# Midterms DA – GOP Good

#### Notes:

This is the exact opposite of original Midterms file, so many of the aff cards from that file can be used for the neg side with this file.

This version of the DA is definitely better for winning uniqueness (GOP likely wins now) and the links aren’t bad. This version also gives you the opportunity to read a hilarious (but maybe true) link argument about disinformation being key to a Republican victory.

The same issues regarding link uniqueness and thumpers plague both DAs.

There are two 1NC impact scenarios to choose from. “Gridlock” can be strategic to insulate yourself from turns, but you’d also have the option to read extra economy internals for why the GOP is good for growth. The other impact is “Energy Independence” which has some built in answers to the inevitable “Republicans bad for climate change” turn.

Regardless of which version you read (Dems Good or GOP Good), you should be prepared to answer a slew of impact turns.

Sincerely,

Classic CS

## 1NC

### 1NC – Top

#### a. Uniqueness: Republicans win in the midterms now, but it’s close – polls and Biden disapproval are predictive.

Roche, 7/7 (Darragh Roche is a US politics news reporter that works for Newsweek and has worked for many local, national, and international publications. “Democrats’ worst case scenario for the midterms,” Newsweek, 7-7-2022, <https://www.newsweek.com/democrats-worst-case-scenario-midterms-joe-biden-republicans-1722543>)- LASA-LC

Democrats are widely expected to suffer defeats in the upcoming 2022 midterm elections, with Republicans aiming to retake the House of Representatives and the Senate. The serving president's party usually performs poorly during midterms and while it seems likely President Joe Biden will see major losses this November, it's not clear just how bad things will be for the Democrats. Polls suggest the Democrats are on course for disappointment and that the party could potentially lose control of both chambers of Congress and see newly empowered Republican majorities stymying Biden's agenda in the run up to the next presidential election. A GOP gain in either chamber would hamstring the Biden administration, but the worst case scenario would see comfortable Republican majorities in both chambers, potentially leading to a slew of investigations and possibly even impeachment of the president. Poll tracker FiveThirtyEight's 2022 election forecast rates the Senate as a toss up with 35 seats up for re-election. Fourteen are currently held by Democrats and 21 by Republicans. FiveThirtyEight gives Republicans an 80 percent chance of holding between 47 and 54 seats. If that latter figure is reached, it would represent a major defeat for Biden's party. The Senate is currently divided between 50 Republicans, 48 Democrats and two independents who caucus with the Democrats. Vice President Kamala Harris has had to use her casting vote on a number of occasions and a single Democratic loss in the midterms would hand control to the Republicans. FiveThirtyEight rates the Senate races in Arizona, Georgia, Nevada and Pennsylvania as toss-ups. If Republicans can win all four, it would be a major loss for the Democrats. Three of those seats are held by incumbent Democrats, while Republican Senator Pat Toomey of Pennsylvania is retiring. However, it's highly unlikely that Republicans could gain enough seats in November to secure a 60-vote, filibuster proof majority. This means Democrats are likely to deploy the filibuster if the GOP retakes the chamber. Nonetheless, a Republican-led Senate could hold up Biden's judicial nominees and potentially prevent him filling any vacant seats that might arise on the U.S. Supreme Court, as Senate Minority Leader Mitch McConnell did in 2016 when he was majority leader. Republicans are favored to win the House, according to FiveThirtyEight, while Democrats currently hold 220 seats to Republicans' 210, with five seats vacant. The poll tracker's analysis gives Republicans an 80 percent chance of holding between 215 and 258 seats. If the larger figure proves accurate, that would be a huge gain for the GOP, though it remains an outside possibility. The single worst midterm loss of House seats occurred in 2010 when Democrats lost 63 seats under then President Barack Obama. However, Obama's party retained control of the Senate until the 2014 midterms. It seems likely that Republican gains this year will be more modest but that the GOP will still win the House. That will allow House Minority Leader Kevin McCarthy to become speaker for the first time and possibly mean the end of Speaker Nancy Pelosi's political career. FiveThirtyEight's generic congressional ballot shows Republicans with 44.8 percent support to the Democrats' 43.2 percent, as of July 6 - a margin of just 1.7 percent.

#### b. Link: Plan is a win for Dems because it distracts voters from Biden’s failures – foreign policy leadership and alliance support increase democratic turnout.

