spokeswoman for the Susan B. Anthony List, a conservative nonprofit. She said she did not expect conservative voting enthusiasm to ebb if the right triumphed at the Supreme Court, an outcome that would bring to fruition years of emphasis on electing anti-abortion lawmakers at the federal and state levels and working aggressively to confirm conservative judges. “What happened on Monday is evidence that elections have consequences,” Ms. Quigley said, referring to the Supreme Court’s decision to take a case about a Mississippi law that seeks to ban most abortions after 15 weeks of pregnancy — about two months earlier than Roe and subsequent decisions allow. The Supreme Court action may have political ramifications before next year. The case is likely to be argued weeks before Virginia voters head to the polls in November to elect a new governor in a race often seen as a midterm bellwether. Terry McAuliffe, a former governor and most likely the Democratic nominee, is eager for another political battle over abortion rights, rattling off his record protecting clinics in the state and vetoing legislation that would impose restrictions.. “This is going to be a huge motivator,” he said in an interview. “In 2013, I promised women I would be a brick wall to protect their rights. And I will be a brick wall again.” Senator Rick Scott of Florida, the chairman of the National Republican Senatorial Committee, downplayed the potential effect of the court ruling, though he said that as an abortion opponent he welcomed the court taking up the case. But Mr. Scott said he believed voters would be more persuaded by what he described as the Biden administration’s failings on issues such as immigration, the economy, taxes, inflation and more. While the lines have always been starkly drawn on abortion into the pro and anti camps, public opinion has proved more nuanced, with a clear majority backing Roe but majorities also favoring some limits. How the Supreme Court comes down on the fine points of abortion law could determine how the issue plays in the elections. “Considering the decision will likely be made five months ahead of the election, and depending on the decision itself, it’s too early to measure its ultimate impact on the midterms,” said Nathan Gonzales, the editor of the nonpartisan Inside Elections. Mr. Gonzales said it could conceivably energize Republicans but also pay benefits for Democrats — a view shared by others. President Donald J. Trump helped inspire record turnout last year from Democratic voters, who were eager to reject his administration. With Mr. Trump no longer on the ballot, many Democrats say the Supreme Court case could provide crucial midterm motivation, particularly for suburban women in swing districts who were instrumental in Democratic wins last year. Katie Paris, the founder of Red, Wine and Blue, a group focused on organizing suburban female voters for Democrats across the country, said the Supreme Court news immediately touched off alarm on the Facebook groups and other social media channels run by her organization. “When the news came out that this was going to be taken up, it was like, ‘Everybody get ready. This is real,’” she said. “We know what this court could do, and if they do it, the backlash will be severe.” Tresa Undem, a pollster who specializes in surveys on gender issues, said that abortion rights would continue to be an effective cause for Democrats because voters link it to larger concerns about power and control that motivated female voters during the Trump administration. “Democrats and independents have felt a loss of control and power from people at the top,” said Ms. Undem, who has conducted polling for several abortion rights organizations. “Now you have six individuals who are going to make these decisions about your body in this personal area that will affect the rest of your life.” Mr. Bennet said he could not predict the political implications of the court taking on abortion, but he wanted to alert his supporters that something of consequence was at hand. “There are a lot of people who have worked for a long time to overturn Roe v. Wade, and that is what is at stake,” he said. “I think people needed to hear that in the wake of the Supreme Court taking this case from Mississippi.”

#### **Roe v. Wade has inflamed voters and urged reevaluation of parties – will cause a dem win**

Cox 7/8 [Ana Marie Cox, Ana Marie Cox is an American author, blogger, political columnist, and critic. The founding editor of the political blog Wonkette, she was also the Senior Political Correspondent for MTV News, and conducted the "Talk" interviews featured in The New York Times Magazine from 2015 to 2017, “Democrats Can Win if They Embrace the Politics of Fear”, New York Times, July 8 2022, https://www.nytimes.com/2022/07/08/opinion/democrats-abortion-midterms.html]//RA

When it comes to abortion rights, the Democrats need to lean into the politics of fear.

They face a base that feels betrayed and a set of wealthy, moderate voters in purple states who [may not realize that their own rights are also on the line.](https://www.kff.org/womens-health-policy/poll-finding/kff-health-tracking-poll-views-knowledge-abortion-2022/) Democrats need both of these groups to stave off defeat in the fall, and fear can drive them to the polls. What should the Democrats tell them to be afraid of? A national abortion ban.

America after the fall of Roe v. Wade might feel like we’re living in the worst-case scenario, but anyone who values reproductive freedom has reason to panic about what could happen if Republicans take back power in Washington. G.O.P. Congress members have already introduced bills that would criminalize abortion in various ways. They are only more emboldened now.

Last month, former Vice President Mike Pence called for a national abortion ban. More to the point, Senator Mitch McConnell, the minority leader, has called it “possible.” Recently, he hedged the prediction by stating an obvious fact: “Neither side on this issue has had 60” votes to pass such a ban. Is that a phrase you feel comfortable hanging your future on?

Plenty of progressive voters don’t need to be made aware of the danger. They are already terrified for the future. But everyone should be, not just those who might want or need an abortion in the future. The conservative legal theories (and the conservative jurists) that brought down Roe threaten marriage equality, privacy in the bedroom, even contraception. A law banning abortion by recognizing fetuses as humans with constitutional rights could criminalize in vitro fertilization. The life-or-death pregnancy scenarios now playing out in red states could be repeated right next door, no matter where you live.

To meet the urgency of the moment and save their razor-thin and often nonexistent hold on the Senate, Democrats must talk about that future, giving voters across the country, in every state, a reason to vote. Lives are on the line. At the same time, Democratic leaders have to understand that the politics of fear can run both ways.

The party needs to scare voters and show that they, too, are scared: scared of the voters themselves. Democratic politicians watched Republicans roll back abortion rights for decades — and when Roe fell, they had no plan. Now, they need to demonstrate that they are willing to put themselves at the mercy of those they failed — making specific promises and letting the voters know that if they fail again, it will be more than a fund-raising opportunity. It will be a reckoning.

Politicians have never shied away from making campaign promises, but the Republicans are better at creating the circumstances for voters to exact revenge. Grover Norquist’s “Taxpayer Protection Pledge” held sway over hundreds of Republican candidates for over a decade. For the G.O.P., the pledge was a neat way to synchronize the interests of the very rich and the defiant antigovernment streak of the white middle class, and the key to making it work, for as long as it has, has been simple: letting voters know they expect to be held accountable. If an elected official bucks the tax pledge, voters have a specific reason to send them home and the politician has no excuses.

A promise to protect abortion rights would not have the same kind of moneyed network behind it that the tax pledge does. But it would carry the same emotional and political weight. In the end, all politicians have to answer for their records.

Say that Democrats committed, for once, to prioritizing action over whatever solution Washington considers reasonable. Call it the Abortion Access Pledge and turn running against the threat of a national abortion ban into a chance to run for something, too.

Don’t quibble, don’t be distracted by debates over whether or when a ban will happen. Instead, decide on a handful of action items around abortion access and get everyone who wants a vote or a dollar to say it out loud: “I will support abortion access in these ways and if I don’t follow through, you should kick me out.”

I am honestly unsure if it matters what those action items are; I do know Democrats will have to throw out any concern for the appearance of moderation. Right now, all the ideas about bridging the gap to abortion access sound extreme. But so did the tax pledge at one point. So did overturning Roe v. Wade.

Take allowing abortions[on federal land](https://www.washingtonpost.com/politics/2022/06/27/nominal-ways-president-biden-could-expand-abortion-rights/). Biden could declare the policy so. Candidates would only have to pledge to support it. Yes, the policy would invoke an avalanche of untested legal theories and complicated jurisdictional questions. But Democrats who want to save the lives of those in need of an abortion can’t fall back on “it’s complicated” as an excuse to not even try.

If you want something less complicated — something that would also help roll out abortions on federal lands — make a pledge not to vote for any appropriation bill that carries the Hyde Amendment, which bans federal funding for most abortions. On its own, abolishing the Hyde Amendment would not greatly expand access outside states where abortion is legal. But combined with abortion access on federal property, the government could act even more directly to help those seeking abortion care. Stonewalling Hyde-burdened budgets could lead to a government shutdown, but if you think that ruins a party’s reputation forever, well, you are probably a current Democratic office holder.

Embracing a politics of fear on reproductive rights unites two of the constituencies the Democrats need to edge out the G.O.P. in key narrow races (Wisconsin, Pennsylvania, Georgia). First, hammering home the danger of a national ban may sufficiently alarm moderate voters in the suburbs, convincing them to abandon Republicans. Second, addressing the widespread sense of betrayal among progressive voters will help keep them activated. The threat of a national abortion ban is also a national message. Democrats can make it clear that the party can’t risk a single loss, no matter how lopsided the polls are. And then there is the simple truth underpinning this entire strategy: Protecting abortion rights is popular.

This plan — where Democratic leaders take real political risks — is untried. But it’s worth the gamble. Bold action is the only way to assure voters that they are prepared to do whatever it takes when other rights are on the chopping block. Most significantly, prioritizing responsiveness to voters would reset the entire framework of Democratic campaigns.

The only way this strategy could truly backfire is if Democrats run on a promise and then break it, again. And expect to be re-elected, again. Of course, that is what Democrats are doing right now. “Protect Roe” was their rallying cry; it turns out that’s all it was.

Fear often divides, but it can also unite. When you have a common threat, there is an opportunity for a common mission. This threat is no longer beyond the horizon — it’s at the door. Now, Democrats, decide on a mission.

#### **Dobbs decision could turn the race towards Democrats**

Narea and Zhou 7/10 – Nicole Narea covers the personalities, conversations, and political battles shaping state-level races and polices and why they matter to the entire country and Li Zhou is a politics and policy reporter for Vox, 7-10-2022, "The battleground House and Senate races where the end of Roe could have the biggest impact," Vox, https://www.vox.com/2022/7/10/23200973/abortion-house-senate-midterms-roe-dobbs

In the wake of the Supreme Court decision overturning Roe v. Wade, Democrats have repeatedly proposed the same solution: voting in the midterms. “If you want to change the circumstances for women and ... girls in this country, please go out and vote,” President Joe Biden emphasized in a speech on Friday. “For God’s sake, there’s an election in November.” As Democrats stare down the typical backlash the president’s party experiences in the midterms, they hope abortion rights will energize voters in key battleground states and districts and combat this dynamic, helping them keep their majorities in the House and Senate. Whether it does remains to be seen: There are still several months before the midterm elections, and voters are focused on a number of issues, including the economy. According to multiple polls conducted in June and July, inflation remains a top issue for many voters, though abortion rights is highly ranked as well. Giving Democratic lawmakers hope, too, are other surveys that have found Democrats are more likely to say they’ll vote in the midterms because of abortion rights compared to Republicans. It’s worth noting that most of these surveys were national, and that abortion rights could have a bigger impact at the regional level, particularly in states where abortion rights are actively being threatened or restricted. When it comes to congressional races, the issue is likely to have the largest effect in swing Senate and House seats where candidates are in extremely tight contests — races in which even small shifts in turnout and enthusiasm could make the difference.

### Uq –– AT innovation bill thumper

#### McConnell kills the bill—no thumper

Joseph Zeballos-Roig 22, 6-30-2022, "Mitch McConnell says he'll kill the bipartisan China bill if Democrats revive their agenda with Joe Manchin and Kyrsten Sinema," No Publication, https://news.yahoo.com/mitch-mcconnell-says-hell-kill-214014174.html

Mitch McConnell vowed to effectively kill major bipartisan legislation if Democrats pursue their own plan. McConnell's statement is a major and perhaps fatal setback for a lengthy effort to pass a China bill. Lawmakers on both sides have moved to bulk up the US semiconductor industry, which is a major part of the plan. Senate Minority Leader Mitch McConnell declared on Thursday that he would block the progress of President Joe Biden's major bipartisan semiconductor bill aimed at thwarting China if Democrats continue to pursue a separate economic plan crafted from the ashes of Build Back Better. "Let me be perfectly clear: there will be no bipartisan USICA as long as Democrats are pursuing a partisan reconciliation bill," McConnell tweeted. In response, House Speaker Nancy Pelosi's office blasted McConnell as a tool of the "Chinese Communist Party." Related video: The moment Ketanji Brown Jackson was confirmed to SCOTUS Scroll back up to restore default view. "Make no mistake: Senator McConnell is now siding with the Chinese Communist Party against American workers and American industry," Pelosi spokesperson Henry Connelly wrote on Twitter. "And why? So that the GOP's pals in Big Pharma can keep ripping off Americans struggling to afford their prescriptions." McConnell's statement all but spells the death knell for bipartisan talks that have dragged on throughout the year as both chambers crafted their own sweeping plans aimed at reinvigorating America's supply chain amid China's rise. It comes as Democrats inch closer to striking a deal at reviving their stalled party-line climate and healthcare bill. Democratic and Republican leaders continuously feuded over the China bill's scope in negotiations this year. Republicans pressed Democrats to ditch provisions dealing with trade, labor, and immigration to keep it smaller. A chunk of the bill set aside $52 billion to shore up the US semiconductor industry during a chip shortage, a key Democratic priority. Centrist Democratic Sens. Joe Manchin and Kyrsten Sinema are key votes on Biden's stalled economic agenda. All 50 Senate Democrats must band together to advance the smaller spending bill with a tie-breaking vote from Vice President Kamala Harris. Spokespeople for Manchin and Sinema didn't immediately respond to a request for comment. Biden and the White House have repeatedly made clear that passing the China bill is a major priority. The legislation, the USICA or United States Innovation and Competition Act, is at times just called the China bill. It is so massive that it has sparked a reputation for all of the various special-interest driven provisions that have found their way into the text. Commerce Secretary Gina Raimondo has repeatedly warned that failing to pass the legislation could have devastating consequences. Raimondo said on CNBC on Monday that GlobalWafers might not follow through on its plans to build a $5 billion factory in Texas if the bill fails. "It has to be done before they go to August recess," said Raimondo, who has been closely involved in the talks. "I don't know how to say it any more plainly. This deal … will go away, I think, if Congress doesn't act." Senate Majority Leader Chuck Schumer authored the Senate's version of the bill, a sign of just how serious leadership is in passing it. Biden also pushed it during his State of the Union address in March. The Senate passed its $250 billion package last June. The House advanced its own plan in February. Both sides have been trying to sort out the details for months. "To compete for the best jobs of the future, we also need to level the playing field with China and other competitors," Biden said during his address. "That's why it is so important to pass the Bipartisan Innovation Act sitting in Congress that will make record investments in emerging technologies and American manufacturing."

### Uq—dems win—AT empirics

#### Empirics flow neg—president’s party has been able to gain seat’s in midterm elections

Dean Obeidallah, 22, 3-8-2022, "Opinion," MSNBC, 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. There are multiple signs that tell us Democrats could not only hold on to the House but even pick up a few Senate seats. 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. In 1998 with Bill Clinton in the White House, Democrats gained five House seats. How did Democrats buck history? GOP arrogance and overreach. 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. While Jan. 6, 2021, and 9/11 are not nearly the same, the 2022 election will be the first after the “domestic terrorism” waged on the U.S. Capitol by Trump supporters trying to prevent the peaceful transfer of power. The big difference, of course, is that after 9/11, Americans united against those who attacked us. In contrast, the GOP overwhelmingly supports and celebrates former President Donald Trump, who radicalized his supporters with lies about the election and called them to Washington to “stop the steal.” Since then, Trump has defended the attackers and suggested he would pardon them if he were elected president again. Republicans want 2022 to be a referendum on Biden’s performance given that his approval ratings are in the low 40s, but Democrats should turn the tables and frame the election as a referendum on Republican extremism: from the oppressive laws mentioned above to their embrace of the man who gave us Jan. 6. That could spike Democratic turnout. Zeeshan Aleem Midterm elections are won and lost on turnout. In the 2018 midterm, when voter turnout was the highest in 100 years, Democrats won 40 House seats. Contrast that with 2014 when voters came out in the lowest number in over 70 years: Democrats lost 13 House seats and nine Senate seats. Ignore the pundits and the noise. When Democrats come out big, Democrats win big. This year is no exception; in fact, history tell us that victory in this November’s election is completely in the hands of Democrats.

### ATL abortion right XO

#### XO wasn’t sufficient – only the promise of congressional action mobilizes voters

Grace Panetta 22, 7-9-2022, "Democrats' priorities have crumbled under Biden and time is running out for the party to deliver before the midterms," Business Insider, https://www.businessinsider.com/why-democrats-cant-pass-bidens-agenda-2022-7

Enshrining abortion rights nationally: On June 24, the Supreme Court overturned Roe v. Wade, a move that made abortion illegal in some states. Most congressional Democrats are in favor of a national abortion rights law, and have voted in favor of the Women's Health Protection Act. The bill would make abortion legal in every state and undo most restrictions. It is similar to the abortion rights set out under the now-defunct Roe, though it also allows abortions after viability for undefined "health reasons." For that reason, Republicans have called it "extreme" and refused to support the legislation. It passed the House but has already failed twice in the Senate this year. Eleven more senators would be needed to pass the legislation under the 60-vote threshold. Manchin opposes the legislation, saying it goes beyond Roe. That's why Biden calling for a filibuster carve-out on June 30 is unlikely to be effective. Manchin and Sinema remain staunchly opposed to abolishing the filibuster for any reason. Even without the filibuster, Democrats lack the 50 votes they would need to pass their bill. GOP Sens. Lisa Murkowski of Alaska and Collins both support abortion rights but say Democrats' bill has gone too far because it doesn't create moral or religious exemptions. Collins is working on a bipartisan abortion rights bill with Sen. Tim Kaine of Virginia, but one senior Democratic Senate aide told Insider that Democratic women senators and abortion rights groups say privately that they don't see the legislation going anywhere because nine Republicans would need to get onboard, "which everyone knows will never happen right now." Democrats have stressed that they want to put Republicans on the spot over the issue to draw a contrast between the parties ahead of the November midterms. Only remote possibilities exist for enshrining abortion rights nationally. One would be for some Republicans to cross over on the filibuster and on the abortion rights bill. Another would be for Democrats and Republicans to compromise on which measures they're willing to support. One former leader in the reproductive rights movement told Insider that even a limited bill, such as guaranteeing access to abortion in the first trimester, would help 90% of patients seeking to terminate pregnancies. In such a scenario, states would be allowed to raise the gestation floor if they choose. But both sides remain staunchly divided on the issue, meaning that without a supermajority in the Senate or the abolishment of the filibuster, it could remain in limbo with a patchwork of rules from state to state for years to come.

#### XO didn’t do enough

Michael Collins 22, 7-8-2022, "Biden announces steps to protect abortion access, but advocates urge him to do more," USA TODAY, https://www.usatoday.com/story/news/politics/2022/07/08/roe-v-wade-biden-executive-order-protecting-abortion-access/10010822002/

WASHINGTON – Facing pressure from his party to act more aggressively to safeguard abortion access, President Joe Biden on Friday announced steps his administration is taking, including protecting access to medication and making legal representation available to women who choose to travel out of state for the procedure. Advocacy groups have pressed for strong action, such as a declaration of a public health emergency and leasing federal property to abortion providers, since the Supreme Court decision overturning Roe v. Wade. Biden has resisted such moves. “This is a moment – the moment – the moment to restore the rights that have been taken away from us and the moment to protect our nation from an extremist agenda,” Biden said in the White House Roosevelt Room before signing an executive order that outlines the steps his administration will take. Biden's order instructs the Department of Health and Human Services to protect and expand access to abortion care, including access to medication approved by the Food and Drug Administration as safe and effective for over 20 years. The order tasks the department with expanding access to reproductive health services, including family planning and providers, emergency contraception and long-acting reversible contraception such as intrauterine devices, according to a fact sheet distributed by the White House. The administration promised to increase outreach and public education on abortion and to ensure the safety of patients and providers, including mobile clinics sent to borders to provide care for out-of-state patients. An advocacy group pushing to restore and sustain public insurance said Biden's actions don't go far enough. "We are glad to see the White House start to implement a whole of government approach to abortion access, but this plan, which the White House committed to months ago, is both late and not enough," said Morgan Hopkins, interim executive director of campaigns and strategies at All\* Above All. Mini Timmaraju, president of NARAL Pro-Choice America, praised Biden’s order as a “really strong next step" but said she wants to see what specific actions the administration is going to take. 'THIS IS NOT OVER':Harris warns Supreme Court may target gay marriage, contraception next Biden called for the creation of a task force on access to reproductive health care and sought to provide protection to women who travel across state lines to access clinical abortion services. The attorney general's office was instructed to give assistance to states that offer legal protection to out-of-state patients and health care providers. The attorney general and the White House counsel's office will convene private attorneys that offer free legal services, as well as bar associations and public interest groups, to encourage legal representation to patients, providers and other groups that provide reproductive services. Two weeks ago, the Supreme Court overturned Roe v. Wade, the decision in 1973 that established a constitutional right to abortion. Friday, Biden cast last month's ruling as a throwback to the 1800s when women didn't even have the right to vote. His voice rising, Biden said a 10-year-old girl in Ohio got pregnant as the result of a rape and was forced to travel to Indiana to get an abortion. “A 10-year-old girl should be forced to give birth to a rapist's child?" he asked. "I can't think of anything that is much more extreme." Biden called again for Congress to overturn the decision by writing Roe v. Wade into federal law. He said he supports changing filibuster rules in the Senate to make it easier to codify the right to abortion and privacy into federal law. Sixty votes are needed in the Senate to pass most legislation because of the filibuster. Changing the rules would allow senators to write Roe v. Wade into law with a simple majority. Getting rid of the filibuster is up to the Senate, and there aren’t enough votes to make that happen. The fastest way to overturn the ruling, Biden said, is to pass a law to protect abortion rights. “For God’s sake, there’s an election in November,” he said. “Vote! Vote! Vote! Vote!” BEYOND ABORTION:Ruling overturning Roe v. Wade sparks debate about Supreme Court's legitimacy amid partisan passions Health and Human Services Secretary Xavier Becerra said federal officials are working to increase access to medication abortion in limited circumstances, ensure providers have appropriate training and resources and direct the Centers for Medicare and Medicaid to take legal steps to protect family planning care. Biden's order instructs Becerra to submit a report in 30 days on protecting access to abortion medication and contraception and ensuring that women have access to emergency medical care. Fatima Goss Graves, president and chief executive officer of the National Women's Law Center, lauded Biden for taking steps to protect access to reproductive services but warned that “speed and intensity” are demanded to get people the care they need. “Undoing these injustices will take efforts by all of us, including using the full force of the federal government,” she said. Hopkins, of All\* Above All, said more women are denied reproductive care every day as a result of the Supreme Court ruling. "The ripple effects of the Supreme Court decision will spare no one – and the harm will fall hardest on people of color working to make ends meet," she said. "President Biden must do more." March for Life, which opposes abortion, criticized Biden for issuing the order. "It is tragic that this administration is using its power to push for more and more painful abortions which harm women and take innocent lives," said the group's president, Jeanne Mancini. "Our nation today faces significant challenges, not enough abortion is not one of them."

## Links

### L—Generic—NATO

#### Increasing defense spending on NATO is unpopular across the board—causes the dem’s to lose swing votes

Steven Kull 19, April 2019, Dr. Steven Kull is a political psychologist who studies the impact of public opinion on public policy. He has conducted polls and focus groups in over 30 countries around the, Program for Public Consultation, No Publication, https://publicconsultation.org/wp-content/uploads/2019/04/NATO\_Report\_0419.pdf

Defense Spending Levels by NATO Allies Respondents were told about the dispute between the US and other NATO members regarding their lower levels of defense spending towards NATO. Presented three options for dealing with this situation, the least popular option was to press European countries to spend more by threatening to disengage from Europe and possibly withdraw from NATO. The most popular option for both parties, supported by half, was to remain part of NATO, but reduce U.S. military investments to bring them more in line with the level that the Europeans spend. The second most popular option was to press European countries to spend more, but not to threaten to disengage or withdraw from NATO. Respondents were introduced to the dispute between the US and European NATO members over defense spending levels as follows: For some years now there has been a dispute between the U.S. and other members of NATO about their level of defense spending. The U.S. has complained that it spends about 4-5% of the U.S. economy on its military, while European nations generally spend about 2% or less, some as low as 1%. Europeans point out that the amount that the U.S. spends is not only in Europe but also in Asia and in the U.S. homeland, and that Europe already spends twice as much as Russia, which is NATO’s primary focus. Nonetheless, in 2014, the European NATO partners agreed to set a goal to increase their defense spending to at least 2% of their budget. There have been some increases, but only 4 of the 26 European countries have met this goal, though several more are expected to reach this level within the year. One of the largest countries, Germany, is unlikely to reach it at any point in the near future. They were then told that there is some debate about what the U.S. should do about this situation and were asked to evaluate three options with an argument in favor of each one. Three possible approaches were presented. The first argument stressed that the Europeans should stop taking advantage of the US after it freed them from Hitler and defended them during the Cold War, that the Europeans can afford to do their share, and that the Russians pose a smaller threat, so if Europeans do not do more, the US should be ready to disengage from Europe. This argument did only moderately well with an overall majority of 56% finding it convincing. However, there was a sharp partisan divide: 76% of Republicans, but only 39% of Democrats found it convincing. Likewise in very red districts 61% found this argument convincing, but only 43% in very blue districts. The second proposal considered was to press European countries to spend more, but to refrain from threatening to disengage from Europe or withdraw from NATO. The argument for this stressed that it is not really feasible to withdraw from Europe or NATO, that the US should not make such a threat, that doing so could backfire by emboldening Russia and causing Eastern European countries to draw closer to Russia, and that overall, it is better for the US to stand close to Europe and that doing so is affordable. This argument did far better than the first argument. Overall 80% found it convincing as did 87% of Democrats. Among Republicans , 72% found it convincing — roughly the same as the 76% who found the argument for the first proposal convincing — suggesting substantial ambivalence. In very red districts , 72% found the argument convincing — more than the 61% that found the argument for the first proposal convincing. The third proposal was that the US should remain in NATO but adjust its military investment there to be more in line with the European investment. This argument stressed that the European members of NATO spend a substantial amount on the military and many troops under arms, that their reluctance to spend more is understandable given the low level of threat from Russia, that adjusting US commitments might cause Europeans to do more, but even if they do not, NATO will still be far stronger than Russia. This argument also did quite well with 74% finding it convincing. Among Republicans (77%) and in very red districts (75%) it did the best of all arguments, with 72% of Democrats concurring. Asked for their final recommendation, the clear favorite, endorsed by about half overall and by both parties, was the third option. The least attractive option was to threaten withdrawal from Europe and NATO , which was endorsed by just 12% overall —one in five Republicans and a miniscule 4% of Democrats. The option of pressing the Europeans but not threatening withdrawal was endorse d by 35% overall — Republicans 29%, Democrats 41%. Those who voted for Donald Trump in 2016 did not differ much from Republicans. One in five said the US should threaten to withdraw, while 48% favored adjusting the US military commitment.

#### NATO security cooperation worries voter and is perceived as trading off with domestic issues that appeal more to swing voters

Bruce Stokes 20, 9-4-2020, "US Electorate Shows Distrust of the Realities of Foreign Policy," Chatham House – International Affairs Think Tank, https://www.chathamhouse.org/2020/09/us-electorate-shows-distrust-realities-foreign-policy

Whoever occupies the White House after the election, it is evident the emphasis will be on ‘America First’, and that only characteristics and approaches will differ. If Donald Trump is re-elected, his electoral base will support a continuation of isolationist, protectionist policies. If Joe Biden becomes president, he will enjoy some limited popular backing for international re-engagement, but his voters still clearly want him to prioritize domestic issues. Implications for the foreign policy of the next US administration are evident. America may have a long history of isolationism, but that should not be confused with ignorance of the growing interconnectedness of today’s world. However, Americans are struggling to find a new equilibrium for their country’s role in the world. Around seven-in-ten hold the view that the United States should take a leading or major role in international affairs, and the same number acknowledge that international events affect their daily life. But Americans remain reticent about global engagement, and half of registered voters believe other countries take unfair advantage of the United States. This clear contradiction is mirrored in what can be expected from the election victor, with a Joe Biden administration likely to speak for those who want America to lead, while a second Donald Trump administration is expected to continue complaining about US victimization by an ungrateful world. A majority (57%) of Americans say foreign policy is ‘very important’ to them as they decide who to vote for in the 2020 election. This may seem like a high priority, but American polls often show many issues are ‘very important’ to voters. What matters is relative importance and foreign policy pales in comparison with the significance the public accords to the economy (79%) or healthcare (68%). Immigration (52%) and climate change (42%) are of even less relative importance to voters. Notably, despite the deep partisanship in American politics today, there is no difference between Republican and Democrat voters on the low priority they accord foreign policy. And barely one-third (35%) of the public give top priority to working with allies and international institutions to confront global challenges such as climate change, poverty and disease — in fact only 31% say improving relations with allies should be a top foreign policy priority over the next five years. However, despite this apparent lack of support for international relations, a rising majority of Americans believe international trade is good for the economy — running contrary to many international assumptions that Americans are inherently protectionist. But this increased interest may not amount to much in reality. Americans also believe trade destroys jobs and lowers wages. Trump is clearly wedded to a protectionist worldview and may continue to try dismantling the World Trade Organization (WTO). Biden is unlikely to initiate any new trade liberalizing negotiations given what would be, at best, a slim Democratic majority in the Senate and anti-trade views held by many unions and blue-collar voters among his constituency. Any political capital he commits to trade is likely to focus on reforming the WTO, but privately his advisers admit they are not optimistic. In addition, both Biden and Trump face strong public support for ratcheting up pressure on China, although their lines of attack may differ, with Trump likely to double down on tariffs while Biden would work closely with Europe on both trade and human rights issues. More broadly, almost three-quarters (73%) of Americans now express an unfavourable view of China, up 18 points since the last presidential election. One-quarter of Americans classify Beijing as an ‘enemy’ with almost half saying the US should get tougher with China on economic issues, although attitudes do divide along partisan lines, with Republicans generally more critical of Beijing, but Democrats are tougher on human rights. On immigration, Trump’s policies are out of step with the public. Six-in-ten Americans oppose expanding the border wall with Mexico, 74% support legal status for immigrants illegally brought to the United States as children — including a majority of Republicans (54%) — and as many Americans favour increasing immigration as support decreasing it. But Trump has already promised to double down on limiting immigration if he wins because it is what his Republican electoral base wants and, as with trade, this is one of his long-expressed personal beliefs. If he wins, expect more mass roundups of undocumented people, completion of his border wall and stricter limitations on legal immigration. In contrast, Biden is likely to loosen constraints on immigration because he believes immigration has been good for the economy and the Democratic party is increasingly dependent on Hispanic and Asian voters, the two fastest growing portions of the population. However, open borders are not a Biden option. The US foreign-born population is at near-record levels and, every time in American history the portion of foreign born has come close to being 14% of the total population — in the 1880s, the 1920s and now — there has been a populist backlash. Democrats cannot risk that again. On climate change, there is strong evidence the American public is increasingly worried, and likely to support rejoining the Paris Agreement if Biden is elected and increases US commitments to cut carbon emissions. But the public also appears unlikely to punish Trump if, as promised, he leaves that accord, and he is almost certain to continue denying climate science in the interest of the coal, oil, and gas industries. The public’s concern about global warming does not necessarily translate into support for taking substantive action. There is a huge partisan divide between the number of Democrats (68%) and Republicans (11%) who say climate change is a very important issue in the 2020 election. When pressed on what action they want on climate change, and who they trust to do it, Americans are less likely than Europeans to accept paying higher prices. A carbon tax stands no chance of passing the Senate, thanks to moderate Democrats from fossil-fuel states, and America’s love affair with large, CO²-emitting vehicles shows no signs of ebbing. The outcome of the 2020 US election will almost certainly not be determined by foreign concerns, although an international crisis — a terrorist incident, a military confrontation with China or North Korea — could impact voting in an unforeseen way. But given the mood of the American electorate, if Trump is re-elected, there will be scant public pressure for a more activist, collaborative US foreign policy, beyond support for a tough line on China, while a win for Biden will give more room for some international initiatives. But public opinion data is clear. Voters want the next US president to focus first on domestic issues — overcoming the pandemic, digging the country out of a deep economic hole, calming racial tensions, and reversing inequality. The outcome of the election may end America’s recently antagonistic foreign policy and halt the deterioration of its international role. But dramatic American re-engagement appears unlikely as the public’s priorities lie elsewhere.

### L—Generic—Emerging tech

#### NATO driven innovation alienates millennial and young voters which depresses dem turn out

Will Moreland 19, 4-3-2019, associate fellow with Foreign Policy at Brookings. His research focused on the future of U.S. alliances and multilateralism in a more geopolitically competitive world "Love me today, love me tomorrow? Millennials and NATO," Brookings, https://www.brookings.edu/blog/order-from-chaos/2019/04/03/love-me-today-love-me-tomorrow-millennials-and-nato/

As NATO leaders commemorate the 70th anniversary of the Washington Treaty, talk of crisis again swirls around the alliance. Yet, against President Trump’s continued skepticism and reports lamenting the lapse in American leadership, signs for optimism surface. Surveys reveal relatively high public support for NATO. The 2019 Munich Security Conference saw the largest, and bipartisan, congressional delegation. Yet, today’s groundswell of public support is likely to instill false confidence in the future of Americans’ sentiments. Backing the alliance is easy today, particularly among the rising millennial generation, as opposition to unpopular policies of Donald Trump. However, when examined in the context of millennial foreign policy priorities, questions emerge as to NATO’s role vis-à-vis the issues that motivate them—and, therefore, the long-term support for the alliance. Despite Trump’s longstanding inclinations, NATO today is in a relatively good place with the American body politic. As the most recent Chicago Council survey finds, not only do “a majority of Americans continue to favor maintaining (57 percent) or increasing (18 percent) the U.S. commitment to NATO…the 18 percent of Americans who want to increase the U.S. commitment to NATO is the highest level ever recorded in Chicago Council surveys.” If talk of a “commitment” seems too vague, respondents broadly feel comfortable, at least in theory, backing up words with action. Fifty-four percent favor using American forces to respond to a Russian invasion of a Baltic state—a new record since the question was first asked in 2014. Such figures help explain the continued, bipartisan willingness to flout the president on this issue. This support is not limitless. For a nation weary from nearly two decades of war, the matter of burden-sharing is a real issue. A Europe perceived to be shirking a growing responsibility for its own defense—such as recent troubling reports from Berlin—could squander that support. Nonetheless, for an alliance turning 70, NATO looks decently well-armed to weather another storm. People carry European Union flags during a protest ahead of a visit by Russian President Vladimir Putin, in Budapest February 16, 2015. Putin will discuss Russian gas supplies to Hungary when he visits Budapest on Tuesday, an adviser to the Russian president said on Monday. The trip will be Putin's first bilateral visit to a European Union country since June 2014, reflecting a warming in ties that has irked some of Hungary's allies in the EU and NATO. REUTERS/Laszlo Balogh (HUNGARY - Tags: POLITICS CIVIL UNREST) - LR2EB2G1H542J no immediate action and is largely synonymous with endorsing partnership with Europe. When the Trump administration—particularly the president—has driven trans-Atlantic rifts over issues from trade to the Iran Deal (Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action, or JCPOA), NATO stands out as a symbol of continued cooperation in a turbulent relationship. But as time passes, it is an open question how NATO’s mission tracks with the foreign policy priorities of millennials, fast becoming the largest voter demographic in the United States. While representing a cooperative partnership, which millennials do value, NATO has less direct bearing on the generation’s top five foreign policy goals, as found by research from the Chicago Council and Charles Koch Institute in 2018. Asked for their priorities, respondents cited the importance of: Protecting American jobs: 70 percent Preventing the spread of nuclear weapons: 64 percent Securing adequate supplies of energy: 59 percent Improving America’s standing in the world: 52 percent Combating world hunger: 47 percent Though important issues in their own right, these objectives are not traditional ones with which NATO was created to contend directly: territorial defense and the maintenance of stability in Europe. Such an absence speaks, in part, to the millennial generation’s distance from NATO’s founding moment. For a cohort without any memory of great power conflict, NATO’s key role in deterring war is baked into assumptions about how the world is naturally. Yet if, as my colleague Robert Kagan argues, “we have lived so long inside the bubble of the liberal world order that we can imagine no other kind of world,” then my millennial generation risks great stakes on this assumption. A lack of historical memory that conflict can spark and spread even in Europe is tragic, but not unreasonable. After all, even a scholar as thoughtful on these issues as Barry Posen can question the U.S. commitment to NATO in the popular press without considering the U.S. role in warding against the return of “the German question.” In this broader historical context, the absence of “maintaining U.S. military superiority”—another option on the survey—from millennials’ top five priorities not only contrasts with preceding generations, but raises concerns as to whether the alliance will be resourced to perform its mission or become more of a hollow symbol. THE NEED FOR INFORMED SKEPTICISM Millennial skepticism of a militarized American foreign policy is not baseless. From lived experience, armed force appears ineffective at best, an expensive boondoggle at worst—especially in the Middle East. Particularly since 9/11, as Robert Malley and Jon Finer have argued, “Washington has become addicted to quick military fixes” when “sometimes what’s needed is a far broader approach.” Nonetheless, a U.S. strategy containing a military component oriented toward the forward defense of democracy in an increasingly contested world—as NATO does in Europe—reflects a different dynamic. While millennials are more familiar with scenes of American soldiers patrolling desert streets or civilians mourning casualties from drone strikes as exemplifying military power, the forward deployment of U.S. forces, as a deterrent, has helped maintain peace in Europe and Asia. As a recent RAND Corporation report notes, “U.S. troop presence was associated with…a lower likelihood of interstate war.” That deterrence factor, however, is increasingly called into question. As the congressionally-charted National Defense Strategy Commission report details in Europe: “Russia is seeking to create situations of military strength vis-à-vis America and its allies, and despite its limited resource base, it is having considerable success.” To repair this growing disparity, the commission asserts, “the United States needs more than just new capabilities; it urgently requires new operational concepts that expand U.S. options and constrain those of China, Russia, and other actors.” As NATO allies confront critical questions about the allocation of resources, a more nuanced understanding of the U.S. military role in NATO and Europe is vital to an informed debate on U.S. strategy. Such a conversation should be a debate, not merely acceptance of a limitless military budget. Already millennial skepticism of pursuing military primacy is increasingly represented in an ongoing and vibrant policy debate—particularly among progressives. Considering a spectrum of views, including deviating from military primacy to military sufficiency, is necessary in a climate of heightened geopolitical competition and limited resources. To draw on President John F. Kennedy, the United States may be willing to “pay any price, bear any burden, meet any hardship,” but it is not wise to pay every price, bear every burden, meet every hardship. Washington must deploy its assets strategically in a competition with authoritarian powers that encompasses a host of domains. The military sphere cannot, and will not, be the end all of the growing competition. But nor can it be wished away as a factor that requires a serious and informed conversation among millennials as to how defense issues, including NATO, should be included in American foreign policy.

#### Big tech lobbyist’s means the plan costs PC

Emily Birnbaum 22, 1-24-2022, "Tech spent big on lobbying last year," POLITICO, https://www.politico.com/newsletters/morning-tech/2022/01/24/tech-spent-big-on-lobbying-last-year-00001144

TECH LOBBYING SURGE — Apple, Amazon, Google and Facebook spent a total of more than $55 million on lobbying the federal government in 2021, according to newly filed lobbying disclosures, breaking their own records and outstripping other top-spending industries in Washington, such as defense and pharmaceuticals, for another year in a row. In comparison, the “Big Four” tech companies spent about $34 million on lobbying in 2020. — Behind the increase: Google’s spending jumped roughly 27 percent, from $7.5 million in 2020 to $9.5 million in 2021, as the company has sought to fend off antitrust legislation and has dealt with concerns about YouTube’s contribution to right-wing radicalization. Facebook and Amazon broke their own spending records, with Amazon shelling out $19.3 million and Facebook spending more than $20 million. Facebook’s spending spree came as the company dealt with fallout from whistleblower Frances Haugen’s revelations; Amazon has faced antitrust heat as well as significant labor complaints. Apple, which has had a more muted presence in Washington, spent $6.5 million in 2021 — a small number compared to its “Big Four” peers but still vastly more than smaller tech companies such as Spotify, which spent $820,000 in 2021. — Speaking of those smaller rivals … 2021 was a huge year for the small- to medium-sized tech companies, which say they have been harmed by gatekeeping by giants like Google, Facebook, Amazon and Apple. Complaints from companies like Oracle, Yelp, Tile and Spotify have taken center stage and informed antitrust legislation now moving through the House and Senate Judiciary Committees. As a result, ‘Big Tech’’s rivals are spending more than ever, too: Oracle, the software company known for taking on Google, spent $9.1 million on lobbying in 2021, up from about $8 million the year before. Microsoft, though hardly a small company, has gained a reputation for lobbying against its tech-sector rivals. It spent about $10.2 million on lobbying in 2021 compared to $9.4 million in 2020, an increase of roughly 8 percent. Fox Corp., the media company owned by Big Tech antagonist Rupert Murdoch, increased its spending by about 22 percent between 2020 and 2021, as the company lobbied in favor of the antitrust bills in both chambers. Fox spent $3.6 million in 2021, compared with $3 million in 2020. Epic Games, which is locked in a legal battle with Apple over Apple’s App Store, registered its first in-house lobbyists during the last month of 2021, reporting $40,000 in in-house lobbying spending. Epic also tapped a pair of high-powered outside lobbying firms last year, the Gibson Group and Subject Matter. — Overall, this spending pales in comparison to the tens of millions spent by Facebook, Amazon and Google. But it’s still notable that these companies are dialing up their presences in Washington, readying themselves for all the fights ahead. NATSEC HAWKS ARE CIRCLING — As the tech antitrust bills pick up steam in the Senate, Google has been the tech company most forcefully pushing the idea that reforms could threaten national security. “Handicapping America’s technology leaders would threaten our leading sources of research and development spending,” Google’s president of global affairs and chief legal officer, Kent Walker, wrote in a blog post last week. He argued that the bill that received a markup, S. 2992 (117), would “give a free pass” to foreign companies and cited a letter from last year from twelve former U.S. national security officials who argued the antitrust bill could hurt U.S. competitiveness. (All 12 former officials have ties to major tech companies, as POLITICO previously reported.) The legislation would prohibit Apple, Facebook, Amazon and Google from favoring their own products and discriminating against rivals on their platforms. Google spokesperson Julie Tarallo told MT that the company believes S.2992 “risks threatening our global competitiveness and security, which is why we will continue urging Congress to take more time to consider these and other unintended consequences.”

### L—Generic—DOD funding

#### Plan perceived as driven by the military industrial complex as a scheme to increase’s DOD funding which angers dems who see it as trading off with domestic issues like Roe

Robert Weissman 22, 6-7-2022, "Americans Widely Reject Proposals for More Pentagon Spending — So Should Congress," Data For Progress, https://www.dataforprogress.org/blog/2022/6/7/americans-widely-reject-proposals-for-more-pentagon-spending

The United States spends, by far, more on its military than other nations. U.S. military spending is more than the next nine countries combined; it is 12 times the amount Russia spends. Yet demands persist from the military-industrial complex to spend ever more. For the upcoming year (fiscal year 2023), the Biden Administration has requested a $31 billion increase in Pentagon spending, to $813 billion. Congress is poised to add even more to that total — with some saying the United States should spend a trillion dollars on the military budget. The House and Senate Armed Services committees are expected to vote in June on spending levels in the National Defense Authorization Act. Polling from Data for Progress and Public Citizen in May 2022 indicates that spending more on the military than requested by President Biden would be out of step with the public. The polling shows: A strong majority of voters oppose an increase in military spending above Biden’s request. Sixty-three percent of those polled say the military's budget should remain at the level that Biden and the Department of Defense requested. Military spending concerns a majority of Americans, with 55 percent of voters reporting they are “somewhat concerned” or “very concerned” about current proposals for $813 billion in defense spending next year. Democrats overwhelmingly say Pentagon spending should not exceed current levels when thinking about proposals to increase funding (83 percent say spending levels are too high or should remain the same, while 8 percent say military spending should be higher). When informed about how much the military is poised to receive, as compared to other agencies, a majority of Republican voters say the military budget should not be raised further (51 percent, versus 37 percent who think too little is spent). There are very strong policy arguments to cut military spending significantly. Not only does the United States vastly outspend other nations, it doesn’t effectively manage what it does spend. The Pentagon is unable to pass an audit, and Pentagon spending is replete with waste and fraud both small (a spare parts maker with a 3,800 percent profit level) and large (the defective and dysfunctional F-35 program that will cost more than $1.7 trillion over its projected 50-year lifespan, according to the Project on Government Oversight). And money allocated to the Pentagon is money that could instead be spent on priority domestic and human needs, and to ensure true national security. For example, last year Congress increased Pentagon spending by $28 billion over the Biden Administration’s request. That same amount could instead have been spent to scale up global vaccine production and end or at least diminish dramatically the pandemic. Did the extra $28 billion for the Pentagon do anything to make us safer? By contrast, is there any doubt that our national security would have been massively improved if we had helped vaccinate the world? Pentagon cuts also are popular. Fifty-six percent of Americans supported reinvesting 10 percent of the Pentagon budget into coronavirus relief, housing, and education in the first year of the pandemic, according to Data for Progress polling. In this immediate moment, however, the congressional debate is not about Pentagon cuts, but about further increases. Those arguing for more Pentagon spending say it is necessitated by inflation. This argument ignores the fact that the Biden request already accounted for inflation and the fact that the Pentagon does not experience inflation in the same way as the general economy, in part because many of its costs are set by long-term contracts. Others say the Ukraine war necessitates more spending. But the U.S. already spends far more than Russia, and Ukraine-specific expenses are being funded by supplemental spending bills and should not be incorporated into the Pentagon’s base budget. The arguments for still more Pentagon spending are, in short, red herrings. But that’s no surprise. In truth, no matter what Pentagon spending level Biden proposed, the military-industrial complex would respond with the same one-word answer: more. It’s not an argument the American people are buying, however. Congress shouldn’t either.

#### Any slight increase in DoD budget angers voter and is seen as a bolt from the blue

Mark Pocan 20, 7- 20, 2020, Congressman Mark Pocan (D-WI) is the Co-chair of the Congressional Progressive Caucus "The American People Agree: Cut the Pentagon’s Budget ," Data For Progress, https://www.dataforprogress.org/blog/2020/7/20/cut-the-pentagons-budget

$740 billion. That’s how much Congress is on track to approve for the defense budget in 2021. In the middle of a pandemic, as millions of Americans face unemployment, evictions, and a broken healthcare system. In 2020, the defense budget was 90 times the size of the budget of the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC). Now, we face a pandemic with a lack of resources, no nationwide testing plan, 3.6 million cases and over 138,000 deaths. Maybe, just maybe, we could have been better prepared for this disaster if the budget for our public health agency wasn’t about 1 percent of the defense budget. On Tuesday, Congress will vote on the National Defense Authorization Act (NDAA), but before that, they will vote on my amendment with Congresswoman Barbara Lee and Senator Bernie Sanders to cut the bloated defense budget by 10 percent. We have a choice. We can ignore the systemic problems that this pandemic has brought to the surface, continue with businesses as usual and rubber stamp a $740 billion giveaway to defense contractors. Or we can listen to the American people and save $74 billion towards their urgent needs—housing, healthcare, education and more. In Data for Progress’ latest poll, the majority of American voters want us to put their needs over the profits of Lockheed Martin, Raytheon and Boeing. Fifty-six percent of voters support cutting the defense budget by 10 percent to pay for priorities like fighting the coronavirus, education, healthcare & housing—including 50 percent of Republicans. image1.png Fifty-seven percent of voters supported cutting the defense budget by 10 percent if funding was reallocated to the CDC and other more pressing domestic needs. Only 25 percent of people opposed the cut, that means more than twice as many people support an over $70 billion cut to our defense budget than don’t, a 2:1 ratio. The polling is abundantly clear: the American people know that new nukes, cruise missiles, or F-35s won’t help them get their next unemployment check, or pay next month’s rent, or put food on their family’s table, or pay for the costs of healthcare in a global pandemic. Over the past four years, during a time of relative peace, America has increased its defense spending by 20 percent, over $100 billion. There is no other part of the Congressionally-appropriated federal budget that has increased by this much—not education, not housing, and not public health. We have seen the effects of supporting this endless cycle of exponential defense spending. In January, President Trump’s unilateral assassination of Iranian General Hassan Soleimani almost led us down the path of another endless war. In the last month, we have seen the President order military responses to civilian protestors in Lafayette Park so he could hold a photo-op and we have seen Department of Homeland Security agents swarm the city of Portland assaulting and arresting protesters. The Pentagon’s bloated budget incentivizes people like President Trump to threaten wars abroad and unleash militarized troops on our own people. The American public has seen this firsthand and this new poll clearly shows that they are fed up. Our nation is facing a pandemic that has killed more American people than the Iraq War, the Afghanistan War, 9/11, the Persian Gulf War, the Vietnam War and the Korean War combined. Yet, despite the coronavirus clearly being the greatest threat to our nation currently, Congress is instead about to authorize and appropriate more money for defense spending than anything else. Tomorrow, you will likely hear some Republicans say that our amendment to cut 10 percent from this budget is another attack from the “leftist mob” in Congress, that we want to undermine this country’s safety. We think America is only as safe as its people at home feel, and right now with rampant unemployment, millions losing healthcare, underfunded education, and families facing eviction—the American people need our help. So often, as progressive members of Congress, we try to explain to our Democratic and Republican colleagues that the American people are more progressive than they think. We point to polls showing overwhelming support for Medicare for All, for a Green New Deal or a $15 minimum wage. Progressive values are mainstream values, because progressive values put people first. That’s why a majority of Americans support cutting our excessively large defense budget—because they no longer see their values or needs reflected in the actions of the Pentagon. Now it’s up to us, the people they elected to represent their interests, to hear them and take action. Tomorrow, Congress can choose—the American people or not.

### L—Generic—AI

#### Military-based AI cooperation fails. Public opposition and major private firms will refuse to cooperation.

Lin-Greenberg 20, postdoctoral fellow at the University of Pennsylvania’s Perry World House (Erik, “Allies and Artificial Intelligence: Obstacles to Operations and Decision-Making,” *Texas National Security Review*, 3.2)//BB

Tepid public support at home and abroad can stymie alliance military operations in two ways. First, public opposition to the use of AI among allied populations may lead policymakers to restrict the use of AI-enabled technologies for military operations. In the event of future hostilities, for example, the South Korean or German governments might oppose an ally’s use of AI-enabled lethal weapon systems on their territory.60 Indeed, advocacy from the public and activist groups has led a growing number of states — including U.S. allies like Pakistan and Jordan — to call for bans on the use of lethal autonomous weapon systems.61 Second, civilian engineers and researchers that develop AI technology may refuse to work on military AI contracts. Disruptions to AI development can hinder the fielding of new capabilities and generate mistrust between the government and civilian firms. Google employees, for instance, protested their involvement in Project Maven, a Defense Department program that uses AI to analyze video collected by military drones.62 In a letter to their CEO, the employees argued that “Google should not be in the business of war,” explaining that the company should not “outsource the moral responsibility of [its] technologies to third parties,” and that work on Defense Department-backed AI would “irreparably damage Google’s brand.”63 The resistance ultimately led Google to terminate its involvement in the contract and generated public criticism of the Defense Department’s AI efforts.64

#### AI policy drains PC

George Dvorsky 17, 10-25-2017, "Powerful Lobby Group Wants to Keep AI Unregulated," https://gizmodo.com/powerful-lobby-group-wants-to-keep-ai-unregulated-1819842165

The Information Technology Industry Council (ITI)—a Washington D.C.-based lobby group that boasts Google, Amazon, and Microsoft among its many clients—is telling governments to think twice about establishing laws to regulate AI. But given mounting safety, ethical, and social justice concerns, is that such a good idea? On Tuesday, ITI released its “AI Policy Principles,” in which the lobby group outlined “specific areas where industry, governments, and others can collaborate, as well as specific opportunities for public-private partnership.” In the new document, ITI acknowledged the need for the tech sector to promote the responsible development and use of AI, while calling upon governments to support, incentivize, and fund AI research efforts. But as for letting governments take a peek at an ITI client’s source code, or enact laws to steer the safe and ethical development of AI, that’s something it’s a bit less enthused about. “We also encourage governments to evaluate existing policy tools and use caution before adopting new laws, regulations, or taxes that may inadvertently or unnecessarily impede the responsible development and use of AI,” notes ITI in its new list of AI principles. “This extends to the foundational nature of protecting source code, proprietary algorithms, and other intellectual property. Failure to do so could present a significant cyber risk.” According to its mandate, ITI seeks to “encourage all governments around the world—including the US government—to develop policies, standards, and regulations that promote innovation and growth for the tech industry.” It represents some of the heaviest hitters in the tech sector, including Amazon, Facebook, Google, IBM, and Microsoft, while claiming to be “the global voice of the tech sector” and “a catalyst for preparing an AI world.” ITI’s document is timely given just how important AI is starting to become, both in terms of its burgeoning influence on our lives (whether it be a photo-sorting app or an algorithm that invents new medicines), and in the global economy (ITI estimates that AI will add at least $7 trillion to the global economy by 2025). But it’s also timely given the recent calls for oversight and regulation. As Bloomberg reporters Gerrit De Vynck and Ben Brody write: Hypersonic Plane From Venus Aerospace Will Travel to the Edge of Space Big tech companies, and their software, are coming under more scrutiny in the wake of news that Russian-sponsored accounts used social networks to spread discord and try to influence the outcome of the 2016 U.S. presidential election. Algorithms designed by Facebook, Twitter Inc. and Google have also been criticized for increasing political polarization by giving people the type of news they already agree with, creating so-called “filter bubbles.” And the concerns don’t stop there. Developers are starting to be criticized for allowing their AI systems to adopt human biases and prejudices (a recent Princeton study, for example, showed that some AI systems are sexist and racist). There’s also uncertainty about how AI will contribute to technological unemployment, automated warfare, and computer hacking. And there’s still no consensus on the specific ethical or moral codes that need to be imbued into these systems. There’s also the frightening potential, as thinkers like Elon Musk, Stephen Hawking, and others have pointed out, for something to go horribly wrong with AI. As the recent AI breakthrough by Google-owned DeepMind demonstrated, a fast takeoff event, in which AI evolves into a superintelligent form, may happen relatively quickly and without warning, thus introducing catastrophic—and possibly existential—threats. As all of this is happening, it shouldn’t come as a surprise that some concerned observers are calling for the government to step in. Musk has warned that governments need to implement regulations “before it’s too late,” and that it’s only after things get out of hand that we tend to act. Two years ago, the White House implemented a preliminary AI strategy, saying AI needs to be ethical, that it must augment, and not replace, humans, and that everyone should have a chance to participate in the development of these systems. But as for formal regulations, the White House said it’s still premature. As former US president Obama told Wired last year, “Most people aren’t spending a lot of time right now worrying about the Singularity—they are worrying about ‘Well, is my job going to be replaced by a machine?’” “A middle path between no regulation and state regulation is to let industry regulate itself, which is the ITI approach. But this is far from ideal as well: it’s letting the fox guard the henhouse.” Patrick Lin, director of the Ethics + Emerging Sciences Group at California Polytechnic State University, says that regulating new technologies is always a delicate balancing act. “If you set regulation too early, then you may be betting on the wrong standards, and that would be terrible for commercialization, which is important,” Lin told Gizmodo. “The same problem exists with setting too many or unnecessary regulations; they can create barriers to innovation. But commercialization isn’t the only value at stake here; public safety is another value in the equation. So, if there’s little or no regulation for technologies that can have serious impact on our lives—from self-driving cars to AI systems that make criminal sentencing and bank lending decisions—then that will be bad for society. It’s a mistake to have a knee-jerk reaction either way, reflexively for or against regulation. Each technology is different and needs to be considered carefully on its own merits.” Lin says this conversation is currently happening in regards to autonomous vehicles, with one camp arguing that regulatory standards will put manufacturers on the same page about safety-critical functions (which would protect the industry from some liability), with the other camp saying we don’t know enough to start forging standards. “A middle path between no regulation and state regulation is to let industry regulate itself, which is the ITI approach,” says Lin. “But this is far from ideal as well: it’s letting the fox guard the henhouse. There’s no teeth to enforce self-regulations if a company breaks rank; there may be even less transparency than with government regulators; and many other problems.” Currently, the US has no federal agency dedicated to regulating or monitoring AI, and it’ll probably be a while before we see anything like that (if ever). In the meantime, it’ll be up to various groups, both inside and outside the government, to monitor developments in AI, such as the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration (to oversee development of autonomous vehicles) and the Department of Homeland Security (to monitor cybersecurity threats). Some private individuals and companies have created their own groups, such as Musk’s OpenAI initiative and Google’s DeepMind Ethics & Society group. But as Lin points out, there’s a “having your cake and eat it, too” aspect to self-regulation. “On one hand, industry (correctly) says that AI is going to be this game-changing, super-revolutionary thing, but on the other hand, they often tell us not to worry about it, that they have it handled,” he said. “Worse, because the AI industry is so fragmented and full of start-ups—or even individuals without formal education or professional training, working from their basements—you couldn’t possibly get them all on board with your self-imposed regulations, whereas government regulations can use the full force of law to achieve compliance.” Lin says that self-regulation may be better than no regulation or uninformed regulation, especially when it’s about a technology that could cause major problems for society. As examples, he points to fake news, dieselgate, biased decision systems, and so on. Sara Wachter-Boettcher, author of Technically Wrong: Sexist Apps, Biased Algorithms, and Other Threats of Toxic Tech, says she’s happy to see an acknowledgement of the problem and development of shared principles, but the underlying message to her seems to be, “trust us, we’re working on it.” “I would ask, what evidence do we have that they’ve got a handle on removing bias from AI? Why should we trust tech companies when we see examples of them embedding bias into software, or launching products with unintended consequences, every day?,” Wachter-Boettcher told Gizmodo. “I understand that it’s not as simple as lifting the curtain and letting the public look at the code, but there needs to be agreed-upon and enforced levels of transparency and accountability. While industry says it’s afraid of slowing down innovation, I think the rest of us should be a lot more worried about the real risk of flying headfirst into even more inequality, bias, and unintended harm.” In an email to Gizmodo, Jaan Tallinn, the co-founder of Skype, said “we need regulation eventually, but first we need more research into what a positive and effective regulation should look like.” And indeed, those arguing for regulations are having some difficulty articulating what actually needs regulating, and how it should be implemented and enforced. Thankfully, however, these conversations have started and the frameworks for AI regulation are starting to emerge. As Tallinn noted, we’re going to need regulations eventually. The self-serving principles set out by ITI can be seen as pre-emptive attack to delay the inevitable, and to protect its clients from what it sees as meddlesome and potentially costly intrusions. And self-serving it is; it can hardly be said, for example—and as stated in the new list of principles—that the ITI clientele could use some additional financial support from the government. As Oxford philosopher Nick Bostrom wrote last year, “Great resources are devoted to making [progress in AI] happen, with major (and growing) investments from both industry and academia in many countries.” At the same time, investments “in long-term AI safety...remains orders of magnitude less than investment in increasing AI capabilities.” That ITI did not list the funding of AI safety initiatives by industry, government, and private sources as an “AI principle” is as problematic as it is revealing. Moreover, it’s not immediately obvious that profit-driven companies with cranky shareholders in the background are in any way interested in constraints imposed by outside forces, or in voluntarily contributing to the public good. Regulations and government oversight exists in the absence of pro-social forces within the overarching capitalist framework. “We can hope that corporate self-interest will align with public interests, but that is a giant leap of faith, and many companies in ITIC don’t exactly have a great track record at winning public trust,” Lin told Gizmodo. “It’s important to remember that they’re not in the business of protecting the public or promoting democracy—their business is business. When profit motives and humanitarian motives collide, take a wild guess which one usually wins.”

### L–– Generic – Biotech

#### Biotech developments unpopular

Cary Funk et. Al 16, 11/2/16, “U.S. Public Wary of Biomedical Technologies to ‘Enhance’ Human Abilities”, Pew Research Center Science & Society, https://www.pewresearch.org/science/2016/07/26/u-s-public-wary-of-biomedical-technologies-to-enhance-human-abilities/

Cutting-edge biomedical technologies that could push the boundaries of human abilities may soon be available, making people’s minds sharper and their bodies stronger and healthier than ever before. But a new Pew Research Center survey of U.S. adults shows that majorities greet the possibility of these breakthroughs with more wariness and worry than enthusiasm and hope. Many in the general public expect continued scientific and technological innovation, broadly speaking, to bring helpful change to society. Yet when people are queried about the potential use of emerging technologies for “human enhancement,” their attitudes are not nearly as affirming. The survey examines public attitudes about the potential use of three emerging technologies that could fundamentally improve people’s health, cognitive abilities or physical capacities. The specific examples were: gene editing to give babies a lifetime with much reduced risk of serious disease, implanting brain chips to give people a much improved ability to concentrate and process information and transfusing of synthetic blood to give people much greater speed, strength and stamina. These are just three of many enhancements that scientists and bioethicists say could arise from biomedical technologies now under development. None of the three are currently available for the purpose of enhancing otherwise healthy babies or adults, though all are in a research and development phase or are being tested in very limited circumstances for therapeutic uses, such as helping patients to recover from a stroke or spinal cord injury. (For background see “Human Enhancement: The Scientific and Ethical Dimensions of Striving for Perfection.”) When Americans are questioned about the prospect of these specific kinds of enhancements for healthy people, their views are cautious and often resistant: Majorities of U.S. adults say they would be “very” or “somewhat” worried about gene editing (68%), brain chips (69%) and synthetic blood (63%), while no more than half say they would be enthusiastic about each of these developments. Some people say they would be both enthusiastic and worried, but, overall, concern outpaces excitement. More say they would not want enhancements of their brains and their blood (66% and 63%, respectively) than say they would want them (32% and 35%). U.S. adults are closely split on the question of whether they would want gene editing to help prevent diseases for their babies (48% would, 50% would not). At least seven-in-ten adults predict each of these new technologies will become available before they have been fully tested or understood. Some 73% say this about gene editing, while an identical share says the same about synthetic blood; 74% says this about brain chip implants. Majorities say these enhancements could exacerbate the divide between haves and have-nots. For instance, 73% believe inequality will increase if brain chips become available because initially they will be obtainable only by the wealthy. In addition, many Americans think recipients of enhancements will feel superior to those who have not received them; 63% say this about synthetic blood transfusions in particular. By the same token, but more optimistically, half of Americans or more think recipients of enhancements will feel more confident about themselves. Substantial shares say they are not sure whether these interventions are morally acceptable. But among those who express an opinion, more people say brain and blood enhancements would be morally unacceptable than say they are acceptable. More adults say the downsides of brain and blood enhancements would outweigh the benefits for society than vice versa. Americans are a bit more positive about the possibility of gene editing to reduce disease; 36% think it will have more benefits than downsides, while 28% think it will have more downsides than benefits. Opinion is closely divided when it comes to the fundamental question of whether these potential developments are “meddling with nature” and cross a line that should not be crossed, or whether they are “no different” from other ways that humans have tried to better themselves over time. The survey data show several patterns surrounding Americans’ wariness about these developments. First, there are strong differences in views about using these technologies for enhancement depending on how religious people are. In general, the most religious are the most wary about potential enhancements. For example, those who score high on a three-item index of religious commitment1 are more likely than those who are lower in religious commitment to say all three types of enhancement – gene editing to give babies a lifetime with much reduced risk of disease, brain chip implants to give people much improved cognitive abilities and transfusions with synthetic blood to give people much improved physical capacities – would be meddling with nature and crossing a line that should not be crossed. Americans who have lower levels of religious commitment are more inclined to see the potential use of these techniques as just the continuation of a centuries-old quest by humans to try to better themselves. Second, people believe that technologies that would bring more dramatic or extreme changes to human abilities are less acceptable than technologies that cause less dramatic or temporary changes. For example, 47% of Americans consider the use of synthetic blood substitutes to improve physical abilities an “appropriate use of technology” if the resulting change to people’s speed, strength and stamina would be “equal to their own peak abilities.” But if the same enhancement results in physical abilities “far above that of any human known to date,” far fewer (28%) say it would be an appropriate use of technology. The same pattern occurs as Americans consider the potential use of gene editing and devices implanted in the brain to augment human abilities. Third, women tend to be more hesitant than men about wanting the enhancements potentially available from these cutting-edge technologies. They are also more negative than men in their judgments and expectations about what such enhancements would mean for society. Interestingly, although majorities of the public expect these enhancements would lead to increased social inequality, there are, at best, only modest differences in attitudes about these topics by race, ethnicity, educational level, income or age. Finally, there are some similarities between what Americans think about these three potential, future enhancements and their attitudes toward the kinds of enhancements already widely available today. Many are skeptical about the need for cosmetic procedures and other current enhancements. For example, 61% of Americans say people are too quick to undergo cosmetic procedures to change their appearance in ways that are not really important. Roughly a third (34%) say elective cosmetic surgery is “taking technology too far.” And, overall, 54% of U.S. adults say elective cosmetic surgery leads to both benefits and downsides for society, while 26% express the belief that there are more downsides than benefits, and just 16% say society receives more benefits than downsides from cosmetic surgery. These are some of the key findings from a new nationally representative Pew Research Center survey of 4,726 U.S. adults conducted online and by mail from March 2 to 28, 2016. The margin of sampling error at the 95% confidence interval for results based on the total sample is plus or minus 2.2 percentage points.2 What do we mean by human enhancement? Human enhancement encompasses a wide range of biomedical interventions intended to increase human abilities. In simple terms, this means making biochemical, surgical or other changes designed to improve cognitive, psychological or physical capacities, and can include changes aimed at bettering physical and mental health. The modern discussion of human enhancement often is traced to an essay by Julian Huxley in 1957. The essay suggested the human species could “transcend itself” through biological intervention.3 Over the millennia, people have tried to improve their abilities by learning, as well as using tools and gadgets. Enhancement is different from those attempts at human betterment because it involves biomedical intervention in the body to notch up a person’s capabilities. Many also think about human enhancement as distinct from therapeutic interventions. Thus, medical treatments aimed at restoring a person’s ability to see or hear – for example, to regain motor control after a stroke or spinal cord injury – would stand in contrast to enhancing abilities in otherwise healthy and well-functioning people beyond their current capacities (or some typical level).4 The line between therapy and enhancement often is blurry, but this distinction provides a framework for thinking about human enhancement in everyday terms. Although the phrase “human enhancement” is used primarily by ethicists, there are numerous enhancements available today. Examples include: anabolic steroids used to promote muscle development; reproductive technologies, including tubal ligation and vasectomies to increase human control over the reproductive system; and an array of cosmetic interventions to change people’s physical characteristics. Two widely available cognitive enhancements include the (off-label) use of modafinil and Ritalin (methylphenidate) to stimulate a person’s focus, concentration or memory. Some also consider vaccines a form of enhancement aimed at making people healthier by reducing the probability of disease, although others consider vaccines to be firmly rooted in medical or therapeutic treatment, not enhancement.5 Until now, biomedical scientists have had the capacity to make only relatively modest enhancements in people. However, the convergence of innovations in biotechnology, nanotechnology, information technology and other fields is raising the possibility that future enhancements could enable much more dramatic changes to human abilities. The pace of innovation is difficult to predict and sometimes takes much of the scientific community, let alone the broader public, by surprise. The development of CRISPR, a gene-editing technique, is one example in which potentially far-reaching techniques evolved very rapidly, within the space of just a few years. Pew Research Center rooted much of this study in exploring public attitudes about breakthroughs that could expand the boundaries of human limits, potentially creating even healthier, stronger and smarter humans. In particular, the study focuses on U.S. public reactions to three potential kinds of enhancement: gene editing to give a healthy baby a much reduced risk of serious diseases and conditions over their lifetime, implanting a computer chip in the brain to give a healthy person a much improved ability to concentrate and process information, and using synthetic blood substitutes to give a healthy person much greater speed, strength and stamina. (For comparison, survey respondents also were asked about a number of procedures, such as elective cosmetic surgery, that are widely available today.) The three future-oriented scenarios are meant to reflect the range of enhancements being discussed by scientists and others as potentially on the horizon, but it is by no means an exhaustive list.6 None of the techniques behind these ideas is being used for “enhancing purposes” today, although all exist in some form of development for therapeutic or medical applications. They were chosen in part because they each raise potentially enticing prospects. What if we, as a society, could virtually do away with illness? What if humans could all raise their thinking capacity manyfold? And what if synthetic “super blood” could boost physical prowess to “superman” and “superwoman” levels? Whatever appeal these ideas may have, they also raise fundamental questions about what it means to be human. From the earliest days of civilization, people have sought to better their condition through the use of tools, medications, surgeries and other therapies. But as new scientific and technological breakthroughs arise, so do questions about whether such developments move beyond limits set by God, nature or reason. Thus, this research is aimed in part at understanding where, if at all, the public might “draw the line” on human enhancements and the possibilities they could bring to society.

#### Biotech lobbyists means the plan costs PC

Jason Mast 18, 19, 11-18-2019, "In rare political foray, top biotech investors urge Congress to reject drug pricing bill," Endpoints News, https://endpts.com/in-rare-political-foray-top-biotech-investors-urge-congress-to-reject-drug-pricing-bill/

Thirteen of the top biotech venture capitalists in the country wrote a letter last week warning lawmakers that if Congress passes a drug pricing bill House Speaker Nancy Pelosi has put before lawmakers, they won’t be able to invest in biomedical research at their current rate, and patients will suffer. “If policies such as those included within H.R. 3, the Lower Drug Costs Now Act, are passed, our ability to continue to invest in future biomedical innovation will be severely constrained, thus crushing the hopes of millions of patient waiting for the next breakthroughs to treat or cure their cancers, rare genetic diseases, Alzheimer’s, or other serious and life-threatening conditions,” they wrote in a letter addressed to the highest-ranking Democrats and Republicans in the House and Senate and acquired by Endpoints News. The list of signatories includes Arch Venture Partners’ Robert Nelsen, Bay City Capital’s David Beier, Flagship Pioneering’s Doug Cole, RA Capital Management’s Peter Kolchinsky and Pappas Capital’s Arthur Pappas. They write they have over $20 billion invested in private and public biopharmaceutical companies. The investors join the larger pharma companies in expressing alarm about the price controls in Pelosi’s bill. Pfizer is urging voters to “Tell Congress: Reject the Dangerous Drug Pricing Bill.” While the large pharma companies have long peddled in Washington through the lobbying group PhRMA and have amped spending to record levels as drug pricing reform has gained traction, biotech venture capitalists have largely been more reluctant to enter the political fray. Increasingly, though, the debate around drug pricing reform and what it might mean for R&D has centered around the smaller biotechs these VC funds keep afloat. Last week, STAT ran a piece quoting tiny biotechs as fearing a “nuclear winter” if the Nancy Pelosi-backed bill passed. In October, Bobby Dubois, the CSO of the industry-backed National Pharmaceutical Council told Endpoints that he couldn’t be sure that a fall in revenue for big pharma would lead to cuts to R&D spending but that it was very likely that such a bill would cut off dollars from smaller biotechs. Biotechs’ high startup costs and attrition rate, the theory goes, make them dependent on huge potential payouts. Without those, investments would dry up. The bill would also likely derail the biotech IPO market, which is how venture capitalists have earned much of their money in biopharma in recent years. Unveiled in September, the Democratic bill — which contains elements Republicans have backed but has little chance of passing the Senate — would tether the price of the nation’s 250 most expensive drugs to an international price index and all-but-force companies to negotiate the final figure with the federal government. An early Congressional Budget Office analysis estimated the bill would reduce federal spending on Medicare Part D by $345 billion between 2023 and 2029 but also lead to between 8 and 15 fewer drugs being brought to market over the next 10 years, although **the CBO said the effect on innovation was difficult to quantify. In the letter, the VCs argued such a system would be “granting the U.S. government essentially unchecked authority” to set prices and pin those prices to countries that “systematically undervalue” medical breakthrough**s. “Biotech investment already is a high-risk enterprise…” they wrote. “If, after we invest hundreds of millions of dollars over a decade or more to achieve such success, the government can impose an artificially low price on the few new drugs that make it to market, our robust biotech investment ecosystem will become unsustainable.” The disagreement between the VCs and Democratic and some Republican lawmakers is both around whether the cuts will affect innovation and the value of some of that innovation. The VCs described the therapies they back as “miracle drugs, with the ability not just to treat, but to actually cure, so many genetically-based diseases and other serious conditions.” In past pushes for drug pricing reform, advocates have mostly said that that rhetoric is overstated and pricing controls will leave R&D spending mostly untouched. But a few Democrats, including Florida Representative Darren Soto and California Representative Anna Eshoo, now argue an uptick in access is worth losing a few drugs. “Three hundred forty-five billion dollars in savings versus the cost of eight to 15 fewer drugs over 10 years,” Soto said at a recent hearing before the House Energy and Commerce Committee, according to STAT. “I frankly think it’s worth it.”

### L—bolt from the blue

#### unforeseen changes trigger inefficient raids on military resources

Kelly 10, principal mathematician at the RAND Corporation (Terrence, et al, “Security Cooperation Organizations in the Country Team: Options for Success,” RAND, <https://apps.dtic.mil/sti/pdfs/ADA517323.pdf)//BB>

Changes Are Needed to Improve Security Cooperation Effectiveness

The RAND research team found that organizations that currently manage U.S. security cooperation work relatively well in most countries where peacetime engagement is the norm. In particular, current practices and authorities suffice if security cooperation efforts can be planned in advance and there is no need for significant change during a given budget year. However, when unbudgeted requirements arise, whether they are for new programs or for significant changes to existing programs, the current system has trouble working within inflexible authorities and funding mechanisms and what is, at times, less-than-ideal interagency coordination. To help DoD and the State Department overcome these hurdles, the RAND team developed three options that

### L– AT not congress

#### Congress has a huge oversight and funding role in security cooperation

**C**ongressional **R**esearch **S**ervice **21**, 3-17-21, "," No Publication, https://crsreports.congress.gov/product/pdf/IF/IF11677

Congressional Role Congress provides the authority and funding for SC programs. Title 10 SC activities fall under the jurisdiction of the armed services committees,while Title 22 (DOS) SA activities are under the jurisdiction of the Senate Foreign Relations and House Foreign Affairs committees. Although the armed services committees are responsible for the authorizing legislation for Title 10 SC programs, both committees exercise oversight of SC activities and the management of SC policy, including the level of coordination between DOD and DOS. Funding for Title 10 SC programs and activities is provided through annual appropriations bills, which originates in the appropriations committees, specifically the defense subcommittees. Primarily (but not solely)through these six committees, Congress plays critical roles in the design and oversight of SC programs and in ensuring that SC activities are aligned with and meeting U.S. national security and foreign policy objectives. Pursuant to statutory authorities, the executive branch must notify relevant committees on a regular basis about some, but not all, SC activities. Congress can exercise oversight rolesin numerous ways, including determining how the executive branch makes decisions for the export of military and dual-use items, usingannual authorizing legislation to establish temporary authorities or modify the U.S. Code on an enduring basis, reviewing proposed arms transfers and planned SC/SA activities and funding obligations, mandating reports, and holding relevant hearings. The Senate also influences SC through its advice and consent to the ratification of relevant treaties.

#### Congressional legislation plays a pivotal role in security cooperation

Scott R. Anderson 22, 7-9-2022, Anderson is a fellow in Governance Studies at the Brookings Institution and a Senior Fellow in the National Security Law Program at Columbia Law School. He previously served as an Attorney-Adviser in the Office of the Legal Adviser at the U.S. Department of State "Congress Has (Less Than) 60 Days to Save Israeli-Palestinian Security Cooperation," Lawfare, https://www.lawfareblog.com/congress-has-less-60-days-save-israeli-palestinian-security-cooperation

Earlier this fall, Congress enacted a new law with potentially dramatic implications for U.S. foreign policy toward the Israeli-Palestinian conflict. The Anti-Terrorism Clarification Act (ATCA) exposes foreign organizations that accept certain forms of U.S. foreign assistance to the possibility of terrorism-related civil litigation in U.S. federal courts. Fearful of potential liability, the Palestinian Authority and Palestine Liberation Organization (PLO) are now preparing to reject the limited amounts of U.S. foreign assistance they still receive—including support for an Israeli-Palestinian security cooperation program that Israeli officials, among others, believe has substantially improved the security situation in the West Bank. Aside from a few astute observers, no one appears to have anticipated this outcome. Or if anyone in the legislative process did, they did not mention it. Both chambers of Congress approved ATCA through unanimous voice votes. Only the House of Representatives engaged in any debate on the matter, none of which raised potential policy ramifications. The Trump administration, meanwhile, made no objections while the bill was being debated, and the president himself signed it without reservations. Yet support for the ATCA as-written has now soured. The Associated Press reported on Nov. 30 that the White House plans to deploy Lt. Gen. Eric P. Wendt, the U.S. Security Coordinator (USSC) in charge of the endangered Israeli-Palestinian security cooperation program, to Capitol Hill in order to push for a legislative fix that will allow that program to continue. **Members of Congress, meanwhile, have expressed growing concerns with some of the dramatic measures that U.S. and Palestinian officials are preparing to pursue in response to the ATCA**, including shutting down the USSC and U.S. Agency for International Development (USAID) offices in the West Bank. All corners, it seems, are hoping for some legislative solution. But it is unclear whether Congress will be able to agree to one before Feb. 1, 2019, when the ATCA takes full effect. Adding a waiver position to the ATCA is likely to be the most effective legislative solution, as it will provide the executive branch with the flexibility necessary to continue to use foreign assistance to advance U.S. foreign policy objectives while allowing Congress and others to hold it accountable. Absent such a legislative fix, the only means of escaping the ATCA’s consequences will be to challenge its constitutionality in federal court. But the resulting litigation is likely to be costly and time-consuming with no guarantee of a final resolution, imposing substantial costs on U.S. foreign policy interests even if the ATCA is ultimately struck down.

#### Even if the aff isn’t entirely through congress, it is still highley politicized and seen as a reflection of congressional choices

Thomas-Durell Young 19, 3-18-2019, Dr. Thomas-Durell Young is a Senior Lecturer at the Naval Postgraduate School."The "Politics" of Security Cooperation and Security Assistance," Office of the Deputy Assistant Secretary of the Army for Defense Exports and Cooperation, https://www.dasadec.army.mil/News/Article-Display/Article/2344014/the-politics-of-security-cooperation-and-security-assistance/

I n 1955 a book titled The Politics of the Prussian Army, 1640–1945 was published; it would soon become a landmark study of civil-military relations.1 Gordon Craig’s unassuming tome became widely influential within and outside the civil-military relations field and spurred the publication of what has become a wide literature on the politics of armies (particularly those of the United Kingdom, Italy, Russia, and France) that takes a different approach to our conventional understanding of civil-military relations.2 What makes these latter books prescient in their instruction is that they disabuse Dr. Thomas-Durell Young is a Senior Lecturer at readers of the erroneous assumption the Naval Postgraduate School. Members of Cameroonian armed forces participate in visit, board, search, and seizure drill aboard Nigerian training vessel during U.S. Africa Command–sponsored exercise Obangame Express 2019, in Lagos, Nigeria, March 18, 2019 (U.S. Navy/Kyle Steckler) JFQ 98, 3rd Quarter 2020 Young 61 that armies are somehow subservient to their political masters and eschew involvement in domestic politics or in any system of governance. As the historical record demonstrates (and, dare one suggest, a reflection of the U.S. Armed Forces in a contemporary setting3 ), armies are all but inherently political and need to be recognized as such if their effect on civil-military relations is to be properly assessed. The intrinsically political nature of military organizations is no less true when it comes to armies’ efforts in the education, training, and equipping of foreign partner nations’ armed forces, known as security cooperation (SC) and security assistance (SA). Yet much of the American bureaucracy and legal framework for these activities treat them as fundamentally technical problems that are susceptible to improvement through better procedures. This technicism, to purloin a term from Samuel Huntington,4 is arguably at the heart of many of our failures and disappointments in building partner security forces (for example, those of Afghanistan,5 Iraq,6 and Mali7 ) or in reforming defense institutions in Central and Eastern Europe.8 Virtually every fix proposed to partners is yet another technical or bureaucratic adjustment rather than an acknowledgment of the fundamentally political nature of these activities, both within a partner nation as well as among U.S. agencies responsible for planning and carrying out the assistance programs. The objective of this article is to argue that administration officials and Congress face two different political challenges related to improving SC and SA. Unless and until U.S. officials formulate solutions to these political problems, both branches of government will struggle to achieve more effective means of reforming partner nations’ key governmental institutions. First—and perhaps the easiest challenge to address—is that SC and SA have unintended political consequences in the government institutions of recipient countries and are not solely technical tasks. No one has expressed this point better than Mara Karlin, albeit she was speaking in reference to weak states: Past experience offers two key lessons for U.S. officials as they seek to strengthen the security sectors of weak states. First, like all state-building endeavors, these are political, not technical, exercises. Instead of focusing narrowly on training and equipment, U.S. policymakers responsible for implementing such programs must address the purpose and scope of the U.S. role and the mission, leadership, and organizational structure of the partner’s military.9 Second, SC and SA are highly politicized; both are inefficient, because of the lack of coordination between the Department of Defense (DOD) and Department of State, and ineffective, because of lack of alignment with national security goals (and/or foreign policy objectives). This important reality needs wider appreciation by these departments, as well as by Congress, if the U.S. Government is to improve its ability to find value for money by improving partner nations’ ability to defend their sovereignty, let alone contribute to expeditionary operations. Recent reforms initiated by Congress, most notably in the fiscal year (FY) 2017 National Defense Authorization Act (NDAA), constitute a good first effort at addressing these longstanding problems; however, a review of the evidence shows that this legislation should be augmented to define the problem as largely political in nature, as opposed to accepting the traditional default assumption that it is solely technical, which would have enabled it to call for even deeper reforms within these bureaucracies. This article argues that, due to internal DOD politics and the interorganizational politics within the U.S. Government, suboptimal results ensue from the way the United States plans and executes SC and SA. It then suggests legislative and policy changes that might better take this reality into account. The stakes are high. If U.S. strategy is to bring troops home from the so-called endless wars overseas and let others do the fighting, then its success must be a core priority. But only by reforming the way the United States organizes itself to build allies’ and partners’ armed forces are we likely to meet with any greater success than we have in the past.

### AT: L/T—plan popular

#### Even if the plan is successful – voter’s don’t care about progress with NATO because it is a perceptual tradeoff

Jonathan Lemire 22, 6-30-2022, "Biden notches wins in Europe — as challenges pile up at home," POLITICO, https://www.politico.com/news/2022/06/30/biden-notches-wins-in-europe-000435683

MADRID — For nearly a week, President Joe Biden was the star attraction at a pair of European summits, hailed as a steadfast ally while he espoused the vital need for democracies to band together against Russia’s invasion of Ukraine. But once Air Force One touched down in Washington late Thursday, Biden returned to a starkly different political reality. The days Biden spent at the G-7 gathering in Germany and the NATO summit in Spain provided a brief oasis for the president, who must confront soaring inflation, surging gas prices, questions about his political future and a rage from his own party about a series of Supreme Court rulings. Despite the domestic turmoil, and dismal poll numbers, Biden rejected the notion that the nation was being doubted on the world stage. “You haven’t found one person, one world leader, to say America is going backwards. America is better positioned to lead the world than we ever have been,” Biden told reporters at the conclusion of the NATO summit in Madrid. “The one thing that has been destabilizing is the outrageous behavior of the Supreme Court of the United States on overruling not only Roe v. Wade, but essentially challenging the right to privacy.” But the trouble Biden left behind across the Atlantic was what dominated the news conference he held at the end of the trip. The summits had undeniable successes — including an agreement to admit two new members to NATO — yet they struggled to break through a domestic news cycle back home. White House aides have long conceded that Biden’s handling of the war in Ukraine, no matter how vital to global security, will win the president and his party few votes back home. And there is growing concern that patience for sustaining the war effort — both among European allies and American voters — could fade if the conflict stretches into next year, exacerbating record inflation by sending energy and food prices soaring. But for this week, there was no doubting the worthiness of the cause, with the United States once again the indispensable nation. In the stunning Bavarian Alps, Biden led the leaders of the six wealthiest democracies to push for a measure to cap Russian oil prices while also unveiling a global infrastructure plan meant to pull some of the developing world out from the influence of another authoritarian regime, China. And in sun-splashed Madrid, Biden publicly declared the U.S. would stand with Ukraine while he worked behind the scenes to assuage Turkey’s concerns to pave the way for both Finland and Sweden to join NATO. “Putin thought he could break the trans-Atlantic Alliance. He tried to weaken us. ... But he’s getting exactly what he did not want.” President Joe Biden Biden declared the alliance would defy Vladimir Putin’s war effort “for as long as it takes,” even if it meant spending billions more on weapons for Ukraine. “Putin thought he could break the trans-Atlantic Alliance. He tried to weaken us. He expected our resolve to fracture,” Biden said. “But he’s getting exactly what he did not want.” Not every item on the summits’ wish list was fulfilled, as talk of fighting climate change took a back seat to trying to bolster fossil fuel production. And when asked at the news conference about oil prices, Biden struggled to justify his upcoming visit to Saudi Arabia, a nation he once deemed a “pariah.” But progress was made, experts said. “NATO enlargement and plans to increase and move forces is a significant plus,” said Richard Haass, head of the Council on Foreign Relations. “When it comes to backing Ukraine economically and militarily, it will all depend on what is actually done.” But Haass warned that the political morass back home “dilutes his ability to lead as they raise questions about both his ability to deliver and the long-term political direction of the United States.” While Biden was in Europe, anger grew among Democrats who believed he wasn’t doing enough to support a woman’s right to choose. He then made headlines Thursday when he announced, for the first time, that he would support a carveout to the Senate filibuster to protect privacy rights, which includes codifying Roe v. Wade. “Any president contending with a Supreme Court that is making decisions largely antithetical to most Americans, along with a Senate gridlocked by the filibuster, would face a challenging political landscape. What matters is how you deal with it,” said Adrienne Elrod, a Democratic strategist who advised Biden’s transition. “His announcement today that he supports getting rid of the filibuster for privacy issues was smart, timely and has ignited an extra flame under an already fired-up Democratic base.” But it seemed unlikely the Senate would move on the suggestion, and Biden’s ability to protect abortion rights through executive action was inherently limited. And the court didn’t stop there in its efforts to hinder the president’s priorities. Days before Biden left for Europe, it issued a decision to weaken gun control laws. Then, just moments after Biden condemned the court on Thursday, the Supreme Court released another ruling viewed as a crushing blow to efforts at combating climate change. And while the White House has pushed more Democrats to vote in this fall’s midterms, to contribute to larger Democratic margins in Congress, many Americans have been frustrated by the lack of progress from a party that controls that White House and both chambers of Congress. And though Biden downplayed worries among his international peers, many heads of state openly condemned the Supreme Court’s abortion decision while privately whispering in both Bavaria and Madrid as to whether America would remain a reliable partner after its next series of elections. “The world knows that we are trouble. Americans know that we are trouble, too,” said Eddie Glaude, professor at Princeton University. “And, to be honest, President Biden best put political calculus aside and fight like hell for a democracy that seems to be in need of life support.”

### PC True

#### Consensus of studies prove PC is true, especially early term PC

Byers et al. 19 — Jason Byers is a Postdoctoral Fellow at the university of Michigan. He received his Ph.D. in Political Science from the University of Georgia and my undergraduate degree from the College of Charleston. His research focuses on American political institutions, Congress, the US Presidency, Separation of Powers, electoral behavior and representation, institutional development, political behavior, and quantitative analysis. Jamie Carson is a Professor in the Department of Political Science at the University of Georgia. He received his PhD from Michigan State University in 2003, where he was a fellow in the Political Institutions and Public Choice Program now located at Duke University. He has worked at the University of Georgia since August 2004 and his research interests include American politics and methods. He regularly teaches courses on the U.S. Congress, the presidency, the politics of congressional elections, and American political development. Ryan Williamson is an Assistant Professor of Political Science in the College of Liberal Arts at Auburn University. He was an APSA Congressional Fellow in the U.S. Senate Committee on Rules and Administration. He received his Ph.D. in Political Science from the University of Georgia and his undergraduate degree from the University of Alabama at Birmingham. ("Policymaking by the Executive: Examining the Fate of Presidential Agenda Items" Taylor & Francis, Congress & the Presidency, Volume 47, 2020 - Issue 1, July 22, 2019. [https://www-tandfonline-com.proxy.lib.umich.edu/doi/full/10.1080/07343469.2019.1631905)//JLPark\*\*sex](https://www-tandfonline-com.proxy.lib.umich.edu/doi/full/10.1080/07343469.2019.1631905)//JLPark**sex) editted

On a similar note, the honeymoon period of a president’s initial time in office has been shown to increase the likelihood of legislative success (Beckmann and Godfrey [2007](https://www-tandfonline-com.proxy.lib.umich.edu/doi/full/10.1080/07343469.2019.1631905); Brace and Hinckley [1991](https://www-tandfonline-com.proxy.lib.umich.edu/doi/full/10.1080/07343469.2019.1631905); Farnsworth and Lichter [2011](https://www-tandfonline-com.proxy.lib.umich.edu/doi/full/10.1080/07343469.2019.1631905); McCarty [1997](https://www-tandfonline-com.proxy.lib.umich.edu/doi/full/10.1080/07343469.2019.1631905)). Presidents lose their favorability with the public and with Congress the longer that they are in office (McCarty [1997](https://www-tandfonline-com.proxy.lib.umich.edu/doi/full/10.1080/07343469.2019.1631905)), which is why they often push for significant legislative accomplishments early in their term. Members of Congress are uniquely aware of the public’s sentiments after a presidential election, especially because they share a common constituency with the president and are more likely to capitulate to a president’s agenda.[10](https://www-tandfonline-com.proxy.lib.umich.edu/doi/full/10.1080/07343469.2019.1631905#EN0010) Therefore, a president should receive more cooperation from members of Congress for their legislative agenda items earlier in ~~his~~ [their] term.

We should also expect the president to have varying levels of success depending on the policy in question (Ragsdale [2014](https://www-tandfonline-com.proxy.lib.umich.edu/doi/full/10.1080/07343469.2019.1631905)). One area where the president is more likely to succeed in Congress is in foreign policy. The amount of knowledge the president possesses in matters of foreign policy, compared to members of Congress, is usually much greater (Canes-Wrone, Howell, and Lewis [2008](https://www-tandfonline-com.proxy.lib.umich.edu/doi/full/10.1080/07343469.2019.1631905); Wildavsky [1966](https://www-tandfonline-com.proxy.lib.umich.edu/doi/full/10.1080/07343469.2019.1631905)). This information asymmetry in foreign policy leads Congress to be relatively deferential to the president’s proposals, therefore often negating their need to act unilaterally in order to achieve the president policy goals (Marshall and Pacelle [2005](https://www-tandfonline-com.proxy.lib.umich.edu/doi/full/10.1080/07343469.2019.1631905)).[11](https://www-tandfonline-com.proxy.lib.umich.edu/doi/full/10.1080/07343469.2019.1631905#EN0011) Furthermore, members of Congress often have little incentive to get involved in foreign policy as there is little or no direct electoral return for them (Mayhew [1974](https://www-tandfonline-com.proxy.lib.umich.edu/doi/full/10.1080/07343469.2019.1631905)).[12](https://www-tandfonline-com.proxy.lib.umich.edu/doi/full/10.1080/07343469.2019.1631905#EN0012)

A president’s ability to pursue policies with Congress is also affected by institutional features such as unified government, polarization, filibuster or veto pivots, and the partisan composition of the chambers (Bond and Fleisher [1990](https://www-tandfonline-com.proxy.lib.umich.edu/doi/full/10.1080/07343469.2019.1631905); Howell [2005](https://www-tandfonline-com.proxy.lib.umich.edu/doi/full/10.1080/07343469.2019.1631905); Krehbiel [1998](https://www-tandfonline-com.proxy.lib.umich.edu/doi/full/10.1080/07343469.2019.1631905); Mayhew [2011](https://www-tandfonline-com.proxy.lib.umich.edu/doi/full/10.1080/07343469.2019.1631905)). Much of the previous work on presidential success in Congress has focused on the distinction between unified versus divided government and has found that presidents are more likely to shift policy when there is unified government, which makes intuitive sense (Barrett and Eshbaugh-Soha [2007](https://www-tandfonline-com.proxy.lib.umich.edu/doi/full/10.1080/07343469.2019.1631905); Bond and Fleisher [1990](https://www-tandfonline-com.proxy.lib.umich.edu/doi/full/10.1080/07343469.2019.1631905); Mayhew [2011](https://www-tandfonline-com.proxy.lib.umich.edu/doi/full/10.1080/07343469.2019.1631905)). If the same party controls the presidency and both chambers of Congress, then it is reasonable to assume that a majority of the legislation that is proposed by the president will at least make it onto the legislative agenda. It also follows that during times of divided government, the president would have a harder time getting legislation passed through Congress as a result of more divergent policy preferences, which therefore impedes their ability to form the necessary coalition needed to move the status quo (Mayhew [2005](https://www-tandfonline-com.proxy.lib.umich.edu/doi/full/10.1080/07343469.2019.1631905); Ragusa [2010](https://www-tandfonline-com.proxy.lib.umich.edu/doi/full/10.1080/07343469.2019.1631905)).[13](https://www-tandfonline-com.proxy.lib.umich.edu/doi/full/10.1080/07343469.2019.1631905#EN0013) The effect of divided government is likely to be exacerbated with greater polarization as well. As the parties’ ideologies diverge, fewer opportunities exist for bipartisan compromise on issues, therefore potentially hampering the president’s ability to move policy.

Beyond simple majority status, the actual size of the president’s party within Congress also matters. Prior research demonstrates that the size of the coalition that the president has within Congress affects the likelihood that policy change is enacted (Bond and Fleisher [1990](https://www-tandfonline-com.proxy.lib.umich.edu/doi/full/10.1080/07343469.2019.1631905); Deering and Maltzman [1999](https://www-tandfonline-com.proxy.lib.umich.edu/doi/full/10.1080/07343469.2019.1631905)). A bare majority is insufficient unless there is no diversity among members’ ideologies, and even substantial majorities may not suffice if one faction holds substantially different policy preferences from the rest of the party (such as the Southern Democrats during the 1950s and 1960s). Therefore, simple majority status is not sufficient for understanding policy changes. Instead, one must consider the size of the president’s coalition and its ideological homogeneity as well (Rohde [1991](https://www-tandfonline-com.proxy.lib.umich.edu/doi/full/10.1080/07343469.2019.1631905)). Increasing the size of the coalition the president has in Congress should result in an easier path in passing legislation.[14](https://www-tandfonline-com.proxy.lib.umich.edu/doi/full/10.1080/07343469.2019.1631905#EN0014) This should be especially true during times of distinctly different ideological preferences between the majority and minority parties.