Kuttner, 3/23(Robert Kuttner, co founder and coeditor of the American Prospect, Professor at Brandeis University, “Democracy Summer”, The American Prospect, 3/23/2022, <https://prospect.org/politics/democracy-summer-prospects/>) – aagg

The survival of Democrats in 2022 will depend heavily on turnout. Though Donald Trump will not be on the ballot, he will be our not-so-secret weapon. American presidents routinely encounter crises they didn’t anticipate. Barack Obama hoped to pull back from foreign-policy adventures and heal America’s racial divides; he ended up getting bogged down in the worst financial collapse since the Great Depression and entangled in new foreign-policy messes. LBJ was going to complete FDR’s New Deal and redeem Lincoln’s emancipation; he blew it all in Vietnam. Woodrow Wilson got elected on the slogan “He kept us out of war,” hoping instead to complete his progressive domestic agenda; he ended up winning the war, losing the peace, and ushering in a decade of Republican rule. Yet it feels like Joe Biden is setting the record for the most simultaneous unexpected crises. He sought to return the country to a competent, normal chief executive who did not govern by fabrications and tweets, one who would repair democracy and support an activist government countervailing predatory capitalism. Instead, Biden got two more waves of COVID, an economic boom hobbled by supply-shock inflation, faithless members of his own party blocking much of his agenda, and the gravest wartime emergency since the Cuban missile crisis of 1962. One thinks of a line attributed to Emerson: “Events are in the saddle and ride mankind.” It’s easy to forget amid that run, but from spring 2020 to summer 2021 Biden was the luckiest politician in living memory. He went from a moribund presidential campaign in February to becoming the certain nominee in March, thanks to the South Carolina primary and Jim Clyburn. Given the immense stakes of defeating Trump, he benefited from rare party unity. Progressive also-rans Elizabeth Warren and Bernie Sanders traded loyalty for influence, and ended up substantially shaping both Biden’s surprisingly progressive program and his personnel. After Biden took office, he was able to unite Democrats on the far-reaching $1.9 trillion ARPA relief law, and catch a wave of emerging economic recovery and subsiding COVID cases. His approval ratings were far from stratospheric but more than serviceable, with a positive spread of 10 to 15 points up until last summer. But Lady Luck deserted Biden. COVID resurged with the delta variant. A supply shock not of Biden’s making exploded on his watch, spiking inflation. He made unforced errors in the long-overdue withdrawal from Afghanistan, despite getting the policy directionally right. As Joe Manchin and Kyrsten Sinema blocked major elements of his program, Biden looked like a leader who couldn’t govern. By the new year, Biden’s approval ratings were negative by more than 20 points. All of this portended disaster for the November midterms and the survival of democracy itself. THEN VLADIMIR PUTIN DECIDED to invade Ukraine, and we got to see Biden at his best. The president issued early warnings of Putin’s designs, using the unorthodox tactic of making public raw intelligence reports. This wrong-footed Putin—not enough to dissuade him from invading, but exposing his deceptions. Biden got credit for reviving and unifying the Western alliance, and organizing a program of damaging economic sanctions. All this knocked the Republicans off their usual game, isolated Putin apologists, and produced more bipartisan unity than anything seen in Biden’s presidency. This was not the work of a foreign-policy establishment reverting to Cold War autopilot. These successes reflected Biden’s own foreign-policy leadership, in extensive conversations with allied leaders, congressional figures in both parties, and Ukraine’s heroic Volodymyr Zelensky. Biden’s leadership and Zelensky’s courage have drawn strength from each other. It also drove a rapid resurgence in the polls. According to the Marist Poll done for NPR and PBS, public approval for Biden’s handling of the Ukraine war rose from 34 percent in late February to 52 percent on March 3. This spilled over into increased approval for Biden generally and for his performance on other issues, thanks in part to the waning of omicron. Some 55 percent approved his handling of COVID, up from 47 percent, and his overall approval rating bounced back to 47 percent, the best margin since early fall. Even on the economy, Biden’s approval recovered to 45 percent from a previous 36 percent. (More recent polls show about ten points negative overall.) A Russian occupation of Ukraine could drag on inconclusively, with the disruptions to the global economy further spiking energy prices and inflation. Putin could stumble into the first ground war between Russia and NATO, bringing the world closer to nuclear conflagration. Yet Biden’s unexpected wartime leadership to date has caused skeptical voters to give him a second look and maybe a second chance. The Russia-Ukraine war may also have spillovers that are good for progressives. It shows that global capitalism can and should be regulated in the national interest after all. The war has also tempered the Fed’s rush to raise interest rates. Politically, the most consequential spillover is that Putin’s invasion and Biden’s response make Donald Trump even more radioactive. It reminds voters how Putin and Trump are twin thugs, joined at the hip. THE USUAL PATTERN IS that the first midterm congressional election is a disaster for a new president’s party. However, 2022 will be anything but a normal off-year election. Neither Biden nor Trump will be on the ballot. But Trump, unsavory and unwelcome to Republicans outside hardcore MAGA territory, will be omnipresent. America today has few swing voters, but dozens of swing districts where turnout will determine the winner. If Democratic voters turn out, Democrats win. With the failure of Congress to enact voting rights legislation, however, the worry is that suppression could offset mobilization. Low Democratic turnout in the elections of November 2021 could portend a midterm with Republicans on the march and Democrats dispirited.