A variety of factors could influence the success of a president’s legislative proposal in Congress. Based on the president’s proclivity to have legislative proposals realized through law, the previous factors will influence the success or failure of a president’s ability to have proposals make it through Congress. Although presidents may not witness a specific proposal become law, this does not mean their initiatives will necessarily remain unrealized. Allowing an issue to remain at its status quo is indeed an option; however, the president may also decide (or be forced) to move policy unilaterally.[15](https://www-tandfonline-com.proxy.lib.umich.edu/doi/full/10.1080/07343469.2019.1631905#EN0015) There are a multitude of reasons that a legislative proposal would receive no action by Congress or the president. At times it is unclear why no action is initially taken in Congress, because it is difficult to ascertain a legislator's motivations in not pursuing a particular course of action. In addition, the use of the Hastert Rule in the House and the filibuster in the Senate could result in no action taken on specific policy proposals. Gridlock is an issue that must be addressed before legislation moves out of either chamber, which would stall progress and result in no action taken by the legislative body. Unpopular presidents usually struggle to have their legislative proposals acted on by Congress (Canes-Wrone and De Marchi [2002](https://www-tandfonline-com.proxy.lib.umich.edu/doi/full/10.1080/07343469.2019.1631905)); based on the fact that the public does not support the president, Congress will decide not to act. When dealing with legislative proposals, there are two specific endings—either the status quo is changed (i.e., Congress or the president creates a policy shift) or the status quo remains the same and the proposal receives no action.

#### PC is real, finite, and trades off with other initiatives – mathematical modeling

Beckmann 11 (Mathew Beckmann, Associate Professor of Political Science at UC Irvine with a B.A. from UCLA and Ph.D. from the University of Michigan, 2011, "How presidents push, when presidents win: A model of positive presidential power in US lawmaking,” Journal of Theoretical Politics 23(1), DOI:10.1177/0951629810378545, acc6/17/21, pg15-17) mamk-j1

Constitutional niceties notwithstanding, American citizens believe their presidents should play a signal role in US lawmaking. Americans expect presidential aspirants to articulate a detailed legislative agenda during the campaign, and then to advocate it once in Washington. Not surprisingly, recent administrations have happily obliged; today’s presidents routinely propose preferred initiatives and consistently lobby for their passage. at GEORGIAN COURT UNIV on April 25, 2015jtp.sagepub.comDownloaded from 16Journal of Theoretical Politics 23(1)In light of this self- and public perception of contemporary presidents as ‘Legislator-in-Chief’, political scientists have long sought to assess the empirical reality of presidents’ potential influence in Congress. Although earlier generations of scholars largely concurred with Woodrow Wilson’s proclamation that ‘The President is at liberty, both in law and conscience, to be as big a man as he can’, subsequent research has rebutted such great man’ conceptions of presidential power in lawmaking. More recent takes suggest presidents may see some opportunities for exerting influence on Capitol Hill, but as yet none has specified either the opportunities or the systematic means by which presidents can exploit them. This was what our paper sought to offer. Agreeing that presidents’ strategic options in Congress do indeed depend heavily on factors beyond their control, our model’s first insight is explicating the two systematic strategies presidents have available for exerting influence in Congress: they can target marginal voters to shift the preference distribution on roll-call votes and they can tar-get congressional leaders to censor the policy alternatives making it that far. While the first of these is widely recognized and studied, the second is not. By detailing the actual mechanisms of president-led coalition building on Capitol Hill, ours is a theory that puts positive presidential power on a firmer conceptual footing; legislative opportunities are predictable (if not controllable) and capitalizing on them depends on nothing more heroic than the normal grist of legislative politics: arm-twisting, brow-beating, and horse-trading. In this way, we subscribe to President Eisenhower’s observation: ‘I’ll tell you what leadership is: it’s persuasion, and conciliation, and education, and patience. It’s long, slow, tough work’ (Hughes, 1963: 124). However, if spending political capital in the service of vote-centered and agenda-centered strategies is a necessary condition for presidents to have positive influence in Congress, it certainly is not a sufficient condition. Instead, we find the exact policy return on a particular presidential lobbying campaign is conditioned by the location of the status quo, and the nature of leading opponents’ and pivotal voters’ preferences. Beyond enjoying ample political capital, then, those presidents who seek to change far-off status quos and confront pliable leading opponents and/or pivotal voters are expected to wield the greatest policymaking impact. By comparison, presidents with little to no political capital, seeking to change centrist status quos, or confronting opposing leaders and pivotal voters who staunchly oppose their proposals can find themselves with ‘nothing to do but stand there and take it’, as Lyndon Johnson once put it. Going forward, then, this more nuanced conception of presidential power suggests presidential leadership in lawmaking works through mechanisms different from those recognized previously and is manifested in ways different from those tested previously. In fact, our theoretical results set forth specific guidelines for properly testing presidents’ legislative influence. To conclude, let us briefly delineate these empirical implications of our theoretical model. The first and perhaps most important prescription is that the White House does not treat all presidential positions equally: most receive nothing more than a mere comment, a precious few get the White House’s ‘full court press’, and such prioritizing matters. Specifically, our basic hypothesis holds that presidents’ positive influence depends heavily on lobbying to work. The corollary, therefore, is that the crucial test of presidents’ influence is not whether ‘skilled’ presidents fare better than their ‘unskilled’ counterparts, at GEORGIAN COURT UNIV on April 25, but rather whether Congress responds differently to bills depending on the presidents’ lobbying, all else being equal. Second, our model underscores the important distinction between policy outcomes and roll-call votes. Because the White House wants to change the nation’s laws, the paramount metric of presidential success is the substantive result. While political scientists lack any precise measure of policy content, that is, there is no metric to judge one policy as ‘units’ more liberal or conservative than another, the foremost tests of presidents’ influence should still highlight outcomes; they should address the legislative process’s ideological results. At the same time, to say presidents’ influence is primarily evidenced in substantive outcomes does not mean its symptoms cannot be seen in roll-call votes. After all, a requisite part of winning on the overall outcome is winning on the relevant votes. On this score, our model has shown (1) tests of presidential power should emphasize those votes that best indicate the substantive outcome, such as CQ’s ‘key’ votes and (2) tests based exclusively on roll-call votes have missed an important aspect of president-led coalition building. To properly test presidents’ influence on votes, researchers must simultaneously account for voting and pre-voting processes. A final empirically relevant point about testing presidential influence in Congress is the relative unimportance of each president’s personal character or idiosyncratic traits. Like other recent scholars, we predict that because presidents’ strategic opportunities are constrained, their tactical resources are limited, so all presidents will execute more or less comparable strategies (see Cameron (2000), Edwards (1989), Hagar and Sullivan (1994),Jones (1994), and Moe (1984, 1993)). This is especially true for presidents’ congressional relations since all modern White House staffs include a team of Washington’s most experienced, successful legislative operatives (Collier, 1997). Thus, we echo the growing scholarly consensus that the presidency’s institutional incentives trump presidents’ personal characteristics.

## Dems Good

### 1nc – Democracy

#### Dems can win midterms now with a domestic pivot in politics

Josh Marshall 22, 6-6-2022, Joshua Marshall is an American journalist and blogger writing about elections for 25 years "Opinion," No Publication, https://www.nytimes.com/2022/06/06/opinion/democrats-midterms-abortion-roe.html

Democrats hope to make November’s midterm elections a referendum on Roe v. Wade, the linchpin decision upholding abortion rights, which the Supreme Court is almost certain to strike down this summer. That strategy makes sense. Polls show that roughly two in three Americans oppose overturning Roe and almost 60 percent support passing a bill to set Roe’s protections in a federal law. What’s more, polls showed a rising number of voters listing abortion as their top midterm issue after news of Roe’s imminent demise leaked in the form of a draft court opinion published by Politico. Unfortunately, their current plan is almost sure to fail. After the Democrats came up with just 49 votes to bring a Roe-protecting bill before the Senate on May 11, they promised to keep fighting and, in the words of Senator Amy Klobuchar, “take that fight right to the ballot box” in November. But you can’t make an election into a referendum on an issue if you can’t point to anything winning the election would accomplish. To make the 2022 elections a referendum on Roe, Democrats have to put protecting Roe and abortion rights on the table. Here’s one way to do that: get clear public commitments from every Senate Democrat (and candidate for Senate) not only to vote for the Roe bill in January 2023 but also to change the filibuster rules to ensure that a majority vote would actually pass the bill and send it to the White House for the president’s signature. At present, there are likely 48 Senate Democrats who can make that pledge. Senators Joe Manchin and Kyrsten Sinema are dead set against any changes to the filibuster — a fact you likely know because most of President Biden’s agenda has been bottled up behind their refusal for the past year. Some claim that Senators Manchin and Sinema are just taking the public heat for a number of other Senate Democrats who are also unwilling to change the filibuster rules. That’s highly unlikely. But if any do have misgivings, that’s why the public commitments are so important. Getting a list of holdouts down to a publicly named handful is the first step to persuading them to fall in line. If my math is right and there are 48 Senate Democrats ready to make that pledge, they need two additional Democratic senators in the next Congress. And that is the party’s message that makes the 2022 midterms a referendum on Roe: “Give us the House and two more senators, and we will make Roe law in January 2023.” The End of Roe v. Wade Commentary by Times Opinion writers and columnists on the Supreme Court’s decision to end ​​the constitutional right to abortion. Michelle Goldberg: “The end of Roe v. Wade was foreseen, but in wide swaths of the country, it has still created wrenching and potentially tragic uncertainties.” Spencer Bokat-Lindell: “What exactly does it mean for the Supreme Court to experience a crisis of legitimacy, and is it really in one?” Bonnie Kristian, journalist: “For many backers of former President Donald Trump, Friday’s Supreme Court decision was a long-awaited vindication.” It might also mark the end of his political career. Erika Bachiochi, legal scholar: “It is precisely the unborn child’s state of existential dependence upon its mother, not its autonomy, that makes it especially entitled to care, nurture and legal protection.” No ambiguity, no haggling, no living in Senator Manchin’s head for a year. You give us this, and we’ll give you that. That tells voters exactly what will be delivered with a Democratic win. It also defines what constitutes a win: control of the House and two more Senate seats. Dig deeper into the moment. Special offer: Subscribe for $1 a week. The campaign message is clear: If you want to protect Roe, give us those majorities. If this is your passion, here’s where to channel that passion. These are the Senate seats we need to hold (in New Hampshire, Arizona, Georgia and Nevada) and here are the ones we need to win (in Pennsylvania and Wisconsin and possibly in Ohio, Florida and North Carolina). With those commitments in hand, one question should be on the lips of every Democratic candidate. Will you make a firm commitment to never vote for a federal law banning abortion nationwide? Few, if any, Republicans would be able to make that pledge. And their evasions wouldn’t just make them look ridiculous; that would put squarely on the table the very real threat that Republicans would enact a nationwide abortion ban as soon as January 2025. That could prove enough to win Senate races in Pennsylvania, Wisconsin and Ohio. In a way, though, this strategy isn’t so much about winning the 2022 midterms or even making Roe into a federal law, although it’s the best way to accomplish both. It’s just an example of how you win elections. Effective campaigns are built on connecting the intense beliefs of the electorate — their hopes and fears — directly to the hard mechanics of political power. You’ve got to connect those wires. If you were testing some new electrical contraption, that’s the first thing you’d do: make sure the energy supply is wired to the engine that makes it run. This is no different. Without tying a specific electoral result to a clear commitment to a specific legislative action after the elections, you’re not connecting those wires. What Democrats would be proposing is a classic small-c conservative solution in the best sense of the word. Codifying Roe would preserve the set of rights and protections that the vast majority of Americans have lived their entire adult lives with and that the overwhelming majority of Americans do not want to change. The threat that the court will strike down such a law is real but overstated. And in any case, refusing to act because of what opponents might do is the definition of political paralysis. So how do Democrats get from here to there? They likely can’t rely on the party’s leaders, at least not at first. But they’re not essential. It’s really up to voters and activists and particularly committed members of Congress. Probably half the Democrats in the Senate would be happy to sign on this dotted line by the end of the day. Those who are up for re-election, even in safe races, will come around quickly. Some senators may resist at first. And that wouldn’t be surprising. Politicians seldom see any advantage to committing themselves in advance or reducing their room for maneuver. It’s always safer to keep your options open and be as general as possible until the final moment. That’s why assembling a clear public list of commitments is critical. Once the list gets down to a handful of hesitaters, the pressure from Democrats nationwide, focused on those members, will be overwhelming. If there are real holdouts, they’ll fold in short order. You don’t need to wait on Nancy Pelosi or Chuck Schumer or President Biden. You can get the ball rolling by calling up your Democratic senator today.

#### The plan signals an unpopular international shift in democrat’s priorities that undermines their path to victory. NATO security cooperation worries voters and is perceived as trading off with domestic issues that appeal more to swing voters

Bruce Stokes 20, 9-4-2020, "US Electorate Shows Distrust of the Realities of Foreign Policy," Chatham House – International Affairs Think Tank, https://www.chathamhouse.org/2020/09/us-electorate-shows-distrust-realities-foreign-policy

Whoever occupies the White House after the election, it is evident the emphasis will be on ‘America First’, and that only characteristics and approaches will differ. If Donald Trump is re-elected, his electoral base will support a continuation of isolationist, protectionist policies. If Joe Biden becomes president, he will enjoy some limited popular backing for international re-engagement, but his voters still clearly want him to prioritize domestic issues. Implications for the foreign policy of the next US administration are evident. America may have a long history of isolationism, but that should not be confused with ignorance of the growing interconnectedness of today’s world. However, Americans are struggling to find a new equilibrium for their country’s role in the world. Around seven-in-ten hold the view that the United States should take a leading or major role in international affairs, and the same number acknowledge that international events affect their daily life. But Americans remain reticent about global engagement, and half of registered voters believe other countries take unfair advantage of the United States. This clear contradiction is mirrored in what can be expected from the election victor, with a Joe Biden administration likely to speak for those who want America to lead, while a second Donald Trump administration is expected to continue complaining about US victimization by an ungrateful world. A majority (57%) of Americans say foreign policy is ‘very important’ to them as they decide who to vote for in the 2020 election. This may seem like a high priority, but American polls often show many issues are ‘very important’ to voters. What matters is relative importance and foreign policy pales in comparison with the significance the public accords to the economy (79%) or healthcare (68%). Immigration (52%) and climate change (42%) are of even less relative importance to voters. Notably, despite the deep partisanship in American politics today, there is no difference between Republican and Democrat voters on the low priority they accord foreign policy. And barely one-third (35%) of the public give top priority to working with allies and international institutions to confront global challenges such as climate change, poverty and disease — in fact only 31% say improving relations with allies should be a top foreign policy priority over the next five years. However, despite this apparent lack of support for international relations, a rising majority of Americans believe international trade is good for the economy — running contrary to many international assumptions that Americans are inherently protectionist. But this increased interest may not amount to much in reality. Americans also believe trade destroys jobs and lowers wages. Trump is clearly wedded to a protectionist worldview and may continue to try dismantling the World Trade Organization (WTO). Biden is unlikely to initiate any new trade liberalizing negotiations given what would be, at best, a slim Democratic majority in the Senate and anti-trade views held by many unions and blue-collar voters among his constituency. Any political capital he commits to trade is likely to focus on reforming the WTO, but privately his advisers admit they are not optimistic. In addition, both Biden and Trump face strong public support for ratcheting up pressure on China, although their lines of attack may differ, with Trump likely to double down on tariffs while Biden would work closely with Europe on both trade and human rights issues. More broadly, almost three-quarters (73%) of Americans now express an unfavourable view of China, up 18 points since the last presidential election. One-quarter of Americans classify Beijing as an ‘enemy’ with almost half saying the US should get tougher with China on economic issues, although attitudes do divide along partisan lines, with Republicans generally more critical of Beijing, but Democrats are tougher on human rights. On immigration, Trump’s policies are out of step with the public. Six-in-ten Americans oppose expanding the border wall with Mexico, 74% support legal status for immigrants illegally brought to the United States as children — including a majority of Republicans (54%) — and as many Americans favour increasing immigration as support decreasing it. But Trump has already promised to double down on limiting immigration if he wins because it is what his Republican electoral base wants and, as with trade, this is one of his long-expressed personal beliefs. If he wins, expect more mass roundups of undocumented people, completion of his border wall and stricter limitations on legal immigration. In contrast, Biden is likely to loosen constraints on immigration because he believes immigration has been good for the economy and the Democratic party is increasingly dependent on Hispanic and Asian voters, the two fastest growing portions of the population. However, open borders are not a Biden option. The US foreign-born population is at near-record levels and, every time in American history the portion of foreign born has come close to being 14% of the total population — in the 1880s, the 1920s and now — there has been a populist backlash. Democrats cannot risk that again. On climate change, there is strong evidence the American public is increasingly worried, and likely to support rejoining the Paris Agreement if Biden is elected and increases US commitments to cut carbon emissions. But the public also appears unlikely to punish Trump if, as promised, he leaves that accord, and he is almost certain to continue denying climate science in the interest of the coal, oil, and gas industries. The public’s concern about global warming does not necessarily translate into support for taking substantive action. There is a huge partisan divide between the number of Democrats (68%) and Republicans (11%) who say climate change is a very important issue in the 2020 election. When pressed on what action they want on climate change, and who they trust to do it, Americans are less likely than Europeans to accept paying higher prices. A carbon tax stands no chance of passing the Senate, thanks to moderate Democrats from fossil-fuel states, and America’s love affair with large, CO²-emitting vehicles shows no signs of ebbing. The outcome of the 2020 US election will almost certainly not be determined by foreign concerns, although an international crisis — a terrorist incident, a military confrontation with China or North Korea — could impact voting in an unforeseen way. But given the mood of the American electorate, if Trump is re-elected, there will be scant public pressure for a more activist, collaborative US foreign policy, beyond support for a tough line on China, while a win for Biden will give more room for some international initiatives. But public opinion data is clear. Voters want the next US president to focus first on domestic issues — overcoming the pandemic, digging the country out of a deep economic hole, calming racial tensions, and reversing inequality. The outcome of the election may end America’s recently antagonistic foreign policy and halt the deterioration of its international role. But dramatic American re-engagement appears unlikely as the public’s priorities lie elsewhere.

#### Midterm’s win for republicans means the collapse of American democracy

Margaret Sullivan 22, 5-15-2022, "Perspective," Washington Post, https://www.washingtonpost.com/media/2022/05/15/democracy-midterms-vote-integrity-media-coverage/

I was mesmerized this past week by two astonishing videos, watching them both multiple times. One showed the stunning Kentucky Derby, where the little-known chestnut colt Rich Strike came out of nowhere to blast past the favorites and win the race by less than a length. The other showed an entire North Carolina beach house tumbling into the ocean, yet another indication of Outer Banks shoreline erosion and, more generally, the world’s catastrophic climate crisis. And I couldn’t help but see both as metaphors for the precarious state of democracy in America and the news media’s role in helping to save the day or in succumbing to disaster. Here’s what I mean. Since Jan. 6 of last year, a growing chorus of activists, historians and political commentators have spoken of “democracy on the brink” or “democracy in peril.” What they mean is that, thanks to a paranoid, delusional and potentially violent new strain in our nation’s politics, Americans may not be able to count on future elections being conducted fairly — or the results of fair elections being accepted. And at least some news organizations are taking heed. The Washington Post established a “democracy team” to expand reporting on the nationwide battles over voting rules, access to polls, and efforts to create unfounded doubt about the outcome of elections. At the New York Times, soon-to-be executive editor Joe Kahn is talking frankly about the need to investigate efforts to undermine the institutions that uphold democracy. (If they don’t, he told the Columbia Journalism Review, “we’re not doing our job as a leading news organization.”) A number of regional journalists are beginning to push against industry norms to speak more clearly about the threat: The Philadelphia Inquirer boldly declined to use the euphemism word “audit” to dignify state Republicans’ endless probes for nonexistent voter fraud — essentially the GOP’s attempt to cast unwarranted doubt on the results of the 2020 election in Pennsylvania. But the clearest recognition I’ve heard so far came last week from a managing editor for CNN. Alex Koppelman is not the editor overseeing the network’s political coverage; instead, he supervises business and media news. But CNN gave him a voice to lay out the harsh reality of what the nation is up against, and what we in the media need to do about it. Koppelman underscored what we should all be clear about by now: that most of the Republican Party publicly touts the lie that Donald Trump won the 2020 election but that the vote was rigged and victory stolen from him. The Republican elected officials who won’t back Trump are being driven out of office by his faithful. “Those true believers think there is no way Trump could lose a presidential election,” he wrote, “and maybe that no Republican nominee could.” That makes the outcome of this year’s midterm elections extraordinarily consequential. If Republicans take one or both houses of Congress, and if Trump or another Trump-inspired Republican runs for president in 2024, Koppelman added, “there may be no stopping the tide.” These true believers will see to it that the Republican nominee is declared the winner — even if it takes a coup to do so. (Let’s face it: We saw that very thing attempted on Jan. 6 last year when a violent mob stormed the Capitol and demanded the election results be reversed.) Nor is it just about elections to Congress. Secretary of state elections across the country may prove even more consequential because those officials oversee elections, control the machinery and vastly influence public opinion with their pronouncements about the integrity of the vote. University of Michigan law professor Barbara McQuade pointed out in a Times opinion piece that 27 states will choose a secretary of state this fall, and in 17 of those states — including some key electoral battlegrounds — at least one of the Republican candidates denies that President Biden is the legitimate president. A Trump lawyer wrote an instruction manual for a coup. Why haven’t you seen it on the news? But do American citizens get it? Do they fully recognize that our precious democracy may soon fall into history’s sea? If they think about it at all, have they resigned themselves to what they consider the inevitable and not recognize that preserving that democracy is every bit as possible — if unlikely — as that Churchill Downs stunner? My sense is that the news media has to try harder — and differently — to get this message across to voters, who are the only ones who can truly protect democracy. How can news organizations do that? Is it just more of the tried-and-true: good, solid, aggressive reporting? Or is another approach necessary, and if so, what might that be? When I followed up by phone with CNN’s Koppelman, he suggested that newsroom leaders take the time to ask themselves and their teams a basic question: “Does our audience understand what the stakes of this election are?” Given the press of daily deadlines and the constant flow of news, journalists don’t always take that step back to assess the overall impact of their coverage. “We have to spend that time now,” he told me. I’ve written before about my own ideas: to make the threats to democracy a central part of media coverage, not a sidelight; to stop treating campaigns like so many horse races; to have coverage reflect a sharp focus on government rather than politics; to label this coverage in a defining and memorable way, as news organizations have done with “Spotlight” or “Watchdog” teams in the past; to make it accessible to all by placing at least some of the coverage in front of the paywall; to communicate with audiences plainly and transparently about what this coverage is about and why it’s important. Those who grapple with this subject every day could probably offer better suggestions. The midterm elections may be the most consequential ones in American history. They are less than six months away, and many Americans don’t understand how high the stakes really are. There’s not much time to fix that. It will require a come-from-behind sprint like the one Rich Strike pulled off. If we fail, we may see American democracy tumble into oblivion like that North Carolina beach house, never to be seen whole again.

#### American democracy spills over globally -- decline causes extinction.

Diamond 19 [Dr. Larry Diamond, Professor of Political Science and Sociology at Stanford University, Senior Fellow at the Hoover Institution, Senior Fellow at the Freeman Spogli Institute for International Studies, PhD in Sociology from Stanford University, Ill Winds: Saving Democracy from Russian Rage, Chinese Ambition, and American Complacency, p. 199-202]

The most obvious response to the ill winds blowing from the world’s autocracies is to help the winds of freedom blowing in the other direction. The democracies of the West cannot save themselves if they do not stand with democrats around the world.

This is truer now than ever, for several reasons. We live in a globalized world, one in which models, trends, and ideas cascade across borders. Any wind of change may gather quickly and blow with gale force. People everywhere form ideas about how to govern—or simply about which forms of government and sources of power may be irresistible—based on what they see happening elsewhere. We are now immersed in a fierce global contest of ideas, information, and norms. In the digital age, that contest is moving at lightning speed, shaping how people think about their political systems and the way the world runs. As doubts about and threats to democracy are mounting in the West, this is not a contest that the democracies can afford to lose.

Globalization, with its flows of trade and information, raises the stakes for us in another way. Authoritarian and badly governed regimes increasingly pose a direct threat to popular sovereignty and the rule of law in our own democracies. Covert flows of money and influence are subverting and corrupting our democratic processes and institutions. They will not stop just because Americans and others pretend that we have no stake in the future of freedom in the world. If we want to defend the core principles of self-government, transparency, and accountability in our own democracies, we have no choice but to promote them globally.

It is not enough to say that dictatorship is bad and that democracy, however flawed, is still better. Popular enthusiasm for a lesser evil cannot be sustained indefinitely. People need the inspiration of a positive vision. Democracy must demonstrate that it is a just and fair political system that advances humane values and the common good.

To make our republics more perfect, established democracies must not only adopt reforms to more fully include and empower their own citizens. They must also support people, groups, and institutions struggling to achieve democratic values elsewhere. The best way to counter Russian rage and Chinese ambition is to show that Moscow and Beijing are on the wrong side of history; that people everywhere yearn to be free; and that they can make freedom work to achieve a more just, sustainable, and prosperous society.

In our networked age, both idealism and the harder imperatives of global power and security argue for more democracy, not less. For one thing, if we do not worry about the quality of governance in lower-income countries, we will face more and more troubled and failing states. Famine and genocide are the curse of authoritarian states, not democratic ones. Outright state collapse is the ultimate, bitter fruit of tyranny. When countries like Syria, Libya, and Afghanistan descend into civil war; when poor states in Africa cannot generate jobs and improve their citizens’ lives due to rule by corrupt and callous strongmen; when Central American societies are held hostage by brutal gangs and kleptocratic rulers, people flee—and wash up on the shores of the democracies. Europe and the United States cannot withstand the rising pressures of immigration unless they work to support better, more stable and accountable government in troubled countries. The world has simply grown too small, too flat, and too fast to wall off rotten states and pretend they are on some other planet.

Hard security interests are at stake. As even the Trump administration’s 2017 National Security Strategy makes clear, the main threats to U.S. national security all stem from authoritarianism, whether in the form of tyrannies from Russia and China to Iran and North Korea or in the guise of antidemocratic terrorist movements such as ISIS.1 By supporting the development of democracy around the world, we can deny these authoritarian adversaries the geopolitical running room they seek. Just as Russia, China, and Iran are trying to undermine democracies to bend other countries to their will, so too can we contain these autocrats’ ambitions by helping other countries build effective, resilient democracies that can withstand the dictators’ malevolence.

Of course, **democratically** elected governments with **open societies** will **not support** the American line on every issue. But no free society wants to mortgage its **future** to another country. The American national interest would best be secured by a pluralistic world of free countries—one in which autocrats can no longer use corruption and coercion to gobble up resources, alliances, and territory.

If you look back over our history to see who has posed a threat to the United States and our allies, it has always been authoritarian regimes and empires. As political scientists have long noted, no two democracies have ever gone to war with each other—ever. It is not the democracies of the world that are supporting international terrorism, proliferating weapons of mass destruction, or threatening the territory of their neighbors.

### 1nc – Climate

#### Dems can win midterms now with a domestic pivot in politics

Josh Marshall 22, 6-6-2022, Joshua Marshall is an American journalist and blogger writing about elections for 25 years "Opinion," No Publication, https://www.nytimes.com/2022/06/06/opinion/democrats-midterms-abortion-roe.html

Democrats hope to make November’s midterm elections a referendum on Roe v. Wade, the linchpin decision upholding abortion rights, which the Supreme Court is almost certain to strike down this summer. That strategy makes sense. Polls show that roughly two in three Americans oppose overturning Roe and almost 60 percent support passing a bill to set Roe’s protections in a federal law. What’s more, polls showed a rising number of voters listing abortion as their top midterm issue after news of Roe’s imminent demise leaked in the form of a draft court opinion published by Politico. Unfortunately, their current plan is almost sure to fail. After the Democrats came up with just 49 votes to bring a Roe-protecting bill before the Senate on May 11, they promised to keep fighting and, in the words of Senator Amy Klobuchar, “take that fight right to the ballot box” in November. But you can’t make an election into a referendum on an issue if you can’t point to anything winning the election would accomplish. To make the 2022 elections a referendum on Roe, Democrats have to put protecting Roe and abortion rights on the table. Here’s one way to do that: get clear public commitments from every Senate Democrat (and candidate for Senate) not only to vote for the Roe bill in January 2023 but also to change the filibuster rules to ensure that a majority vote would actually pass the bill and send it to the White House for the president’s signature. At present, there are likely 48 Senate Democrats who can make that pledge. Senators Joe Manchin and Kyrsten Sinema are dead set against any changes to the filibuster — a fact you likely know because most of President Biden’s agenda has been bottled up behind their refusal for the past year. Some claim that Senators Manchin and Sinema are just taking the public heat for a number of other Senate Democrats who are also unwilling to change the filibuster rules. That’s highly unlikely. But if any do have misgivings, that’s why the public commitments are so important. Getting a list of holdouts down to a publicly named handful is the first step to persuading them to fall in line. If my math is right and there are 48 Senate Democrats ready to make that pledge, they need two additional Democratic senators in the next Congress. And that is the party’s message that makes the 2022 midterms a referendum on Roe: “Give us the House and two more senators, and we will make Roe law in January 2023.” The End of Roe v. Wade Commentary by Times Opinion writers and columnists on the Supreme Court’s decision to end ​​the constitutional right to abortion. Michelle Goldberg: “The end of Roe v. Wade was foreseen, but in wide swaths of the country, it has still created wrenching and potentially tragic uncertainties.” Spencer Bokat-Lindell: “What exactly does it mean for the Supreme Court to experience a crisis of legitimacy, and is it really in one?” Bonnie Kristian, journalist: “For many backers of former President Donald Trump, Friday’s Supreme Court decision was a long-awaited vindication.” It might also mark the end of his political career. Erika Bachiochi, legal scholar: “It is precisely the unborn child’s state of existential dependence upon its mother, not its autonomy, that makes it especially entitled to care, nurture and legal protection.” No ambiguity, no haggling, no living in Senator Manchin’s head for a year. You give us this, and we’ll give you that. That tells voters exactly what will be delivered with a Democratic win. It also defines what constitutes a win: control of the House and two more Senate seats. Dig deeper into the moment. Special offer: Subscribe for $1 a week. The campaign message is clear: If you want to protect Roe, give us those majorities. If this is your passion, here’s where to channel that passion. These are the Senate seats we need to hold (in New Hampshire, Arizona, Georgia and Nevada) and here are the ones we need to win (in Pennsylvania and Wisconsin and possibly in Ohio, Florida and North Carolina). With those commitments in hand, one question should be on the lips of every Democratic candidate. Will you make a firm commitment to never vote for a federal law banning abortion nationwide? Few, if any, Republicans would be able to make that pledge. And their evasions wouldn’t just make them look ridiculous; that would put squarely on the table the very real threat that Republicans would enact a nationwide abortion ban as soon as January 2025. That could prove enough to win Senate races in Pennsylvania, Wisconsin and Ohio. In a way, though, this strategy isn’t so much about winning the 2022 midterms or even making Roe into a federal law, although it’s the best way to accomplish both. It’s just an example of how you win elections. Effective campaigns are built on connecting the intense beliefs of the electorate — their hopes and fears — directly to the hard mechanics of political power. You’ve got to connect those wires. If you were testing some new electrical contraption, that’s the first thing you’d do: make sure the energy supply is wired to the engine that makes it run. This is no different. Without tying a specific electoral result to a clear commitment to a specific legislative action after the elections, you’re not connecting those wires. What Democrats would be proposing is a classic small-c conservative solution in the best sense of the word. Codifying Roe would preserve the set of rights and protections that the vast majority of Americans have lived their entire adult lives with and that the overwhelming majority of Americans do not want to change. The threat that the court will strike down such a law is real but overstated. And in any case, refusing to act because of what opponents might do is the definition of political paralysis. So how do Democrats get from here to there? They likely can’t rely on the party’s leaders, at least not at first. But they’re not essential. It’s really up to voters and activists and particularly committed members of Congress. Probably half the Democrats in the Senate would be happy to sign on this dotted line by the end of the day. Those who are up for re-election, even in safe races, will come around quickly. Some senators may resist at first. And that wouldn’t be surprising. Politicians seldom see any advantage to committing themselves in advance or reducing their room for maneuver. It’s always safer to keep your options open and be as general as possible until the final moment. That’s why assembling a clear public list of commitments is critical. Once the list gets down to a handful of hesitaters, the pressure from Democrats nationwide, focused on those members, will be overwhelming. If there are real holdouts, they’ll fold in short order. You don’t need to wait on Nancy Pelosi or Chuck Schumer or President Biden. You can get the ball rolling by calling up your Democratic senator today.

#### The plan signals an unpopular international shift in democrat’s priorities that undermines their path to victory. NATO security cooperation worries voters and is perceived as trading off with domestic issues that appeal more to swing voters

Bruce Stokes 20, 9-4-2020, "US Electorate Shows Distrust of the Realities of Foreign Policy," Chatham House – International Affairs Think Tank, https://www.chathamhouse.org/2020/09/us-electorate-shows-distrust-realities-foreign-policy

Whoever occupies the White House after the election, it is evident the emphasis will be on ‘America First’, and that only characteristics and approaches will differ. If Donald Trump is re-elected, his electoral base will support a continuation of isolationist, protectionist policies. If Joe Biden becomes president, he will enjoy some limited popular backing for international re-engagement, but his voters still clearly want him to prioritize domestic issues. Implications for the foreign policy of the next US administration are evident. America may have a long history of isolationism, but that should not be confused with ignorance of the growing interconnectedness of today’s world. However, Americans are struggling to find a new equilibrium for their country’s role in the world. Around seven-in-ten hold the view that the United States should take a leading or major role in international affairs, and the same number acknowledge that international events affect their daily life. But Americans remain reticent about global engagement, and half of registered voters believe other countries take unfair advantage of the United States. This clear contradiction is mirrored in what can be expected from the election victor, with a Joe Biden administration likely to speak for those who want America to lead, while a second Donald Trump administration is expected to continue complaining about US victimization by an ungrateful world. A majority (57%) of Americans say foreign policy is ‘very important’ to them as they decide who to vote for in the 2020 election. This may seem like a high priority, but American polls often show many issues are ‘very important’ to voters. What matters is relative importance and foreign policy pales in comparison with the significance the public accords to the economy (79%) or healthcare (68%). Immigration (52%) and climate change (42%) are of even less relative importance to voters. Notably, despite the deep partisanship in American politics today, there is no difference between Republican and Democrat voters on the low priority they accord foreign policy. And barely one-third (35%) of the public give top priority to working with allies and international institutions to confront global challenges such as climate change, poverty and disease — in fact only 31% say improving relations with allies should be a top foreign policy priority over the next five years. However, despite this apparent lack of support for international relations, a rising majority of Americans believe international trade is good for the economy — running contrary to many international assumptions that Americans are inherently protectionist. But this increased interest may not amount to much in reality. Americans also believe trade destroys jobs and lowers wages. Trump is clearly wedded to a protectionist worldview and may continue to try dismantling the World Trade Organization (WTO). Biden is unlikely to initiate any new trade liberalizing negotiations given what would be, at best, a slim Democratic majority in the Senate and anti-trade views held by many unions and blue-collar voters among his constituency. Any political capital he commits to trade is likely to focus on reforming the WTO, but privately his advisers admit they are not optimistic. In addition, both Biden and Trump face strong public support for ratcheting up pressure on China, although their lines of attack may differ, with Trump likely to double down on tariffs while Biden would work closely with Europe on both trade and human rights issues. More broadly, almost three-quarters (73%) of Americans now express an unfavourable view of China, up 18 points since the last presidential election. One-quarter of Americans classify Beijing as an ‘enemy’ with almost half saying the US should get tougher with China on economic issues, although attitudes do divide along partisan lines, with Republicans generally more critical of Beijing, but Democrats are tougher on human rights. On immigration, Trump’s policies are out of step with the public. Six-in-ten Americans oppose expanding the border wall with Mexico, 74% support legal status for immigrants illegally brought to the United States as children — including a majority of Republicans (54%) — and as many Americans favour increasing immigration as support decreasing it. But Trump has already promised to double down on limiting immigration if he wins because it is what his Republican electoral base wants and, as with trade, this is one of his long-expressed personal beliefs. If he wins, expect more mass roundups of undocumented people, completion of his border wall and stricter limitations on legal immigration. In contrast, Biden is likely to loosen constraints on immigration because he believes immigration has been good for the economy and the Democratic party is increasingly dependent on Hispanic and Asian voters, the two fastest growing portions of the population. However, open borders are not a Biden option. The US foreign-born population is at near-record levels and, every time in American history the portion of foreign born has come close to being 14% of the total population — in the 1880s, the 1920s and now — there has been a populist backlash. Democrats cannot risk that again. On climate change, there is strong evidence the American public is increasingly worried, and likely to support rejoining the Paris Agreement if Biden is elected and increases US commitments to cut carbon emissions. But the public also appears unlikely to punish Trump if, as promised, he leaves that accord, and he is almost certain to continue denying climate science in the interest of the coal, oil, and gas industries. The public’s concern about global warming does not necessarily translate into support for taking substantive action. There is a huge partisan divide between the number of Democrats (68%) and Republicans (11%) who say climate change is a very important issue in the 2020 election. When pressed on what action they want on climate change, and who they trust to do it, Americans are less likely than Europeans to accept paying higher prices. A carbon tax stands no chance of passing the Senate, thanks to moderate Democrats from fossil-fuel states, and America’s love affair with large, CO²-emitting vehicles shows no signs of ebbing. The outcome of the 2020 US election will almost certainly not be determined by foreign concerns, although an international crisis — a terrorist incident, a military confrontation with China or North Korea — could impact voting in an unforeseen way. But given the mood of the American electorate, if Trump is re-elected, there will be scant public pressure for a more activist, collaborative US foreign policy, beyond support for a tough line on China, while a win for Biden will give more room for some international initiatives. But public opinion data is clear. Voters want the next US president to focus first on domestic issues — overcoming the pandemic, digging the country out of a deep economic hole, calming racial tensions, and reversing inequality. The outcome of the election may end America’s recently antagonistic foreign policy and halt the deterioration of its international role. But dramatic American re-engagement appears unlikely as the public’s priorities lie elsewhere.

#### EPA ruling drastically limited executive power in climate action -- means only dem controlled senate can solve climate change

Daniel Sherrell 22, 7-5-2022, "Democrats have a month to revive the climate deal our planet needs," https://www.theguardian.com/commentisfree/2022/jul/05/democrats-have-a-month-to-revive-the-climate-deal-our-planet-needs

On Thursday, the supreme court of the United States struck down the EPA’s Clean Power Plan, sharply limiting the federal government’s ability to fight climate change. The US supreme court has declared war on the Earth’s future Kate Aronoff Read more With Earth’s temperature rising steadily, with the scientific community shouting at the top of its lungs for more aggressive action, with fires and hurricanes pushing entire regions beyond the bounds of human habitability, the court’s Republican-appointed supermajority has chosen to actively inhibit our ability to respond to the crisis. The decision was in keeping with the Republican party’s deepening climate nihilism: as the train careens off the rails, they strangle the conductor, destroy the brakes. Though it’s been subtext since the advent of Maga, it is worth stating plainly what this ruling makes obvious: there is a death drive animating the modern conservative movement. It is merciless and strange and remarkably consistent. It stands on the side of whatever makes our country poorer, greedier, less safe and more desperate. It deregulates firearms after a massacre at an elementary school. It deregulates carbon after experts issue a “code red for humanity”. It forces mothers to bring their children to term, and then abandons those children to bullets, to wildfires, to grinding, generational poverty. Its pro-life policies seem to reverse precisely at the moment of birth. When it comes to living children, conservatism is a pro-death movement. Advertisement After the court gutted the EPA, conservative leaders celebrated it as a win for democracy. Mitch McConnell argued that it had given “power back to the people” by wresting climate policy from the hands of “unelected, unaccountable bureaucrats” and investing it in Congress alone. The irony could not be more acute. Nevermind that “the people” – 60% of Americans by one recent estimate – actively support the EPA regulating carbon emissions. Never mind that the decision was issued by an unelected, unaccountable court with no claim to democratic legitimacy (the Republican supermajority having taken shape over an era in which Democrats won the popular vote in eight of nine presidential elections). The point is that Mitch McConnell has spent decades systematically eroding Congress’s ability to legislate – not just on climate, but on almost anything at all. With the court deferring to Congress, Congress hog-tied by the filibuster and the White House stripped of its main administrative recourse, control of our nation’s climate policy falls to exactly those conservative donors – many with ties to the fossil fuel industry – who helped drive the nomination and confirmation of the current Republican bench. They are the only people on the planet who profit from seeing it burn. Their interests are in perfect opposition to those of the public. And when it comes to the most consequential challenge of the 21st century, the supreme court they hired is clearing a path for them to rule by default. It would be a mistake to dismiss this as pure, self-dealing avarice. To at least some of the conservative stalwarts who spent decades orchestrating the decision, it represents a sincere vision of the good. The richest people in the world, loosed from the bounds of expertise, oversight or electoral accountability, imposing their will on a prostrate public. It is a clean, satisfying system. It activates something deep in the amygdala, a slavering, animal need for dominion. This is the animating spirit of the court’s decision: an old ethic of might makes right, something much closer to Friedrich Nietzsche than to Jesus Christ. Nietzsche memorably referred to Christianity – with its exhortations to mercy and selflessness –as a slave’s religion. Justices Alito, Barrett, Gorsuch, Kavanaugh, Roberts and Thomas appear to have agreed. Why let the meek inherit the Earth, when you can make so much money burning it? Their nihilism has left the rest of us, the proverbial meek, increasingly desperate. Our ability to maintain a safe climate now rests on the Democrats passing clean energy investments through congressional budget reconciliation. They only have about five weeks left to do it. This will be the defining moment of Joe Biden and Chuck Schumer’s political careers. They cannot waffle. They cannot get distracted. They cannot take two weeks to digest the ruling. Their best people should be working around the clock to land a climate deal that can pass the Senate. In the glare of history, failure on climate will overshadow any other fact about their tenure. Let’s hope they feel the heat as much as we do.

#### Warming leads to extinction---it’s a conflict-multiplier and defense doesn’t assume non-linearity

Kareiva 18, Ph.D. in ecology and applied mathematics from Cornell University, director of the Institute of the Environment and Sustainability at UCLA, Pritzker Distinguished Professor in Environment & Sustainability at UCLA, et al. (Peter, “Existential risk due to ecosystem collapse: Nature strikes back,” *Futures*, 102)

In summary, six of the nine proposed planetary boundaries (phosphorous, nitrogen, biodiversity, land use, atmospheric aerosol loading, and chemical pollution) are unlikely to be associated with existential risks. They all correspond to a degraded environment, but in our assessment do not represent existential risks. However, the three remaining boundaries (climate change, global freshwater cycle, and ocean acidification) do pose existential risks. This is because of intrinsic positive feedback loops, substantial lag times between system change and experiencing the consequences of that change, and the fact these different boundaries interact with one another in ways that yield surprises. In addition, climate, freshwater, and ocean acidification are all directly connected to the provision of food and water, and shortages of food and water can create conflict and social unrest. Climate change has a long history of disrupting civilizations and sometimes precipitating the collapse of cultures or mass emigrations (McMichael, 2017). For example, the 12th century drought in the North American Southwest is held responsible for the collapse of the Anasazi pueblo culture. More recently, the infamous potato famine of 1846–1849 and the large migration of Irish to the U.S. can be traced to a combination of factors, one of which was climate. Specifically, 1846 was an unusually warm and moist year in Ireland, providing the climatic conditions favorable to the fungus that caused the potato blight. As is so often the case, poor government had a role as well—as the British government forbade the import of grains from outside Britain (imports that could have helped to redress the ravaged potato yields). Climate change intersects with freshwater resources because it is expected to exacerbate drought and water scarcity, as well as flooding. Climate change can even impair water quality because it is associated with heavy rains that overwhelm sewage treatment facilities, or because it results in higher concentrations of pollutants in groundwater as a result of enhanced evaporation and reduced groundwater recharge. Ample clean water is not a luxury—it is essential for human survival. Consequently, cities, regions and nations that lack clean freshwater are vulnerable to social disruption and disease. Finally, ocean acidification is linked to climate change because it is driven by CO2 emissions just as global warming is. With close to 20% of the world’s protein coming from oceans (FAO, 2016), the potential for severe impacts due to acidification is obvious. Less obvious, but perhaps more insidious, is the interaction between climate change and the loss of oyster and coral reefs due to acidification. Acidification is known to interfere with oyster reef building and coral reefs. Climate change also increases storm frequency and severity. Coral reefs and oyster reefs provide protection from storm surge because they reduce wave energy (Spalding et al., 2014). If these reefs are lost due to acidification at the same time as storms become more severe and sea level rises, coastal communities will be exposed to unprecedented storm surge—and may be ravaged by recurrent storms. A key feature of the risk associated with climate change is that mean annual temperature and mean annual rainfall are not the variables of interest. Rather it is extreme episodic events that place nations and entire regions of the world at risk. These extreme events are by definition “rare” (once every hundred years), and changes in their likelihood are challenging to detect because of their rarity, but are exactly the manifestations of climate change that we must get better at anticipating (Diffenbaugh et al., 2017). Society will have a hard time responding to shorter intervals between rare extreme events because in the lifespan of an individual human, a person might experience as few as two or three extreme events. How likely is it that you would notice a change in the interval between events that are separated by decades, especially given that the interval is not regular but varies stochastically? A concrete example of this dilemma can be found in the past and expected future changes in storm-related flooding of New York City. The highly disruptive flooding of New York City associated with Hurricane Sandy represented a flood height that occurred once every 500 years in the 18th century, and that occurs now once every 25 years, but is expected to occur once every 5 years by 2050 (Garner et al., 2017). This change in frequency of extreme floods has profound implications for the measures New York City should take to protect its infrastructure and its population, yet because of the stochastic nature of such events, this shift in flood frequency is an elevated risk that will go unnoticed by most people. 4. The combination of positive feedback loops and societal inertia is fertile ground for global environmental catastrophes Humans are remarkably ingenious, and have adapted to crises throughout their history. Our doom has been repeatedly predicted, only to be averted by innovation (Ridley, 2011). However, the many stories of human ingenuity successfully addressing existential risks such as global famine or extreme air pollution represent environmental challenges that are largely linear, have immediate consequences, and operate without positive feedbacks. For example, the fact that food is in short supply does not increase the rate at which humans consume food—thereby increasing the shortage. Similarly, massive air pollution episodes such as the London fog of 1952 that killed 12,000 people did not make future air pollution events more likely. In fact it was just the opposite—the London fog sent such a clear message that Britain quickly enacted pollution control measures (Stradling, 2016). Food shortages, air pollution, water pollution, etc. send immediate signals to society of harm, which then trigger a negative feedback of society seeking to reduce the harm. In contrast, today’s great environmental crisis of climate change may cause some harm but there are generally long time delays between rising CO2 concentrations and damage to humans. The consequence of these delays are an absence of urgency; thus although 70% of Americans believe global warming is happening, only 40% think it will harm them (http://climatecommunication.yale.edu/visualizations-data/ycom-us-2016/). Secondly, unlike past environmental challenges, the Earth’s climate system is rife with positive feedback loops. In particular, as CO2 increases and the climate warms, that very warming can cause more CO2 release which further increases global warming, and then more CO2, and so on. Table 2 summarizes the best documented positive feedback loops for the Earth’s climate system. These feedbacks can be neatly categorized into carbon cycle, biogeochemical, biogeophysical, cloud, ice-albedo, and water vapor feedbacks. As important as it is to understand these feedbacks individually, it is even more essential to study the interactive nature of these feedbacks. Modeling studies show that when interactions among feedback loops are included, uncertainty increases dramatically and there is a heightened potential for perturbations to be magnified (e.g., Cox, Betts, Jones, Spall, & Totterdell, 2000; Hajima, Tachiiri, Ito, & Kawamiya, 2014; Knutti & Rugenstein, 2015; Rosenfeld, Sherwood, Wood, & Donner, 2014). This produces a wide range of future scenarios. Positive feedbacks in the carbon cycle involves the enhancement of future carbon contributions to the atmosphere due to some initial increase in atmospheric CO2. This happens because as CO2 accumulates, it reduces the efficiency in which oceans and terrestrial ecosystems sequester carbon, which in return feeds back to exacerbate climate change (Friedlingstein et al., 2001). Warming can also increase the rate at which organic matter decays and carbon is released into the atmosphere, thereby causing more warming (Melillo et al., 2017). Increases in food shortages and lack of water is also of major concern when biogeophysical feedback mechanisms perpetuate drought conditions. The underlying mechanism here is that losses in vegetation increases the surface albedo, which suppresses rainfall, and thus enhances future vegetation loss and more suppression of rainfall—thereby initiating or prolonging a drought (Chamey, Stone, & Quirk, 1975). To top it off, overgrazing depletes the soil, leading to augmented vegetation loss (Anderies, Janssen, & Walker, 2002). Climate change often also increases the risk of forest fires, as a result of higher temperatures and persistent drought conditions. The expectation is that forest fires will become more frequent and severe with climate warming and drought (Scholze, Knorr, Arnell, & Prentice, 2006), a trend for which we have already seen evidence (Allen et al., 2010). Tragically, the increased severity and risk of Southern California wildfires recently predicted by climate scientists (Jin et al., 2015), was realized in December 2017, with the largest fire in the history of California (the “Thomas fire” that burned 282,000 acres, https://www.vox.com/2017/12/27/16822180/thomas-fire-california-largest-wildfire). This catastrophic fire embodies the sorts of positive feedbacks and interacting factors that could catch humanity off-guard and produce a true apocalyptic event. Record-breaking rains produced an extraordinary flush of new vegetation, that then dried out as record heat waves and dry conditions took hold, coupled with stronger than normal winds, and ignition. Of course the record-fire released CO2 into the atmosphere, thereby contributing to future warming. Out of all types of feedbacks, water vapor and the ice-albedo feedbacks are the most clearly understood mechanisms. Losses in reflective snow and ice cover drive up surface temperatures, leading to even more melting of snow and ice cover—this is known as the ice-albedo feedback (Curry, Schramm, & Ebert, 1995). As snow and ice continue to melt at a more rapid pace, millions of people may be displaced by flooding risks as a consequence of sea level rise near coastal communities (Biermann & Boas, 2010; Myers, 2002; Nicholls et al., 2011). The water vapor feedback operates when warmer atmospheric conditions strengthen the saturation vapor pressure, which creates a warming effect given water vapor’s strong greenhouse gas properties (Manabe & Wetherald, 1967). Global warming tends to increase cloud formation because warmer temperatures lead to more evaporation of water into the atmosphere, and warmer temperature also allows the atmosphere to hold more water. The key question is whether this increase in clouds associated with global warming will result in a positive feedback loop (more warming) or a negative feedback loop (less warming). For decades, scientists have sought to answer this question and understand the net role clouds play in future climate projections (Schneider et al., 2017). Clouds are complex because they both have a cooling (reflecting incoming solar radiation) and warming (absorbing incoming solar radiation) effect (Lashof, DeAngelo, Saleska, & Harte, 1997). The type of cloud, altitude, and optical properties combine to determine how these countervailing effects balance out. Although still under debate, it appears that in most circumstances the cloud feedback is likely positive (Boucher et al., 2013). For example, models and observations show that increasing greenhouse gas concentrations reduces the low-level cloud fraction in the Northeast Pacific at decadal time scales. This then has a positive feedback effect and enhances climate warming since less solar radiation is reflected by the atmosphere (Clement, Burgman, & Norris, 2009). The key lesson from the long list of potentially positive feedbacks and their interactions is that runaway climate change, and runaway perturbations have to be taken as a serious possibility. Table 2 is just a snapshot of the type of feedbacks that have been identified (see Supplementary material for a more thorough explanation of positive feedback loops). However, this list is not exhaustive and the possibility of undiscovered positive feedbacks portends even greater existential risks. The many environmental crises humankind has previously averted (famine, ozone depletion, London fog, water pollution, etc.) were averted because of political will based on solid scientific understanding. We cannot count on complete scientific understanding when it comes to positive feedback loops and climate change.

### 1nc – tech leadership

#### Dems can win midterms now with a domestic pivot in politics

Josh Marshall 22, 6-6-2022, Joshua Marshall is an American journalist and blogger writing about elections for 25 years "Opinion," No Publication, https://www.nytimes.com/2022/06/06/opinion/democrats-midterms-abortion-roe.html

Democrats hope to make November’s midterm elections a referendum on Roe v. Wade, the linchpin decision upholding abortion rights, which the Supreme Court is almost certain to strike down this summer. That strategy makes sense. Polls show that roughly two in three Americans oppose overturning Roe and almost 60 percent support passing a bill to set Roe’s protections in a federal law. What’s more, polls showed a rising number of voters listing abortion as their top midterm issue after news of Roe’s imminent demise leaked in the form of a draft court opinion published by Politico. Unfortunately, their current plan is almost sure to fail. After the Democrats came up with just 49 votes to bring a Roe-protecting bill before the Senate on May 11, they promised to keep fighting and, in the words of Senator Amy Klobuchar, “take that fight right to the ballot box” in November. But you can’t make an election into a referendum on an issue if you can’t point to anything winning the election would accomplish. To make the 2022 elections a referendum on Roe, Democrats have to put protecting Roe and abortion rights on the table. Here’s one way to do that: get clear public commitments from every Senate Democrat (and candidate for Senate) not only to vote for the Roe bill in January 2023 but also to change the filibuster rules to ensure that a majority vote would actually pass the bill and send it to the White House for the president’s signature. At present, there are likely 48 Senate Democrats who can make that pledge. Senators Joe Manchin and Kyrsten Sinema are dead set against any changes to the filibuster — a fact you likely know because most of President Biden’s agenda has been bottled up behind their refusal for the past year. Some claim that Senators Manchin and Sinema are just taking the public heat for a number of other Senate Democrats who are also unwilling to change the filibuster rules. That’s highly unlikely. But if any do have misgivings, that’s why the public commitments are so important. Getting a list of holdouts down to a publicly named handful is the first step to persuading them to fall in line. If my math is right and there are 48 Senate Democrats ready to make that pledge, they need two additional Democratic senators in the next Congress. And that is the party’s message that makes the 2022 midterms a referendum on Roe: “Give us the House and two more senators, and we will make Roe law in January 2023.” The End of Roe v. Wade Commentary by Times Opinion writers and columnists on the Supreme Court’s decision to end ​​the constitutional right to abortion. Michelle Goldberg: “The end of Roe v. Wade was foreseen, but in wide swaths of the country, it has still created wrenching and potentially tragic uncertainties.” Spencer Bokat-Lindell: “What exactly does it mean for the Supreme Court to experience a crisis of legitimacy, and is it really in one?” Bonnie Kristian, journalist: “For many backers of former President Donald Trump, Friday’s Supreme Court decision was a long-awaited vindication.” It might also mark the end of his political career. Erika Bachiochi, legal scholar: “It is precisely the unborn child’s state of existential dependence upon its mother, not its autonomy, that makes it especially entitled to care, nurture and legal protection.” No ambiguity, no haggling, no living in Senator Manchin’s head for a year. You give us this, and we’ll give you that. That tells voters exactly what will be delivered with a Democratic win. It also defines what constitutes a win: control of the House and two more Senate seats. Dig deeper into the moment. Special offer: Subscribe for $1 a week. The campaign message is clear: If you want to protect Roe, give us those majorities. If this is your passion, here’s where to channel that passion. These are the Senate seats we need to hold (in New Hampshire, Arizona, Georgia and Nevada) and here are the ones we need to win (in Pennsylvania and Wisconsin and possibly in Ohio, Florida and North Carolina). With those commitments in hand, one question should be on the lips of every Democratic candidate. Will you make a firm commitment to never vote for a federal law banning abortion nationwide? Few, if any, Republicans would be able to make that pledge. And their evasions wouldn’t just make them look ridiculous; that would put squarely on the table the very real threat that Republicans would enact a nationwide abortion ban as soon as January 2025. That could prove enough to win Senate races in Pennsylvania, Wisconsin and Ohio. In a way, though, this strategy isn’t so much about winning the 2022 midterms or even making Roe into a federal law, although it’s the best way to accomplish both. It’s just an example of how you win elections. Effective campaigns are built on connecting the intense beliefs of the electorate — their hopes and fears — directly to the hard mechanics of political power. You’ve got to connect those wires. If you were testing some new electrical contraption, that’s the first thing you’d do: make sure the energy supply is wired to the engine that makes it run. This is no different. Without tying a specific electoral result to a clear commitment to a specific legislative action after the elections, you’re not connecting those wires. What Democrats would be proposing is a classic small-c conservative solution in the best sense of the word. Codifying Roe would preserve the set of rights and protections that the vast majority of Americans have lived their entire adult lives with and that the overwhelming majority of Americans do not want to change. The threat that the court will strike down such a law is real but overstated. And in any case, refusing to act because of what opponents might do is the definition of political paralysis. So how do Democrats get from here to there? They likely can’t rely on the party’s leaders, at least not at first. But they’re not essential. It’s really up to voters and activists and particularly committed members of Congress. Probably half the Democrats in the Senate would be happy to sign on this dotted line by the end of the day. Those who are up for re-election, even in safe races, will come around quickly. Some senators may resist at first. And that wouldn’t be surprising. Politicians seldom see any advantage to committing themselves in advance or reducing their room for maneuver. It’s always safer to keep your options open and be as general as possible until the final moment. That’s why assembling a clear public list of commitments is critical. Once the list gets down to a handful of hesitaters, the pressure from Democrats nationwide, focused on those members, will be overwhelming. If there are real holdouts, they’ll fold in short order. You don’t need to wait on Nancy Pelosi or Chuck Schumer or President Biden. You can get the ball rolling by calling up your Democratic senator today.

#### The plan signals an unpopular international shift in democrat’s priorities that undermines their path to victory. NATO security cooperation worries voters and is perceived as trading off with domestic issues that appeal more to swing voters

Bruce Stokes 20, 9-4-2020, "US Electorate Shows Distrust of the Realities of Foreign Policy," Chatham House – International Affairs Think Tank, https://www.chathamhouse.org/2020/09/us-electorate-shows-distrust-realities-foreign-policy

Whoever occupies the White House after the election, it is evident the emphasis will be on ‘America First’, and that only characteristics and approaches will differ. If Donald Trump is re-elected, his electoral base will support a continuation of isolationist, protectionist policies. If Joe Biden becomes president, he will enjoy some limited popular backing for international re-engagement, but his voters still clearly want him to prioritize domestic issues. Implications for the foreign policy of the next US administration are evident. America may have a long history of isolationism, but that should not be confused with ignorance of the growing interconnectedness of today’s world. However, Americans are struggling to find a new equilibrium for their country’s role in the world. Around seven-in-ten hold the view that the United States should take a leading or major role in international affairs, and the same number acknowledge that international events affect their daily life. But Americans remain reticent about global engagement, and half of registered voters believe other countries take unfair advantage of the United States. This clear contradiction is mirrored in what can be expected from the election victor, with a Joe Biden administration likely to speak for those who want America to lead, while a second Donald Trump administration is expected to continue complaining about US victimization by an ungrateful world. A majority (57%) of Americans say foreign policy is ‘very important’ to them as they decide who to vote for in the 2020 election. This may seem like a high priority, but American polls often show many issues are ‘very important’ to voters. What matters is relative importance and foreign policy pales in comparison with the significance the public accords to the economy (79%) or healthcare (68%). Immigration (52%) and climate change (42%) are of even less relative importance to voters. Notably, despite the deep partisanship in American politics today, there is no difference between Republican and Democrat voters on the low priority they accord foreign policy. And barely one-third (35%) of the public give top priority to working with allies and international institutions to confront global challenges such as climate change, poverty and disease — in fact only 31% say improving relations with allies should be a top foreign policy priority over the next five years. However, despite this apparent lack of support for international relations, a rising majority of Americans believe international trade is good for the economy — running contrary to many international assumptions that Americans are inherently protectionist. But this increased interest may not amount to much in reality. Americans also believe trade destroys jobs and lowers wages. Trump is clearly wedded to a protectionist worldview and may continue to try dismantling the World Trade Organization (WTO). Biden is unlikely to initiate any new trade liberalizing negotiations given what would be, at best, a slim Democratic majority in the Senate and anti-trade views held by many unions and blue-collar voters among his constituency. Any political capital he commits to trade is likely to focus on reforming the WTO, but privately his advisers admit they are not optimistic. In addition, both Biden and Trump face strong public support for ratcheting up pressure on China, although their lines of attack may differ, with Trump likely to double down on tariffs while Biden would work closely with Europe on both trade and human rights issues. More broadly, almost three-quarters (73%) of Americans now express an unfavourable view of China, up 18 points since the last presidential election. One-quarter of Americans classify Beijing as an ‘enemy’ with almost half saying the US should get tougher with China on economic issues, although attitudes do divide along partisan lines, with Republicans generally more critical of Beijing, but Democrats are tougher on human rights. On immigration, Trump’s policies are out of step with the public. Six-in-ten Americans oppose expanding the border wall with Mexico, 74% support legal status for immigrants illegally brought to the United States as children — including a majority of Republicans (54%) — and as many Americans favour increasing immigration as support decreasing it. But Trump has already promised to double down on limiting immigration if he wins because it is what his Republican electoral base wants and, as with trade, this is one of his long-expressed personal beliefs. If he wins, expect more mass roundups of undocumented people, completion of his border wall and stricter limitations on legal immigration. In contrast, Biden is likely to loosen constraints on immigration because he believes immigration has been good for the economy and the Democratic party is increasingly dependent on Hispanic and Asian voters, the two fastest growing portions of the population. However, open borders are not a Biden option. The US foreign-born population is at near-record levels and, every time in American history the portion of foreign born has come close to being 14% of the total population — in the 1880s, the 1920s and now — there has been a populist backlash. Democrats cannot risk that again. On climate change, there is strong evidence the American public is increasingly worried, and likely to support rejoining the Paris Agreement if Biden is elected and increases US commitments to cut carbon emissions. But the public also appears unlikely to punish Trump if, as promised, he leaves that accord, and he is almost certain to continue denying climate science in the interest of the coal, oil, and gas industries. The public’s concern about global warming does not necessarily translate into support for taking substantive action. There is a huge partisan divide between the number of Democrats (68%) and Republicans (11%) who say climate change is a very important issue in the 2020 election. When pressed on what action they want on climate change, and who they trust to do it, Americans are less likely than Europeans to accept paying higher prices. A carbon tax stands no chance of passing the Senate, thanks to moderate Democrats from fossil-fuel states, and America’s love affair with large, CO²-emitting vehicles shows no signs of ebbing. The outcome of the 2020 US election will almost certainly not be determined by foreign concerns, although an international crisis — a terrorist incident, a military confrontation with China or North Korea — could impact voting in an unforeseen way. But given the mood of the American electorate, if Trump is re-elected, there will be scant public pressure for a more activist, collaborative US foreign policy, beyond support for a tough line on China, while a win for Biden will give more room for some international initiatives. But public opinion data is clear. Voters want the next US president to focus first on domestic issues — overcoming the pandemic, digging the country out of a deep economic hole, calming racial tensions, and reversing inequality. The outcome of the election may end America’s recently antagonistic foreign policy and halt the deterioration of its international role. But dramatic American re-engagement appears unlikely as the public’s priorities lie elsewhere.

#### Only a dem midterm win can assure successful China policy to counter Chinese leadership

Baer 11-6-2020, senior fellow at the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace. He was U.S. ambassador to the Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe from 2013 to 2017 (Daniel, “America Under Biden Won’t Go Soft on China,” *Foreign Policy*, <https://foreignpolicy.com/2020/11/06/biden-china-trump-election/>)

A Biden White House is likely to oversee a steadier and more coherent China policy than the Trump administration, whose erratic approach careened from President Donald Trump’s fawning praise of Chinese President Xi Jinping—including reportedly condoning concentration camps in Xinjiang—to name-calling and fighting a failed tariff war. A consistent approach will bring more stability to a delicate and difficult relationship. But a more stable approach does not mean a soft one, since there is now a bipartisan recognition in the United States that China is a strategic competitor. Indeed, while Beijing may appreciate soon having a more predictable set of interlocutors, it should not expect them to be more pliable. Helping Biden is the fact that much of U.S. foreign policy is the prerogative of the president and therefore less constrained than domestic policy by the legislative branch. But if Republican Sen. Mitch McConnell remains in control of the U.S. Senate, one of the first tests for the Republicans in the Senate will be whether they will cut off America’s nose in order to spite the new president’s face. The United States needs a robust economic stimulus, including significant investment in infrastructure, in order to make it to the other side of the pandemic and jump-start the economy. Republicans who want to be tougher on China must recognize that a strong U.S. economy is a strategic imperative. Some commentators have suggested that the Trump presidency, and its undignified end, has emboldened Chinese government leaders and raised their confidence in the superiority of their own system. On Election Day, the editor of the Chinese government propaganda newspaper Global Times, Hu Xijin, gleefully posted on Twitter about storefronts being boarded up in U.S. cities, writing that unrest is usually a “complication of elections in poor countries, but people are worried it may appear in the US. The US is in degradation.” It should be noted, of course, that the Chinese Communist Party boards up its windows from the inside, metaphorically speaking, to keep citizens from seeing how the leaders of its authoritarian regime are selected. We cannot deny or dismiss the damage done to the global reputation of U.S. democracy by Trump’s antics. But neither should we overstate that damage. In the end, the United States—a giant, multiethnic, multiconfessional, industrialized democracy—had an election where the result was unknown ahead of time. It generated record voter participation and was held with relatively few problems in the midst of a global pandemic. It delivered a defeat for the incumbent and a new president. Biden will most likely lead the United States with a divided government. His administration will have to work with senators and representatives from diverse constituencies and make compromises in order to strike deals that equip the county to confront the challenges of the 21st century, including its strategic rivalry with. It will be messy and challenging, and progress will not be linear. But this is not a new story—it is a very old one. Chinese leaders pride themselves on taking a long view. The United China States faces plenty of foreign and domestic challenges today, including in its democratic institutions. But in the long view, its democracy is not a source of weakness; it is a source of strength.

#### US tech leadership solves nuclear war

Kroenig & Gopalaswamy 18, \*Associate Professor of Government and Foreign Service at Georgetown University and Deputy Director for Strategy in the Scowcroft Center for Strategy and Security at the Atlantic Council \*\*Associate Professor of Government and Foreign Service at Georgetown University and Deputy Director for Strategy in the Scowcroft Center for Strategy and Security at the Atlantic Council (\*Matthew Kroenig \*\*Bharath Gopalaswamy, 11-12-2018, "Will disruptive technology cause nuclear war?," Bulletin of the Atomic Scientists, <https://thebulletin.org/2018/11/will-disruptive-technology-cause-nuclear-war/>)

Recently, analysts have argued that emerging technologies with military applications may undermine nuclear stability (see here, here, and here), but the logic of these arguments is debatable and overlooks a more straightforward reason why new technology might cause nuclear conflict: by upending the existing balance of power among nuclear-armed states. This latter concern is more probable and dangerous and demands an immediate policy response. For more than 70 years, the world has avoided major power conflict, and many attribute this era of peace to nuclear weapons. In situations of mutually assured destruction (MAD), neither side has an incentive to start a conflict because doing so will only result in its own annihilation. The key to this model of deterrence is the maintenance of secure second-strike capabilities—the ability to absorb an enemy nuclear attack and respond with a devastating counterattack. Recently analysts have begun to worry, however, that new strategic military technologies may make it possible for a state to conduct a successful first strike on an enemy. For example, Chinese colleagues have complained to me in Track II dialogues that the United States may decide to launch a sophisticated cyberattack against Chinese nuclear command and control, essentially turning off China’s nuclear forces. Then, Washington will follow up with a massive strike with conventional cruise and hypersonic missiles to destroy China’s nuclear weapons. Finally, if any Chinese forces happen to survive, the United States can simply mop up China’s ragged retaliatory strike with advanced missile defenses. China will be disarmed and US nuclear weapons will still be sitting on the shelf, untouched. If the United States, or any other state acquires such a first-strike capability, then the logic of MAD would be undermined. Washington may be tempted to launch a nuclear first strike. Or China may choose instead to use its nuclear weapons early in a conflict before they can be wiped out—the so-called “use ‘em or lose ‘em” problem. According to this logic, therefore, the appropriate policy response would be to ban outright or control any new weapon systems that might threaten second-strike capabilities. This way of thinking about new technology and stability, however, is open to question. Would any US president truly decide to launch a massive, bolt-out-of-the-blue nuclear attack because he or she thought s/he could get away with it? And why does it make sense for the country in the inferior position, in this case China, to intentionally start a nuclear war that it will almost certainly lose? More important, this conceptualization of how new technology affects stability is too narrow, focused exclusively on how new military technologies might be used against nuclear forces directly. Rather, we should think more broadly about how new technology might affect global politics, and, for this, it is helpful to turn to scholarly international relations theory. The dominant theory of the causes of war in the academy is the “bargaining model of war.” This theory identifies rapid shifts in the balance of power as a primary cause of conflict. International politics often presents states with conflicts that they can settle through peaceful bargaining, but when bargaining breaks down, war results. Shifts in the balance of power are problematic because they undermine effective bargaining. After all, why agree to a deal today if your bargaining position will be stronger tomorrow? And, a clear understanding of the military balance of power can contribute to peace. (Why start a war you are likely to lose?) But shifts in the balance of power muddy understandings of which states have the advantage. You may see where this is going. New technologies threaten to create potentially destabilizing shifts in the balance of power. For decades, stability in Europe and Asia has been supported by US military power. In recent years, however, the balance of power in Asia has begun to shift, as China has increased its military capabilities. Already, Beijing has become more assertive in the region, claiming contested territory in the South China Sea. And the results of Russia’s military modernization have been on full display in its ongoing intervention in Ukraine. Moreover, China may have the lead over the United States in emerging technologies that could be decisive for the future of military acquisitions and warfare, including 3D printing, hypersonic missiles, quantum computing, 5G wireless connectivity, and artificial intelligence (AI). And Russian President Vladimir Putin is building new unmanned vehicles while ominously declaring, “Whoever leads in AI will rule the world.” If China or Russia are able to incorporate new technologies into their militaries before the United States, then this could lead to the kind of rapid shift in the balance of power that often causes war. If Beijing believes emerging technologies provide it with a newfound, local military advantage over the United States, for example, it may be more willing than previously to initiate conflict over Taiwan. And if Putin thinks new tech has strengthened his hand, he may be more tempted to launch a Ukraine-style invasion of a NATO member. Either scenario could bring these nuclear powers into direct conflict with the United States, and once nuclear armed states are at war, there is an inherent risk of nuclear conflict through limited nuclear war strategies, nuclear brinkmanship, or simple accident or inadvertent escalation. This framing of the problem leads to a different set of policy implications. The concern is not simply technologies that threaten to undermine nuclear second-strike capabilities directly, but, rather, any technologies that can result in a meaningful shift in the broader balance of power. And the solution is not to preserve second-strike capabilities, but to preserve prevailing power balances more broadly. When it comes to new technology, this means that the United States should seek to maintain an innovation edge. Washington should also work with other states, including its nuclear-armed rivals, to develop a new set of arms control and nonproliferation agreements and export controls to deny these newer and potentially destabilizing technologies to potentially hostile states. These are no easy tasks, but the consequences of Washington losing the race for technological superiority to its autocratic challengers just might mean nuclear Armageddon.

## !—Democracy

### I/L – Filibuster

#### The filibuster hinders democratic progression and stunts governance

**Zajdowicz 5/25** [Thad Zajdowicz, Co-editor of the Book Corner, “The Filibuster—Good or Bad?”, League of Women Voters, June 25 2022, https://my.lwv.org/california/pasadena/article/book-corner-5]//RA

The word *filibuster* does not appear in the Constitution. The word is originally from the Dutch *vrijbueter* (freebooter), with contributions from the Spanish and French. The genesis of the filibuster is arcane and the history voluminous.

Filibusters were uncommon in the nineteenth century. In 1917, the Senate created Rule 22, which allowed cloture to bring a bill or other matter to a vote. Between 1917 and 1975, cloture required only a supermajority (two-thirds) of senators who were present and voting. “Present and voting” was defined as being in or near the Senate chamber. This meant that cloture could be invoked by a small number of senators (e.g., two out of three who were present and voting). In 1975, the cloture requirement was changed to three-fifths of all senators, none of whom needed to be in Washington to count. Cloture became very difficult to invoke with that rule, making the simple threat of a filibuster enough to stall legislation.

Filibusters increased after 1951 as Southern senators worked to block civil rights legislation. Strom Thurmond infamously conducted the longest filibuster on record, twenty-four hours and eighteen minutes, in opposition to the Civil Rights Act of 1957. This was not what the Framers intended when they wrote the Constitution. James Madison and the other Framers viewed the Senate as a body that would debate measures in meaningful ways, rather than reading from the Bible or recipe books. When the membership of the Senate was smaller and communications slower, the idea made sense. But the rise of political parties in the early nineteenth century and the splits over policy resulting from the Civil War and Reconstruction—not to mention our more recent political polarization—have enabled a minority party to drive the federal legislative agenda. The simple threat of a filibuster is now enough to kill prospective legislation and nominations; tweets and emails suffice to sink important agendas. The Senate today is anti-majoritarian.

Is the filibuster good or bad? Mostly, it is a mistake that was allowed to grow for partisan purposes over two centuries. Those who believe the filibuster resembles anything like Jimmy Stewart’s version in *Mr. Smith Goes to Washington* are mistaken. Republicans, currently the minority in the Senate, have threatened that elimination of the filibuster will be paid back in full if and when they regain a Senate majority. The reality is that there have been more than twenty years of legislative gridlock, in large part due to the threat of filibusters.

There is so much to be done to move our nation forward that requires passing laws: voting rights, solving inequality, healthcare, climate change, and dealing with over 400 years of racism. The answer is not abolishing the filibuster but deciding that a minority that wants to preserve it must endure pain. Senators should have to stand and deliver their objections, on their feet, yielding the floor only because of fatigue or calls of nature. Senate work may grind to a halt, but honest debate—not obstruction by the minority—was why the Framers created the Senate. The filibuster as it stands impairs governance.

### IL – Dems k2 solve

#### American democracy threatened by a republican midterms sweep

Al From 22, 7-6-2022, Al From is founder of the Democratic Leadership Council and author of The New Democrats and the Return to Power, which is the basis for the documentary film, Crashing the Party. He is currently an adjunct professor at Johns Hopkins University. "The challenge to democracy—overcoming the small state bias," Brookings, https://www.brookings.edu/blog/fixgov/2022/07/06/the-challenge-to-democracy-overcoming-the-small-state-bias/

The stakes for the 2022 midterm elections just got a lot higher. American democracy and majority rule, a cornerstone principle of our democracy, are on the ballot. The recent decisions to overturn Roe v. Wade and to allow gun owners’ to carry a weapon in public reveal a Supreme Court far out of touch with the views of an overwhelming majority of Americans. The attempted coup by former President Trump and his cronies, exposed by Republican witnesses at the explosive hearings of the January 6 special committee, represents the greatest threat to American democracy since before the Civil War. And the continued success of pro-Trump election deniers in Republican primaries this year coupled with the reticence of far too many Republicans to renounce Trump’s brazen and illegal efforts to overturn 2020 election demonstrate that threat is ongoing. “Our democracy is on a knife’s edge,” warned conservative judge J. Michael Luttig in testimony before the January 6 committee. How can democracy in America, the constitutional republic that has been a model for free people everywhere for nearly 250 years be suddenly in trouble? First, the vitality of any democracy depends on the ability of democratic institutions to keep pace with changing times. But in the last quarter century, important democratic institutions like the Senate, the Electoral College and the Supreme Court have not kept up with changes in our culture and the electorate. That failure has resulted in a structural imbalance in national politics. Second, a vibrant democracy must be a nation of laws, not of men. We’ve had unscrupulous politicians throughout our history, but until now we’ve always been able to stop the rise of “cunning, ambitious, unprincipled men” who, George Washington warned in his farewell address, would “usurp for themselves the reins of government.” Trump, his cronies, and, to a lesser extent, Senate Republican leader Mitch McConnell have shown themselves to be the kind of men Washington warned us about. The root of the institutional imbalance is in the structure of the United States Senate. Our founding fathers were men of great foresight, but in drafting the constitution, they could hardly have imagined the chasm that divides today’s America between the fast growing, populous, increasingly diverse states along the two coasts and the more numerous, more homogenous, less densely populated, slower growing states in between. Because the constitution allots two senators to each state, regardless of population, the senate has in recent decades taken on a decidedly small state bias. For example, California, the nation’s largest state, and Wyoming, the nation’s least populous state, both get two senators despite the fact that California’s population is eighty times larger than Wyoming’s. In fact, the population of California is bigger than the combined populations of the smallest 21 states. That means that more than 39 million people in those 21 states have 42 votes in the Senate while the same number of people in California have just two. Since California votes Democratic by large margins, if those 44 senators were allotted on a per capita basis, they would overwhelmingly tilt Democratic by a margin of about three to one, or 33 to 11. But because each state gets two senators, and a majority of those 21 states vote Republican, the actual tally is 25 Republicans and 19 Democrats. That’s a swing of 28 seats. If you believe in one person one vote, the small state bias clearly puts Democrats at a significant disadvantage. Just to break even in the Senate, Democrats need to win more of the national vote for Senate than the Republicans. With the even split in the current Senate, the 50 Democratic senators represent 56.5% of the voters, while the 50 Republican senators represent just 43.5% of the voters. In 2018, the Democrats won nearly 18 million more votes for Senate than the Republicans, but the Republicans still gained two seats. Because so many Republican senators come from very small states, the last time they represented a majority of voters nationally was in 1996. But in seven of 12 Congresses since then, Republicans have held a majority of Senate seats. Political data analyst David Shor projects that to have an even chance of holding on to the Senate this year, Democrats need to win the national vote for Senate by four points. If they win 51% of the national vote for Senate this year, they’ll likely lose a seat—and control of the Senate. And Shor’s model projects that in 2024 if the Democrats win that same 51% majority, they could lose seven seats. The small state bias in the Senate carries over to the Electoral College since each state gets an Electoral College vote for each of its senators. So small states get proportionately more electors. As a result, political analyst Nate Silver estimates that a Democratic candidate must win the popular vote by at least three percentage points to have an even chance of winning in the electoral college. That reality has never been more evident than in recent presidential elections. In the 25 presidential elections in the 20th century, not once did the candidate who lost the popular vote win the presidency in the Electoral College. But in the six elections in this century, that has already happened twice. The Supreme Court by design inevitably lags behind the public will. Because justices have lifetime appointments, at any one time, the majority of the justices will have been appointed by a past president and, thus unlikely to reflect current majority opinion. The recent Roe and gun decisions are prime examples. The three justices who cast the deciding votes in both cases were appointed by former President Trump who lost the popular vote (in 2016) by nearly three million votes and were confirmed by senators who represented less than 45% of the electorate. Trump, elected by a minority of voters, had three court appointments because McConnell manipulated Senate procedures to block confirmation of a justice appointed by President Obama, who twice won a majority of the popular vote. In the best of all worlds, the two parties would get together to reform and modernize our institutions to eliminate their biases. But with today’s polarized politics, that’s not going to happen. Instead, Republican leaders, as evidenced by McConnell’s manipulation of the Supreme Court confirmation process and Trump’s attempted coup, have exploited these institutional imbalances in order to cling to vital levers of power even though their coalition now represents a minority of voters. Think about this: the Democrats have won the popular vote in seven of the last eight presidential elections, the longest winning streak for any party in American history, yet they have won the presidency only five times.[1] The chances of changing the small state bias are slim to non-existent. Representatives from small states cannot be expected to amend the political deal that gave them such outsized power in the first place, particularly if, as most pundits predict, the Republicans, who benefit from it, win control of the House and Senate this year. RELATED CONTENT Congresswoman Diane DeGette (D-CO) speaks with reporters while surrounded by pro-choice Congresswomen at the Supreme Court, vowing to fight for reproductive rights after the Court issued its opinion on Dobbs v. JWHO. The opinion reverses the federal right to abortion decided in Roe v. Wade, allowing each state to set its own laws. The legal basis for the decision could be used in the future as precendent to overturn other rights not explicitly stated in the Constitution (e.g., same-sex marriage). With the exception of Thomas, all of the conservative justices in the majority testified under oath in their confirmation hearings that they consider abortion access 'settled law.' (Photo by Allison Bailey/NurPhoto)NO USE FRANCE Demonstrators gather outside the United States Supreme Court as the court rules in the Dobbs v Women's Health Organization abortion case, overturning the landmark Roe v Wade abortion decision in Washington, U.S., June 24, 2022. REUTERS/Michael Mccoy The only alternative is for Democrats to appeal beyond party lines to voters concerned about democracy and majority rule, even small state conservatives, and win House and Senate seats not only in traditional Democratic areas but also in districts and states that ordinarily vote Republican. Admittedly, with voters dissatisfied with President Biden over high inflation and rising crime, that’s not likely to happen. Even in years that the political environment favors Democrats they have to over perform just to break even. But it’s not impossible as the Democratic sweep in the post-Watergate election of 1974 has shown. That was the last time the fate of our democratic system was on the line. To win in normally hostile territory, Democrats will need to find new allies among all voters who want to preserve our democracy—independents, suburban voters, moderate and anti-Trump Republicans, and hardworking ordinary Americans—voters who would normally vote Republican but are appalled at the actions of Trump, his extremist MAGA supporters, and the McConnell Supreme Court. That will require the Democrats to ditch their normal base-oriented midterm election strategy. They need to make this fall’s election about preserving democracy and majority rule. Democrats need to open their tent to all voters who share that grand purpose—regardless of party or ideology. Pressing partisan Democratic agendas, and pet programs will have to wait until our democratic system is secure. Progressives will have to understand that Democrats will not defeat Republican extremism by offering extreme ideas of their own. The late Democratic political commentator Mark Shields once said that politics is about looking for converts, not punishing heretics. 2022 is not a year for ideological purity tests and punishing heretics. For the sake of our country, our democracy and the principle of majority rule, this year more than ever Democrats need to find more converts.

#### Midterm’s crucial to prevent democratic backsliding

Laura Gambino 22, 6-15-2022, "Pro-Trump Republicans’ primary wins raise alarm about US democracy," Guardian, https://www.theguardian.com/us-news/2022/jun/15/pro-trump-republicans-primary-wins-us-democracy

In pivotal primary races from Nevada to South Carolina on Tuesday, Republican voters chose candidates who fervently embraced Donald Trump’s lie about a stolen election, prompting warnings from Democrats that US democracy will be at stake in the November elections. Victories of pro-Trump candidates in Nevada set the stage for match-ups between election-deniers and embattled Democrats in a state both parties see as critical in the midterms. In taking on Disney, Florida’s Republican Gov. Ron DeSantis is testing the limits of his combative leadership style while sending an unmistakable message to his rivals: There is nothing or no one he won’t fight as he plots his political future. (AP Photo/John Raoux, File) Is rising Maga star Ron DeSantis the man to displace Trump in 2024? Read more In South Carolina, a vote to impeach Trump for inciting the January 6 insurrection proved one Republican’s undoing while another survived the former president’s wrath to win the nomination. n In south Texas, where Hispanic voters have shifted sharply toward the Republican party, a Republican flipped a House seat long held by a Democrat. The loss was a stark warning that Democrats’ standing with a crucial voting bloc is slipping. Nevada, a swing state that has trended Democratic in past election cycles, will play host to a number of consequential races this fall, for House, Senate, governor and secretary of state, as Democrats seek to defend narrow majorities in Congress. In the 50-50 Senate, every race will matter. But the party is saddled with a deeply unpopular president in a political system primed for revolt against the party in power. Inflation and the war in Ukraine have caused the cost of food and gas to shoot up while angst over gun violence and a shortage of baby formula deepens voter frustration. Republicans view the Nevada Senate race as one of their best chances of flipping a Democratic seat. They also sense an opportunity to make inroads in a state dominated by Democrats who were guided to power by the late Senate majority leader, Harry Reid. The senator up for re-election, Catherine Cortez Masto, was his chosen successor. Adam Laxalt, a former state attorney general endorsed by Trump, easily won the Republican primary to take on Cortez Masto in one of the most fiercely contested races of the cycle. Jim Marchant, a former lawmaker who has dabbled in the QAnon conspiracy theory and openly embraced the idea of overturning elections, will be the Republican nominee to become secretary of state, and therefore the top election official in a swing state that could be crucial to determining the presidential contest in 2024. Advertisement The elevation of election-denying Republicans across the US comes even as a bipartisan House panel investigating the Capitol attack unspools damning testimony from Trump’s inner circle, discrediting the former president’s claims. In South Carolina, Republicans ousted the five-term incumbent, Tom Rice, who crossed Trump and loyalists by voting to impeach the former president. Rice was defeated by Russell Fry, a Republican state lawmaker backed by Trump. The result was a welcome one for Trump after setbacks last month in races where Trump sought retribution against Republicans who rebuffed his attempts to overturn the 2020 election. But as in Georgia, there were limits to his influence. Another Republican House incumbent, Nancy Mace, fended off a Trump-backed challenger. Unlike in Rice’s staunchly conservative district, Mace – who did not vote to impeach but did criticise Trump – held on by attracting support from suburban voters who abandoned the party during the Trump years. On social media, Trump spun the evening as a resounding success. Mace’s challenger, Katie Arrington, he said, was a “very long-shot” who “did FAR better than anticipated”. “The ‘Impeacher’ was ousted without even a runoff. a GREAT night!,” Trump wrote on his social media site, Truth Social, about Rice. In Maine, Jared Golden, one of the few Democrats to represent a House district Trump carried, will attempt to defy political gravity in a rematch against the seat’s former representative, Bruce Poliquin. Golden narrowly beat Poliquin in the anti-Trump wave of 2018. With political winds reversed, Poliquin hopes to regain the seat. The state’s combative former governor, Paul LePage, is also attempting a comeback. Facing no opposition, he clinched the Republican nomination to run against the incumbent, Janet Mills. Perhaps most worrying for Democrats was the loss in south Texas. A Republican state representative, Mayra Flores, cruised to victory, avoiding a runoff against her main Democratic opponent, Dan Sanchez, in a special election to fill a seat vacated by a Democratic congressman, Filemón Vela. Flores will have to run again in November. Because of redistricting, she is set to square off against the Democratic congressman Vicente Gonzalez in a district considerably more left-leaning than the one she will temporarily represent. Nevertheless, some prognosticators moved their ratings for the district in Republicans’ favor, citing gains among Hispanic voters in the Rio Grande Valley. In a memo from the National Republican Congressional Committee obtained by CNN, the party touted Flores’ victory as the culmination of efforts to recruit and run more diverse candidates and said it offered a “blueprint for success in South Texas”. It concluded: “This is the first of many Democrat-held seats that will flip Republican in 2022.”

#### Democratic win revives democracy and prevents backsliding

Brent Budowsky 22, 5-25-2022, Budowsky is an American political opinion writer and columnist for The Hill "Budowsky: How Dems can win an epic midterm election," Hill, https://thehill.com/opinion/3500318-budowsky-how-dems-can-win-an-epic-midterm-election/

On Nov. 8, 2022, the American people will make a decision that will change the course of history, send shock waves across the globe, and be written about by historians a century from now. It may literally be the most important midterm election in a century. Here’s why: Today democracy is fighting back fiercely against attacks by foreign dictators abroad and Republican partisans at home who still try to reverse the 2020 election, elect state Republicans who would corrupt the 2024 election, and practice aggressive voter suppression reminiscent of the dark days of segregation. Many of our citizens are deeply concerned about the dangers to their economic lives. They face the risks of inflation and recession. They widely distrust politicians in BOTH parties. Americans are enormously frustrated by the inability of official Washington to transcend gridlock, act to protect them, and lift their lives and those of their family, community and country. They are appalled by a packed Supreme Court essentially employing party-line votes to undermine their rights, while extremist Republicans states try to force-feed far-right views while attacking the right to vote. Democrats need to powerfully address their concerns with a Contract for America that includes specific pledges to improve their economic lives, health care, environment, safety from crime and right to vote. To defend against threats to our democracy, they should mobilize the largest voter registration in history, propel massive small donor fundraising and inspire a rousing defense for democracy with large donations from the wealthiest believers in the cause. ADVERTISING It is often suggested, in my view incorrectly, that because President Biden’s favorable numbers are low, Democrats are doomed to defeat in the midterms. This results from a misunderstanding of the political situation today. If we review the RealClearPolitics 10 most recent 2022 generic congressional vote polls as of yesterday morning, Democrats were leading in five, Republicans in four, and the other was tied. How can this be? If we review the RealClearPolitics favorable ratings of political leaders, as of yesterday morning, Biden’s rating was 43.6 percent, House Minority Leader Kevin McCarthy (R-Calif.) was much lower, at 28 percent, and Senate Minority Leader Mitch McConnell (R-Ky.) was even lower, at 26.3 percent! Voters are not dissatisfied with Biden, they are dissatisfied with ALL leaders of BOTH parties in Washington, with Biden’s approval significantly higher than McCarthy’s or McConnell’s! Given this season of discontent in our democracy, with more than a 90 percent probability, on the morning of Nov. 9, the nation and world will wake up to one of two potential midterm outcomes. The first possibility is that Republicans gain control of the House, the Senate or both. This result would be armageddon for the Biden presidency. The legislative branch would be unable to pass any major proposal from President Biden or Democrats in Congress. Congressional Republicans would be unable to enact any legislation without President Biden’s signature. In this scenario, a Republican House or Senate would degenerate into little more than permanent partisan Republican investigations of Democrats and partisan Republican gridlock in Washington — provoking widespread anger and rage from a majority of Americans, while Republicans compete with each other to be more extreme, in the party of Trump, not Lincoln. The second possibility, which is less likely than I wish but more likely than most pundits believe, is that Democrats retain control of the Senate and House, and gain one or two Senate seats. In this scenario, Biden and Democrats would be able to enact a substantial program of economic, health care, crime, climate change and voting rights legislation, which a majority of Americans would applaud. What good is intelligence in Ukraine? The Supreme Court fires broadside against the Constitution Let’s be clear, blunt and honest. Biden and Democrats do not control a 50-50 Senate in which one or two Democratic senators alone can overrule the Democratic president, 48 Democratic senators, and all Democratic House members before they host fundraisers with grateful Republican donors and special interests. With only one or two more Democratic senators, Democrats and democracy would flourish! Budowsky was an aide to former Sen. Lloyd Bentsen (D-Texas) and former Rep. Bill Alexander (D-Ark.), who was chief deputy majority whip of the House of Representatives.=

#### Republican majority means increased voting right restrictions and propping up election denier’s which deck democracy

Scott Dworkin 22, 5-2-2022, "There's no choice in the midterms. The Democrats are the only side defending democracy," Newsweek, https://www.newsweek.com/theres-no-choice-midterms-democrats-are-only-side-defending-democracy-opinion-1702290

As we get closer and closer to November's midterm elections, doomsday predictions about a bloodbath for Democrats have come to dominate the news. It seems like you can't turn on your TV or scroll through Twitter for five minutes without being informed by some pundit or other—on both sides of the political spectrum—about the dire situation the Democrats face in races across the country. These naysayers are missing the robust record that the Democrats have to run on—one that includes the not insignificant line item of being the only side standing up for Democracy itself. Republicans have shown their laissez faire attitude toward democracy in numerous ways, starting with passing bills across the country restricting the right to vote. Then there's their penchant for denying the results of the 2020 election, or opposing the bipartisan commission to investigate the storming of the Capitol on January 6, an effort designed to undermine the electoral process altogether. Most recently, leaked tapes revealed how Republican House Minority Leader Kevin McCarthy really felt about Trump's role in inciting the January 6 attack, going so far as to say that Trump should resign immediately. In another recently released tape, McCarthy accused some GOP lawmakers of putting people in jeopardy. McCarthy was telling the truth: GOP lawmakers put their colleagues in jeopardy and Trump should've resigned. But instead of admitting this, McCarthy attacked the press, accusing them of spreading lies. Of course, he had to deny his condemnation of Trump; he has done nothing but defend him since January 6, fighting the creation of an inquiry into that ugly day. Meanwhile, it's been the Democrats (and two exiled Republicans) who have worked overtime to expose Republicans' corruption and sedition. Kevin McCarthy and Donald Trump President Donald Trump reportedly said House Minority Leader Kevin McCarthy (R-California) has an "inferiority complex." Above, Trump speaks as he is joined by McCarthy at the White House on January 4, 2019 in Washington, D.C. But while the work of the January 6 Committee is crucial to stabilizing our democracy, it's only the first in a long list of accomplishments that Democrats can tout to their constituents. President Biden's infrastructure bill is already delivering: The bill has created jobs and is already fixing roads, bridges and railways. It's already bringing clean drinking water to some of the poorest communities and building access to high-speed internet across the country. Democrats should be speaking nationally about these accomplishments while showing the specific locations that are being improved in their states or congressional districts. This is nothing short of a home run for candidates running on the blue ticket. Another huge victory for Democrats to tout is the American Rescue Plan, which helped put money directly in the pockets of the American people, helped protect them from COVID-19 and gave money directly to working families. Democrats should remind voters of this—and of the fact that most Republicans voted against the plan. Democrats also swiftly pushed through Justice Ketanji Brown Jackson's nomination, a historic victory that made Judge Jackson the first Black woman on the Supreme Court, another thing most Republicans opposed. Reminding voters of this accomplishment, and that it happened under the most diverse administration in American history, should remind folks that diversity in leadership matters. Then there's the fact that Biden helped unite the western world against Russia together with the leadership shown by Speaker Nancy Pelosi and Democrats. Finally, we must remind Americans what Republicans stand for: a whole lot of nothing. Nothing good, at least. The Republicans are the party of January 6, of banning Critical Race Theory (CRT) in schools where it's not taught, and of anti-gay legislation that addresses "problems" that don't exist. So as Democrats move into the midterm elections, they must remember one key thing: This is their election to lose. They have the record to run on and theirs is the only party defending democracy. If the Democratic Party can focus on a clear, cohesive and united message that just tells the American people the truth, they will prove to be unbeatable.

### !---Dem

#### Democracy solves a laundry list of impacts---economic growth, public goods, alliances, and war---the US is key.

Lee ’18 (Carrie; is an assistant professor at the U.S. Air War College and a Security Fellow with Truman National Security Project. Any views expressed are those of the author and do not reflect the official policy or position of the U.S. government, the Department of Defense, Air University, or Truman National Security Project; *The Truman Project*; September 10th; “Why Democracy Promotion is in the Strategic Interest of the United States”; [https://medium.com/truman-doctrine-blog/why-democracy-promotion-is-in-the-strategic-interest-of-the-united-states-ae959c111b2f](about:blank); accessed 7/9/19; MSCOTT)

However, reducing the United States’ emphasis on a values-driven foreign policy is wrong, and contrary to the strategic interests of the United States. Democracy promotion in particular serves a key role in safeguarding U.S. interests and promoting global, long-term growth in ways fundamentally compatible with U.S. strategic interests. After all, democracies protect private property in important ways, invest in public goods, are more politically stable, make for more dependable allies, and empirically do not go to war with one another. Ultimately, a world full of democratic governments is safer, more prosperous, and more stable — all states of being that the United States has an interest in promoting.