### 1NC – Gridlock Econ Impact

#### c. Impacts:

#### 1. GOP victory key to the economy – gridlock good for markets and republicans are better on growth

Klebnikov 22(Sergei Klebnikov is a senior reporter at Forbes covering markets and business news. “Here’s What Happens To The Stock Market If Republicans Take Congress In November,” Published 1/19/22, Accessed 7/14/22, *Forbes,* <https://www.forbes.com/sites/sergeiklebnikov/2022/01/19/we-looked-at-how-the-stock-market-performs-during-midterm-election-yearsheres-how-2022-may-be-worse/?sh=40f0813d2562>. NSH

Stocks are off to a rocky start so far this year thanks to a laundry list of challenges including inflation spikes and interest rate hikes. Midterm elections in November are going to make 2022 even trickier by adding yet another layer of uncertainty to the investing mix. Consumer prices are surging with inflation at nearly 40-year highs, supply chain issues continue to persist and coronavirus cases are spiking due to the Omicron variant. What’s more, the Federal Reserve has started tightening monetary policy in a bid to control inflation: Once the central bank finishes tapering its monthly asset purchases in March, it intends to hike interest rates three times later this year–something it hasn’t done since 2018. “The worst that can happen **for Democrats is if they lose control** over both houses of Congress. In that case **the market would win by losing**, and see a slightly improved average performance.” Sam Stovall, chief investment strategist at CFRA Research Come November, Republicans are hoping to win back control of either the House of Representatives or the Senate. They’ll need five seats to win a majority in the House and one seat in the Senate. Pennsylvania, Wisconsin, Arizona, Georgia and Florida all have key elections that could determine whether or not Congress flips. “**The most favorable outcome for markets would be a Republican win in both the House and the Senate,”** says Jeremy Siegel, the Russell E. Palmer Professor of Finance at the Wharton School of the University of Pennsylvania. “If Republicans take the House and not the Senate, that would also be a relatively favorable outcome.” To find out how various election results would impact stocks, Forbes analyzed market data going back to 1945 with the help of CFRA Research. In short, when it comes to stock market performance, Democratic presidents have an edge. From 1945 through the end of 2021, the compound annual growth rate for the S&P 500 has been 9.4% under Democratic presidents compared with 6.6% for Republican commanders-in-chief. **The best returns**, however, **have come under Democratic presidents kept in check by a split or Republican Congress**. “Historically, investors prefer shared power across the Federal government,” says RSM chief economist Joe Brusuelas. For instance, President Barack Obama faced a split Congress from November 2010 to 2014, with Republicans holding the House of Representatives while Democrats held the Senate. Equity investors weren’t complaining: The S&P 500 surged nearly 70% during that period. Markets historically prefer Democratic presidents kept in check by a split Republican Congress. The S&P 500 average return in years where Democrats have simultaneously held the Oval Office and both houses of Congress is 10.5%. While those returns are nothing to balk at, the best-case scenario for investors—with a 13.6% average gain for the S&P 500—is when a Democratic president is presiding over a split Congress. The second-best performance, with a 13% average gain: A Democratic president working with a unified Republican Congress. “The worst that can happen for Democrats is if they lose control over both houses of Congress,” says Sam Stovall, chief investment strategist for CFRA Research. “In that case the market would win by losing—meaning that Wall Street will see a slightly improved average performance.”