Democracy guarantees that the public has a stake in its own institutions and government, which leads to investor confidence and growth. Since elected politicians are accountable to property owners and are held in check by an independent judiciary, democracies tend to have better mechanisms for protecting private property than their autocratic counterparts. This makes democracies a particularly attractive type of country for investors — both public and private — because checks and balances make it difficult for the state to nationalize industries. Further, private property rights protected by the legal system encourage entrepreneurship and small business development, both of which are key to a growing and modernizing economy. As a result, democracies tend to be wealthier and more economically stable than their autocratic counterparts. This is fundamentally in the interest of the United States in that both private and public investors have an interest in seeing returns on their investments, thereby potentially making countries less willing to go to war if that would require severing economic ties. Democratic institutions ensure that citizens with both economic and political power are heard.

Democracies also invest in public goods at much higher rates than autocratic governments. Because politicians must cater to the median voter, they approve policies that invest in public education and healthcare, both of which promote long-term growth and development. Public education invests in a country’s human capital, setting the stage for long-term innovation, adaptability, and advancement. Public healthcare, meanwhile, has been shown to increase overall societal productivity and well-being as people take fewer sick days, citizens are able to afford their healthcare without going bankrupt, and ultimately, the overall costs of healthcare are driven down as citizens become healthier. Productive, innovative societies are also better for the United States — innovation around the world improves global quality of life, results in more educational and vocational opportunities for Americans (both because other universities and jobs become more attractive to Americans who want to go abroad and because potential immigrants are more likely to want to stay in their own country, opening up opportunities for U.S. citizens at home), and may reduce friction between countries over resources and labor.

Democracies are also generally more politically stable because regular election cycles ensure an established process for the habitual and peaceful removal of leaders from power. Elections ensure the non-violent transition of power and reduce the need for mass protest, rioting, and revolution — which makes countries more politically stable. Further, when citizens are granted rights and protections from government abuse, enforced by an independent judiciary, they have fewer grievances against the government and are thus less able to mobilize large numbers of people to violently overthrow the regime. Revolution, while not always violent, often leads to political instability, challenges to growth, increased incentives for diversionary war and conflict, and oftentimes civil war. The externalities of civil war and international conflict then put pressure on the United States to intervene, protect human rights, and otherwise expend resources on other countries’ issues. Further, civil wars are highly destructive to institutions, human capital, and resources, and can have significant security spillover effects, increasing global risk of political instability and violent extremism.

This political stability, in addition to institutional checks and balances, makes democracies better international partners and allies in the long-term. Treaties ratified by multiple branches of government are more durable than executive agreements signed by a single leader who may be replaced within a short period of time. While democracies may be more reluctant to commit to alliances and formal security pacts, once a party to them, they are more dependable than other states with concentrated power at the executive level. These kind of durable commitments are of interest to the United States as it seeks to preserve the liberal world order; it is far more effective to ally with partners whose institutions make withdrawal from the alliance costly.

Finally, it has been empirically observed that democracies do not go to war with one another. While there is a robust debate around the exact nature of the so-called “democratic peace,” it appears that there are qualities particular to democracies that make war between them particularly unlikely: a dovish public constrains leaders’ ability to wage war, competitive elections and a free press make it easier to credibly communicate resolve to potential adversaries, consolidated democracies tend to be more wealthy and economically interdependent, like-minded people are more hesitant to wage war against one another, and so on. Regardless of the precise mechanisms, however, a world of democracies is inherently safer, more prosperous, and less likely to initiate a war against the United States — a key factor in protecting American security and interests.

## !—Climate

### IL – Dems k2 solve

#### Dem win in the midterms is key to implimenting effective climate policy

Ben **Geman 21**, 6-26-2021, "The clock is ticking on Biden's climate agenda," Axios, https://www.axios.com/2021/06/26/biden-climate-change-ticking-clock

President Biden is under intense pressure to deliver on his historic climate plans, with real danger that he’ll miss his window on major goals that allies had hoped were in their grasp. Why it matters: Only six months into his presidency, Biden has a limited amount of time to tackle what he calls "the No. 1 issue facing humanity." Key parts of his platform are tethered to the infrastructure push underway right now. Biden and liberal Democrats want huge clean energy investments and tax incentives. They hope a Democrats-only package would provide vastly more than energy measures in the infrastructure outline Biden unveiled with a bipartisan Senate group on Thursday. Threat level: Republicans have a good chance of regaining one — and perhaps both — chambers of Congress in the 2022 midterms, effectively slamming Biden's window shut. And already Democrats are having trouble locking down enough votes in their own ranks for anything resembling Biden's proposals around electric cars, renewables, efficient buildings and more. The intrigue: The time pressure is even more intense than the electoral calendar suggests. November brings the most important United Nations climate summit since the 2015 talks that birthed the Paris agreement. Walking into that summit with an enacted package would help show that the White House pledge to slash U.S. emissions by 50% by 2030 is realistic. But if the U.S. effort is foundering, winning higher ambition and tangible new steps from other nations could be a harder diplomatic lift. The big picture: The U.S. is the world's second-largest greenhouse gas polluter behind runaway leader China. Biden's campaign platform pledged a sweeping emissions-cutting agenda that would go far beyond that of former President Obama. The goals include a carbon-free power sector by 2035; strong new regulations to limit tailpipe emissions; new restrictions on fossil fuel development; and massive new resources for clean energy R&D and deployment. Big new investments and greatly expanded clean energy incentives would require approval from Congress. Another part of Biden's plan — a "clean energy standard" that forces utilities to vastly ramp up carbon-free power — also requires legislation. Yes, but: The White House also hopes to accomplish a lot with executive actions by redirecting agencies, including the EPA and the Interior and Energy Departments, to be more climate-focused. Just one of many examples: Biden is pushing the EPA and the Transportation Department to rewrite vehicle efficiency rules to be much tougher. There's also a multi-agency push to accelerate the development of large offshore wind projects. And U.S. development finance agencies — including the U.S. International Development Finance Corp. — are putting a higher priority on clean energy. Executive actions face their own hurdles, however, including litigation that greets every major rulemaking. This month, a federal judge issued an injunction against Biden's freeze on new oil lease sales — a move that foreshadows legal battles that will confront all his regulatory efforts. The bottom line: "Every passing day tests [Biden's] ability to achieve an ambitious climate agenda in his first term, especially if the infrastructure bill doesn’t include the transformative investments and tax credits for clean energy," Margaret Jackson of the Atlantic Council's Global Energy Center tells Axios via email.

#### Dems need to maintain control of senate for climate – 2010 proves

Nilsen 6/23 [Ella Nilsen covers the White House for Vox, focusing on domestic policy. She previously covered campaigns and Congress. Before coming to Vox, she worked at the Concord Monitor newspaper in New Hampshire, where she covered Bernie Sanders and Donald Trump in the 2016 primary. https://www.vox.com/22537509/democrats-climate-bill-biden-waxman-markey]//LP

Biden “needs the investments, and a lot rides on, does he get the things he’s proposed in the American Jobs Plan?” Podesta said. “You can get some things going, but boy, I think they’re pretty dependent on some of the things [Congress] puts forth.” And progressives are also worried what not delivering on a bold climate and infrastructure package could mean for the 2022 midterms, which largely hinge on turning out a fired-up Democratic base. More liberal lawmakers are coalescing around a new slogan: “No climate, no deal.” “We’re not going to be able to get votes for a bill that does not seriously address the climate crisis,” Rep. Pramila Jayapal (D-WA), the chair of the Congressional Progressive Caucus, said. The tepid economic recovery under Obama pushed Democrats to go big on recent stimulus. Many also learned a darker lesson about opportunities to pass climate legislation: The stakes of inaction are incredibly high. Why the 2009 climate bill failed Fresh off resounding victories in the White House and Congress in the 2008 election, Democrats had an ambitious list of policy proposals. Combatting climate change was a big priority, but it fell behind passing economic stimulus, expanding health care, and a financial reform bill after the recent economic crash. For about a six-month window from summer 2009 to January 2010, Democrats had the 60 votes needed for a filibuster-proof majority. But that changed when Republican Scott Brown won the special Senate election in Massachusetts to fill the seat of the late Democratic Sen. Ted Kennedy. “We thought we had more time with that supermajority than we ended up having,” Sen. Debbie Stabenow (D-MI), a member of Senate Democratic leadership, told me in an interview last summer. “Sen. Byrd died and Sen. Kennedy died, and we only had a matter of months and got the [Affordable Care Act] done, an economic stimulus package, and Dodd-Frank done.” Work on the Waxman-Markey climate bill began in the US House, where it would continue for months of drafting and committee input. The officially titled “American Clean Energy and Security Act” was introduced in May 2009, weighing in at 1,400 pages. RELATED The once and future Democratic consensus on climate change Democrats’ plan would have capped the nation’s greenhouse gas emissions at a lower level, giving fossil fuel companies the ability to buy emissions offsets to hit their targets, or pay up if they went over. They settled on the cap-and-trade model in part because it was something that past Republican presidents had embraced. President George H.W. Bush proposed a cap-and-trade system as part of the 1990 Clean Air Act to help reduce sulfur emissions — and many Republican senators voted for it. Indeed, the Waxman-Markey cap-and-trade bill was controversial among climate activists and experts who thought it was too friendly to big business and called for a carbon tax instead. The bill also contained funding for many of the things Biden is trying to do today, including incentives to support more electric vehicles and clean energy. The bill squeaked through the House on a vote of 219-212 in June 2009, after months of work and whipping votes by Pelosi’s team. It never even made it to the floor of the Senate, because then-Senate Majority Leader Harry Reid had lost his supermajority with the Massachusetts election, and Democrats were suddenly staring down a set of tough midterms in the House and Senate. “The votes weren’t there,” said Jim Manley, a former spokesperson for Reid. “I found that some of the worst vote counters around were in the environmental community at this time. I don’t blame them for trying.” Democrats’ big climate bill died in the Senate in 2010. That history is a warning for Democrats today, who have no margin for error in their current 50-50 Senate, where Vice President Kamala Harris gives them one vote to break ties. Looking back, a number of things set Waxman-Markey’s demise in motion, current and former lawmakers and staff told me. Democrats’ big climate bill was too in the weeds, was introduced when the country was still in a painful economic recession, and wasn’t the top priority. And even though Democrats’ climate bill was modeled on a Republican idea, Republicans pounced on it as a job killer, taking a do-nothing stance on climate in the process. “It was a very tenuous economic time in a deeper, more profound way than currently,” said John Lawrence, who was chief of staff to House Speaker Nancy Pelosi at the time. “It was difficult to figure out where to put a big new controversial bill that looked to some people like it would compound problems impacting the economy rather than alleviating it.” Then-Rep. Ed Markey speaks in 2009 as, left to right, Reps. Henry Waxman, Steny Hoyer, James Clyburn, and House Speaker Nancy Pelosi listen during a news conference after a vote on the Clean Energy and Security Act on Capitol Hill. Alex Wong/Getty Images Sen. Tammy Baldwin (D-WI), who was serving on the House Energy and Commerce Committee at the time, said that cap and trade was too complicated for voters to understand. Democrats need to improve their messaging, tying a climate and clean energy agenda to a clear message about jobs, she said. “Lessons learned [are] that we have to be able to show how we’re protecting working people, how we’re creating new job opportunities, and how we’re protecting the planet,” said Baldwin. “We have to be very proactive, not just policy nerds.” Ultimately, Waxman-Markey’s failure in 2010 meant that what Obama feared came to pass. The vast majority of Obama’s climate change agenda happened through the executive branch, with regulations on vehicles and electrical appliances, and the creation of the Clean Power Plan. Obama officials assumed that 2016 Democratic nominee Hillary Clinton would build on that, but Obama’s successor was instead President Donald Trump. It hasn’t all been bad. As the Atlantic’s Robinson Meyer recently wrote, the US was still able to hit — even slightly exceed — the carbon emissions targets Waxman-Markey laid out (though, as Meyer points out, it’s impossible to know how much more emissions could have been avoided if the bill had passed). Even then, it still hasn’t been enough to stop the devastating impacts of climate change around the world and in the US. All of this has convinced climate-minded Democrats that action from Congress is needed to push the US into a clean energy transition. While Podesta told E&E News in 2016 that Waxman-Markey’s failure had shown him that strong executive branch action was the way to go on climate, five years later, he believes that action from Congress is essential, he told me. Biden “needs a big jolt of federal investment to grease the gears,” Podesta said.

#### Solves warming.

Tucker and Steinbaum 18 [Tucker and Steinbaum are fellows at the Roosevelt Institute.” 2020 Matters for the Left. Here's Why 2022 Matters Much More” https://time.com/5475791/2020-bernie-sanders-2022-progressives-left-corbyn/]//LP

For progressives across America, 2020 can’t come fast enough. Fresh on the heels of the biggest blue sweep of congressional seats since Watergate, dozens of Democrats are readying potential presidential runs. Mere days after trouncing his Republican opponent in a Senate, Ohio’s Sherrod Brown announced he was “thinking” about a run. Ditto for Beto O’Rourke, who narrowly lost to Texas’ arch-conservative Ted Cruz. Both Elizabeth Warren and Bernie Sanders have given major foreign policy speeches this fall — a common prelude to a presidential campaign. Any of these candidates would likely govern to the left of any recent Democratic presidents.

But American progressives may be thinking too small. While the next U.S. presidential election is a crucial stepping stone, an even bigger year rests on the horizon: 2022. By that time, the major European countries will have had their national elections, and there is a non-trivial chance that progressives could make a clean sweep. The first round of voting in France will take place in April 2022, while the UK’s must happen no later than May 2022. German polls will take place no later than October 2021. In the U.K., the Tories’ unpopular Brexit and “universal credit” policies have boosted Jeremy Corbyn’s Labour Party. In France, the economically marginalized are protesting Emanuel Macron’s austerity measures, giving an opening to Jean-Luc Mélenchon, a socialist who would have come in first in the 2017 elections had his votes not been split with other likeminded candidates. And in Germany, the Green Party made significant gains in local elections last month, while the youth wing of the Social Democrats is pushing their party elders to the left or to the side. And outside of Europe, the Brazilian elections are also scheduled for 2022, while progressive governments are already in place now in Canada, Mexico, and New Zealand.

If the stars align, 2022 could be a once-in-a-century opportunity for progressives to push through major changes to an international system that has often held back progress at the domestic level. After all, the fundamental problems the left wants to solve don’t respect borders. Take the latest projections from the United Nations on climate change. The agency estimates mass food shortages and wild fires as soon as 2040, unless greenhouse gas pollution is cut in half in the next decade. Such a rapid energy transition has no precedent in human history, and is unthinkable without internationally coordinated government interventions and spending far beyond that envisioned in the Paris climate accords.

### IL – Narrow Window

#### There’s a narrow window to avoid climate catastrophe

Orszag 3-2-2021, chief executive officer of financial advisory at Lazard. He was director of the Office of Management and Budget from 2009 to 2010, and director of the Congressional Budget Office from 2007 to 2008 (Peter, “Congress’s Infrastructure Plan Must Put Climate First,” *Bloomberg*, https://www.bloomberg.com/opinion/articles/2021-03-02/biden-s-build-back-better-plan-must-put-climate-over-deficit)//BB

Yet sacrificing climate investments at the altar of budget neutrality would be a grave mistake. We have reached a crucial moment in the climate debate. Lazard’s studies of the levelized cost of energy and storage have documented stunning declines in the expense of generating and storing renewable energy. What’s more, a generation of electricity-producing capacity needs to be replaced, and hydrogen technology may be on the verge of a revolution. The window for making bold investments to cut the risk of catastrophic climate change remains open, but it won’t stay open forever. There’s a reason Bill Gates took this moment to write a book about the clean-energy transition: He knows it’s essential to act now to “avoid a climate disaster.” So there are two fundamental risks in requiring deficit neutrality for new climate investments: It would shift the debate to offsets, rather than the need for ambitious new investment. And the investments would be scaled back to match the available offsets, making the legislation insufficiently ambitious. 3 Forced to choose between going big on climate mitigation or limiting deficit expansion, I would take the first option without hesitation. Fiscal problems can be fixed in the future if need be, but the opportunity to fix climate change won’t last. If our main concern is our legacy for future generations, climate must be the priority.

#### It’s our last, best bet to stop 2 degree warming.

-grid impact too

-says our approach will be modeled

Economist 21 – The Economist, “How America can rid itself of both carbon and blackouts”, https://www.economist.com/leaders/2021/02/20/how-america-can-rid-itself-of-both-carbon-and-blackouts

Texas prides itself on being different. Yet it is in the grip of a winter storm that typifies the Snowmageddon-size problems facing energy in America. Although nobody can be sure if this particular freeze is a sign of climate change, the growing frequency of extreme weather across the country is. Texan infrastructure has buckled. The problem is not, as some argue, that Texas has too many renewables. Gas-fired plants and a nuclear reactor were hit, as well as wind turbines. Worse, Texas had too little capacity and its poorly connected grid was unable to import power from elsewhere (see article). Texas shows that America needs both a cleaner grid and a more reliable one.

Plans to overhaul American energy will come before Congress in the next few months. President Joe Biden has said that he wants fossil-fuel emissions from power generation to end by 2035 and the economy to be carbon-neutral by 2050. America is not just the world’s second-largest emitter, but also a source of climate-related policy, technology and, potentially, leadership. What is about to unfold in Washington will set the course in America for the next decade—and quite possibly beyond.

Time is pressing. Neither Mr Biden nor his successors may get a second chance to recast policy on such a scale. Global emissions from fossil fuels and cement production in 2019 were 16% higher than in 2009. It will be even harder to limit climate change to less than 2°C above the pre-industrial level, the global threshold from which America’s target for 2050 comes. To be carbon neutral, the world must curb emissions by 7.6% a year for a decade, a steeper decline than in 2020, when covid-19 cut demand for oil and coal. For America, delaying action to 2030 would nearly double the cost of reaching net zero or, more likely, mean it overshoots its targets.

Yet there are grounds for hope. Although the Republican Party is against almost all action, voters are increasingly alarmed by climate change. Two-thirds of them think the federal government is doing too little about it, and that share includes plenty of younger Republicans. Although the fossil-fuel lobby remains powerful, many Republican business donors want more action—partly because asset managers are urging firms to align their strategies with the net-zero world Mr Biden envisions.

Most encouraging of all, the costs of power from wind and solar have plunged by 70% and 90% over the past decade. Along with cheap gas, this has already helped America decarbonise at an impressive rate, despite Donald Trump’s rolling back of fossil-fuel regulations. Price has not been the only factor; more than half of the states have some sort of clean-energy mandate, a device that Mr Biden wants to introduce on a national scale.

This involves a regulatory framework that favours renewable-energy developments and grid connections to hook them up. It will take a lot of extra investment—about $2.5trn in the coming decade, say researchers at Princeton (see Briefing). In a new book, Bill Gates, a billionaire philanthropist, argues that research is needed into a host of areas such as energy storage, advanced nuclear reactors to complement renewables and technologies for clean concrete-making and other activities that are hard to decarbonise (see article). Without these, even if a clean grid is powering electric cars and light trucks, it will displace only around half of emissions.

America is good at innovation, but new ideas need to be deployed at scale, not languish in the lab. One tool is a carbon price which, if it were high enough and if investors believed it would last, would signal what improvements were needed where. But for all its attractions, carbon pricing failed in Congress in 2009. Although many economists and opinion-makers on the right favour it, Republican politicians do not. And even if a carbon price were in place, public-private co-operation would still be needed for America to act as fast as Mr Biden proposes.

For all those reasons, an ambitious climate-oriented infrastructure bill looks like Mr Biden’s best chance of getting new policy on climate through the Senate. Unfortunately such a plan will be lucky to attract any Republican votes. Yet, if mustering the 60 needed to see off a Senate filibuster is improbable, a plan could be stripped of some measures, including a clean-energy standard, and passed with a simple majority through the parliamentary manoeuvre known as reconciliation. The bill must still be of a scale and ambition that matches America’s challenge.

Failure to act would bring big risks. For a start, it would make America less competitive in the new clean-energy economy. China is the dominant producer of solar panels and batteries; it has also invested in foreign mines to secure minerals needed for them. Europe has its own “green deal” to boost its clean-energy industries. It plans to tax imports from countries that do not pledge to lower their emissions.

America would also be deprived of global influence over climate. It has direct control over only about 10% of the world’s greenhouse-gas effluvia. If it wants the benefit of a stabler climate—and with it a stabler world economy, stabler geopolitics and much avoided suffering—it needs to influence the other 90%, too. Mr Biden has appointed John Kerry, a former secretary of state, to spearhead that effort (see Lexington). America is to rejoin the Paris agreement on February 19th, making it a full participant in the un conference to be held in Glasgow, in Scotland, in November, when countries will be able to lodge new and more ambitious pledges to cut emissions. If America tables goals and gives evidence that it will back them with domestic policy, it will gain influence. China’s two big development banks have doled out $51bn for foreign coal plants since 2008. America should be part of a push against such subsidies.

Enough drifting

Unfortunately, America brings little credibility to action on climate. Mr Trump took pleasure in subverting it, but his country’s poor record precedes him. George W. Bush declined to implement the Kyoto protocol. Congress has not considered serious climate legislation since 2009. Today must be different. There will never be a better chance for Mr Biden to show real ambition. If the blackouts in Texas are any guide, it would not just be the world that would thank him, but Americans, too.

### Extinction

#### Extinction

Spratt 19—Research Director for Breakthrough National Centre for Climate Restoration, Melbourne (David and Ian T. Dunlop (member of the Club of Rome. Formerly an international oil, gas and coal industry executive, chairman of the Australian Coal Association, chief executive of the Australian Institute of Company Directors, and chair of the Australian Greenhouse Office Experts Group on Emissions Trading 1998-2000), May 2019, “Existential climate-related security risk: A scenario approach”, Breakthrough Policy Paper, <https://docs.wixstatic.com/ugd/148cb0_a1406e0143ac4c469196d3003bc1e687.pdf>)

Even for 2°C of warming, more than a billion people may need to be relocated and In high-end scenarios, the scale of destruction is beyond our capacity to model, with a high likelihood of human civilisation coming to an end. 21 National security consequences: For pragmatic reasons associated with providing only a sketch of this scenario, we take the conclusion of the Age of Consequences ‘Severe’ 3°C scenario developed by a group of senior US national-security figures in 2007 as appropriate for our scenario too: Massive nonlinear events in the global environment give rise to massive nonlinear societal events. In this scenario, nations around the world will be overwhelmed by the scale of change and pernicious challenges, such as pandemic disease. The internal cohesion of nations will be under great stress, including in the United States, both as a result of a dramatic rise in migration and changes in agricultural patterns and water availability. The flooding of coastal communities around the world, especially in the Netherlands, the United States, South Asia, and China, has the potential to challenge regional and even national identities. Armed conflict between nations over resources, such as the Nile and its tributaries, is likely and nuclear war is possible. The social consequences range from increased religious fervor to outright chaos. In this scenario, climate change provokes a permanent shift in the relationship of humankind to nature’. (emphasis added)

Prefer the spratt evidence—its not over exaggerated scenarios spratt takes alternative factors into account, 2 degrees warming leads to pandemics, rise in migration, changes in food and water availability, resulting in resource wars. Prefer our ev takes into account not just environmental impacts but the societal effects of warming leeaading to increased conflict

### !---Conflict Multiplier

#### Warming’s a conflict multiplier

Scheffran 16, Professor at the Institute for Geography at the University of Hamburg and head of the Research Group Climate Change and Security in the CliSAP Cluster of Excellence and the Center for Earth System Research and Sustainability, et al (Jürgen, “The Climate-Nuclear Nexus: Exploring the linkages between climate change and nuclear threats,” <http://www.worldfuturecouncil.org/file/2016/01/WFC_2015_The_Climate-Nuclear_Nexus.pdf>)

Climate change and nuclear weapons represent two key threats of our time. Climate change endangers ecosystems and social systems all over the world. The degradation of natural resources, the decline of water and food supplies, forced migration, and more frequent and intense disasters will greatly affect population clusters, big and small. Climate-related shocks will add stress to the world’s existing conflicts and act as a “threat multiplier” in already fragile regions. This could contribute to a decline of international stability and trigger hostility between people and nations. Meanwhile, the 15,500 nuclear weapons that remain in the arsenals of only a few states possess the destructive force to destroy life on Earth as we know multiple times over. With nuclear deterrence strategies still in place, and hundreds of weapons on ‘hair trigger alert’, the risks of nuclear war caused by accident, miscalculation or intent remain plentiful and imminent. Despite growing recognition that climate change and nuclear weapons pose critical security risks, the linkages between both threats are largely ignored. However, nuclear and climate risks interfere with each other in a mutually enforcing way. Conflicts induced by climate change could contribute to global insecurity, which, in turn, could enhance the chance of a nuclear weapon being used, could create more fertile breeding grounds for terrorism, including nuclear terrorism, and could feed the ambitions among some states to acquire nuclear arms. Furthermore, as evidenced by a series of incidents in recent years, extreme weather events, environmental degradation and major seismic events can directly impact the safety and security of nuclear installations. Moreover, a nuclear war could lead to a rapid and prolonged drop in average global temperatures and significantly disrupt the global climate for years to come, which would have disastrous implications for agriculture, threatening the food supply for most of the world. Finally, climate change, nuclear weapons and nuclear energy pose threats of intergenerational harm, as evidenced by the transgenerational effects of nuclear testing and nuclear power accidents and the lasting impacts on the climate, environment and public health by carbon emissions.

### AT Paris Solves

#### Re-joining alone is insufficient. That only solves if it’s perceived as a credible and genuine commitment.

Dennis 12-22-2020 (Brady, “The U.S. will soon rejoin the Paris climate accord. Then comes the hard part.,” *Washington Post*, <https://www.washingtonpost.com/politics/2020/12/22/biden-paris-climate-accord/>)//BB

Leaders from 75 countries gathered this month — virtually, of course — to mark the fifth anniversary of the Paris climate accord and to outline more ambitious plans to cut planet-warming emissions in the critical years ahead. The United Kingdom vowed to stop funding fossil fuel projects abroad. The European Union said it will push to cut emissions 55 percent by 2030. Canada detailed plans to ramp up its tax on carbon to more than $130 per ton over the same period. A handful of smaller countries pledged to reach net-zero emissions by 2035, if not sooner. Three dozen nations have declared a “climate emergency” inside their borders. “They recognize the urgency and the stakes,” said António Guterres, secretary general of the United Nations. “It’s time for all countries to do the same.” Dangerous new hot zones are spreading around the world The one glaring absence at the anniversary gathering: the United States. The nation that has historically spewed more greenhouse gases into the atmosphere than any other, and the only country to withdraw from the global pact, was nowhere in sight. But just before the Dec. 12 event got underway, President-elect Joe Biden blasted out a statement, vowing to rejoin the Paris agreement “on day one” and to restore the United States as a world leader in climate action. “I’ll immediately start working with my counterparts around the world to do all that we possibly can, including by convening the leaders of major economies for a climate summit within my first 100 days in office,” he said. Biden promised to put the nation on a path to achieve net-zero emissions by 2050, to ensure that the shift toward cleaner energy brings new U.S. jobs, and to “listen to and engage closely with the activists, including young people, who have continued to sound the alarm and demand change from those in power.” Biden’s promises no doubt provided relief to many world leaders, who are eager for the United States to rejoin an effort that remains far from meeting the goals forged five years ago in Paris. But Biden may not find as warm a reception as he hopes when the United States steps back onto the global stage in 2021. Instead, he is likely to encounter a hopeful but wary world. “The U.S. has to do a lot to rebuild trust,” said Harjeet Singh, global climate lead for the advocacy group ActionAid. “It really needs to find a way to convince the world that this time, the U.S. is genuinely ready to do its share.” Many in the international community have harbored resentment about the United States’ seeming inability, or unwillingness, to live up to its lofty promises to the rest of the world when it comes to climate change. President Trump announced early in his tenure that he would withdraw the nation from the Paris accord — insisting that following through with the nonbinding pledges of the Obama era could economically disadvantage the country. But the United States has wavered even before Trump, most notably on a key global climate treaty forged in 1997, known as the Kyoto Protocol. The United States signed that global climate treaty in 1998 under the Clinton administration, but did not ratify the deal and backed away from it under President George W. Bush. Over the years, the United States has failed to hit its own emissions-cutting targets — even as overall emissions have decreased. It also has not adequately contributed to a fund meant to help vulnerable nations that have done little to cause climate change but are most affected by it. President Bill Clinton makes a statement celebrating the Kyoto Protocol on climate change on “There’s no papering it over,” John Holdren, an environmental policy professor at Harvard who served as President Barack Obama’s top science adviser, said of the loss of trust the United States has suffered internationally during the Trump era. “It’s going to involve more than just saying we are back. We are going to have to demonstrate we are back, and we are going to have to demonstrate it powerfully.”

## !—China tech scenario

### IL – Dems k2 solve

#### Only dem lead congress pushes through China tech bill that’s k2 competition

Editorial 22, 2-1-2022, "Opinion," Washington Post, https://www.washingtonpost.com/opinions/2022/02/01/democrats-want-win-tech-war-with-china-best-way-is-bolster-us-allies/

House Democrats are poised to vote this week on a massive bill designed to best China in high technology and preserve U.S. access to critical goods. The America Competes Act would direct billions into technological research and manufacturing, improving education, and stockpiling critical items such as prescription drugs and personal protective equipment. A hefty 68-to-32 majority passed a similar bill in the Senate last June, making it likely some version of this legislation will reach President Biden’s desk this year. Sign up for a weekly roundup of thought-provoking ideas and debates But many issues still need to be worked out between the chambers, and the details could make it substantially better — or much worse. The House bill would pump money into federal agencies to fund a dizzying array of research initiatives: nanoscience, quantum computing, artificial intelligence, climate technology, even biometric identification systems. The bill would also make it easier for scientists and engineers to stay in the country, a long-needed update to the nation’s irrational immigration laws. More questionable is the bill’s provision allocating $52 billion to onshore semiconductor fabrication. While the United States remains a leader in semiconductor research, the country manufactures only 12 percent of the chips that run everything from toasters to Toyotas. A recent semiconductor shortage has driven up the price of cars and other consumer goods; to many, this painful bout of inflation underlines the risk of allowing China to consolidate control over industries that the United States should consider strategic, such as chipmaking. Indeed, $52 billion may seem like too small a response to China’s recently announced $150 billion program to establish more chip production facilities inside its borders. In fact, however, the United States cannot meet China dollar for dollar, and it should not try. Much of China’s chips money will be wasted as the country tries to create artificially many of the advantages the United States already has, such as a concentration of expertise, an advanced research and development ecosystem, and the free flow of capital. Congress should double down on these advantages by funding the development of the next generation of chips that might render obsolete the ones lawmakers are currently worried about manufacturing, as other provisions of the bill would do, and cracking down on Chinese intellectual property theft. Meantime, if lawmakers are going to make chip manufacturing a top national priority, they should pursue a broader strategy. The bill’s backers argue that the United States cannot ignore the possibility that the Chinese regime will corner the market on manufacturing critical components, then use that economic power to bully the world. The best response would be to coordinate with friendly trading partners, such as the European Union, Japan, Korea and Taiwan, to ensure that sufficient manufacturing capacity remains outside China. The legislation’s proponents argue that the United States must still ensure that more chips are produced here, so that disruption in one link in the supply chain — if, for example, U.S. ports slow, as they did during the pandemic — does not cause another punishing shortage. It is not clear this risk justifies massive new onshoring subsidies. But if lawmakers are determined to approve them, they must attach substantial strings. Federal agencies should have broad authority to manage government aid — and terminate funding to failing firms. Otherwise taxpayers may get paltry returns on their investment.

#### Necessary and sufficient---now is key

Anderson 3-9-2021, Chairman & CEO of CG/LA Infrastructure, a firm focused on global infrastructure project development, driving productivity across countries, and maximizing the benefits of infrastructure for people in the U.S. and around the world (Norman, “AI & The Biden Infrastructure Plan - How To Invest In Our Future,” Forbes, <https://www.forbes.com/sites/normananderson/2021/03/09/ai-and-infrastructurethe-schmidt-report--the-wild-blue-yonder/?sh=357facf8366b>)

Last week was a bad week for democracy, and for liberty globally - but hopefully a wake-up call for all of us. The Schmidt AI Report highlighted a huge danger in how quickly we could fall behind China in AI, across the board, and - especially from my point of view - in the area of infrastructure. China’s National People’s Congress - no way to sugarcoat this - set out goals, and a confident plan, for becoming the leading economy across the board, and across the world, with average 6% growth through to the end of the decade (U.S. growth is barely 1/3 of that, and we don’t set goals anyway). To top off the week Freedom House released their annual report showing an increase in the velocity of the fifteen year decline in democracy around the world - “The malign influence of the regime in China, the world’s most populous dictatorship, was especially profound in 2020.” This is not a good set of facts. What does AI have to do with infrastructure and investment? Everything. By focusing on the digitization and electrification of infrastructure we can drive an industrial Renaissance, turbo-charging a sustained period of productivity growth and opportunity creation. The best way to start is to unleash an AI mini moonshot on infrastructure by opening up the sector’s investment potential: addressing regulation (speed, transparency), so that great projects can be approved quickly; identifying best practices, so that the death valley of construction risk is minimized, or obliterated; and highlighting priority brownfield projects - digitizing and electrifying the $33 trillion in invested assets (the interstate highway system, our transmission network, our ports and waterways) - so that we finally put our industrial commons in a position to compete globally. From Infrastructure to Neuralstructure. In my book, Vision - Our Strategic Infrastructure Roadmap Forward, I highlight this shift from physical infrastructure - roads, bridges, power plants as foundational to our productivity - to something that might be called ‘neuralstructure,’ in which 5G, AI and Machine Learning create an end to end, coast to coast, logistics network - the brains enabling a new era of economic productivity. This is where our attention, our dollars and our innovation should go This injection of intelligence into everything from roads to transmission networks, in which these networks become the brains of the economy, also means - quite obviously - that new infrastructure investment is no longer a supporting investment, but a first order strategic priority. This in turn means that the way we think about that investment needs to leapfrog past the way we thought about it in the past. This has already happened in most industries, of course - we don’t even think about all of the intelligence behind banking, or consumer advertising. Now this change is coming to the physical world - it’s going to happen fast, and it will easily be the biggest economic shift in 120 years. One of the quickest bangs for our buck is investment in a new logistics system. This is a $12 trillion global market - and sized at $2 trillion in the the U.S. By electrifying and digitizing our highways, we enable local distributed and advanced manufacturing - the industrial equivalent of farm to table. We also create an industrial logic that makes deep environmental sense, bringing manufacturing (and well-paying jobs) back home rather than shuttling goods back and forth across the Pacific. Panasonic’s March 8th purchase, for $6.5 billion, of the software logistics firm Blue Yonder gives you a glimpse of how quickly industry will embrace this potential - as long as we quickly make progress on the right infrastructure investments. It can’t continue to take 9.5 years to approve a new smart highway - how do we get things done with 2030 as the outside of the envelope? Here are three priorities that can focus this effort: Priority 1 - Focus on Strategic Projects/Mini Moonshots. Above all, we have to get moving - waiting for a $3-4 trillion infrastructure bill, based on tax increases, is meager gruel for a great country. A series of mini moonshots, focused on strategic advances, will build our confidence, build trust between the public and private sectors, and create real capacity. Here are three candidates: Arizona’s Technology Highway, uniting Reno and Las Vegas - and the Port of Oakland and the Port of LA/Long Beach; The Great Basin Logistics Project, creating an integrated rail, highway and airport corridor around greater Chicago; and the Autonomy Institute’s plan to create 5G-enabled autonomous truck lanes on the 50,000 miles of the U.S. Interstate Highway System. Think of what this would do for people’s investment plans - and for our country’s confidence! Utilizing U.S. Pension Funds for Infrastructure Investment Growth of U.S. Pension Fund Assets STATISTA Priority 2 - Unleash Investment. Right now it is difficult to bring pension fund or other private investments to priority projects, since nobody knows a) how long the approval process will take, b) whether it will be interrupted capriciously, and c) whether someone will throw a wrench into the process even after that happens. You cannot overestimate the chilling effect that the pre-digital and easily manipulated approvals process has on investors. At the same time, we have a powerful public/private opportunity: Privately, our $32 trillion in pension fund assets (projected to exceed $55 trillion in ten years) can be quickly brought to bear on a robust pipeline of key projects; Publicly, we have enormous available resources support these investments, including from the Department of Commerce (a revitalized Economic Development Administration); the Department of Transportation (TIFIA, and the Build America Bureau); and the Department of Energy (especially the loan guarantee program). Priority 3 - Use Muscle Memory. A great strength is that the U.S. has navigated through turbulence and uncertainty in the past - our national identify is defined by these successes. We know we are good at this, and need to build a vision for the future based on these successes: launching a new economy in 1900, navigating the transition to automobiles and airplanes; rebuilding an economy in the 1930’s, recovering from economic collapse to win a war; and doing something extraordinary in the 1960’s, erasing economic uncertainty by galvanizing the pride of an entire country around the Apollo moon mission. A Hinge Moment in History. This is a hinge moment in history, and one that - with the right vision, bringing us all together - can take us to the Promised Land. It feels a lot like what 1901 must have felt like (this is easy to say, of course, since no-one alive knows what that felt like): a moment of great promise, tremendous dislocation, huge optimism. I am optimistic, but concerned.... Two things have to happen if we are going to mobilize our country to effectively create the next great American economy. First, we have to recognize that new infrastructure is a first order issue, and create a predictable pipeline of projects so that investment - especially pension fund investment - can take place efficiently, and as cheaply as possible. Getting this right is clearly a national security priority as well - nobody ever built a secure economy on a weak economy. Second, we live in a Madisonian Republic, and along with technocratic leadership driving industrial strategy and direction, we need active and engaged Congressional involvement, and that will involve the return of earmarks - there is nothing wrong with that, it is how democracy actually works.

### !---Chinese Tech lead Bad

#### Chinese control of tech governance leads to extinction

Jain 19, senior fellow with the Scowcroft Center for Strategy and Security, where he oversees the Atlantic Council’s Democratic Order Initiative and D10 Strategy Forum; and Matthew Kroenig, deputy director for strategy in the Scowcroft Center for Strategy and Security and associate professor of government and foreign service at Georgetown University (Ash, “Present at the Re-Creation: A Global Strategy for Revitalizing, Adapting, and Defending a Rules-Based International System,” *Atlantic Council*, <https://www.atlanticcouncil.org/wp-content/uploads/2019/10/Present-at-the-Recreation.pdf>)

The system must also be adapted to deal with new issues that were not envisioned when the existing order was designed. Foremost among these issues is emerging and disruptive technology, including AI, additive manufacturing (or 3D printing), quantum computing, genetic engineering, robotics, directed energy, the Internet of things (IOT), 5G, space, cyber, and many others. Like other disruptive technologies before them, these innovations promise great benefits, but also carry serious downside risks. For example, AI is already resulting in massive efficiencies and cost savings in the private sector. Routine tasks and other more complicated jobs, such as radiology, are already being automated. In the future, autonomous weapons systems may go to war against each other as human soldiers remain out of harm’s way. Yet, AI is also transforming economies and societies, and generating new security challenges. Automation will lead to widespread unemployment. The final realization of driverless cars, for example, will put out of work millions of taxi, Uber, and long-haul truck drivers. Populist movements in the West have been driven by those disaffected by globalization and technology, and mass unemployment caused by automation will further grow those ranks and provide new fuel to grievance politics. Moreover, some fear that autonomous weapons systems will become “killer robots” that select and engage targets without human input, and could eventually turn on their creators, resulting in human extinction. The other technologies on this lisgt similarly balance great potential upside with great downside risk. 3D printing, for example, can be used to “make anything anywhere,” reducing costs for a wide range of manufactured goods and encouraging a return of local manufacturing industries.61 At the same time, advanced 3D printers can also be used by revisionist and rogue states to print component parts for advanced weapons systems or even WMD programs, spurring arms races and weapons proliferation.62 Genetic engineering can wipe out entire classes of disease through improved medicine, or wipe out entire classes of people through genetically engineered superbugs. Directed-energy missile defenses may defend against incoming missile attacks, while also undermining global strategic stability. Perhaps the greatest risk to global strategic stability from new technology, however, comes from the risk that revisionist autocracies may win the new tech arms race. Throughout history, states that have dominated the commanding heights of technological progress have also dominated international relations. The United States has been the world’s innovation leader from Edison’s light bulb to nuclear weapons and the Internet. Accordingly, stability has been maintained in Europe and Asia for decades because the United States and its democratic allies possessed a favorable economic and military balance of power in those key regions. Many believe, however, that China may now have the lead in the new technologies of the twenty-first century, including AI, quantum, 5G, hypersonic missiles, and others. If China succeeds in mastering the technologies of the future before the democratic core, then this could lead to a drastic and rapid shift in the balance of power, upsetting global strategic stability, and the call for a democratic- led, rules-based system outlined in these pages.63

#### Chinese tech norm-creation leads to extinction

Jain 19, senior fellow with the Scowcroft Center for Strategy and Security, where he oversees the Atlantic Council’s Democratic Order Initiative and D10 Strategy Forum; and Matthew Kroenig, deputy director for strategy in the Scowcroft Center for Strategy and Security and associate professor of government and foreign service at Georgetown University (Ash, “Present at the Re-Creation: A Global Strategy for Revitalizing, Adapting, and Defending a Rules-Based International System,” <https://www.atlanticcouncil.org/wp-content/uploads/2019/10/Present-at-the-Recreation.pdf>)

This international system, while not perfect, has proven to be more successful than any in human history at providing security, economic prosperity, and freedom. The evidence of this is apparent in the numbers. Before 1945, major powers frequently engaged in direct warfare on a massive scale, as in the Napoleonic Wars, World War I, and World War II. Since 1945, however, there have been zero great-power wars. As shown in Figure 1, the percentage of people killed in armed conflict has drastically declined in the post-World War II era. Armed conflict killed an average of 1–2 percent of the human population from 1600 to 1945. During the Cold War, an average of 0.4 percent of the world’s population perished due to war. Since the year 2000, less than one one-hundredth of 1 percent of people have died this way.8 Under a rules-based system, the world has continued to make progress in reducing deaths from all kinds of war, including often-intractable civil conflicts.9 Turning to economic prosperity, the global gross domestic product (GDP) per capita in 1945 was $4,079.10 Today it is $11,570.11 This drastic increase in global living standards is evident in Figure 2. The share of the global population living in poverty has dramatically decreased. In 1929, the number of people living in extreme poverty (defined as earning less than 1.90 international dollars per day) was 1.35 billion, almost two-thirds of the world population at the time. In 2015, that figure was 733.48 million, or slightly less than 10 percent of the world population.12 China itself has been one of the biggest beneficiaries of this system, as geopolitical stability in Asia and integration into the global economy helped to lift four hundred million Chinese out of poverty. In the realm of good governance, the number of democracies has substantially increased. With the end of World War II and decolonization, the number of democracies increased from seventeen to forty-eight between 1945 and 1989.13 That number further skyrocketed at the end of the Cold War, as countries formerly behind the Iron Curtain rushed to join the West. In the year 1900, there were twelve democracies in the world. Today there are ninety-six.14 The percentage of the world’s population living under democratic governments has also increased from about 12 percent in 1900 to more than 55 percent today.15 This trend is visible in Figure 3. To be sure, these outcomes are the result of an enormous and interconnected range of factors. International-relations scholars, for example, believe that nuclear deterrence and the absence of a multipolar distribution of power also contributed to great-power peace.16 In addition, globalization and economic development have been fueled by new technological developments. Further, global norms on democratic governance and human rights have come a long way since the early twentieth century.17 Still, it is doubtful whether this dramatic improvement in the human condition could have been achieved in the absence of the rules-based international system. Moreover, many of these other driving forces are themselves constitutive of, if not partially the result of, that system. Global bipolarity, and then unipolarity with the United States at its center, was critical for the postwar development of a rules-based system, which may not have been possible in a more multipolar distribution of international power, or with a non-democratic hegemon at the system’s apex. The splitting of the atom could have resulted in widespread nuclear-weapons proliferation and nuclear use had it not been for the NPT and extended US nuclear deterrence in Europe and Asia.18 The most important technological advances for globalization, including the Internet, occurred and flourished in the free world, defended by the United States and its democratic allies and partners.19 Finally, the United States and its democratic partners, along with nongovernmental organizations and individuals operating in these states, were the most important norm entrepreneurs propagating global norms around issues of good governance, democracy, and human rights. In sum, the rules-based international system that has been the defining feature of global order for the past seventy years has coincided with—and was almost certainly essential in bringing about—the most secure, prosperous, and well-governed world humanity has ever known. Despite this record of unprecedented and enduring success, the rules-based international system is currently besieged by a number of challenges unleashed by rapid and dramatic global change. Understanding the current strategic context, including global trends and threats both external and internal to the system’s democratic core, is a necessary first step toward devising a strategy to revitalize, adapt, and defend a rules-based international system. Global Diffusion of Power. The international distribution of power, as defined by relative economic weight, is shifting away from the founders of the post-World War II system to other emerging economies. As recently as the 1990s, nearly 70 percent of global economic activity occurred in Europe and the Americas. By the 2040s, that number is expected to drop to roughly 40 percent. At the same time, the Asian share of global GDP will increase from 32 percent at present to 53 percent in 2050, meaning that, by that time, the majority of all economic activity on Earth will occur in Asia. While the United States remains the world’s most powerful state militarily and economically, it is declining relative to other rising powers, particularly China. When corrected for purchasing-power parity (PPP), China’s GDP has already surpassed the United States. The better metric for international power and influence, however, is real GDP; here, too, the US advantage is narrowing, but more slowly.21 At the conclusion of World War II, the United States possessed roughly 50 percent of global GDP.22 From the 1970s through today, that number has held steady at roughly 25 percent.23 Despite a common misperception, the United States’ share of global power is not declining in absolute terms. Rather, other powers—especially China—are rising. China’s share of global GDP rose from 4.6 percent in the 1990s to 15 percent today.24 Many economists predict that China could surpass the United States as the world’s largest economy by 2030. It is noteworthy, however, that in 2009, economists predicted that this transition would happen by 2020. That date has been pushed back a decade as Chinese growth has slowed. Future projections depend entirely on assumptions about growth rates in the United States and China that cannot be known with certainty. Still, most economists expect that China will, at some point, surpass the United States as the world’s largest economy. China is joined by other emerging economies with rapid growth rates, including India, Indonesia, and others. US allies, including Japan, Germany, and the United Kingdom, remain among the wealthiest nations on Earth, but their share of global power is also declining relative to the rise of the rest. This shift is significant because international orders function best when their formal attributes at least roughly reflect the underlying balance of power. While only one measure of global influence, economic power is central given the leverage it provides over trade and investment, and the resources it offers to sustain military and security advantages. It is also important to point out, however, that the United States and its formal treaty allies continue to possess a preponderance of power in the international system. As Figure 4 shows, the United States and its formal allies currently produce 59 percent of global GDP. When including other countries considered to be “democracies” by the widely used Polity scores, that number rises to 75 percent of global GDP. Democracies continue to retain global influence because more countries have transitioned to democracy since the end of the Cold War, and overall economic growth in democratic countries has outpaced that in autocratic states since 1991. The major shift since the dawn of the post-Cold War world, therefore, is not that the power of the United States and its democratic allies and partners has declined substantially. The major difference is that the share possessed by autocratic challengers, especially China, has grown. As Figure 4 shows, the world is approaching a more bipolar distribution of power, with more wealth concentrated in the democracies and in a grouping of autocratic challengers led by China. This means that, if they are able to work together more cohesively, the United States and its democratic allies and partners still have the power and influence necessary to significantly shape international outcomes. Moreover, if they are able to expand their ranks to court other nonaligned democracies like India, Indonesia, and Mexico, their influence on the international system can be even more decisive. Disruptive Technologies. New technologies—including artificial intelligence (AI), robotics, quantum computing, and biotech, among others—are being developed at an exponential pace, and have the promise to transform society. They will determine how people live and function in the twenty-first century, significantly shaping the global economy, international security, and the course of geopolitics. Throughout history, progress has been built on technological innovation, ranging from Thomas Edison’s light bulb to Henry Ford’s assembly line to the silicon chip, the personal computer, and the Internet. While new technology promises improved productivity and quality of life, it will bring serious downside risks, including economic dislocation and weapons proliferation. AI, for example, is already being widely adopted in the private sector to achieve great efficiencies and cost savings.25 At the same time, automation threatens to put millions out of work as jobs once performed by humans are replaced by machines. Moreover, AI is also being introduced into national militaries. A logical next step is fully autonomous weapons that can select and engage targets without a human in the decision-making loop. Some warn that these “killer robots” introduce many ethical and security risks, including the fear that they may turn on their creators and threaten humans’ very existence or, indeed, what it means to be human.26 Henry Kissinger warns, “We are in danger of losing the capacity that has been the essence of human cognition.”27 The existing international system was designed to deal with the most important dual-use technologies of the twentieth century, such as nuclear power, but it must be updated to deal with the technologies of the twenty-first century. As with nuclear energy, the international community needs an entirely new set of international norms, standards, and agreements for responsible uses of new technologies that mitigate their downside risks, while maximizing their upside potential. Since the time of Edison, the United States has been the world’s most innovative country, but it is at risk of losing that title to China and other countries that aim for the first-mover advantage in the next round of technological breakthroughs. Throughout history, technological progress and international leadership have gone hand in hand. Think of roads and aqueducts in ancient Rome, the steam engine in nineteenth-century Great Britain, and the Internet in the United States. If China or another country takes the lead in the new tech arms race, Beijing may be in a better position to rewrite the international system’s rules. Nuclear Proliferation. Even as the world grapples with the technological challenges of the twenty-first century, century-old technological challenges remain. The NPT may be the most successful treaty in history, but its future is uncertain. North Korea has become the only country in history to sign the treaty, withdraw, and build nuclear weapons. If North Korea is allowed to become an accepted nuclear-weapons state, it would pose a severe threat to international peace and security. Other members of the treaty may also reconsider their nuclear options. In particular, South Korea and Japan may be at risk of pursuing nuclear-weapons programs if the program in Pyongyang continues to advance and the United States is unwilling or unable to provide Seoul and Tokyo with adequate security assurances. Iran’s nuclear program was allowed to operate within strict limits according to the terms of the Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action (JCPOA), but the US withdrawal from that agreement may lead Tehran to accelerate its nuclear program or dash to achieve a nuclear weapon. A bomb in Iran could also instigate further regional nuclear proliferation.28 Officials in Saudi Arabia, for example, have declared that if Iran acquires nuclear weapons, Riyadh will follow suit. A proliferation cascade in East Asia or the Middle East would undermine the global nonproliferation regime and fuel regional insecurity. Moreover, new technologies such as additive manufacturing may make it easier for future proliferators to build nuclear-weapons programs, and harder for the international community to catch and stop them.29 The additional spread of a weapon that remains the ultimate instrument of military force could threaten the global security and stability necessary for the smooth functioning of the rules-based international system. Ecological Disaster. As with nuclear war, an ecological disaster could constitute a direct threat to humanity’s very existence. While states have made efforts to address climate change caused by carbon emissions, including in the Paris Climate Agreement, these steps will not be sufficient to keep emissions below the target levels set by leading scientific panels. Higher average global temperatures are leading to rising sea levels, drought, an increased frequency of violent storms, and forced migrations, all of which are threatening vulnerable societies, undermining already-weak national governments, and contributing to conflicts over natural resources.

#### Chinese tech leadership is existential

Rogers and Nye 19, served in Congress as a Republican representative from Michigan and is a former chairman of the House Intelligence Committee. He is now the David Abshire chair with the Center for the Study of the Presidency and Congress. Glenn Nye served in Congress as a Democratic representative from Virginia. He is now the chief executive officer and president of the Center for the Study of the Presidency and Congress (Mike and Glenn, “Why America must boldly win the technological race against China,” *The Hill*, <https://thehill.com/opinion/technology/466705-why-america-must-boldly-win-the-technological-race-against-china>)

We are in the midst of a heated global competition. The race to take leadership in advanced technologies such as artificial intelligence, quantum computing, and 5G networks will determine the future balance of geopolitical power. Where the United States and its partners once enjoyed a clear edge, that advantage can no longer be assumed. China is racing ahead at full speed and trying to steal a march on a distracted United States in order to claim unrivaled technology leadership during the 21st century. We cannot afford to lose this critical competition. The Chinese model for achieving technological superiority is a clear and present danger. Through a sheltered domestic market, forced technology transfers by Western companies, outright industrial espionage, and intellectual property theft, China is forging technology champions designed to compete with and surpass their international competitors. Through legal mandates that force corporate cooperation with security and intelligence organs, Chinese technology companies serve as the eyes and ears of Beijing in a digital global economy. This model appeals to despots around the world, while cheap prices appeal to everyone else. Make no mistake of the existential stakes as to whether open societies or authoritarian regimes will set the course of the technological future.
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#### Dems winning midterms allows for renegotiating bills to solve for the looming recession

Tony Romm 22, 6-27-2022, "Democrats race to revive economic package as inflation spikes," Washington Post, https://www.washingtonpost.com/us-policy/2022/06/27/manchin-schumer-build-back-better/

With inflation on the rise and the threat of a recession looming, congressional Democrats are scrambling to revive their long-stalled economic spending package, hoping to deliver relief to Americans whose finances have soured during months of political bickering. When Democrats last tried to advance the party’s $2 trillion initiative in December, hoping to overhaul the nation’s health-care, education, climate and tax laws, the economy seemed to be booming: Stocks traded high, gas prices were low and lawmakers saw an opening to advance the measure then known as the Build Back Better Act. More than six months later, however, the economy has shifted considerably. Along with Russia’s invasion of Ukraine and another resurgence of the coronavirus, the nation faces soaring costs for housing, gasoline, groceries and other goods, all made worse by the specter of another downturn. The economic peril has fueled new urgency on Capitol Hill, where Democrats hope to resolve their differences, re-craft their agenda and deliver before fall on at least some of the promises they made in the last election. “It’s essential to do because it responds to pocketbook concerns right now — financial concerns right now, it moves to cut costs right now — and it also lays the foundation for these smarter approaches for the future,” said Sen. Ron Wyden (D-Ore.), the leader of the tax-focused Senate Finance Committee. How the White House lost Joe Manchin, and its plan to transform America The chief obstacle remains Sen. Joe Manchin III (D-W.Va.), a moderate whose opposition last year scuttled President Biden’s agenda. Manchin has huddled privately and repeatedly with Senate Majority Leader Charles E. Schumer (D-N.Y.) in recent weeks, as Democrats labor anew to secure his must-have vote on a scaled-back bill that they hope to bring to the floor in July. Manchin has remained steadfast in his belief that the U.S. government should spend less, and raise more, than others in his party prefer. Increasingly, Democrats believe they will end up with a package far smaller in scope than they first envisioned — one focused on lowering prescription drug prices and combating climate change, with spending financed through changes to tax laws that also cut the deficit. But many of the key details are still unresolved, generating fresh discomfort among lawmakers. In a sign of the lingering schisms, a broadly supported attempt to lower the price of health insurance by extending subsidies under the Affordable Care Act remains at risk of falling out of the package entirely. The loss of those tax credits could result in premium increases for millions of Americans next year. The delays and doubts have only compounded Democrats’ frustrations after they had to abandon plans to lessen the price of housing, make child care more affordable and push the development of energy sources that can be alternatives to expensive gas — ideas, they say, that might have made a difference with a potential recession on the horizon. “You know how strongly I felt about Build Back Better as we passed it. … None of that has changed,” said Rep. Pramila Jayapal (D-Wash.), the leader of the left-leaning Congressional Progressive Caucus. “What I also know is that we desperately need to deliver on some big policies immediately. “Much to my chagrin, we have one person that didn’t want to vote for the deal that had been agreed to, but we need that one person,” she added. “We need to pass the maximum we can pass that’s going to make a real difference for people.” For Democrats, the economic challenges are immense as a slow-motion crisis comes into view. This year, inflation has reached a nearly half-century high, and gas prices in particular have soared due to geopolitical instability. The Dow Jones industrial average, meanwhile, has lost more than 5,000 points since the start of the year, part of a broad market slump that has hit even the once-burgeoning tech industry hard. Hoping to cool a hot economy, the Federal Reserve has responded aggressively in recent weeks with steep interest rate increases. That may eventually bring prices down, but only after making mortgages and other borrowing more expensive for Americans. Higher rates could also slow a hiring boom brought about by trillions of dollars in federal stimulus spending over the past two years, some under Biden’s watch. The situation didn’t seem as dire last year, when Democrats last tried to advance their agenda. Many in the party saw their proposed spending as a way to shore up the economy — offering financial help to Americans already grappling with high costs in the wake of the pandemic. But Manchin argued then that the economic package would add to the debt and worsen inflation. Although the House passed its $2 trillion version of the measure in November, the Senate ultimately concluded the year without even holding a vote. Since then, Democrats have insisted they are not giving up, even as time begins to run out. They have about three months to broker the sort of compromise that has eluded them for more than a year; otherwise, they may lose the ability to adopt the bill under a special legislative tactic that allows them to bypass a GOP filibuster in the Senate. To speed up their efforts, the party’s lawmakers are already huddling with the Senate’s parliamentarian, hoping to ensure their final package works within the confines of the process known as reconciliation, according to two people familiar with the matter, who spoke on the condition of anonymity to describe the talks. Speaking to reporters Wednesday, Schumer stressed after his latest meeting with Manchin that they are having “very good and productive discussions, but there are still some issues that have to be resolved.” Sam Runyon, a spokesman for Manchin, added in a statement that the senator “continues to engage in respectful conversations about the best way to move our country forward but is still seriously concerned about harmful inflation taxes hurting Americans and our nation’s lack of energy security.” Democrats scramble to resurrect ‘chunks’ of $2 trillion spending plan backed by Biden In the meantime, though, the stakes in their deliberations have grown exponentially higher. The party now faces an even tougher balancing act as it looks to whittle down a roughly $2 trillion package in a way that lowers costs, satisfies Manchin’s whims and shores up the economy — without making inflation worse. “Anything that Congress does that adds to inflation will lead to more interest rate increases,” said Jason Furman, an economist at Harvard University who previously advised President Barack Obama. “Anything Congress does to take the pressure off inflation will consequently lead the Fed not to raise interest rates as much. This is much more of an interaction between fiscal and monetary policy than one would have expected a year ago.” Some of the ideas Democrats initially proposed might have offered more of a direct, immediate financial reprieve from rising prices — including, for example, restoring expanded monthly tax credit payments to families with children. The pandemic-era program expired last year partly because Manchin objected to renewing it, which economists say has cut deeply into families’ finances and raised the risks of child poverty. “If you expanded the child tax credit the way we did … wouldn’t that help families pay for child care, for prescription drugs, for school supplies for kids?” asked Rep. Rosa L. DeLauro (D-Conn.), a leading advocate for the tax credit and the chairwoman of the House Appropriations Committee. Democrats had also proposed more than $166 billion to construct new homes and help low-income Americans pay their rents and mortgages in the original Build Back Better Act. That would have marked the largest-ever federal investment in housing affordability, clinching what might have been a key policy before rental prices reached record highs in some major cities. “There’s no part of the country that has enough affordable homes for families to buy or rent,” said Sen. Sherrod Brown (D-Ohio), the leader of the Senate Banking Committee, which helped craft the provision. “If we want to address the costs that are weighing families down, we have to tackle the shortage of quality, affordable homes.” But those ideas long ago fell out of the discussions on Capitol Hill, frustrating many Democrats, who have come to acknowledge their final bill may offer only limited relief for families — no free prekindergarten, no rebates for child care, no aid for elder care, no paid family and medical leave. While DeLauro, Brown and others pledged to continue pushing, party leaders broadly have resigned themselves to securing whatever deal they can with Manchin. “I think there’s great support still for some of the key elements of the package, especially some of the elements that reduce costs for consumers,” said Sen. Chris Van Hollen (D-Md.), a top lawmaker on the chamber’s appropriations panel. But Van Hollen acknowledged that Congress and the economy are “not where we were months ago, and getting something important now is better than getting nothing.” Fed chair acknowledges that higher interest rates could cause a recession Democrats do still believe they can secure prescription drug pricing revisions, empowering the government to negotiate some costs on behalf of Medicare beneficiaries. Wyden, who helped craft the provision, said that alone would help seniors who are “getting clobbered at the pharmacy counter just as they’re getting clobbered at the gas station.” An earlier version of the proposal also would have saved the government about $160 billion, according to estimates at the time. But some other health-care initiatives remain in doubt. That includes an existing federal program that lowers insurance costs for millions of Americans who purchase coverage through national health exchanges. These expanded subsidies under the Affordable Care Act are set to expire at the end of the year. Yet Democrats so far have not been able to strike a deal with Manchin to preserve them, according to three people familiar with the matter who spoke on the condition of anonymity to describe the talks. The sources cited Manchin’s broader cost concerns as a key reason for the trouble, especially since he has rejected past Democratic attempts to proffer short-term extensions in a bid to save money. Manchin publicly has expressed mixed views on the idea, at times citing the need to restrict any benefits to lower-income Americans. Without action, however, roughly 13 million Americans could see higher premiums in 2023. The prospect prompted some Democrats this week to redouble their calls for action, with House Majority Leader Steny H. Hoyer (D-Md.) telling reporters on a call Thursday that the provision “must be included” in any Senate deal. “Inflation is causing great shock at the pump and in the grocery store,” Hoyer added. “We must not let the cost of health care go up as well when we have the power to stop that from happening.”

#### Prolonged decline causes great power war

**Sandaram 19** [Jomo Kwame Sundaram, a former economics professor, was United Nations Assistant Secretary-General for Economic Development, and received the Wassily Leontief Prize for Advancing the Frontiers of Economic Thought, and Vladimir Popov is a Research Director at the Dialogue of Civilizations Research Institute in Berlin, “Economic Crisis Can Trigger World War,” Feb 12, 2019, http://www.ipsnews.net/2019/02/economic-crisis-can-trigger-world-war/]

Economic recovery efforts since the 2008-2009 global financial crisis have mainly depended on unconventional monetary policies. As fears rise of yet another international financial crisis, there are growing concerns about the increased possibility of large-scale military conflict. More worryingly, in the current political landscape, prolonged economic crisis, combined with rising economic inequality, chauvinistic ethno-populism as well as aggressive jingoist rhetoric, including threats, could easily spin out of control and ‘morph’ into military conflict, and worse, world war. Crisis responses limited The 2008-2009 global financial crisis almost ‘bankrupted’ governments and caused systemic collapse. Policymakers managed to pull the world economy from the brink, but soon switched from counter-cyclical fiscal efforts to unconventional monetary measures, primarily ‘quantitative easing’ and very low, if not negative real interest rates. But while these monetary interventions averted realization of the worst fears at the time by turning the US economy around, they did little to address underlying economic weaknesses, largely due to the ascendance of finance in recent decades at the expense of the real economy. Since then, despite promising to do so, policymakers have not seriously pursued, let alone achieved, such needed reforms. Instead, ostensible structural reformers have taken advantage of the crisis to pursue largely irrelevant efforts to further ‘casualize’ labour markets. This lack of structural reform has meant that the unprecedented liquidity central banks injected into economies has not been well allocated to stimulate resurgence of the real economy. From bust to bubble Instead, easy credit raised asset prices to levels even higher than those prevailing before 2008. US house prices are now 8% more than at the peak of the property bubble in 2006, while its price-to-earnings ratio in late 2018 was even higher than in 2008 and in 1929, when the Wall Street Crash precipitated the Great Depression. As monetary tightening checks asset price bubbles, another economic crisis — possibly more severe than the last, as the economy has become less responsive to such blunt monetary interventions — is considered likely. A decade of such unconventional monetary policies, with very low interest rates, has greatly depleted their ability to revive the economy. The implications beyond the economy of such developments and policy responses are already being seen. Prolonged economic distress has worsened public antipathy towards the culturally alien — not only abroad, but also within. Thus, another round of economic stress is deemed likely to foment unrest, conflict, even war as it is blamed on the foreign.

### I/L – Inflation

#### Unchecked inflation---triggers a Deep recession

Tully 11-3-2021, citing William Luther, an economics professor at Florida Atlantic University (Shawn, "The Fed has two options on inflation—and neither are pretty", *Fortune*, <https://fortune.com/2021/11/03/fed-inflation-recession-forecast/>)

The two possible scenarios for inflation

The longer market participants view the big numbers arriving month after month, the more they'll lose faith that the Fed's committed to doing what's necessary to conquer inflation. The Fed could quell the outbreak now by raising rates and otherwise modestly tightening its monetary grip, notes William Luther, an economics professor at Florida Atlantic University. But the central bank isn't moving. Although Fed-watchers expect the central bank to hike rates twice next year, those actions would simply mark the close of its super-stimulative stance, maintained to counter the pandemic. So far, the Fed's shown no intention of taking tough measures to slow jack rabbit prices. "Instead, all companies and consumers are witnessing is rising inflation when the CPI reports each month, and the Fed saying nothing about fighting it," says Luther. "If prices keep increasing at the current clip, producers will start baking expectations of higher inflation into their wage and procurement contracts." Those locked-in escalators will give the hot streak legs.

If strong inflation takes hold, Luther predicts, the Fed will face two options, both bad for the economy and stocks. "The first is that the Fed 'sticks to its guns' by pledging to wrestle the price trend back to 2%, and because it's waited so long, must radically contract credit to get there," say Luther. That course would cause a deep recession, pounding bonds and equities. In the second course, the Fed would simply accept and perpetuate the today's higher inflation as a new normal. "The market participants would be expecting 3% inflation, and the Fed would meet those expectations by delivering 3% inflation," says Luther. The appeal of taking that path: It would avoid an immediate recession. "The first 'stick to your guns' solution would be require such a steep downturn because the Fed delayed getting tough for so long," says Luther. "It might take the second option because the harder something is to do, the the less likely the Fed is to do it." Punting carries a cost. The central bank would be scrapping its longstanding, 2% goal, and adopting a new stance of tolerating high inflation to sidestep a recession. "That would greatly increase uncertainty for consumers, producers and investors," says Luther. "They'd worry that the Fed is no longer credible, that it could let inflation get out of control."

#### Tolerating inflation shatters growth

Tully 11-3-2021, citing William Luther, an economics professor at Florida Atlantic University (Shawn, "The Fed has two options on inflation—and neither are pretty", *Fortune*, <https://fortune.com/2021/11/03/fed-inflation-recession-forecast/>)

Or, the Fed could take the low road and skirt the agony of a hard times. But embracing inflation of 3%-or-higher creates its own set of problems. Suppliers would avoid long-term contracts that provide their clients certainty on their future input costs. "Those suppliers would stand to lose money if they committed to multi-year contracts, and inflation raised their costs a lot more than they anticipated," says Luther. The bigger worry: America would become a far riskier place to do business, chiefly because consumers, companies and investors could no longer rely on the Fed to keep purchasing power steady, a pillar of our economic might. More uncertainty raises the "equity risk premium," the extra investors are willing to pay for stocks over super-safe Treasuries. A rising ERP means lower multiples, and lower equity prices. "If the Fed permits higher inflation to avoid recession, we know that it conducts policy not the way it promised, but the way it sees fit at the moment," says Luther. If the Fed's gone this far, market participants will fret, who knows if it will allow inflation to race even faster?

### Turns China

#### Failure to prevent economic collapse guarantees US-China war

Tkacik, 20 (Michael Tkacik, professor of government and director of the School of Honors at Stephen F Austin State University in Texas, 4-21-2020, accessed on 11-12-2020, Asia Times, "Ingredients in place for new great power war", <https://asiatimes.com/2020/04/ingredients-in-place-for-new-great-power-war/>)

The events leading to war in 1939 included a sharp division between the wealthy and everyone else, economic catastrophe in the Great Depression, sharp reductions in global trade, a breakdown in international cooperation, and the end of liberal governance in much of the world. Once again, these variables are present. Even before the Covid-19 pandemic, trade was decreasing and beggar-thy-neighbor economic policies had become the norm. It might be tempting to place this blame on Trump, but he was elected by people in his country who have suffered 40 years of criminal economic competition from China. It is no wonder they elected Trump and it is no wonder he undermined a global trade system that has failed America’s working class. Similarly, evidence of the breakdown of international cooperation and liberalism are everywhere. The world is unable to deal with the existential threat of climate change. Authoritarian regimes have seats on the UN Human Rights Council. There is a great and increasing gap between the wealthy and everyone else, a new Gilded Age. Liberalism, unable to cope, is in retreat everywhere, from the US and the UK to fledgling democracies in Eastern Europe and Latin America. Our world is gravely ill. Pandemic Into this morass we stir a global pandemic, with its origin in a corrupt, authoritarian state that is hostile to openness, human dignity and truth. That China denied and then exported the pandemic was as predictable as it is lamentable. The pandemic will bring a global economic depression, the only variable from World War II not present today. We should expect more governments to fall, we should expect liberalism to retreat further, and we should expect increased nationalism and violence upon our own species. In short, we are in for dark days. Dictators attempt to divert the attention of their people from corruption and injustice by seeking external enemies. Wars will therefore increase, and status quo powers such as the United States may attempt to defend a crumbling system. The chance of war between China and the United States has increased dramatically because almost all of the structural variables today point toward war. Both World War I and II were avoidable because different variables were present. Consequently, had skilled leadership been present, each war might have been avoided by correctly diagnosing the causes of the impending crises. That the wars were not avoided does not mean they could not have been; it simply means leadership was not up to the task. But today the causes of both of those wars have been combined in a single cauldron. So it is reasonable to ask, even with good leadership (of which there is no doubt we are lacking), can great-power war be avoided?
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### UQ – House

#### **The GOP has an 87% chance of winning the House**

Silver 6/30 – Nate Silver is the founder and editor in chief of FiveThirtyEight and the author of “The Signal and the Noise: Why So Many Predictions Fail — But Some Don’t.”, 6-30-2022, "Why Republicans Are Favored To Win The House, But Not The Senate," FiveThirtyEight, https://fivethirtyeight.com/features/why-republicans-are-favored-to-win-the-house-but-not-the-senate/

Republicans have an 87 percent chance of taking over the House, according to the Deluxe version of our model. That’s far from certain, but Democrats are fighting the odds: Their 13 percent chances are equivalent to tossing a coin and having it come up tails three times in a row. Ball-swarm (or bee-swarm) chart showing which party wins control of the House in 100 sample outcomes from our Deluxe model’s 40,000 simulations, where Democrats have a 13 percent chance of winning the chamber and Republicans have a 87 percent chance. That’s not to say House control will be a matter of luck, exactly. A change in the political environment could have ripple effects. For instance, sometimes one party wins nearly all the toss-up races, as Republicans did in 2020. However, even if Democrats were to win all 13 races that our model currently designates as “toss-ups” (meaning that no party has more than a 60 percent chance of winning), plus hold on to all the seats in which they’re favored, they would still wind up with only 208 seats, 10 short of the number they need for a majority. Instead, Democrats will also have to win some seats where Republican candidates are currently favored, and that requires the national political environment in November to be more favorable for Democrats than our model is currently expecting. On the one hand, the task isn’t that daunting for Democrats. Our model calculates that Democrats would be favored to keep the House if they win the House popular vote — or lose it by less than 0.7 percentage points — something that Democrats did in both 2018 and 2020. Moreover, Democrats are down by only about 2 points in our current average of generic-ballot polls. Given the inherent error in polling, and how much time there is between now and November, it isn’t hard to turn a 2-point deficit in the polls into a 1-point win. However, in important ways, that 2-point deficit understates the degree of trouble that Democrats are in. One reason is because many of those polls are conducted among registered voters rather than likely voters, and the electorate that turns out in November is likely to be more Republican than the broader universe of all registered voters. Historically, the patterns in midterm elections are that: 1) Republicans turn out more than Democrats, and 2) voters for whichever party doesn’t control the presidency are more enthusiastic and turn out more. In 2018, those factors canceled one another out. Democrats, not controlling the presidency, were the more enthusiastic party, helping to neutralize the Republicans’ historical turnout advantage. This year, though, they both work in the favor of Republicans. Thus, the model adjusts those registered-voter polls based on its estimate of what likely-voter polls would show, and when it does that, the Republicans’ generic-ballot lead is really more like 4 points than 2 points. I should note that this adjustment is not rigid in the model. Although the model uses historical turnout patterns as its baseline assumption, it will override that based on polls. In other words, if polls come out showing Democrats holding their own among likely voters — such as because of increased Democratic enthusiasm in the wake of Roe being overturned — the model will adjust to reflect that. Put another way, a very strong turnout would give Democrats a fighting chance of keeping the House. But also, the generic ballot isn’t the only input that the model considers, and some of the other factors look worse for Democrats than the generic ballot does. Based on the historical tendency for the president’s party to lose seats in the midterms and Biden’s poor approval rating, for instance, the situation is more likely to get worse for Democrats than better. The model also evaluates factors such as polling and fundraising data in individual races. Overall, the Deluxe forecast expects Democrats to eventually lose the popular vote for the House by closer to 6 points, about the margin that they lost it by in 2014. And it expects Republicans to wind up with 237 seats in an average outcome, a gain of 24 seats from the 213 they had at the start of the current Congress.2 Histogram of each party’s seat count in scenarios where it wins the House in our Deluxe model’s 40,000 simulations, where Republicans have an 80 percent chance of holding between 215 and 259 seats. As I mentioned, this analysis is based on the Deluxe version of our model, which accounts for polling, “fundamentals” — or factors such as fundraising and incumbency — and expert race ratings such as those put out by the Cook Political Report. The Classic version of our model, which leaves out the expert ratings — sacrificing the additional accuracy they add but sticking to purely quantitative factors — tells a similar story, with Democrats also having a 12 percent chance of keeping the House. The Lite version of our model, meanwhile, which tries to forecast as much as it can based on polls alone, does paint a more optimistic picture for Democrats, giving them a 22 percent chance of keeping the House. But that version leaves out a lot of useful information, especially given that there isn’t much polling in a number of competitive House races.

### Uq – republicans win

#### Republicans regain support to win despite current tensions

Palmer 7/8 [Ewan Palmer, Palmer is a Newsweek reporter based in the London bureau. He joined the company in February 2018 after spending several years working at the International Business Times U.K, where he predominantly reported on crime, politics and current affairs, “Republicans' Best Case Scenario for the Midterms”, Newsweek, July 8 2022, https://www.newsweek.com/gop-midterms-house-senate-democrats-best-case-trump-abortion-1722650]//RA

With exactly four months [until the midterms](https://www.newsweek.com/topic/midterms), it is still the [Republican Party](https://www.newsweek.com/topic/republican-party) who is expected to come out on top in November.

Historically, the party controlling the White House is the one that loses the most seats in the first midterm election of its administration, a fact that doesn't bode well for President [Joe Biden](https://www.newsweek.com/topic/joe-biden).

With [rising inflation](https://www.newsweek.com/topic/inflation), record-breaking [gas prices](https://www.newsweek.com/federal-gas-tax-holiday-isnt-relief-americans-truly-need-opinion-1721989) and [Biden's continuously low approval ratings,](https://www.newsweek.com/joe-biden-approval-rating-worse-donald-trump-this-stage-presidency-midterms-1720688) it has been long predicted that the [Democrats](https://www.newsweek.com/topic/democrats) will see particularly heavy losses this year, raising the potential of them losing majority power of both the House and the [Senate](https://www.newsweek.com/topic/senate) to the GOP.

However, there have been significant developments just in the past few weeks which may drastically alter how people vote, including the [ongoing January 6 hearings surrounding Donald Trump](https://www.newsweek.com/donald-trump-jan6-cassidy-hutchinson-testimony-capitol-1720510), and the [Supreme Court](https://www.newsweek.com/topic/supreme-court) vote to overturn *Roe v. Wade*, triggering abortion bans and severe restriction in several states across the country.

With several weeks still to go before the polls open, a number of experts have suggested what the realistic best case scenario for the GOP is, given the current political and economic climate.

Sean Freeder, an assistant professor of political science at the University of North Florida, suggested that out of more than 450 congressional elections, only around six to 10 Senate races and 30-40 congressional House seats are competitive.

While Freeder expects the GOP to easily regain control of the House, it may be more difficult for the party to take the Senate because of what he calls "a slate of weak Republican candidates" such as [Mehmet Oz](https://www.newsweek.com/equality-deleted-mehmet-ozs-juneteenth-post-truth-social-1717218) in Pennsylvania, [Herschel Walker in Georgia](https://www.newsweek.com/herschel-walker-says-there-are-52-us-states-while-slamming-stacey-abrams-1718306), and hopefuls in Arizona and Wisconsin.

"It will ultimately come down to framing by each party. Democrats want this election to be a referendum on Trump and the Dobbs decision. [Republicans](https://www.newsweek.com/topic/republicans) want this election to be a referendum on Biden and the economy," Freeder told *Newsweek*.

"Best case scenario for Republicans: Young and/or leftist voters, disillusioned, stay home, and independents focus on inflation and the concern of a looming recession. Republicans sweep the winnable Senate seats, giving them 54-46 control of the Senate, and a 40 seat advantage in the House.

"It would then be virtually impossible for Democrats to then pass any major legislation in the period prior to the 2024 election."

Dr. Bernard Tamas, associate professor of political science at Valdosta State University, also suggested that the best case scenario for Republicans would be winning around 50 seats in the House, but only gain around four or five seats in the Senate.

"Flipping 10 seats in the Senate seems out of rea ch, which means that the Republicans are unlikely to gain a [filibuster proof](https://www.newsweek.com/manchin-sinema-critics-say-gop-will-end-filibuster-anyway-ban-abortion-1721215) majority," Tamas told*Newsweek.*

"Since the Republicans tend to vote as a bloc (much more than Democrats), and since having a total of 60 seats in the Senate seems unlikely, there might not be that much difference between the Republicans doing either moderately well or extremely well against the Democrats."

However, Tamas suggested it may still be too difficult to predict how the overturning of Roe V. Wade will influence voters by the time of the midterms, despite polls suggesting a [majority of Americans disagree with the decision.](https://www.newsweek.com/supreme-court-overturning-roe-met-67-disapproval-among-women-poll-1719267)

"This is partially because we haven't faced a situation quite like this before, and partially because we don't know what the abortion-related politics will look like in November," he said.

"Midterm elections are heavily influenced by turnout. Anger drives up turnout, and Republicans were the angrier group up until the Dobbs decision was announced."

Dawn Teele, associate professor of political science at Johns Hopkins University's SNF Agora Institute, believes "big symbolic wins" for people who have expressed [anti-abortion views in the wake of *Roe W. Wade*](https://www.newsweek.com/roe-wade-abortion-gop-midterms-democrats-1719910)—such as Gov Greg Abbot in Texas, Walker in Georgia, and J.D Vance in Ohio, all of whom have been endorsed by Trump—would be considered a success for the GOP.

However, David Niven, a political science professor at the University of Cincinnati, believed that the best case scenario for the Republicans is a "triumph of mundane frustrations" in which people decide to vote for issues other than abortion.

"Inflation. Gas prices. Concerns about the strength of the economy. If voters make up their minds at the kitchen table while they're paying bills, Republicans could [sweep back into control of the House](https://www.newsweek.com/just-how-much-trouble-are-democrats-these-polls-give-you-clue-1721692) and the Senate—and maintain their advantage in governor's races," Niven said.

#### Dem’s can’t win—failure to pass policy on other domestic issues thump’s the internal link

Grace Panetta 22, 7-9-2022, "Democrats' priorities have crumbled under Biden and time is running out for the party to deliver before the midterms," Business Insider, https://www.businessinsider.com/why-democrats-cant-pass-bidens-agenda-2022-7

Democrats have run into several blockades in their quest to pass ambitious policy. They've hit a wall on issues such as voting rights, abortion, and climate. We took a look at Democrats' priorities and evaluated what shot they have at passage. The Refresh logo Listen to The Refresh: Insider's real-time news podcast. President Joe Biden and congressional Democrats have checked some big-ticket items off their list before the first half of his term is over. First, there was the $1.9 trillion coronavirus relief bill, followed by a bipartisan infrastructure bill, and a narrow gun safety bill that nevertheless was supported by Republicans and represented the biggest change to gun laws in 20 years. They confirmed the first Black woman to the Supreme Court, Justice Ketanji Brown Jackson. But when it comes to the 2022 midterm elections in November, it's what the party hasn't gotten done that's making the most headlines. Time and time again Democrats have had to contend with the confines of legislating in a 50-50 Senate, weighing various priorities, as well as the prominent divisions between centrists and progressives. In recent months, Democrats are increasingly questioning whether Biden is the right person to deliver on the party's promises. Time is running out on Democrats who want to deliver before the November midterms. Republicans are widely expected to win the House, which would make policymaking incredibly difficult during the last two years of Biden's term. The GOP also has a shot at winning a majority in the Senate. But there is still time for Democrats to move ahead. We reviewed each of their big policy items, why they failed, and scored (out of 5) their chance of passage before the midterms: Protester David Barrows carries a sign during a rally to press Congress to pass voting rights protections and the "Build Back Better Act," Monday, Dec. 13, 2021, in Washington. Protester David Barrows carries a sign during a rally to press Congress to pass voting rights protections and the "Build Back Better Act," Monday, Dec. 13, 2021, in Washington. Patrick Semansky/AP Voting rights & democracy reform: Biden and congressional Democrats placed passing voting rights legislation as a top agenda item in response to a years-long erosion of the Voting Rights Act at the hands of the Supreme Court, new restrictions tightening voting rights in Republican-controlled states, and President Donald Trump's brazen efforts to overturn his 2020 election loss. But Democratic leaders' soaring rhetoric came careening against the math of the 50-50 Senate and the reality of the filibuster. Neither of the bills that Senate Democrats proposed, a sweeping voting rights and campaign finance reform bill and legislation to refortify the VRA, garnered firm support from Republicans. Most GOP senators decried the measures as a federal takeover of elections and a Democratic power grab and filibustered voting rights legislation four times in 2021 and 2022. Biden expressed his frustration with the bills stalling out in a January 2022 speech in which he blasted the Senate as a "shell of its former self," saying the filibuster has been "weaponized" and "abused." "I've been having these quiet conversations with members of Congress for two months," Biden said. "I'm tired of being quiet!" After that speech, in which Biden endorsed filibuster reform to pass voting rights legislation, Schumer deployed the last-ditch tactic of calling for a vote on changing the Senate's filibuster rules via the "nuclear option," under which a simple majority of senators can vote to change the chamber's filibuster rules, in January 2022 But two Democrats — Sen. Krysten Sinema of Arizona and Sen. Joe Manchin of West Virginia — have been steadfast in their opposition to scrapping or modifying the filibuster rules, arguing that lowering the threshold to pass Democratic priorities would come back to bite their party when Republicans retake power and exacerbate partisan divisions in the chamber. The two Democrats joined all 50 Senate Republicans in shooting down Schumer's proposal to change the filibuster rules, striking the final nail in the coffin for Democrats' voting rights push. Since then, Manchin and GOP Sen. Susan Collins of Maine have been **leading a bipartisan group of senators in talks for more narrowly-targeted election reform focused on preventing partisan sabotage of elections, including modernizing and shoring up federal laws governing the counting of electoral votes and the presidential transition process. But the group has yet to announce an agreement or legislative framework with the clock ticking toward August recess**. Any legislation they do propose would fall far short of the voting rights protections Democrats want. And it could be a heavy lift to get 60 votes in the Senate and pass the House. Chances of priority passing before the midterms: 1/5 Benjamin Crump, center, the civil rights attorney representing the family of George Floyd, joined at right by NAACP President Derrick Johnson, speaks to reporters after they met with Sen. Cory Booker, D-N.J., about police reform legislation, at the Capitol in Washington, Tuesday, May 25, 2021 Benjamin Crump, center, the civil rights attorney representing the family of George Floyd, joined at right by NAACP President Derrick Johnson, speaking to reporters after they met with Sen. Cory Booker, D-N.J., about police reform legislation, at the Capitol in Washington, Tuesday, May 25, 2021 Scott J. Applewhite/AP Police reform: The May 2020 murder of George Floyd and police-inflicted killings of other Black Americans, including Daunte Wright and Breonna Taylor, sparked massive protests around the globe and reinvigorated a push to enhance accountability and overhaul standards for law enforcement at the federal level and in many states and cities. After taking office, Biden directed Congress to deliver a police reform bill to his desk by May 25, 2021, the one-year anniversary of Floyd's murder. In June 2020 and again in March 2021, the House passed **the George Floyd Justice in Policing Act**, a wide-ranging bill sponsored by Democratic Rep. Barbara Lee that would ban chokeholds and no-knock warrants for federal drug cases, require all federal law enforcement officers to wear body cameras, end qualified immunity, impose more federal oversight of police departments, and restrict access to military-grade equipment. Democratic Sen. Cory Booker and Republican Sen. Tim Scott took point on leading bipartisan negotiations to work out a version of the legislation that could earn 60 votes in the Senate. But talks officially broke down in September 2021 "after months of exhausting every possible pathway to a bipartisan deal," and securing the backing of major law enforcement unions, Booker said. The negotiations fell apart when the parties deadlocked over how far to rein in qualified immunity, the controversial legal doctrine that shields law enforcement officials from personal liability for actions they take on the job, including the use of force, that don't violate "established law." "Unfortunately, even with this law enforcement support and further compromises we offered, there was still too wide a gulf with our negotiating partners and we faced significant obstacles to securing a bipartisan deal," Booker said. Chances of priority passing before the midterms: 0/5 Sen. Elizabeth Warren, D-Mass., and Sen. Patty Murray, D-Wash., express their frustration during a news conference as the Supreme Court is poised to possibly overturn Roe v. Wade and urge President Joe Biden to use his executive authority to protect abortion rights, at the Capitol in Washington, Wednesday, June 15, 2022. Sen. Elizabeth Warren, D-Mass., and Sen. Patty Murray, D-Wash., express their frustration during a news conference as the Supreme Court is poised to possibly overturn Roe v. Wade and urge President Joe Biden to use his executive authority to protect abortion rights, at the Capitol in Washington, Wednesday, June 15, 2022. Scott J. Applewhite/AP Enshrining abortion rights nationally: On June 24, the Supreme Court overturned Roe v. Wade, a move that made abortion illegal in some states. Most congressional Democrats are in favor of a national abortion rights law, and have voted in favor of the Women's Health Protection Act. **The bill would make abortion legal in every state and undo most restrictions. It is similar to the abortion rights set out under the now-defunct Roe, though it also allows abortions after viability for undefined "health reasons." For that reason, Republicans have called it "extreme" and refused to support the legislation**. It passed the House but has already failed twice in the Senate this year. Eleven more senators would be needed to pass the legislation under the 60-vote threshold. Manchin opposes the legislation, saying it goes beyond Roe. That's why Biden calling for a filibuster carve-out on June 30 is unlikely to be effective. Manchin and Sinema remain staunchly opposed to abolishing the filibuster for any reason. Even without the filibuster, Democrats lack the 50 votes they would need to pass their bill. GOP Sens. Lisa Murkowski of Alaska and Collins both support abortion rights but say Democrats' bill has gone too far because it doesn't create moral or religious exemptions. Collins is working on a bipartisan abortion rights bill with Sen. Tim Kaine of Virginia, but one senior Democratic Senate aide told Insider that Democratic women senators and abortion rights groups say privately that they don't see the legislation going anywhere because nine Republicans would need to get onboard, "which everyone knows will never happen right now." Democrats have stressed that they want to put Republicans on the spot over the issue to draw a contrast between the parties ahead of the November midterms. Only remote possibilities exist for enshrining abortion rights nationally. One would be for some Republicans to cross over on the filibuster and on the abortion rights bill. Another would be for Democrats and Republicans to compromise on which measures they're willing to support. One former leader in the reproductive rights movement told Insider that even a limited bill, such as guaranteeing access to abortion in the first trimester, would help 90% of patients seeking to terminate pregnancies. In such a scenario, states would be allowed to raise the gestation floor if they choose. But both sides remain staunchly divided on the issue, meaning that without a supermajority in the Senate or the abolishment of the filibuster, it could remain in limbo with a patchwork of rules from state to state for years to come. Chances of priority passing before the midterms: 0/5 Job applicants fill out forms with CSC Global, left, and Skilled Staffing, right, at the 305 Second Chance Job & Resource Expo, Friday, June 10, 2022, in Miami Job applicants fill out forms with CSC Global, left, and Skilled Staffing, right, at the 305 Second Chance Job & Resource Expo, Friday, June 10, 2022, in Miami Lynn Sladky/AP The economy and climate: The Democratic record on the economy is a mixed one. The party's enormous legislative ambitions to overhaul the American economy and diminish worsening inequality have been undermined by their needle-thin majorities in both chambers of Congress. Biden campaigned on restoring the economy after it sharply contracted at the onset of the pandemic with mass business closures and a drop in discretionary spending. Taking office, he instilled a sense of urgency as he sought to avoid the kind of drawn-out recovery that plagued past economic crises in the US. "There is real pain overwhelming the real economy," Biden said as he introduced a COVID-19 rescue plan in January 2021. "The very health of our nation is at stake." During Biden's time in office, Americans have poured back into the labor market and unemployment has fallen to lows last seen in the late 1960s. In 2021, the economy grew at its fastest pace since the Reagan years. Some of that progress can be attributed to the $1.9 trillion stimulus law, which provided financial relief to Americans along with state and municipal governments. It also set aside money for vaccine distribution that helped states and cities ease pandemic restrictions. The law passed with unanimous GOP opposition. However, **the stimulus also partly caused another problem that blindsided Biden administration officials. Inflation is now at its highest level since the 1980s, largely the product of Americans with plenty of cash to spend facing supply-chain bottlenecks**. Democrats made limited legislative headway on what they intended to do. Biden secured a $1 trillion infrastructure law with some GOP support, locking in a victory that eluded past Republican and Democratic presidents. It contained $550 billion in new funding to repair roads and bridges, airports, ports and waterways. Other parts of Biden's economic agenda — including climate initiatives to reduce greenhouse gas emissions and encourage the production of electric vehicles — remain an open question. Joe Manchin speaks with Kyrsten Sinema Sen. Joe Manchin speaks with Sen. Kyrsten Sinema Jacquelyn Martin/AP Photo The infrastructure law was originally tied to the passage of a larger social spending and climate bill. Binding the priorities together was intended to keep the small but potent centrist faction in line with progressives. But when Republicans lined up against the larger bill, Democratic leadership decided to settle for the smaller infrastructure-only package, which Biden signed into law in November**. Efforts to advance immigration reform have also floundered**. Some Democrats initially viewed setting up a pathway to citizenship for unauthorized immigrants as a way to finance their spending ambitions, arguing it would provide an economic boost. But it was knocked out of the social bill by a Senate official and separate talks with Republicans haven't yielded a breakthrough. Manchin and Sinema both wielded immense influence over the Democratic agenda in the past year. That allowed them to shrink the size and scope of the original safety-net bill since Democrats couldn't afford to lose their votes in the 50-50 Senate. **The House-approved "Build Back Better" legislation died after Manchin torpedoed it in December. D**emocrats are poised to take another shot at passing a slimmer energy, climate and tax bill this month. But it won't include many of the initiatives that Biden pressed for, such as establishing a monthly child tax credit for parents, universal pre-K, tuition-free community college, and expanding affordable housing. Senate Democrats face a serious time-crunch to approve the bill and send it to Biden's desk before the start of the August recess. But they've blown past deadlines before. Democrats have until Sept. 30 to pass it with many elements outstanding as lawmakers begin focusing on campaigning. Chances of priority passing before the midterms: 2/5 President Joe Biden and former President Barack Obama shake stand together on stage during an event about the Affordable Care Act, in the East Room of the White House in Washington, Tuesday, April 5, 2022. President Joe Biden and former President Barack Obama stand together on stage during an event about the Affordable Care Act, in the East Room of the White House in Washington, Tuesday, April 5, 2022. AP Photo/Carolyn Kaster Expanding healthcare coverage: Biden ran on a promise to expand the Affordable Care Act, more colloquially known as Obamacare, so that more people living in the US could buy health insurance. Biden and the Democratic-controlled Congress did deliver on that to a small extent. The 2021 American Rescue Plan Biden signed into law poured billions of federal dollars into the private health insurance market. Doing so allowed buyers to get health insurance at a lower price than before the stimulus law, sometimes even at no — or very little — cost to themselves. But Democrats appear to have largely backed off Biden's promise to create a "public option" for health insurance. Such a system would give people the option to buy a health plan similar to Medicare, rather than going to private insurers. As for the subsidies, they are limited and set to run out at the end of the year. That means that in the weeks leading up to the election Democrats will face a barrage of stories about soaring health insurance costs. An estimated 13 million people are expected to be affected, according to the Department of Health and Human Services. Once again, Manchin holds the cards. In June, he signaled to Insider he was open to expanding the Obamacare subsidies but wanted to workshop them so they wouldn't go to wealthy people. Under current law, some people receive more generous subsidies than others depending on their income. People with middle-class incomes and higher pay no more than 8.5% of their annual income on health insurance they buy through the Obamacare marketplaces, with the federal government picking up the rest of the tab. Democrats may be able to extend the subsidies or make them permanent alongside their economic policy proposals. Health insurers are pressing lawmakers to get it done, and Democratic leaders have said it's a priority. Manchin has been noncommittal. Democrats also are in talks about a bill that would allow the federal government to negotiate the prices of some prescription medicines. Doing so would help pay for the health insurance subsidies. But pharmaceutical companies have been generous to Democrats during recent election cycles and will oppose any attempt to curb their profits. Plus the prescriptions proposal would need to get the agreement of the Senate parliamentarian, Elizabeth MacDonough, to ensure that it fits the rules of reconciliation. If it doesn't, then whether Senators accept it or not becomes moot.