#### 2. US economic stagnation wrecks geopolitical dominance---that triggers global war

Kempe 20, best-selling author, prize-winning journalist and president & CEO of the Atlantic Council, one of the United States’ most influential think tanks on global affairs. He worked at The Wall Street Journal for more than 25 years as a foreign correspondent, assistant managing editor and as the longest-serving editor of the paper’s European edition. (Frederick, Updated: 4-21-2021, “Op-ed: How the US can win the post-coronavirus race for global dominance,” CNBC, https://www.cnbc.com/2020/04/18/op-ed-how-us-can-win-the-post-coronavirus-race-for-global-dominance.html)

Place your bets for the coming race to growth. It will be an epic contest among the world’s most significant economies, with generational and geopolitical consequences. For context, think back to what the United States accomplished after World War II, when it rose as an economic power to shape a better world. The post-COVID19 race could determine whether the U.S. rebounds in a manner that allows it to retain the mantle of global leadership. More likely for the moment, Beijing could leverage its first-mover advantage – alongside a faster economic recovery across Asian markets – accelerating the trend toward a Chinese-centric globalization. Elsewhere, as President Macron [argued](https://www.ft.com/content/3ea8d790-7fd1-11ea-8fdb-7ec06edeef84) this week to the Financial Times, the coming months could determine whether the European Union collapses as a political and economic project. The days ahead also could trigger a dangerous widening of the economic gap between emerging markets and the developed world – with escalating conflict and surging migration. It may seem premature to reflect on which of the globe’s economies is likely to have the most robust and lasting economic comeback – and with what geopolitical impact. After all, this was a week in which the International Monetary Fund [projected](https://www.imf.org/en/Publications/WEO/Issues/2020/04/14/weo-april-2020) a 3% contraction in global GDP for 2020, the most dramatic drop since the Great Depression. Yet it is the details behind that dismal forecast that should raise concerns within the U.S. and Europe. Their steeper economic decline and slower recovery could lay the seeds for a long-lasting shift of global tectonic plates to China’s advantage. The IMF projected a U.S. economic decline of about 6% in 2020 and a contraction of the eurozone of 7.5%. That compares to projected Chinese economic growth for 2020 of 1.2% after a first quarter real decline of 6.7% – far less than the 10%-plus dip many experts had expected. The only group of countries in the world projected to be in positive territory are East Asian, at roughly 1%. Even if one accepts that Chinese coronavirus fatalities likely are greater than their public figures and that the growth decline is likely larger, that doesn’t change the potential for a scenario that Deloitte and Salesforce this week [referred to](https://www2.deloitte.com/global/en/pages/about-deloitte/articles/covid-19/covid-19-scenarios-and-impacts-for-business-and-society-world-remade.html) as “Sunrise in the East.” Describing this scenario, as one of four possibilities they list, they write, “The global center of power shifts decisively east as China and other East Asian nations take the reigns as primary powers on the world stage and lead global coordination of the health system and other multilateral institutions.” That comes with the broader acceptance of greater surveillance mechanisms as part of the public good, a faster recovery of East Asian countries with less economic impact from COVID19, and a significant ramping up of Chinese foreign direct investment to burnish its global reputation. Still, the U.S. has a host of incumbent advantages that could serve it well if it uses its economic recovery to also strengthen its infrastructure, if it reverses runaway unemployment