#### No chance of dem’s winning – razor thin margins, empirical midterms loss, and approval ratings are in the trash

Alison Durkee 22, 6-14-2022, "Democrats’ Midterm Nightmare: Polls Suggest Party Could Face Historic Loss," Forbes, https://www.forbes.com/sites/alisondurkee/2022/06/14/democrats-midterm-nightmare-polls-suggest-party-could-face-historic-loss/?sh=720fb2c15193

The Gallup poll, conducted May 2-22 among 1,007 U.S. adults, found only 41% approve of President Joe Biden’s job performance, 18% approve of Congress’ performance and 16% are “satisfied with the way things are going in the U.S.” Only 14% have a positive view of economic conditions right now and 46% rate the economy negatively, meaning Americans have a 32-point net negative view of the economy. All of those metrics are at least 10 points below the average for midterm years, based on Gallup’s polling going back to 1974. Americans have a 51% approval rating for the president on average during midterm election years, a 30% congressional approval rating, 35% satisfaction with the state of the U.S. and a nine-point net positive rating of the economy. Other than presidential approval rating—where Biden’s 41% approval is tied with former President Donald Trump’s in 2018 and higher than President George W. Bush’s 38% in 2006—every metric recorded this year marks a historic low. Gallup suggests the low ratings mean Democrats will likely lose seats in the election this year—as a president’s party typically does during the midterms—and their losses would likely be even larger than usual if these low ratings hold. BIG NUMBER 23. That’s the average number of House seats a president’s party loses during the midterms, Gallup found based on data going back to 1974. Parties suffer even bigger losses when Americans aren’t satisfied with how things are going, though: Republicans lost 40 seats in 2018 when Americans had a 21% positive view of Congress and 41% approval of Trump, for instance, and Democrats lost 63 seats in 2010 during Barack Obama’s presidency. Though Obama was slightly more popular than Biden (45% approval), Americans similarly had a 21% approval of Congress, 22% satisfaction with the U.S. and 31-point net-negative view of the economy that year. WHAT TO WATCH FOR How Democrats will fare in the midterms. Republicans only need to flip five House seats to gain control of the chamber, and one seat in the Senate, where the parties are now evenly split. Based on current trends, Gallup projects the midterms will potentially be a “wave election” for the GOP and give them a “comfortable governing majority.” WHAT WE DON’T KNOW How things could change before November for Democrats. The Supreme Court is poised to likely overturn Roe v. Wade and let states ban abortion in the coming weeks, for instance, which recent polling has suggested may help galvanize Democrats and get more to the polls. Gun control could also come into play in the wake of a string of mass shootings, Gallup notes, as polling shows most Americans favor stricter gun measures and thus could be motivated to vote against Republicans who oppose them. KEY BACKGROUND Gallup’s polling comes as Biden has seen record-low approval ratings in recent months, with a FiveThirtyEight analysis finding 39.7% approve of him on average—the lowest share at any point during his presidency. The president has not had an average approval rating over 50% since August 2021. Other polls have similarly found Republicans are likely to have a clear advantage in the midterms, with a FiveThirtyEight poll analysis finding 45% of Americans prefer to vote for a Republican candidate in November versus a Democrat (42.6% would support the Democrat). A Morning Consult/Politico poll from May found Republicans were still more enthusiastic about voting in the midterms than Democrats (61% versus 54%), even after Politico leaked a draft opinion suggesting the Supreme Court will overturn Roe v. Wade.

#### Republican’s win inevitable BUT no impact to the DA because dems can win next election

Gallup. 22, 6-14-2022, "Usual Midterm Indicators Very Unfavorable for Democrats," Gallup, https://news.gallup.com/poll/393626/usual-midterm-indicators-unfavorable-democrats.aspx

WASHINGTON, D.C. -- With less than five months to go before voters elect all members of the House of Representatives and one-third of the Senate, the current Democratic congressional majority is facing an extremely unfavorable election environment. The party of the president typically loses U.S. House seats in midterm elections -- an average of 23 since 1974. However, 2022 is not shaping up to be an average year. Rather, as of May, Gallup finds presidential job approval and three other key national mood indicators well below the historical averages measured in past midterm election years. On their own, those numbers would all predict a greater-than-average loss of seats for the Democratic Party this fall. Gallup's latest data, from a May 2-22 survey, finds 41% of Americans approving of the job President Joe Biden is doing, 18% approving of the job Congress is doing, 16% satisfied with the way things are going in the U.S., and a 32-percentage-point deficit in positive (14%) versus negative (46%) ratings of current economic conditions. Each of those metrics is at least 10 points lower than the historical average at the time of past midterm elections, and most are on pace to be the worst of such readings. The following sections of this report discuss how each of these four polling indicators, as well as party affiliation, has related to midterm election outcomes historically. President Biden Job Approval Rating Midterm elections are widely seen as a referendum on the incumbent president, and this is justified by the high correspondence between overall job approval and seat loss for the president's party. Given this, congressional seat losses for unpopular presidents' parties have been above average historically, averaging 37 since 1946. Biden's current 41% approval rating puts him in the lower tier of all prior presidents' job approval ratings taken just before past midterm elections. Biden currently has the same approval rating that Donald Trump did at the time of the 2018 elections, when the GOP lost 40 House seats, and similar to Ronald Reagan's 42% in October 1982, before the Republicans lost 26 seats. Only one president, George W. Bush, had a lower rating than Biden does today, and his 38% rating in November 2006 was associated with a 30-seat loss. Biden's fellow Democrats Bill Clinton and Barack Obama lost an even larger number of House seats in 1994 and 2010, respectively, with slightly higher approval ratings than Biden has now. Those steeper losses reflect the relatively large number of House seats held by Democrats going into those elections in addition to the president's unpopularity. The Democratic Party lost fewer seats in Obama's second midterm in 2014 when Obama was no more popular than in his first midterm four years earlier, but Democrats were defending fewer seats. In the few elections where the president's party has gained seats (1998 and 2002) or lost a small number of seats (1986 and 1990), the incumbent president has been broadly popular, with approval ratings well above 50%. The exception was 1974, with Gerald Ford's 54% job approval more reflective of his honeymoon period in the months after he took office following Richard Nixon's resignation in August of that year. The GOP's 43-seat loss was likely tied to Nixon's unpopularity (24% approval in his last rating) stemming from the Watergate scandal that led to his resignation. While Biden's job approval rating could improve by November, putting his party in a less precarious position, he would be bucking the trend for second-year presidents. Historically, presidents' job approval ratings have rarely improved in the last few months before their first midterms. Democrats currently hold 220 seats in the House, just two above the number needed for a majority, and far fewer than the 250-plus they held before the Republican wave elections of 1994 and 2010. This relatively low seat exposure could help to check Democratic losses, as occurred in 2014. Congressional Job Approval Rating The 18% of Americans who approve of the job Congress is doing would be the lowest Gallup has measured in a midterm election if it holds at that level through the fall. However, it would not be much lower than the 20% to 21% approval ratings for Congress at the time of the past three midterm elections. Americans' view of the job Congress is doing is also broadly predictive of how the president's party -- if not also the majority party in Congress -- will perform in the midterms. In 1994, 2010 and 2018 -- all years when Congress' approval rating was between 21% and 23% and the president's party was in the majority -- the incumbent party lost between 40 and 63 House seats. In 2014, even with approval of Congress at 20%, the Democratic Party lost only 13 seats -- again explained by Democrats' weak starting position that year when House Republicans were in the majority. In years when congressional approval was significantly higher, the president's party suffered minimal losses or even gained seats. U.S. Satisfaction Americans' satisfaction with the way things are going in the U.S. is also on pace to be the worst it has been in a midterm election year. The 16% currently satisfied is six points lower than the prior midterm low -- 22% in 2010. Satisfaction relates to midterm House seat loss in a similar way as the job approval variables, with greater losses tending to happen in elections when satisfaction is low -- such as in 1982 (24%), 1994 (30%) and 2010 (22%) -- and more minimal losses or gains for the president's party in years when satisfaction is high, including 1986 (58%), 1998 (60%) and 2002 (48%). Ratings of the Economy Gallup has a shorter history of measuring Americans' perceptions of current U.S. economic conditions, dating back to the early 1990s. Since that time, Americans' views of the economy during midterm election years have only ever been similarly bad as now once before -- in 2010, when net ratings of economic conditions were -31. Economic ratings tend to be less strongly related to midterm election outcomes than other mood indicators are, though views of the economy certainly influence how Americans rate the job that political leaders are doing and whether they are satisfied with the way things are going in the country. Positive evaluations of the economy in 2006 and 2018 were not enough to overcome weak job approval ratings for Presidents Bush and Trump, respectively, and for Congress, suggesting political leaders were being evaluated on factors besides the economy. But even if the economy is less correlated with midterm election outcomes, the fact that Americans view it negatively this year is just one more issue that does not reflect favorably on the governing Democratic Party. Party Affiliation Vote choices in elections are strongly tied to a voter's political leanings. Party affiliation has been a good indicator of midterm election outcomes in the past because it either related to the partisanship of the electorate or was a harbinger of how people would vote. On average over the past three months, Americans have been equally likely to identify politically as Republicans or say they are independents who lean toward the Republican Party (45%) as to identify as Democrats or to lean Democratic (45%). While the parties appear, then, to be on equal footing heading into the midterms, the figures are generally a better sign for the Republican Party than the Democratic Party for two key reasons: First, historically, Democrats usually have an advantage on this measure of party affiliation. For example, in 2021, Democrats had a three-point advantage (though the numbers varied greatly over the course of the year), which is typical. Second, Republican voters usually turn out at higher rates than Democratic voters do. If usual turnout patterns hold, and partisanship among all national adults is even, then the electorate will have more Republican identifiers and leaners than Democratic ones. There were also even splits in party affiliation in 1994, 2002, 2010, 2014 and 2018 election years, and all but one were good years for Republican candidates. The major exception was 2018, a year in which the parties were fairly evenly matched but Democrats did better in the elections, perhaps because of Trump's unpopularity and the unusually high turnout that year. By contrast, in years when the Democratic Party had sizable advantages on party identification, like in 1998 and 2006, Democrats picked up seats in Congress. Implications Americans' dour evaluations of the president, Congress, the economy and direction of the country all suggest that the typical pattern by which the president's party loses seats in midterm elections will hold this year. While Republicans need to only pick up five seats in the House to take the majority in that chamber (assuming the vacant seats formerly held by Republicans stay with the party), the national mood is such that 2022 has the potential to be a wave election for the Republican Party and the GOP could have a more comfortable governing majority. At the same time, the relatively slim majority enjoyed by House Democrats should shield the party from losses in the upper range of what's possible when presidential approval is in the low 40s and less than a quarter of Americans are satisfied with the state of the nation. While it is unclear whether policy issues can eclipse presidential performance or the national mood as midterm election voting factors, Democrats may benefit politically from the Supreme Court overturning Roe v. Wade and Republican opposition to gun control measures in the wake of a series of mass shootings. Recent Gallup data suggest abortion will be a more important voting factor this year than it usually is in U.S. elections, more so among those who support rather than oppose legalized abortion. Also, even before the mass shootings, the majority of Americans expressed dissatisfaction with U.S. gun laws and favored enacting stricter laws. On the other hand, further increases in gas prices or renewed focus on the border crisis could compound Democrats' problems in November. Regardless of what issues might drive voter behavior, unless Americans' opinions of the job Biden is doing and the state of the nation improve over the next five months, the Democratic Party may face a situation similar to 1994 and 2010 when it suffered major losses in its presidents' first midterms but regrouped in time to win the presidential election two years later.

#### Dem voter turn out low now and midterm cycle empirics means dems can’t win -- that’s debate math

Susan Milliga 22, 6-3-2022, senior political writer at U.S. News & World Report. She has covered domestic and foreign politics for 35 years, "Midterm Math Works Against Democrats With Senate at Stake," US News & World Report, https://www.usnews.com/news/the-report/articles/2022-06-03/midterm-turnout-math-works-against-democrats-with-senate-at-stake

Joe Biden can thank record voter turnout, women, Black and Latino Americans, young people and voters eager to get Donald Trump out of office for the Democratic president's 2020 victory. Unfortunately for Biden and his Democratic Party, the voters expected to turn out this fall will be fewer, older, more likely to be white – and eager to take out their frustrations on the party in charge. Those historical voting patterns are a big reason why Democrats face such daunting challenges this fall as they struggle to hang onto razor-thin majorities in Congress. And it has Democrats scrambling to find ways to tweak the turnout machine in key states, where even a shift of a single percentage point in a voter group could decide who controls the Senate next year. Not only are minority and young voters typically less likely to vote in midterm elections, but the people who are inclined to turn out are in a mood to punish – and that means voting out incumbents, says Matt Grossman, director of the Institute for Public Policy and Social Research at Michigan State University. "It's better to say that you've done something," if you are the party in power, "but you can't expect that to overwhelm the basic dynamic – and that is that people are more motivated by something that has happened that they didn't like than that they did like," Grossman says. Record high jobs creation? That's not resonating much with voters upset about inflation that is at a 40-year high, experts say. Record numbers of Black women being named to judicial posts by the Biden administration? The voters who are thrilled by that development can't match the motivation of parents convinced their K-12 children are being made to feel guilty in the classroom for America's history of slavery and racism. An anticipated Supreme Court opinion undoing guaranteed abortion rights could well propel disaffected Democratic voters to the polls in some areas of the country, making a pivotal difference in key races, analysts say. With the governor poised to be the one-person roadblock to abortion bans in several states, pro-abortion rights voters may be more motivated to turn out, casting votes for Democrats up and down the ballot. But Democrats still suffer from basic math that disadvantages the party in midterms. Voters 18-29 made up 17% of the 2020 electorate and voted heavily for Biden. In 2014, the last midterm where a Democrat was president, young voters made up just 13% of the electorate. In several states – notably Wisconsin, Georgia and Arizona – small shifts could decide whether Biden will have a Democratic or GOP-run Senate next year. But the peculiar natures of those states' electorates and candidates could make this fall far less predictable, analysts and political operatives say. In Georgia, slight upticks in turnout by women and Black voters helped Biden eke out a dramatic 2020 victory there and helped put Democrats Sen. Raphael Warnock and Sen. Jon Ossoff over the top in 2021 runoffs, flipping control of the Senate to Democrats. COMMERCE, GA - MARCH 26: Heisman Trophy winner and Republican candidate for US Senate Herschel Walker speaks to supporters of former U.S. President Donald Trump during a rally at the Banks County Dragway on March 26, 2022 in Commerce, Georgia. This event is a part of Trump's Save America Tour around the United States. (Photo by Megan Varner/Getty Images) Herschel Walker, Georgia's Republican candidate for U.S. Senate, speaks during a rally in Commerce, Georgia, on March 26.(MEGAN VARNER/GETTY IMAGES) If typical midterm trends stayed the same, Warnock would likely lose to a Republican. But "there are a couple of wild cards in the mix here" that make the race far more competitive, says political science professor Alan Abramowitz, an expert on polling and elections at Emory University. Black turnout – which typically dips in a midterm – might be unusually higher because both Warnock and Stacey Abrams, the Democratic nominee for governor, are Black. Abrams is also widely credited with get-out-the-vote efforts that helped elect Biden, Warnock and Ossoff. Secondly, Abramowitz says, incumbent Democrats could have someone to run against, if Trump – who was an early endorser of GOP nominee Herschel Walker for the Senate – makes himself very visible in the campaign. "The more prominent a role Trump plays in these elections, the better it probably is for Democrats," who would be more inspired to vote if their old nemesis is around, Abramowitz says. In Arizona, Republicans are in great shape on paper, political experts say, since GOP voters are much more likely to turn out in midterm elections. Democratic Sen. Mark Kelly is defending his job, and the race for governor in the Grand Canyon State is open. But again, the ghosts of the 2020 election – and repeated lies that it was stolen from Trump – could mix things up, says Chuck Coughlin, a longtime Arizona Republican consultant. Trump was "the greatest turnout machine that has ever existed, at least in my lifetime here," Coughlin says. And several leading GOP candidates this fall are continuing to push the falsity that Biden did not legitimately win the election, which could bring those Democrats back to the polls, he says. "As we've observed many times out here, Republicans are being their own worst enemy. The focus on election fraud is clearly not a general election winner in Arizona," Coughlin says. Despite the numbers – Coughlin predicts an 8-point GOP turnout advantage in the midterms – such talk by GOP candidates might turn off independent voters critical to a general election win in Arizona, he says. "They are giving Democrats a giant opportunity to prevail in the general," he says. In Wisconsin, Democrats have a rare chance at a pickup as they seek to topple incumbent GOP Sen. Ron Johnson. They also have a tough race in keeping Democratic Gov. Tony Evers in office. A loss there would mean Republicans would have a trifecta, control of both chambers of the state legislature and the governorship. Biden won Wisconsin last year by a mere six-tenths of a percentage point, so turnout among party loyalists could determine both the Senate and gubernatorial races. And midterm cycle trends would tend to give Republicans that tiny edge they need. Black turnout, especially in the Democratic-heavy area around Milwaukee, tends to drop off in midterm cycles, as does the student vote, says David Canon, a political science professor and expert on elections at the University of Wisconsin. One "wild card" that could make a difference is if Lt. Gov. Mandela Barnes, who is running in the Democratic primary for the Senate seat, prevails, Canon says. Barnes is Black and from Milwaukee and might be able to wrest a critical number of additional votes from those residents, Canon says. "Historically, Wisconsin has usually seen a midterm election that is on balance more Republican than Democratic," says Charles Franklin, director of the Marquette Law School poll. The big exception, he says, was 2018, when an anti-Trump sentiment brought out more Democrats. But with Trump not on the ballot in 2022, the 2018 blip in Democratic turnout is less likely to repeat, Franklin says. Democrats believe they have a solid case against Johnson, who has advocated repealing the Affordable Care Act (an issue that helped get Democratic Sen. Tammy Baldwin win in an earlier race) and voted to reject the slate of electors making Biden president. That could not only motivate Democrats but alienate moderate Republicans, Democratic operatives believe. The strategy will have to include finding ways to reach a typical midterm audience, says a Democratic Wisconsin political consultant. That means using older forms of communication – such as broadcast TV channels, instead of social media – to connect with older voters who don't get their information online, the consultant said. In many of the pivotal races, big issues – inflation, energy prices, the outcome of the war in Ukraine and the prospects of the landmark Roe v. Wade ruling legalizing abortion being overturned by the Supreme Court – could motivate certain voter groups to show up at the polls. But for Democrats, desperate to avoid a complete GOP takeover of Congress, math is the enemy.

### AT UQ–roe

#### Economy swings voters to republicans – overcomes roe

E.J. Dionne 22, 6-15-2022, "Opinion," Washington Post, https://www.washingtonpost.com/opinions/2022/06/15/inflation-anger-could-sweep-election-deniers-midterm-victory/

Elections are decided by the issues on voters’ minds, not the issues many of us might wish were on voters’ minds. This lesson was brought home forcefully by the juxtaposition of the Federal Reserve’s big rate hike on Wednesday with the victory of Trumpist “big lie” candidates in primaries the day before — and the work of the House committee investigating the Jan. 6, 2021, insurrection. The Fed’s decision to raise interest rates by three-quarters of a point — the largest single increase since 1994 — put the economy smack in the news cycle while underscoring how little control President Biden has over what happens to costs between now and November. Meanwhile, the House committee investigating Jan. 6 continued its effective work in calling attention to just how off-the-charts dangerous and egregious Donald Trump’s efforts to overturn the 2020 election were. Its hearings have shown how close we came to a democratic meltdown, how complicit — often through their silence — many Republicans were with Trump’s schemes, and how the threat to our democracy is ongoing. Yet none of this could matter on Election Day. If Republicans up and down the ballot win this fall because so many voters choose to punish Biden and the Democrats for high prices, the GOP sweep would carry into office outright election deniers as well as politicians too timid or too opportunistic to challenge them. As Amy Gardner and Isaac Arnsdorf reported in The Post, more than 100 GOP primary winners backed Trump’s false claims of election fraud. Tuesday’s primaries underscored Trump’s ongoing power to defeat decent Republicans and bully others into submission. In South Carolina, Rep. Tom Rice, one of 10 Republicans who voted to impeach Trump, managed just one-quarter of the vote and was rebuked by a 2-to-1 margin. Rep. Nancy Mace, who was critical of the former president in early 2021, defeated a Trump-backed candidate with 53 percent of the vote. But she survived only by turning hard toward sycophancy, casting herself as a longtime Trump loyalist. The most troubling result for friends of democracy came in Nevada, where GOP voters nominated Jim Marchant, a devout trumpeter of the former president’s election falsehoods, for secretary of state. Marchant has said he would not have certified Biden’s victory in the state. Inflation, of course, has nothing to do with the secretary of state’s job, but the trend toward straight-ticket voting means that a revolt against Democrats at the top of the ballot could put management of the 2024 elections in the hands of the same sorts of people the Jan. 6 committee is exposing as dangerous frauds. The potential for an economy-led GOP landslide is high. As Gallup’s Jeffrey Jones and Lydia Saad reported this week, data from a May 2-22 survey found that only 41 percent of Americans approve of the job Biden is doing, 18 percent approve of the job Congress is doing, 16 percent are satisfied with the way things are going in this country, and just 14 percent rate current economic conditions positively. “Voters tend to vote on the immediate, particularly in midterms,” said Jim Kessler, vice president at the Third Way think tank. “Their long-term worries are back-burner. And inflation is immediate.” This points to several imperatives for not just Democrats but anyone who wants to protect democracy. Especially in state and local races that affect election administration — think secretary-of-state positions and governorships, particularly in swing states such as Wisconsin, Pennsylvania and Michigan — voters angry about the price of gas and groceries must be persuaded not to let their rage translate into support for Republicans who would throw sand into the gears of our democracy. Much will depend on moderate independents and Republicans being willing to put free elections first. Ben Wikler, the Democratic Party chair in Wisconsin, also sees Trumpists’ obsession with the “big lie” as a potential opening for his party. “Republicans are so tied around the axle of trying to relitigate the 2020 election,” he told me, “that they’re leaving a lot of room for Democrats to demonstrate that we are trying to bring down costs for people while they’re concerned with locking in their power.” This points up the need for Democrats, especially Biden, to try to cut their losses on inflation by arguing their proposals to reduce costs are more credible than anything Republicans are offering. It won’t be an easy sell, but Biden took a decent shot at this with a rousing speech to the AFL-CIO on Tuesday. But there is no substitute for trying — however hard it will be — to make the preservation of democracy a much higher priority for voters. Their ballots won’t cut prices at the pump or what they pay for groceries. But they will determine the future of our experiment in self-government.

### UQ – ukraine thumps

#### Ukraine thumps

Radhika Desai 22, 5-24-2022, "Ukraine on the midterms: Biden's nightmare," No Publication, https://news.cgtn.com/news/2022-05-25/Ukraine-on-the-midterms-Biden-s-nightmare-1ak6F2TaSFq/index.html

U.S. President Joe Biden must have hoped that his war against Russia, albeit a proxy war, would unite the nation and help his embattled Democratic party in the November midterm congressional elections. After all, he had a slavish media willing to repeat practically anything issued from Washington word-for-word and without question. If any such hope was not already illusory given the deep economic, social and political divisions plaguing his country to the point of ungovernability, recent events are making it so. In recent weeks, 57 Republican Representatives and 11 Republican senators opposed the passage of President Biden's $40 billion Ukraine assistance bill, up from only three Representatives who voted against the first Ukraine bill in March. To be sure, the senators and representatives were too few to halt the passage of the bill, though U.S. Republican Senator Rand Paul held passage up for a week with his demand that a special inspector general be appointed to oversee how the Ukraine military aid is spent. No innocuous hiccup, this was a major contributor to Biden's nightmare to come. Senator Paul's insistence on oversight pointed to the deep corruption of U.S.-Ukraine relations, to which Joe Biden's son Hunter Biden has made a great contribution through his liaisons with various Ukrainian politicians and oligarchs. Those liaisons are under renewed scrutiny after the media put the lid on it for the 2020 elections. That, however, is only the sensationalist tip of a very troubling iceberg. Essentially, President Biden's proxy war is not going according to plan. The plan includes destroying the Russian economy through sanctions. However, while it is proving resilient despite the most and most vicious sanctions imposed on any country, the U.S. economy, still reeling from the pandemic crisis, is suffering from inflation, led by politically sensitive food and fuel prices, and supply shortages. The plan was to destroy the ruble by freezing the Russian central bank assets and throwing Russia out of the Society for Worldwide Interbank Financial Telecommunication (SWIFT) payments information system. However, while Russia continues to export oil, the weaponization of the dollar system has put its future in doubt. And the plan was to pump Ukraine with so much weaponry that its NATO trained troops would defeat the Russians. However, Russians have slowly and methodically secured Donetsk and Luhansk and destroyed Ukraine's fighting capacities and infrastructure, including fresh shipments of weapons. They may yet achieve a neutral, or neutralized, Ukraine, the last of their declared objectives. President Biden signs the Ukraine Democracy Defense Lend-Lease Act of 2022 in the Oval Office of the White House, in Washington, May 9, 2022. /VCG In a mid-term election year, the Republicans would be foolish not to milk Biden's failures for all their worth in funding, publicity, and votes. As inflation reaches 40-year highs, Senator Paul, for instance, rattled off a series of statistics about the magnitude of the aid to Ukraine: adding to the billions the U.S. has given to Ukraine since 2014, Congress will have authorized some $60 billion in total spending to the country, with the last $40 billion making Kiev the largest annual U.S. aid recipient. With dominant media propaganda sounding more shrill than convincing, in April, 63 House Republicans voted against a bill supporting NATO, because some of its provisions about strengthening democratic institutions might be used against governments of member states, such as Hungarian Prime Minister Viktor Orban's. Most recently, Russia's undeniable military gains have forced some of the most prominent voices to oppose Biden's war. Former U.S. Secretary of State and long-time diplomat Henry Kissinger argued that Russia had always been and remains part of the stability of Europe and escalating tensions with it could only be disastrous for that continent. Restraint and compromise, including Ukraine accepting territorial losses, was better. The normally hawkish New York Times, while repeating may illusions about Ukrainian military advances, nevertheless argued that it was not in the U.S. interest to "plunge into an all-out war with Russia" even if it meant that Ukraine faced some "hard decisions," a reference to territorial concessions. Moreover, it added, "popular support for a war far from U.S. shores will not continue indefinitely. Inflation is a much bigger issue for American voters than Ukraine, and the disruptions to global food and energy markets are likely to intensify." Even before things began to go sour for Biden's proxy war, his Democratic Party was looking at a defeat in the mid-term elections. Unless he manages a nearly magically deft U-turn on its proxy war, the defeat will become a rout.

### UQ—redistricting thumps

#### Redistricting thumps- shifts house control

Zach Montellaro and Elena Schneider, 11-8-2021, "Republican wave builds to take back the House," POLITICO, https://www.politico.com/news/2021/11/08/republican-wave-house-congress-520238

Lost among the GOP's election victories in Virginia and elsewhere were three new redistricting proposals in Republican-controlled states that dismantled a handful of Democratic seats.

North Carolina Republicans last week enacted new congressional districts that will doom first-term Democratic Rep. Kathy Manning and places Democratic Rep. G.K. Butterfield in a seat Biden only carried by a few points. The GOP could control as many as 11 of the state’s 14 districts after the 2022 elections.

In Ohio, Republican legislators unveiled draft congressional maps that could reduce Democrats to just two of the state’s 15 districts by 2023. And while the final configuration isn’t set, most party operatives can’t envision a map that would leave intact the seats of Democratic Rep. Tim Ryan — who chose to run for Senate rather than hang around for a brutal redistricting — or Democratic Rep. Marcy Kaptur, whose current district snakes 141 miles along the coast of Lake Erie.

“There’s a very disruptive set of forces at work in Columbus in that legislature,” Kaptur said in an interview, vowing to compete for the Toledo-based seat no matter how red it becomes in a new map. “This one makes mincemeat of more Democratic voters because of the way that they draw the lines.”

If other red states follow Ohio’s lead, Kaptur said, “it would mean that we would have a much harder time retaining any kind of majority here.”

Also last week, New Hampshire Republicans proposed a map that would swing Democratic Rep. Chris Pappas’ district sharply to the right, leaving him in a much redder seat. And Georgia is expected to soon release its new plan that will leave Democratic Reps. Lucy McBath and Carolyn Bourdeaux fighting over just one blue seat in the northern Atlanta suburbs.

### UQ-- Innovation bill thumps

#### Innovation bill thumps

Jeffrey Mervis 22, 2-10-22, "House passes sweeping U.S. innovation bill, teeing up talks with Senate," No Publication, https://www.science.org/content/article/house-passes-sweeping-u-s-innovation-bill-teeing-talks-senate

Remember when your mother said you might choke if you crammed too much food into your mouth? In the weeks to come, Democrats in the U.S. Congress will find out whether that warning also applies to their ability to finalize sweeping legislation that promises to double the budgets of the National Science Foundation (NSF) and other key research agencies, pour money into high-tech industry, curb “malign foreign influence” on U.S. research, and root out sexual harassment in academic science. The effort, designed to maintain the country’s technological edge over China, took a major step forward today when the U.S. House of Representatives passed the America COMPETES Act. The 2900-page bill must now be reconciled with a similar, comparably massive bill called the U.S. Innovation and Competition Act (USICA) that the Senate passed in June 2021. But ironing out the differences will test the Democrats’ razor-thin majorities in each body. Although USICA (S.1260) was approved by a vote of 68 to 32, including 19 Republican senators, COMPETES (H.R. 4521) was supported by just one Republican and passed the House on a 220 to 210 vote. (One Democrat said nay.) Although key House Republicans have said they support many of the research-related elements in the bill, they strongly objected to other provisions, including language on trade and labor policy. Negotiating a compromise bill acceptable to enough lawmakers–and President Joe Biden–to make it into law will be a complex task touching on a wide range of issues. They include how to allocate new research funds, how to protect U.S. research from foreign interference while also reshaping immigration rules to make it easier for the United States to attract foreign-born technical talent, and whether to take a more aggressive stance to combat climate change. Both bills come with hefty price tags: $250 billion for USICA and $350 billion for COMPETES. And both include provisions that authorize the government to spend tens of billions of dollars on research across several federal agencies. The numbers are mostly aspirational; Congress would still have to approve most of the spending through its annual budget process. Higher education lobbyists hope legislators won’t repeat what happened in 2007 and 2010, when Congress failed to deliver promised big hikes in research spending that it had authorized. The increased investments include adding an NSF technology directorate and doubling the agency’s overall budget over 5 years. The Department of Energy’s Office of Science and its national laboratories would get a similarly large boost. And the Department of Commerce would get $7 billion to establish a network of new regional innovation hubs. The nation’s semiconductor industry would receive $52 billion, with the bulk of the money used to increase manufacturing capacity but some also going to microelectronics research facilities. ADVERTISEMENT Both bills call for tightening oversight of research collaborations with China and a handful of other countries deemed to exert a “malign foreign influence” on federally funded research. For example, both bills would prohibit scientists with federal grants from participating in Chinese talent recruitment programs and require universities to provide more information about any foreign gifts they receive. The two bills also seek to stamp out sexual harassment on college campuses, calling for a uniform policy on reporting allegations and findings to federal funding agencies. But there are also important differences between the two bills on research policy. For example, the Senate wants NSF’s new technology directorate to focus on 10 key disciplines, such as artificial intelligence and quantum computing. In contrast, the House bill asks NSF to combat climate change, reduce economic and social inequality, and build a robust scientific workforce along with advancing strategically important fields. “The Senate bill implies a trade-off between supporting key technologies to maintain our competitive edge and improving the quality of life for all Americans,” says a Democratic staffer on the House science committee, which crafted many of the research provisions in the COMPETES bill. “But we think that technology is simply a means to an end, and that you can do both things.” The House and Senate also have competing visions of how to spread federal research dollars more equitably across the country, including to institutions that enroll large numbers of students from groups traditionally underrepresented in science. The Senate bill requires that 20% of the money slated for NSF and DOE be spent in the roughly two dozen states that receive the fewest federal research dollars. In contrast, the House bill avoids any mandatory set-asides, instead creating new programs that target institutions in those have-not states. The COMPETES Act would also change immigration policy to allow more foreign students to stay after they earn advanced degrees in science and engineering at U.S. universities. One provision would exempt them from the existing cap on the number of applications for permanent residency status. The bill would also create a new visa category for budding high-tech entrepreneurs. Those measures are likely to be opposed by lawmakers who want to shut off the flow of immigration, especially from China and other countries seen as economic and military foes, and the Senate bill contains no such changes. The House bill includes a raft of provisions on climate change. For example, it would authorize a 2-year, $8 billion U.S. contribution to the United Nations’s Green Climate Fund, aimed at helping emerging economies respond to the climate crisis. It calls for spending $600 million annually through 2026 to help U.S. solar energy companies become “less reliant on solar components made in China.” And it would give the Department of State additional funds for climate-related foreign aid, and for developing a new 10-year strategy to mitigate global climate change impacts. The House bill’s sweeping scope is its strength, says Representative Eddie Bernice Johnson (D–TX), chair of the House science committee. “With this legislation, we are making investments to build clean energy solutions, address the climate crisis, reinforce our national security, enhance our semiconductor manufacturing capabilities, and so much more,” Johnson said in kicking off debate on the House floor that ended this morning. “In short, we are acting to address the critical needs identified by the scientific community, industry, academia, and other stakeholders as what they need most to succeed in the 21st century.” But the science panel’s top Republican, Representative Frank Lucas (OK), thinks Democrats overreached by ignoring the concerns of his colleagues. The COMPETES bill “undoes more than a year of bipartisan work by the House Science Committee to develop and pass comprehensive legislation to double investment in basic research,” Lucas said in floor debate. “[House Speaker Nancy Pelosi (D–CA)] hijacked good bipartisan bills dealing with U.S. competitiveness and countering the malign influence of China to pass another Democratic wish list that will go nowhere in the Senate.” Lawmakers on both sides of the aisle say they hope to negotiate a final bill by this spring. But with the November elections looming, and both bodies busy with other issues, including the Senate confirmation of a new Supreme Court justice, it’s not clear whether they can meet that goal.

### AT: Dems win on Covid

#### **Covid isn’t a thumper – voters don’t care anymore**

Scott 6/16 – Dylan Scott is a senior correspondent for Vox, where he has led the news organization’s health care coverage, 6-16-2022, "Why have politicians stopped talking about Covid?," Vox, https://www.vox.com/coronavirus-covid19/2022/6/16/23167365/covid-19-2022-us-midterm-elections-vaccines-masks

Why Covid-19 feels — mostly — invisible in the midterm campaigns Covid’s decline as an overt political issue has been precipitous. In January, in the thick of the omicron wave, it was one of the top answers in Gallup’s poll asking Americans to name the most important problem facing the country. But three months later, in April, the share who still put the pandemic as the No. 1 issue had dropped from 20 percent to 4 percent; it was trailing Russia and fuel prices among people’s concerns. Inflation and the state of the economy in general have become the dominant issues for voters. Those problems have their origins in the pandemic, but they are complicated by other events like the war in Ukraine. Over time, voters typically have less tolerance for politicians blaming the same thing for all the problems in the world, even if there is some truth to it. It’s old news. So candidates are responding to that apathy in the 2022 campaigns. Democratic politicians, in particular, tend to be very reactive to voters’ attitudes, Malhotra said, and voters right now are done with Covid-19. “They’re really trying hard to see where voters are, trying to reach what the median voters believe,” he said. “The mass voting base in this country is over Covid. They just are. That is the truth.”

### Inflation Thumps

#### **The economy has locked in a GOP win in the midterms**

Pethokoukis 6/28 – James Pethokoukis, Senior Fellow; Editor, AEIdeas Blog; and DeWitt Wallace Chair, 6-28-2022, "The Inflation Election: Economics Factors May Have Already Cooked the Midterm Election Results," American Enterprise Institute - AEI, https://www.aei.org/economics/the-inflation-election-economics-factors-may-have-already-cooked-the-midterm-election-results/

And what do betting markets say today about the 2022 midterms? PredictIt gives the GOP a 71 percent chance of taking control of Congress. That’s down 5 points from just before the US Supreme Court overturned Roe v. Wade. But to the extent that economic factors will prove more important than the Court’s decision, Republicans should be favored to win. Right now, it’s looking like the Inflation Election. Here’s a bit from new Goldman Sachs analysis looking at the relationship between economic variables and election results (bold by me): Republicans look very likely to win a majority in the House of Representatives. The thin 5-seat majority Democrats now hold (counting vacant seats) is much smaller than the average midterm loss for the President’s party over the last 70 years of around 25 seats. The economic environment suggests larger-than-average losses. We revisit our prior work on the relationship between economic performance and election outcomes, adding inflation measures to the variables we normally consider. We find that headline CPI and gas prices are roughly equal in their statistical significance for midterm election results, but neither is as strong a predictor of election result as real disposable income growth, which has declined more over the last year than in any midterm election year since the data began.

### COMPETES Act Thumps

#### Biden is hyper-focused on the COMPETES Act which leaves no room for anything else

**Sargen 7/7** [Nicholas Sargen (Ph.D. is an economic consultant with affiliations with Fort Washington Investment Advisors and the University of Virginia’s Darden School of Business. Opinion Contributor.), 7-7-2022, "Biden needs an easy win: House Dems should pass the America Competes Act now," Hill, <https://thehill.com/opinion/international/3548678-biden-needs-an-easy-win-house-dems-should-pass-the-america-competes-act-now/>] // st

Meanwhile, the urgency of improving domestic capabilities in domestic production of computer chips has been highlighted by ongoing supply-chain disruptions associated with the COVID-19 pandemic. One year ago, U.S. officials were confident that the worst was over. But there is still no indication this is happening: PBS recently reported that new U.S. car sales plummeted by 21 percent in the second quarter over a year ago owing to shortages of computer chips, which have also driven up prices of new and used autos.¶ On several occasions this year, Biden has singled out Intel for committing to build a fabricating plant in Ohio that would develop state of the art chip-making technology. In January, Intel CEO Pat Gelsinger said the company would invest up to $100 billion to build the world’s largest chip-making complex if it could be assured of receiving some federal support. But with the legislation now up in the air, Intel has since indicated that it is considering delaying its initial $20 billion investment, which was slated to be launched this month.¶ Amid these developments, Biden has urged Congress to “Pass the damn bill and send it to me.” However, as David Ignatius observes, Biden appears unwilling to “crack some heads” to get the job done: “You can’t fix everything in our messed-up country. But you can deliver on your promise to create good high-tech jobs in the semiconductor industry and compete with China for the strategic high ground.” ¶ The impasse over the semiconductor legislation is emblematic of a larger issue. Namely, Biden’s legislative agenda has sought to enact the most sweeping social programs since LBJ’s Great Society when Democrats control both house of Congress by the narrowest of margins. One would hope that Biden and progressive Democrats would have learned by now that the way to produce tangible results is to narrow the focus of bills they consider. ¶ Indeed, the major economic accomplishment of the Biden administration was the recasting of the infrastructure bill to gain bipartisan support. Now it has an opportunity to demonstrate how the federal government can play a role in enhancing U.S. technology prowess by helping to develop state of the art manufacturing capability.¶ If this isn’t clear to progressive Democrats, Biden should tell them in no uncertain terms that he wants the America Competes Act to be passed without further delay.

#### Controversy over the COMPETES Act in the Senate and the House ensure that it saps up congress’ time

**Mitchell 7/4** [Tia Mitchell (The Atlanta Journal-Constitution’s Washington correspondent. In this role, she writes about Georgia’s congressional delegation, campaigns, elections and the impact that decisions made in D.C. have on residents of Georgia. Chair of the Political Task Force for the National Association of Black Journalists.), 7-4-2022, "As China competition bill takes shape, Georgia lawmakers push for resources," AJC, <https://www.ajc.com/politics/as-china-competition-bill-takes-shape-georgia-lawmakers-push-for-resources/TPJPJ2ZN2BAHVCMFPOBBZNFSTE/>] // st

The Senate passed its package, called the United States Innovation and Competition Act, roughly a year ago. The House proposal is called the America COMPETES Act. It was approved in February with all but one Democrat in favor and all but one Republican opposed.¶ Now, leaders from both chambers are negotiating a final bill they hope can get the support of at least 60 senators and a majority of House members. The committee held its first and only public meeting so far on May 12, but much of the negotiating on the roughly 3,000-page measure has happened behind closed doors.¶ Senate Leader Chuck Schumer and House Speaker Nancy Pelosi issued a statement last week after meeting with their Republican counterparts, Mitch McConnell and Kevin McCarthy, to determine a pathway to finalizing the legislation. Their words hinted that there have been snags along the way.¶ “On behalf of House and Senate Democrats, we expressed our belief that there is no reason that we should not pass this bill through Congress in July,” Schumer and Pelosi wrote. “Democrats have already made accommodations in the name of reaching an agreement, which we are optimistic can happen soon. This legislation is necessary to help lower costs for the American people by addressing supply chain issues, the chips shortage and more, and we urge all Members to work with the urgency the situation deserves.”¶ Pelosi and Schumer’s goal is for the bill to be finished before Congress breaks for the August recess, but the days are ticking away. McConnell, in a post on social media Thursday, raised the possibility of yet another roadblock.¶ He was responding to news that a separate package being shaped by Democrats was beginning to take shape and is using a process, called reconciliation, that would allow it to become law without the support of any Republicans. That legislation is likely to focus on climate change, prescription drug costs and insurance premiums for low-income people purchasing coverage on federal exchanges.¶ If Democrats pursue that package, the Kentucky Republican wrote, he will withdraw GOP support from the China competition measure that needs the votes of at least 10 Senate Republicans to avoid a filibuster.¶ “Let me be perfectly clear: there will be no bipartisan USICA as long as Democrats are pursuing a partisan reconciliation bill,” McConnell wrote on Twitter, using the acronym for the Senate version of the bill.

### AT abortion right XO

#### Abortion rights XO thumps

Kate Sullivan 22, 7-8-2022, "Here's what's in Biden's executive order on abortion rights," CNN, https://www.cnn.com/2022/07/08/politics/what-is-in-biden-abortion-executive-order/index.html

President Joe Biden on Friday signed an executive order aimed at protecting access to reproductive health services in the wake of the Supreme Court overturning Roe v. Wade and eliminating the constitutional right to an abortion. The executive order attempts to safeguard access to medication abortion and emergency contraception, protect patient privacy, launch public education efforts as well as bolster the security of and the legal options available to those seeking and providing abortion services. Abortion rights demonstrators gather to protest against the Supreme Court's decision in the Dobbs v. Jackson Women's Health case on June 24, 2022, in Austin, Texas. Where state abortion bans stand amid legal challenges “President Biden has made clear that the only way to secure a woman’s right to choose is for Congress to restore the protections of Roe as federal law. Until then, he has committed to doing everything in his power to defend reproductive rights and protect access to safe and legal abortion,” the White House said in a statement on Friday. There is no action the President can take to restore the nationwide right to an abortion in the wake of the Supreme Court’s ruling. Biden has acknowledged publicly his options to expand abortion access remain limited, and has called on the American people to elect more members of Congress in November’s midterm elections who will support federal legislation protecting abortion access. The White House has dismissed several progressive ideas to protect abortion access, including allowing abortion providers to work from federal property in states where the procedure is banned. White House press secretary Karine Jean-Pierre said using federal lands for abortion services would have “dangerous ramifications.” The White House has also reiterated the President does not support expanding the Supreme Court, as many progressives have pushed for. Here’s what’s in the executive order that was signed Friday: The President is directing Health and Human Services Secretary Xavier Becerra to submit a report to him within 30 days on the actions his department is taking on the matter. The President is also establishing an interagency task force on reproductive health care access, which will include Attorney General Merrick Garland. HHS will take action to expand access to emergency contraception and long-acting reversible contraception like intrauterine devices, or IUDs, according to the White House. The department is tasked with ensuring patients have access to “the full rights and protections for emergency medical care afforded under the law” and the President has directed Becerra to consider updating guidance that clarifies physician responsibilities and protections under the Emergency Medical Treatment and Labor Act. Garland has also issued a statement saying states cannot ban Mifepristone – a medication used to end early pregnancy that has FDA approval. The department will ramp up outreach and public education efforts on abortion “to ensure that Americans have access to reliable and accurate information about their rights and access to care.” In preparation for expected legal challenges ahead, the attorney general and the White House counsel are convening private pro bono attorneys and organizations to provide more legal representation to those lawfully seeking abortions as well as those providing them. The executive order also focuses on protecting patient privacy. The President is asking the chair of the Federal Trade Commission to consider taking steps to protect consumer privacy when seeking information about reproductive health care services. Biden has also directed Becerra, in consultation with Garland and the FTC, to consider options to address deceptive or fraudulent practices and protect access to accurate information. The President is directing HHS to consider additional actions to safeguard sensitive information related to reproductive health care, including under the Health Insurance Portability and Accountability Act. Becerra has directed the HHS Office for Civil Rights to issue new guidance related to the HIPAA Privacy Rule to clarify that doctors and medical providers are in most cases not required – and in many instances not permitted – to disclose the private information of patients, including to law enforcement. The office will also issue a guide for consumers on how to protect personal data on mobile apps. The order also looks to ensure the safety of those seeking as well as providing abortion care, including by protecting mobile clinics that have been deployed to provide care for out-of-state patients.

## Link

### AT L—Tech regs bipartisan

#### Regulations on tech have bipartisan support

Bradley Tusk 22, 6-10-2022, "Big Tech regulation is bipartisan," Tusk is a political strategist and writer. He is the founder and CEO of Tusk Ventures, the first venture capital fund to work with and invest solely in high-growth startups facing political and regulatory challenges. Protocol, https://www.protocol.com/policy/bipartisan-tech-regulation-tusk#toggle-gdpr

We live in a society where each party instinctively opposes the views of the other. If Democrats say they like ice cream, Republicans say that ice cream has secret microchips that spy for the Chinese. If Republicans say they like apple pie, Democrats say the dessert is a symbol of oppression and must be banned. Sadly, it sometimes does reach levels almost this silly. But there seems to be one issue defying political gravity: tech regulation. From Congress to the Supreme Court, from states to presidential candidates, from think tanks on the left to those on the right, the stars have aligned far differently around regulating Big Tech than they have for almost any other current issue. For example, the U.S. Supreme Court recently issued a stay of a Texas law that was designed to ban online platforms from restricting user posts based on political views. The social media companies argued that the Texas law violated their First Amendment rights to control the content on their platforms. So you have what’s meant to be a pro-Republican position on the Texas law — preventing platforms like Twitter from banning people like Trump — against what’s normally a Democratic position, protecting the First Amendment. But the outcome was surprising. The majority who voted to pause the Texas law — Chief Justice John Roberts (appointed by George W. Bush) and Justices Stephen Breyer (appointed by Bill Clinton), Sonia Sotomayor (appointed by Barack Obama), Brett Kavanaugh and Amy Coney Barrett (both appointed by Donald Trump) — make an unusual set of allies. And on the other side, Justice Elena Kagan (Obama), one of the most liberal members of the court, sided with Justices Samuel Alito (W. Bush), Neil Gorsuch (Trump) and Clarence Thomas (George H.W. Bush) to oppose the stay — not the usual coalition. But justices aren’t beholden to voters, so maybe it’s easier for them to agree while everyone else still has to toe the party line. Disproving that theory, though, only requires one glance at the American Innovation and Choice Online Act in Congress. The bill prohibits dominant media platforms, defined by their market cap and number of users, from discriminating against other businesses that rely on their services. So for example, Amazon wouldn’t be able to make products from outside vendors far less attractive or easy to find than their own products. The legislation, led by prominent Democratic Sen. Amy Kloubchar, passed out of the Senate Judiciary Committee in January with a 16-6 vote, reflecting broad bipartisan support. Republican Sens. Chuck Grassley, Lindsey Graham, Ted Cruz, Josh Hawley and John Kennedy all supported it, with Grassley and Kennedy both serving as co-sponsors. Passing anything in Congress is still akin to a miracle, but if one bill has a shot of passing this year, it may be this one. The bipartisan trend toward regulating Big Tech even occurred during the 2020 presidential race, one of the ugliest races in history. Trump and Biden didn’t agree on much, but they did agree on one issue: revoking Section 230. Sec. 230 is a federal law that protects platforms like Facebook or Twitter from being sued for content posted by its users. In my view, it is the single biggest contributor to making the internet toxic. And that issue is so much of concern to both sides that Trump publicly called out “the horrendous tech giants,” and argued for repealing Sec. 230 at a rally in Georgia. Biden then said the same thing: “Sec. 230 should be revoked, immediately should be revoked, No. 1. For Zuckerberg and other platforms. It should be revoked because it is not merely an internet company. It is propagating falsehoods they know to be false.” Now, given Washington’s ineptitude, Sec. 230 is of course still alive and well. But in a world where most issues are automatically doomed because one side’s support immediately prevents the other’s, there’s at least a chance something can get done. The same holds true at the state level. California, a blue state if there ever was one, approved the California Consumer Privacy Act in 2018, giving consumers the ability to protect themselves and their data from big tech companies. The CCPA, which went into effect in 2020, contains a broad array of consumer protections, ranging from the right to opt out of a business’s sale of their personal information to the ability to request that business delete their personal information. Which were the next three states to follow along? Colorado and Virginia, both purple states, and Utah, an extremely red state. The legislation in each state effectively does the same thing, providing consumers with some ability to protect their privacy and their data. If Big Tech regulation were a strictly partisan issue, this never would have happened. Even think tanks on the left and right are in unusual places. No one ever confuses the Brookings Institution and the Heritage Foundation, but they both agree strongly on regulating Big Tech. Brookings supports the creation of a federal agency to oversee Big Tech. The Heritage Foundation has equated big tech to totalitarianism, calling for aggressive reforms to constrain tech’s ability to reshape society. Unlike almost every other issue out there — guns, climate, immigration, education, health care, abortion and so on — regulating Big Tech appeals to elected officials, judges and scholars on both sides of the aisle. Does this mean we should now expect a torrent of bipartisan legislation that finally takes on issues like privacy, antitrust and platform liability? No. We’re still talking about the government; you should always bet on failure and incompetence. But if you wanted to find one issue that at least has a shot in an impending divided government — with a likely Republican-led House and Senate and a Democratic-led White House — regulating Big Tech may be your best bet.