quickly, if it can tame political polarization and, most significantly, if it rediscovers its taste for collaborative global leadership. In the economic race, no advantage is greater than the dollar. China may be the world’s second largest economy, but the Chinese yuan [makes up](https://asiatimes.com/2019/12/yuan-globalization-remains-a-long-way-off/) only 2% of global payments and reserves while the dollar [accounts](https://asiatimes.com/2019/12/yuan-globalization-remains-a-long-way-off/) for roughly two thirds of foreign exchange reserves. The dollar [underpins](https://www.economist.com/finance-and-economics/2020/04/16/the-dollars-dominance-masks-chinas-rise-in-finance) four-fifths of global supply chains. The Economist [reckons](https://www.economist.com/finance-and-economics/2020/04/16/the-dollars-dominance-masks-chinas-rise-in-finance) China could chip away at U.S. economic advantages through three underestimated strengths of its own: as a trusted debtor, an attractive creditor, and increasingly as a tech partner. As a debtor, China’s $13 trillion bond market is the world’s second largest and [has weathered the crisis well](https://www.ft.com/content/41044876-6ab4-11ea-a3c9-1fe6fedcca75). Chinese debt [returned](https://www.cbsnews.com/news/china-cuts-us-treasury-debt-holding-by-13/) 1.3% in the first quarter, vastly better than the 15.5% [decline](https://www.economist.com/finance-and-economics/2020/04/16/the-dollars-dominance-masks-chinas-rise-in-finance) for other emerging market bonds. Over the same period, the Chinese market added $8.5 billion (60 billion yuan) in net inflows. As a creditor, China has remained willing and generous, an approach that served the U.S. well after World War II. For example, it [declared](https://www.ft.com/content/5f296d54-d29e-4e87-ae7d-95ca6c0598d5) its willingness to back a G20 deal to suspend bilateral loan repayments by poorer countries, a sizable benefit also at its own cost. On the tech front, few countries were as ready as China for money and people to go entirely online. Tencent and Ant Financial have more than a billion users each for their digital wallets, and they are expanding rapidly throughout Asia. OneConnect, an offshoot of China’s largest insurer, provides financial institutions in sixteen Asian countries with cloud-based services. So, what other advantages can the United States leverage in this race? Never underestimate the brittleness of an authoritarian country under stress. Its broad censorship, it’s opaque legal system, and the nature of its surveillance state are hardly models to emulate. Beyond that, Japanese Prime Minister Shinzo Abe is not alone [in proposing](https://asia.nikkei.com/Editor-s-Picks/China-up-close/Xi-fears-Japan-led-manufacturing-exodus-from-China) that his country relocate high-value supply chains from China. If many countries do the same, the manufacturing foundation of China’s economy could erode. The Financial Times’ Gideon Rachman [adds](https://www.ft.com/content/2e8c8f76-7cbd-11ea-8fdb-7ec06edeef84) that the global trust in the dollar is just one of two built-in U.S. advantages that are difficult to dislodge. The other? “Where, outside your home country, would you most like your children to go to university or to work?” he writes. Most significant in this race would be if the United States regained its appetite for political and economic leadership as the world’s premier “convening power.” That need not be done at the cost of China – or anyone else. The race still can be won if U.S. leaders see it as a marathon and recall that much of the world long embraced their global leadership because partners learned they were more likely to win as American partners. This economic rebound from COVID19 will be patchy and uneven. Being first out the gate will be significant, and that is likely to be China. Yet history has taught the United States that it’s victory will be longest lasting if it can achieved alongside partners and allies.