#### Voter’s favor tech regulation – means at most the plan turns the DA and at the least there is no link

Lauren Feiner 20, 7-29-2020, “New poll shows voters favor tech regulation, but rank it a low priority,” CNBC, https://www.cnbc.com/2021/06/23/new-poll-shows-voters-favor-tech-regulation-but-rank-it-low-priority.html

Voters favor tech regulation but are less supportive of measures they perceive to hamper their favorite services, according to a poll conducted by Morning Consult and commissioned by tech-funded advocacy group Chamber of Progress. The survey results come Wednesday, just hours before the House Judiciary Committee is set to debate a series of antitrust bills aimed at reining in the power of the largest tech firms. The bills follow an investigation by the panel that found that Amazon, Apple, Facebook and Google hold monopoly power. The Big Tech companies or industry groups they fund, including Chamber of Progress, have publicly opposed the bills, saying they would fundamentally alter services users have come to rely on. According to the new poll, that’s a scenario voters would oppose. Overall, survey respondents didn’t rank tech regulation high on their list of concerns for Congress. Of a list of priorities including the economy, public health, climate change and infrastructure, 44% of respondents ranked technology company regulations as last on the list of what Congress should address. Prior to seeing specific examples of how large tech platforms would have to change their services, 53% of respondents said they at least somewhat supported Congress passing legislation to impose new regulations on companies like Amazon, Apple, Facebook and Google. But when given specific examples of how the businesses might have to alter their offerings under the bills, more respondents said they would oppose them. For example, when presented with the possibility that Amazon could be restricted from giving free shipping on some Amazon Prime products, just 15% said they would still support such legislation, 17% said it would have no impact on their thinking, 9% said they didn’t know or had no opinion and 59% said it would make them at least somewhat more likely to oppose the bill. Two of the bills introduced by a bipartisan group of lawmakers earlier this month could have the greatest structural impact on the tech platforms. The American Choice and Innovation Online Act would prevent dominant platforms from favoring their own services over competitors that use their marketplaces, while the Ending Platform Monopolies Act would prohibit such platforms from owning business lines that present a conflict of interest. That presents a clear threat to companies like Amazon and Apple, which operate marketplaces on which they also offer products. After being presented with other possible implications of the bills, like Google being restricted from showing Google Maps in its main search results or Apple being prevented from pre-installing certain apps, 39% said they would still at least somewhat support such legislation. Both Democrats and Republicans were more likely to oppose the bills after being presented with the scenarios. Morning Consult surveyed nearly 2,000 registered voters from Thursday to Monday on a range of questions about tech regulation. It gave the margin of error as plus or minus 2 percentage points. Of the group, 40% identified as Democrats, 34% as Republicans and 26% as Independents. Respondents skewed slightly older, with 36% ages 45 and older, and only 19% made over $100,000 in annual income. Chamber of Progress identifies itself as a center-left group

### AT L—NATO popular

#### US action with NATO popular

Kathy Frankovic 21, 6-14-2021, "Americans tend to favor NATO by 48% to 28%," No Publication, https://today.yougov.com/topics/international/articles-reports/2021/06/14/americans-favor-nato-poll

President Joe Biden’s trip to Europe has multiple goals. The president will meet with many world leaders, ranging from NATO, EU and G7 allies, to Turkish President Recip Tayyip Erdogan and Russian President Vladimir Putin. During the meetings, he will seek to reinforce the United States’ “shared democratic values” while bolstering key alliances. At least one ambition of Biden’s – to cement relations with NATO – has the support of Americans in the latest Economist/YouGov poll, although many Republicans remain skeptical of the organization. That skepticism increased during Donald Trump’s presidency, when he criticized NATO for not contributing enough to the group members’ mutual defense. Nearly half the public now has a favorable opinion of NATO (48% positive vs 28% negative), but that is up only slightly from two years ago (44% vs 25%), with Republicans today remaining negative (34% positive, 46% negative). While Republicans are negative toward NATO, they agree by better than two to one (52% to 24%) that the United States must maintain its commitment to defend any NATO member that has been attacked. Even in the middle of the Trump presidency, when as many Republicans wanted to withdraw from NATO as remain in the alliance, most Republicans believed the U.S. should keep that defense commitment to members of the alliance.

### AT L—AI regs

#### American’s support US taking the lead in developing AI responsibly

Emily **Birnbaum 22**, 1-24-2022, "Tech spent big on lobbying last year," POLITICO, https://www.politico.com/newsletters/morning-tech/2022/01/24/tech-spent-big-on-lobbying-last-year-00001144

FIRST IN MT: AI REGULATION GETS PUBLIC BACKING — More than 80 percent of Americans favor regulating all or most uses of artificial intelligence technologies, according to a survey from the U.S. Chamber of Commerce. Respondents identified self-driving vehicles, law enforcement and health care as the top uses of AI they want to see regulated, based on the survey of 1,000 respondents throughout the country. More than 80 percent of respondents said the U.S. should lead in AI tech development in general. Americans surveyed also recognized that there will be job loss due to automation — 42 percent of respondents said believe AI will lead to “some job loss” in the U.S.

### AT L–Biotech

#### Global collaboration over regulating biotech popular

Val Giddings 21, 4-15, 2021, "How the Biden Administration can accelerate prosperity by fixing agricultural-biotech regulations," Genetic Literacy Project, https://geneticliteracyproject.org/2021/04/15/how-the-biden-administration-can-accelerate-prosperity-by-fixing-agricultural-biotech-regulations/

Key takeaways With bipartisan support, U.S. biotech regulations since 1986 have enabled innovation to flourish, leading a global revolution in agricultural productivity and sustainability that has benefitted farmers, consumers, and the environment. Yet regulations have not been modernized to keep pace with scientific innovation, and they have strayed from relying on science and data. This has impeded further biotech innovation that could improve safety and solve pressing societal problems. USDA has made some progress updating and streamlining regulations, but data and experience show it needs to move farther and faster. EPA and FDA have become obstacles to progress and safety advances and urgently need to correct course. The Office of Science and Technology Policy should work with the Office of Management and Budget to ensure updates take place quickly. This will stimulate innovations in agricultural biotechnology across multiple sectors of the economy

#### Innovative biotech investments have public support

Mark Strauss 18, 8-28-18, “A majority of Americans support using biotechnology to grow human organs in animals for transplants,” Pew Research Center, https://www.pewresearch.org/fact-tank/2018/08/20/a-majority-of-americans-support-using-biotechnology-to-grow-human-organs-in-animals-for-transplants/

Almost six-in-ten Americans (57%) consider it an appropriate use of technology to genetically engineer animals to grow organs or tissues that could be used for humans needing a transplant, while 41% say this would be going too far, according to a new survey by Pew Research Center. The findings are part of a larger pattern that reveals Americans are more likely to support the bioengineering of animals if it benefits human health. Demand for transplantable organs and tissues continues to grow in the United States. Last year saw the most organ transplants ever performed in the country. Organs were recovered from more than 10,000 donors – an increase of more than 25% over the past 10 years. Health experts attribute this increase, in part, to breakthroughs in medical technology that have made it possible to recover organs that previously would have been unsuitable for transplants. But, despite these advances, the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services reports that the gap between supply and demand remains wide. Researchers are hoping to close that gap through the development of new medical technologies. One such approach is 3D organ printing– a process that uses “bio-ink” to print layers of cells that grow to form transplantable tissue. Another method under development uses genetic engineering to grow human organs and tissues in animals. There was a breakthrough with this technique earlier this year, when scientists used gene editing to create hybrid embryos containing both human and sheep cells. When the survey – conducted April 23-May 6 – asked the 41% of respondents who opposed this application of genetic engineering to explain, in their own words, the main reason behind their view, the objections included concerns about the use of animals in this way for human benefit (21% of those asked) and the potential risks for human health (16% of those asked). The responses included: “In manufacturing organs, the existence of these animals would be miserable … I can’t ethically say that I would agree with such a practice.” “Factory farming already as an industry unethically treats animals. I imagine organ growing wouldn’t treat the animals any differently.” “When you mix human and non-human genetics I believe that will cause extreme problems down the road.” “Even human-to-human organ transplants often reject, so I can only imagine the bad side effects that an animal-to-human transplant would cause. Keep things simple and the way nature intended.”

## AT !---Democracy

### No !

#### Multiple alt causes to democracy or it’s resilient

**Shattuck 18**

John Shattuck (a professor at the Fletcher School of Law and Diplomacy and a senior fellow at the Carr Center for Human Rights Policy at the Harvard Kennedy School. He served as the president and rector of Central European University in Budapest from 2009 to 2016, assistant secretary of state for democracy, human rights and labor (1993-1998) and ambassador to the Czech Republic (1998-2000). Earlier, he was national staff counsel and Washington office director of the American Civil Liberties Union (1971-1984)). “How Democracy in America Can Survive Donald Trump.” The American Prospect. February 23, 2018. http://prospect.org/article/how-democracy-america-can-survive-donald-trump

WHAT LESSONS CAN BE drawn from the first year of the Trump administration about the potential resilience of liberal democracy in the United States? A key question going forward is whether the popular revulsion against Trump will focus on his assaults on democracy—or will spill over into even deeper distust of democratic politics and government. How Trump’s critics perform in defending democratic institutions and dispelling this distrust will determine whether post-Trump America brings an era of democratic renewal. Long before the election of Donald Trump, democratic institutions were in trouble and vulnerable to attack. For more than a decade, there has been growing discontent and a steady deterioration of public support for the U.S. system of democratic governance. Political polarization and differing partisan perceptions of government are the main contributors to this trend. Senate Majority Leader Mitch McConnell famously announced in 2010 that his main legislative goal was to make Barack Obama a one-term president, signaling that Republican obstruction and legislative gridlock would hobble the Obama presidency. The electoral process has been weakened by the influence of unregulated campaign spending and an increase in state-level voting restrictions and legislative gerrymandering. The result has been a weakening of public belief in the ability of the courts, Congress, and the Constitution to be effective in checking and resisting abuses of power by the executive, and a drop in the percentage of people who agree that the United States fully or mostly lives up to democratic standards. Trump has exacerbated and accelerated the degradation of liberal democratic institutions. By repeatedly lying and manipulating factual reality, he has promoted the view that there is no objective truth. By attacking and insulting opponents, he has degraded public discussion of issues and politicized the institutions that are normally seen as nonpartisan guardrails of democracy. The federal courts, the media, law enforcement agencies, and the federal civil service have all been attacked by the president as partisan when they have resisted his agenda. The president’s attack on the FBI in its ongoing Russia investigation into potential collusion and obstruction of justice is a case study of how Trump politicizes nonpartisan institutions and undermines the rule of law. Trump’s attacks have been aimed at altering the public’s perception of an agency previously held in high regard as professional and nonpartisan. In response to these attacks, the institutions of American democracy have demonstrated varying degrees of resistance and potential for resilience. Those that have been most resilient, like civil society, are strong and innately capable of defense, while others, like the electoral process, have been weakened by partisan manipulation and are unlikely to be resilient unless reformed. The greatest resilience has been demonstrated by the strongest institutions, civil society and state and local government, and the greatest vulnerability by the weakest, the electoral process and norms of presidential conduct. Several institutions vulnerable to presidential attack, like the media, have shown significant levels of resistance, while others with inherent institutional strengths, like Congress, have exhibited little to none. What makes some liberal democratic institutions strong and others weak? The history of American political culture has shaped a broad and diverse civil society with a tradition of political activism, often in opposition to government. Tocqueville pointed out two centuries ago that Americans make up for their skepticism about government with their commitment to civic engagement. Political culture in the United States has created a system of state and local government which serves to check and balance federal power, sometimes constructively, as over the past year, and sometimes destructively, as during the post-Reconstruction period and the civil rights revolution. At the same time, American political culture has created a weak electoral process, plagued by historical anomalies such as the Electoral College, multiple state and local jurisdictions, unregulated campaign funding, legislative gerrymandering, and state restrictions on voting. Presidential norms are vulnerable because they are not written into law and are no match for a president who overrides them. Congress has been badly weakened by political polarization, despite its express constitutional powers. The most surprising resistance to presidential attack during the first year of the Trump presidency has come from four institutions with significant political vulnerabilities that make them ready targets for an anti-democratic president—the media, the federal judiciary, law enforcement, and the federal civil service. The mainstream media, as noted, have done surprisingly well, and could emerge stronger for Trump’s assaults. The federal judiciary is vulnerable because the president is reshaping the courts by exercising his power to appoint new judges, but parts of the judiciary have been resistant over the past year to the administration’s anti-pluralist agenda on immigration, minority rights, and partisan gerrymandering. Similar resistance to the president’s attack on the rule of law in seeking to end or control the special counsel’s investigation has come from within the Justice Department and the FBI. And the federal civil service, despite senior positions filled by political appointees or left empty, generally has maintained its professionalism and resisted the administration’s effort to denigrate its work. It is too soon to tell how the institutions of American democracy will perform beyond the first year of the Trump presidency. Flaws in these institutions predating the Trump presidency have been exacerbated by Trump’s attacks. But U.S. public opinion continues to reflect strong opposition to concentrations of authority in the presidency, and this should provide a basis for continuing resistance. There is an opening for Democrats to mobilize public support in defense of constitutional norms and the rule of law in the 2018 congressional elections, and a surge of new Democratic candidates and court-ordered cutbacks in gerrymandering make it possible to bring about change. The bottom line is that American democracy has shown a potential for resilience during Trump’s first year. When compared with other backsliding democracies where neo-authoritarian leaders—such as Orban in Hungary, Kaczyński in Poland, and Erdoğan in Turkey—have destroyed the independence and functioning of pluralist institutions, the situation in the United States is better.

### Democracy thumpers

#### Democracy is fricked – bipartisan perception proves democratic backsliding inev

Callie Patteson 22, 6-15-2022, "Most Democrats, Republicans say US ‘democracy’ won’t last, poll finds," New York Post, https://nypost.com/2022/06/15/most-democrats-republicans-say-us-democracy-wont-last-poll/

More than half of self-identified Democrats and Republicans believe the US will no longer be a “democracy” at some point in the future, according to a new poll. The striking findings were reported in a Yahoo News/YouGov survey which found 55% of Democrats and 53% of Republicans said it was “likely” the US will “cease to be a democracy in the future.” It was unclear how the poll defined “democracy.” The US is officially a constitutional federal republic where states run direct elections for most high offices — though not, most notably, for president. When independents and the non-affiliated were factored in, the depressing notion was shared by 49% of all respondents — while only 25% said they consider the end of democracy to be “unlikely,” while another 25% said they were unsure. In addition, 60% of Democrats and 61% of Republicans believe America is becoming a “less democratic country.” Both political sides also believe they were treated more fairly “in the past” than now – 71% of Republicans and 50% of Democrats agreed with that statement. A new poll from Yahoo News/YouGov found that a majority of Republicans and Democrats believe the United States will “cease to be a democracy in the future.” A new poll from Yahoo News/YouGov found that a majority of Republicans and Democrats believe the United States will “cease to be a democracy in the future.” Photo by Michael Ciaglo/Getty Images Additionally, the poll found that 52% of Republicans, 50% of independents and 46% of Democrats believe “there will be a civil war in the United States in [their] lifetime.” While there appears to be bipartisan hopelessness for the future of America, respondents were quick to blame the other side for the present predicament. A plurality of Republicans — 30% — described Democrats as “out of touch with reality,” while 25% claimed they were a “threat to America.” Another 8% see the Democratic Party as “immoral” and 4% said it was a “threat to me personally.” The poll found that nearly half of Republicans, Democrats and independents believe there will be a civil war in the US in their lifetime. The poll found that nearly half of Republicans, Democrats and independents believe there will be a civil war in the US in their lifetime. Photo by ROBERTO SCHMIDT/AFP via Getty Images Democrats’ opinions of the GOP were similar, with 27% calling the Republican Party “out of touch with reality,” 23% saying they are a “threat to America,” 7% claiming the GOP is “immoral” and 4% calling it a “threat to me personally.” The Yahoo News/YouGov survey also polled voters on the ongoing hearings held by the House select committee investigating the Jan. 6 Capitol riot — and overall, Americans are not impressed. Only 24% of respondents said they watched the initial primetime session broadcast last week, while 27% said they followed news coverage after the fact. A whopping 49% said they have not followed the hearings at all. Just 24% of participants in the survey said they watched the initial coverage Jan. 6 Capitol riot hearings. Just 24% of participants in the survey said they watched the initial coverage of the Jan. 6 Capitol riot hearings. The committee is seeking to convince Americans that the Jan. 6, 2021, Capitol riot was part of a conspiracy to overturn the 2020 presidential election results. However, only 45% of Americans believe that claim, according to the survey. Another 35% said they did not believe it while 20% said they were unsure. Even fewer respondents — 37% — believe that “Donald Trump was at the center” of any plot to keep him in power. The survey of 1,541 US adults was conducted June 10 to 13 and carries a margin of error of approximately 2.9%.

## AT !---Climate

### No !

#### No warming impact

Sandberg 18—James Martin Research Fellow at the Future of Humanity Institute, Faculty of Philosophy and Oxford Martin School, University of Oxford [Anders, February 2018, “Human Extinction from Natural Hazard Events”, Oxford Research Encyclopedia of Natural Hazard Science, DOI: 10.1093/acrefore/9780199389407.013.293, Accessed through the Wake Forest Library, language edited change denoted by brackets] AMarb

In the past climate change has likely threatened the early H. sapiens by long periods of drought or ecological change, typically driven by the glacial cycles. Cooling periods have been associated with population contractions and extinctions (Foley, 1994; Gamble et al., 2004). Still, given human survival through these cycles they have been insufficient to cause species extinction. Typical discussions of anthropogenic climate change focus on scenarios with a few °C of warming, because such scenarios are high probability, they are near-term and can be analyzed using current data and models. Such “normal” climate change (comparable to past temperature change during the Holocene [Marcott et al., 2013]) is expected to affect food security but not in a radical way. An increase in climate related extremes such as floods, droughts, cyclones, and wildfires can be expected but would do mainly localized damage. Reductions in agricultural productivity and water scarcity are to be expected. Effects depend on the vulnerability profile of different regions but are overall negative (Schmidhuber & Tubiello, 2007; IPCC, 2014). Still, despite serious local problems the overall situation appears to pose no major risk to the survival of the species. Large temperature increases (4+ °C) would affect ecosystems at the same level as human land-use changes, cause substantial increase in extinction of non-human species, and increase the probability of large-scale tipping points (when a smooth change of parameters leads to an abrupt qualitative change in behavior) such as disintegrating ice sheets, methane release from undersea deposits (clathrates), and long-term droughts in some areas that act as reinforcing feedbacks for a changed climate and ecosystem. At this point crop yields can be expected to drop on the order of 20% or more (depending on crop and location), outdoor activity in the tropics becomes [difficult] ~~impaired~~, and global food security becomes less stable (IPCC, 2014). While this could seriously stress human societies or force a smaller population it is again not per se an extinction risk. However, little is known about tail risks corresponding to higher temperature increases; uncertainty about climate sensitivity and future emissions is compounded by the possibility of positive feedbacks producing significantly more warming. Wagner and Weitzman (2016) argued, based on IPCC data, that depending on emission scenario there is a 3% to 10% risk of a 6+ °C increase. At this point large regions would be too warm for unprotected humans to survive in, and beyond 11–12 °C warming this would encompass most currently inhabited regions (King et al., 2015; Sherwood & Huber, 2010). While this does not ensure extinction, the global population would have a constrained and vulnerable habitat. An even more extreme scenario would be causing a runaway greenhouse effect sterilizing earth. However, this is unlikely to be possible through adding greenhouse gases (Goldblatt & Watson, 2012). Conversely, triggering a snowball earth state (where the surface is nearly entirely frozen and the ice and snow maintains the low temperature by reflecting sunlight into space effectively) would require a 10% reduction in solar input, or a more modest reduction plus drastically lower CO2 levels (Yang, Peltier, & Hu, 2012). Although the biosphere is expected to destabilize eventually (dooming any terrestrial species) the expected lifespan is on the order of 1.6–2 billion years. The cause of extinction is thought to be the increasing solar luminosity, making conditions too hot, combined with CO2 levels becoming too low for photosynthesis, or water loss to space (Franck, Bounama, & von Bloh, 2006; Wolf & Toon, 2015).

## AT !---China

#### No great power war with China.

Stashiwick 20 (Steven Stashwick is an independent writer and researcher focused on East Asian security and maritime issues.; “A Cold War Movie’s (Wrong) Lessons About US-China Competition”; The Diplomat; March 6, 2020; <https://thediplomat.com/2020/03/a-cold-war-movies-wrong-lessons-about-u-s-china-competition/>) Accessed 6/25/21//eleanor

This helps move the film’s plot along, but gets the logic behind nuclear missile submarines backwards. A first strike only works if the majority of an adversary’s nuclear arsenal can be destroyed because whatever survives will be launched in retaliation. That’s what makes missile submarines important, their function isn’t to conduct first strikes but to survive them by being at sea where they are less easily targeted than fixed missile silos on land. This makes them “survivable second strike” platforms that guarantee retaliation in response to an attack, thereby removing the incentive to conduct a “first strike.” The Red October wasn’t, as one on-screen admiral laments, “built to start a war,” but to more effectively deter one. Unspoken in the concern of all the American admirals and generals in the movie, is that the Red October wasn’t a threat to mutual nuclear deterrence between the United States and the Soviet Union, it was a guarantor of it; what it really threatened was the ability of the United States to survive a Soviet nuclear retaliation and “win” a potential nuclear war. This is an understandable advantage to seek, but one that actually raises the risk of the disaster trying to be averted. The Cold War is often described as a condition of mutual deterrence between the United States and the Soviet Union – “M.A.D.” – but this was never quite the United States’ strategy, which sought to deter its rivals but avoid being deterred itself if it could be helped. Now the United States, which already enjoys an enormous nuclear advantage over China, is working to ensure it has sufficient conventional advantage against it. For more than a decade the United States has sought new strategies and technologies to defeat China’s anti-access and area denial capabilities – thousands of long-range land attack and anti-ship missiles intended to keep U.S. fleets and warplanes far away from its coasts. This restriction on its freedom of action is broadly unacceptable to the United States, motivating research into a host of advanced weapons to respond to China’s missile arsenal. These include new long-range missiles that had been banned under the Cold War-era INF Treaty that the United States exited last year, a range of hypersonic missiles that can travel at five times the speed of sound or more, and the U.S. Army’s Strategic Long Range Cannon, a super gun designed to fire rocket-assisted artillery shells to ranges of at least 1,000 miles. From the outside, the argument that China’s efforts to thwart the United States’ ability to conduct attacks against China is sign of malign intention might appear to be bad faith, or at least obtuse. The United States contends that this situation would give China a free hand to take advantage of partners and allies, and potentially seize the island of Taiwan by force. If China’s capabilities all work as planned, and at the outset of a war against Taiwan it sinks a U.S. fleet sent to deter it, would China really expect that the United States would not retaliate, and potentially with nuclear weapons? During the 1996 Taiwan Strait crisis, a PLA general implicitly threatened that China might use its nuclear deterrent to prevent the United States from coming to Taiwan’s aid, reportedly telling a senior U.S. official that Americans “care more about Los Angeles than they do about Taiwan.” But even if true, China could not be confident that it could issue a nuclear threat against the United States without a response. The question then isn’t only whether the United States cares more about its cities than keeping Taiwan free, but simultaneously whether China cares more about Shanghai, for example, than it does about seizing Taiwan. For the architects of the Trump administration’s defense strategy, the Pentagon’s new weapons programs are a way to fight a major war against China without having to resort to using nuclear weapons. This is true as far as it goes, that the United States needs a credible conventional deterrent against Chinese aggression, but sidesteps how a war that would lead to conventional strikes against targets on China’s mainland on the one hand, and against U.S. territories and allies on the other, doesn’t rush precipitously towards nuclear use anyway. And in trying to figure out how to fight a major war against China without nuclear weapons, dismisses the idea that a credible risk of that war going nuclear is a much surer deterrent against it breaking out in the first place. Since both the United States and China have nuclear weapons, and especially in light of China’s efforts to improve the survivability of its nuclear missile submarines, a major armed conflict between the two should be deterred by the threat of mutual nuclear attack. The possibility of a non-nuclear conflict between them rests on the logic of the stability-instability paradox. This theory posits that two nuclear-armed countries both desire to avoid total destruction and therefore will avoid conflicts that risk escalating to that level of force. But as a result of that strategic-level stability, each feels secure in engaging in lower-intensity conflict, confident that the other would not risk nuclear escalation over comparatively minor provocations. This is likely part of the reason that Chinese planes and ships, like the Soviets before them, have felt secure to engage in “games of chicken” with U.S. planes and ships resulting in incidents from the 2001 EP-3 collision in which a Chinese pilot died to near-collisions between warships in 2013 and 2018. The Hunt for Red October also suggests, incorrectly (or at least exaggeratedly), that dangerous incidents like these might lead to cataclysm. In a scene where the National Security Advisor admonishes the Soviet Ambassador, he warns that U.S. and Soviet warships and planes operating close together was highly dangerous, and that “wars have begun that way.” It’s a concern both the United States and China have invoked about interactions between their navies when operating in the South China Sea, on the theory that an unintended incident might spark an armed clash and escalate from there. But as straightforward as the logic seems, the worry that incidents like these might lead to miscalculation and escalation appears unfounded, and historically, wars haven’t ever begun that way. Still, the fear of unintended escalation has motivated some positive steps, such as a series of agreements between the Chinese and U.S. militaries to define safe behavior between their units, mirroring similar Cold War agreements between the United States and the Soviet Union. But China and Russia appear to have figured out a strategic asymmetry that the United States still struggles with. At the low-end, both China and (now) Russia still repeatedly violate those agreements, variously in letter and spirit, recognizing that these incidents, dangerous as they are, lack the potential for escalation the United States often asserts they do, leaving it with mostly unsatisfactory responses. But at the high-end, the United States is working feverishly to figure out how to fight major wars under the assumption that they would not go nuclear, one that the implicated adversaries may not share. If it is going to succeed in great power competition, the United States has to figure out how to flip both scripts.

## AT ! – Filibuster

### Filibuster good

#### Eliminating the filibuster would allow a Republican takeover after midterms – preservation is key to checking the GOP

**Thiessen 7/5** [Marc A. Thiessen, Thiessen is a columnist focusing on foreign and domestic policy. He writes a twice-weekly column for The Post on foreign and domestic policy. He is a fellow at the American Enterprise Institute, and the former chief speechwriter for President George W. Bush. He is a Fox News contributor, “Weaken the filibuster before a wave election? That would be a bad move, Democrats.”, Washington Post, June 5 2022, https://www.washingtonpost.com/opinions/2022/07/05/filibuster-roe-democrats-manchin-sinema/]//RA

Do Democrats never learn from their mistakes?

In an act of stunning political and legislative incompetence, President Biden is calling on Senate Democrats to bypass the filibuster to pass legislation codifying Roe v. Wade — even though he knows full well he does not have the votes to make this happen. Democratic Sens. Joe Manchin III (W.Va.) and Kyrsten Sinema (Ariz.) don’t support weakening the filibuster to codify Roe. Biden is raising expectations among his base that he will almost certainly dash — further dispiriting them before the November midterm elections.

But even if he did have the votes, it would be foolish to weaken the filibuster just months before a wave election that is expected to sweep Democrats out of power on Capitol Hill. The president’s party has lost, on average, 27 House seats in midterm elections since 1946. And this will not be an average midterm election. Biden has been the most unpopular president since the modern polling era began with Harry S. Truman. Republicans are all but certain to win back the majority in the House, and need only a net gain of one seat to take back the Senate.

It’s possible that Democrats could somehow manage to hold off a GOP Senate takeover in 2022, but the field is even more tilted toward Republicans in 2024. Democrats will be defending 23 seats, while the GOP will be defending just 10. None of those GOP seats are in states Biden won in 2020 — and only one, Florida Sen. Rick Scott’s, is in a state that Donald Trump won by less than five points. So the odds are overwhelming that if Republicans don’t win back the Senate this year, they will do so in 2024. And considering the unprecedented serial disasters Biden has unleashed in his first term, Republicans are more than likely to control the House, Senate and White House in just over two years’ time.

Given that grim political reality, why on earth would Democrats want to do anything to weaken the filibuster? Let’s say they succeeded in using a filibuster carve-out to codify Roe. Two years from now, Republicans could use that same carve-out to reverse the Democrats’ action and pass a national abortion ban in its place.

That would be just the beginning. History shows that partial filibuster carve-outs don’t last. During the Obama administration, then-Senate Majority Leader Harry M. Reid (D-Nev.) eliminated the filibuster for all federal judicial appointments except Supreme Court nominees. That set the precedent for Republicans to eliminate it for Supreme Court justices as well when Trump came to power — paving the way for the 6-to-3 conservative majority that just overturned Roe.

If Democrats dilute the legislative filibuster by setting it aside when it comes to their key priorities, that will set a precedent for Republicans to eliminate it entirely when they take over. If Democrats like the string of victories the Supreme Court’s conservative majority handed down this term, they will love what a Republican-controlled, filibuster-free Senate will do.

They should look back on all the legislation they stopped Republican majorities from enacting because of the filibuster — from entitlement reforms to lawsuit reforms, election reforms, border-wall funding, an end to sanctuary cities and restrictions on cash bail, the elimination of restrictions on oil and gas exploration, national right-to-work legislation, expanded gun rights and the defunding of Planned Parenthood — and then imagine all that and more being enacted by simple majority vote when Republicans regain control of both Congress and the presidency. In the words of my Post colleague Ruth Marcus, “Welcome to the apocalypse.”

What is remarkable is that despite these obvious consequences, Senate Democrats would eliminate the legislative filibuster without hesitation were it not for Manchin and Sinema. They justify this legislative vandalism by arguing that Senate Minority Leader Mitch McConnell (R-Ky.) will eliminate the filibuster anyway when Republicans take power, so they might as well do it now while they have power. There is no evidence to suggest that he would. Quite the opposite, McConnell wisely refused to scrap this rule at a time when Republicans controlled the White House, Senate, and House of Representatives, despite President Trump’s repeated urging that he do so, because, McConnell said, “There are no permanent victories in politics.”

Biden once understood this. Back in 2005, when Democrats were filibustering President George W. Bush’s judicial nominees, then-Sen. Biden took to the Senate floor to warn Republicans against eliminating the filibuster to get them through. “You may own the field right now, but you won’t own it forever,” Biden said. He’d do well to remember those words, and take his own advice.

#### Maintaining the filibuster is integral to democrats’ long term goals – removal would be detrimental

Hohmann 7/6 [James Hohmann, Education: Stanford University, B.A. in History. Hohmann writes an opinion column for The Washington Post. In his previous role as a national political correspondent, he was the author of The Daily 202, The Post's flagship political newsletter; the voice of The Big Idea podcast, the paper's premier morning news audio briefing; and the anchor of PowerPost, a vertical focused on the intersection of politics and policy. Hohmann covered local news for The Post in the aughts and returned in 2015 after six years at Politico. He has also written for the Los Angeles Times, Dallas Morning News and San Jose Mercury News, “Busting the filibuster for abortion now is madness”, Washington Post, July 6 2022, https://www.washingtonpost.com/opinions/2022/07/06/busting-filibuster-abortion-crazy/]//RA

Democrats hoping to change the rules of the Senate in a futile bid to pass a federal law protecting abortion rights are displaying the most myopic political thinking since liberals called for defunding the police.

Then, as now, their anger was righteous and raw. Millions of Americans took to the streets in the spring of 2020 to protest systemic racism after the murder of George Floyd in Minneapolis. But the shortsighted demands to divert resources from law enforcement continue to hobble Democrats who never even embraced the idea. Revising the filibuster will hurt even more in the long term.

The left’s thirst for Senate Democrats to do something about Dobbs is understandable, but the reality is that weakening the filibuster would simply open the door for Republicans to pass their own, far-more-punitive federal restrictions once they inevitably return to power.

Sen. Kyrsten Sinema (D-Ariz.) points to seven bills restricting abortion rights that would have passed the Senate in recent years had it not been for the 60-vote threshold necessary to overcome a filibuster. With Roe gone, Sinema says the filibuster is “more important now than ever.”

Republican visions of an abortion-free America will turn very real if the Democrats pursue this goal. Just two years ago, when Donald Trump was president, 53 senators voted to advance a 20-week abortion ban and 56 senators backed a Born-Alive Abortion Survivors Protection Act, which would have created criminal penalties for doctors who failed to follow new federal standards after procedures went awry. In 2015, 53 senators voted to ban federal funding for Planned Parenthood. In 2006, 57 senators voted to make it a federal crime to transport a minor across state lines to get an abortion without notifying her parents in advance.

Pretending Democrats can carve out a narrow filibuster “exception” that Republicans won’t exploit to their own ends later requires a willful blindness to political reality. Republicans would use an abortion exception to pass all sorts of federal restrictions on abortion as soon as they have the votes.

Democrats should have learned this lesson by now. In 2013, then-Senate Majority Leader Harry M. Reid (D-Nev.) wrangled the votes to get rid of the filibuster for most presidential nominations, but he insisted it would not apply to the Supreme Court. That opened the door in 2017 for his successor as majority leader, Sen. Mitch McConnell (R-Ky.), to remove the high court exemption so he could confirm Justice Neil M. Gorsuch. If Reid had left the original 60-vote threshold in place for all nominations, Justice Amy Coney Barrett — who cast the deciding vote to overturn Roe — might not have been confirmed on the eve of the 2020 election.

“The filibuster is going to protect the interests of Democrats in the future, as it has in the past,” said Ronald Weich, who was chief counsel to Reid and is now dean of the University of Baltimore School of Law. “We’d live to regret it. … I don’t know how you get the genie back in the bottle.”

Besides, Senate Democrats don’t even have a majority ready to codify the principles of Roe. A vote in May only mustered 49 votes. Nor should Democrats take any solace that two Republican women currently in the Senate identify as pro-choice. Alaska’s Lisa Murkowski faces a tough reelection fight in November. Pro-lifers may not even need the vote of Maine’s Susan Collins.

Biden surely understands these dynamics, and he’s spoken eloquently in the past about the virtues of the filibuster. So why did he announce his support for suspending the rules? It’s the same reason he backed “going nuclear” this year to expand voting rights, which also fell short.

Grassroots Democratic activists are angry and talk to each other in a deafening echo chamber called Blue Twitter. The president is insecure about his standing with his base. He is worried liberal voters will stay home this fall if he doesn’t take steps to secure reproductive freedom. And his aides know that abortion is not an issue he has always been comfortable discussing.

Nonetheless, it would be madness for Democrats to roll back the filibuster four months before midterm elections when the president’s approval rating is below 40 percent, and the Senate is split 50-50. Democrats only control the chamber because of the tiebreaking vote of Vice President Harris.

Five years ago, when she was a freshman senator from California, Harris joined 60 other senators in signing a letter that called for saving the legislative filibuster. Back then, Trump was publicly berating GOP leaders to change the rules to pass his agenda. But McConnell resisted that pressure.

Now it’s time for Biden, Harris and the current Democratic leader, Sen. Charles E. Schumer (N.Y.), to do the same and reject demands from their left.

#### Removing the filibuster would be short-sighted and disastrous for a democratic future

Geraghty 6/30 [Jim Geraghty, Geraghty is the senior political correspondent of National Review, “What Happens If Democrats Start Creating Exceptions to the Filibuster?”, National Review, June 30 2022, https://www.nationalreview.com/corner/what-happens-if-democrats-start-creating-exceptions-to-the-filibuster/]//RA

[President Biden said in Europe today](https://www.nationalreview.com/news/biden-calls-for-filibuster-exception-to-codify-roe-after-outrageous-supreme-court-decision/) that Senate Democrats should eliminate the filibuster for abortion legislation, as well as for his preferred election reform legislation: “If the filibuster gets in the way, it’s like voting rights, it should be provided an exception for this…to the filibuster.”

In other words, the minority party in the Senate should be able to block legislation with 41 votes, unless Joe Biden thinks the legislation is really important.

At [the risk of echoing Charlie](https://www.nationalreview.com/corner/joe-biden-wants-a-filibuster-carve-out-for-the-democratic-party/), one of the hallmarks of this era is a stupefying lack of foresight in our political leaders, where they fail to foresee the most likely consequences of their actions. If Senate Democrats vote to change the rules of the chamber, and eliminate the filibuster for one or two of their top priority issues, then when Republicans regain control of the chamber — which could be as soon as January! — the GOP majority will vote to eliminate the filibuster, either on their own priority issues or entirely. After all, why should Republicans keep this provision to help the minority, when Democrats eliminated it to disempower the GOP minority of 50 senators?

This is a repeat of when Harry Reid eliminated the filibuster for lower court nominees… and then a few years later, Democrats were shocked when a Republican majority eliminated the filibuster for Supreme Court nominees.

If you want a lasting national legislative change in the United States, you need to get some buy-in from the opposition party. If Barack Obama enacts a nuclear deal with Iran, and joins the Paris Accords by executive fiat, then Donald Trump can undo those moves with the stroke of his pen. If Donald Trump approves the Keystone Pipeline and border wall funding through executive order, Joe Biden can repeal those decisions upon taking office. If Congressional Democrats enact an Obamacare on a party-line vote, a GOP Congress and president can repeal it on a party-line vote.

You know what’s not going to get repealed or quickly undone in the coming years? The [Right to Try Act](https://www.congress.gov/bill/115th-congress/senate-bill/204/all-actions?overview=closed#tabs), the [First Step Act,](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/First_Step_Act) the [infrastructure bill](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Infrastructure_Investment_and_Jobs_Act), and the recent [gun safety/mental health legislation](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Bipartisan_Safer_Communities_Act) – because they all had some significant level of support from the opposition party.

Presidents and Congressional majorities change from cycle to cycle; for a long time, America has had a pendulum effect. One party wins a big majority, starts to overreach, triggers a backlash, and the opposition party racks up big gains in the next election. Then once the opposition party has climbed back into control over the White House and Congress, they start to overreach themselves, starting the cycle all over again.

You could argue there’s even a similar effect on the Supreme Court — turnover is slow and not on any set schedule, but it happens – and any decision enacted by one court, like *Roe v. Wade*, can be reversed by a later court that looks at it again and concludes it is not consistent with the U.S. Constitution. The more you want a change to be lasting, the more you need all branches of government to formally sign off on the change.

For some reason, a surprising number of shortsighted political leaders keep making decisions with the assumption that their side will be in charge of these institutions forever – and that the opposition will never be in a position to reverse those changes.

## AT !---Econ

#### No econ decline impact.

Walt 20 [Stephen M. Walt is the Robert and Renée Belfer professor of international relations at Harvard University. “Will a Global Depression Trigger Another World War?”, May 13th, <https://foreignpolicy.com/2020/05/13/coronavirus-pandemic-depression-economy-world-war/>]

On balance, however, I do not think that even the extraordinary economic conditions we are witnessing today are going to have much impact on the likelihood of war. Why? First of all, if depressions were a powerful cause of war, there would be a lot more of the latter. To take one example, the United States has suffered 40 or more recessions since the country was founded, yet it has fought perhaps 20 interstate wars, most of them unrelated to the state of the economy. To paraphrase the economist Paul Samuelson’s famous quip about the stock market, if recessions were a powerful cause of war, they would have predicted “nine out of the last five (or fewer).”

Second, states do not start wars unless they believe they will win a quick and relatively cheap victory. As John Mearsheimer showed in his classic book Conventional Deterrence, national leaders avoid war when they are convinced it will be long, bloody, costly, and uncertain. To choose war, political leaders have to convince themselves they can either win a quick, cheap, and decisive victory or achieve some limited objective at low cost. Europe went to war in 1914 with each side believing it would win a rapid and easy victory, and Nazi Germany developed the strategy of blitzkrieg in order to subdue its foes as quickly and cheaply as possible. Iraq attacked Iran in 1980 because Saddam believed the Islamic Republic was in disarray and would be easy to defeat, and George W. Bush invaded Iraq in 2003 convinced the war would be short, successful, and pay for itself.

The fact that each of these leaders miscalculated badly does not alter the main point: No matter what a country’s economic condition might be, its leaders will not go to war unless they think they can do so quickly, cheaply, and with a reasonable probability of success.

Third, and most important, the primary motivation for most wars is the desire for security, not economic gain. For this reason, the odds of war increase when states believe the long-term balance of power may be shifting against them, when they are convinced that adversaries are unalterably hostile and cannot be accommodated, and when they are confident they can reverse the unfavorable trends and establish a secure position if they act now. The historian A.J.P. Taylor once observed that “every war between Great Powers [between 1848 and 1918] … started as a preventive war, not as a war of conquest,” and that remains true of most wars fought since then.

The bottom line: Economic conditions (i.e., a depression) may affect the broader political environment in which decisions for war or peace are made, but they are only one factor among many and rarely the most significant. Even if the COVID-19 pandemic has large, lasting, and negative effects on the world economy—as seems quite likely—it is not likely to affect the probability of war very much, especially in the short term.

### no runaway inflation

#### No risk of runaway inflation

La Monica 21 (Paul, digital correspondent for CNN Business. He writes daily about the markets and blue chip companies. May 20. "The Fed needs to get real about inflation" <https://www.cnn.com/2021/05/20/investing/inflation-stocks-economy-federal-reserve/index.html>)]

But does the Fed risk losing Wall Street credibility if Powell continues to put on blinders and stick his fingers in his ears whenever someone mentions inflation? Not necessarily.

"How much inflation actually sticks?" Foster wondered. She noted that many companies are using more automation and are spending to boost productivity. That could be an "antidote to runaway inflation."

Companies managing cost pressures for now

Even as top US companies like Walmart (WMT)boost their minimum wages, which should be inflationary, there are other ways for businesses to keep a lid on prices.

"We'll navigate the supply chain challenges and inflationary pressures, whether that's in cost of goods or wages," said Walmart CEO Doug McMillon on an earnings call with investors this week. "We'll monitor our price gaps and adjust as appropriate."

Both McMillon and Walmart US president John Furner repeatedly referred to "levers" that Walmart could pull to make sure the retailer won't have to dramatically raise prices.

In other words, major American companies are going to do what they can to eat some of the rising labor and commodity costs instead of passing them on to consumers.

One market expert also pointed out that the hyper-focus on inflation could be a good thing. Investors are often spooked by problems they don't anticipate, the proverbial black swans. Inflation fears are hardly that. At this point, inflation fears are about as common as cats and dogs.

"It's great that everybody is talking about inflation. The market can't really be shocked by it anymore," said Linda Duessel, senior equity strategist at Federated Hermes.

## poll stuff

### Five-thirty-eight polls good

#### Five-thirty-eight polls good

Nate Silver 22, 6-30-2022, Silver is the founder and editor in chief of FiveThirtyEight."Why Republicans Are Favored To Win The House, But Not The Senate," FiveThirtyEight, https://fivethirtyeight.com/features/why-republicans-are-favored-to-win-the-house-but-not-the-senate/

Changes to the model Overall, we’re happy with our congressional and gubernatorial forecasts, which last underwent a major revision before the 2018 elections. They performed very well in 2018 and fairly well in 2020 (despite a challenging year for the polls in 2020; it helped that our model also considers a number of other factors in addition to the polling). Therefore, the overall methodology is largely the same. However, after assessing the performance of the models, we did make a few changes around the margins: In evaluating fundraising for congressional candidates, the model now places more emphasis on contributions received within the candidate’s state. Fundraising is a highly nationalized activity these days; Democrats in California and New York regularly contribute to Senate campaigns like that of Democrat Jaime Harrison of South Carolina, who raised a record amount of money in 2020 but nonetheless lost to Republican Sen. Lindsey Graham by 10 percentage points. As such, our analysis finds that a dollar received from within a candidate’s state is about five times as valuable as a dollar received outside of it in predicting the eventual election outcome.5 That’s why the model now applies that ratio, multiplying any funds raised from voters within the candidate’s state by 5, when assessing which candidate has the fundraising edge. The model now puts more emphasis on basic partisanship as opposed to other fundamentals. The fundamentals component of our model, used in the Classic and Deluxe versions, evaluates a series of variables such as fundraising, incumbency, candidate experience, congressional voting records and even scandals to make a forecast. The formula is fairly complicated, so we tested a simple alternative in an era of high partisanship. Specifically, we looked at what would happen if you made a forecast based solely on the partisan lean of a state or district, plus generic-ballot results. For instance, if the generic ballot favors Republicans by 4 percentage points, and a state leans Republican by 3 points, you might expect the Republican to win there by 7 points. In testing this on 2018 and 2020 races, we found that the more complicated version of our fundamentals formula does outperform this simple alternative. But it’s pretty close, and a blend of the complicated and simple formulas does better than either one taken alone.6 What this means is that state partisanship and the generic ballot will have more influence on our model going forward and the other fundamentals factors less, although they certainly matter some. We assume errors are more correlated from race to race. In presidential races, forecast and polling errors are highly correlated from state to state. It wasn’t a surprise that Trump won Wisconsin and Pennsylvania in 2016 given that he also won Michigan, for example, since the states are fairly similar demographically. (Accounting for this properly was a big reason that FiveThirtyEight’s model gave Trump a better chance than others in 2016.) This also holds in congressional races, though to a considerably lesser degree since there are different candidates on the ballot in each state. A scandal affecting the Republican candidate in Georgia won’t necessarily have any impact in Arizona, for instance. However, our analysis suggests that polling errors are becoming more correlated in congressional races, too. Certainly, 2020 was a prominent example given that Republicans won nearly every toss-up race for the House and that polls for Congress had a strong overall bias toward Democrats. Therefore, we’ve increased the degree to which race-by-race errors are assumed to be correlated in the model.7 We’ve reduced the emphasis on sample size when weighting polls. This is consistent with a change in our pollster ratings methodology and is explained in more detail there. We’ve removed a series of changes in the 2020 model that were specific to the COVID-19 pandemic. Yes, I know the pandemic isn’t over yet, but voting will take place under far more normal conditions than in 2020.