### 1NC – Energy Security Impact

#### c. Impacts:

#### 1. GOP win key to energy independence and emission reductions.

Reams ‘22 (Heather Reams is the president at Citizens for Responsible Energy Solutions, a nonprofit organization that advocates for clean energy policy, “Under Republican Leadership, Expect Lower Global Emissions and Increased Energy Independence”, RealClear Energy, <https://www.realclearenergy.org/articles/2022/06/15/under_republican_leadership_expect_lower_global_emissions_and_increased_energy_independence_837376.html>, 6/15/22. Accessed 7-14-22) - AC

Under Republican Leadership, Expect Lower Global Emissions and Increased Energy Independence” By all accounts, Republicans are well-positioned to take back the House of the Representatives next Congress. That comes as welcomed news for the overwhelming majority of Americans who support “commonsense” policies to reduce emissions that cause climate change and reduce energy costs that are devastating American families today. Last week, the U.S. House Republican Energy, Climate, and Conservation (ECC) Taskforce led by Rep. Garret Graves of Louisiana – a leading conservative advocate for lowering global emissions while increasing U.S. productivity – introduced the first of its six-part policy framework seeking to rebalance our nation’s economic, energy and environmental agenda. The six-point plan, which rolls out over the course of the summer, is rooted in fundamental conservative principles—lowering costs for American families, investing in America, innovating, unlocking American resources, eliminating government obstacles that delay deployment of clean energy, reducing reliance on adversarial nations like China and Russia, enhancing our national security, and reducing global emissions. This plan recognizes the value of a free-market system that demands efficiency and has made the United States one of the most carbon-efficient producers in the world, whether it is energy, agriculture, or manufacturing. It is also an approach that differs from long held conventional wisdom on the political left that constraining the American economy and increasing energy costs for American families are necessary to address climate change. The Republican plan recognizes global realities and responds to those realities with actions to reduce both domestic and global emissions as opposed to costly policies that nearsightedly focus solely on domestic emissions without regard to their global impact. The average product made in China results in over three times the emissions than a product made in the United States. When America produces, we reduce. When America innovates, we reduce. When we constrain American production and allow other nations to dominate markets, global emissions increase, and global security is diminished. Conservatives recognize America can regain its energy independence by expediting the deployment of innovative clean energy technologies. This means reshaping the federal regulatory and permitting processes to increase predictability, shorten the time to project delivery, and reduce costs while still providing for robust consideration of public and environmental concerns. These commonsense improvements will push much-needed clean energy projects forward at a time when Americans continue to face growing price tags at the gas pump and supermarket. Republicans have long sounded alarm bells our nation must prioritize energy independence. The ongoing war in Ukraine made it clear: we must abandon the energy resources provided by hostile countries and relieve our allies of their dependence on those same nations—if not for our national security, for our pocketbooks. America is fortunate to have abundant, clean and low-cost natural gas. Increasing America’s natural gas production can support our domestic energy needs and the needs of our allies to help offset their Russian imports while reducing global emissions. According to the Department of Energy’s National Energy Technology Lab, Russian natural gas exported to Europe results in 41% more global emissions than U.S. liquefied natural gas (LNG) exported to Europe. The Biden Administration recently released projections showing global demand for natural gas increasing over the coming decades in every modeled scenario. Who supplies that demand will have far reaching geopolitical, economic and global emissions implications. It’s time to reclaim our global energy dominance and bring back critical supply chains to the United States. This includes embracing an all-of-the-above approach to domestic energy production that invests in homegrown energy sources for tomorrow’s use while developing technologies that will enhance the environment performance of reliable and affordable abundant domestic resources – including critical minerals. Our nation is blessed with a wealth of critical minerals necessary for clean energy technologies—including solar, wind and electric vehicles. They are also vital for our national defense systems. Conservatives are pushing to remove roadblocks to better enable environmentally responsible domestic mining, processing, and refining of critical minerals in the U.S., and through partnership with our allies. Doing so will reverse our trend of dependency on places like China, Russia, and the Democratic Republic of the Congo and significantly reduce emissions if mined in the United States. Last week, in conjunction with the initial roll-out of Republican’s climate and energy policy strategy, Rep. Graves, alongside Rep. Randy Feenstra (R-IA) and Rep. Jay Obernolte (R-CA), traveled to Hobbs, New Mexico for a roundtable conversation hosted by Rep. Yvette Herrell (R-NM). New Mexico embodies the GOP’s all-of-the-above vision for domestic energy production—ranking second in the nation in crude oil production and among the top ten in natural gas. In fact, Hobbs is in the famous Permian Basin—the largest petroleum-producing basin in the United States. But the state also generates 30 percent of its energy from wind power—ranking sixth in the country—and is on the cutting edge of nuclear energy innovation and research and development (R&D) thanks to its two national laboratories: Los Alamos National Laboratory and Sandia National Laboratory. Conservatives know that when we harness what’s best about America, as exemplified by states like New Mexico, we can move our country forward. Under Republican leadership, the commonsense solutions that Americans want will be prioritized to make our nation cleaner, more resilient and energy independent.

#### 2. Energy security solves Russia war, Mideast instability, and warming.

Agnia Grigas 17. Nonresident Senior Fellow with the Atlantic Council’s Eurasia Center and a PhD in International Relations from Oxford. “A Natural Gas Diplomacy Strategy for the New US Administration,” Atlantic Council, 1/26/2017, p. 10, <http://tinyurl.com/jpjhpmo>.

The budding US role as an energy superpower offers a number of opportunities for the new administration and the American natural gas industry. At the same time, the United States faces a number of challenges: a resurgent Russia, a vulnerable and potentially fracturing Europe, and an unstable Middle East. How can Washington leverage its natural gas endowment for diplomatic aims under these circumstances? How should the United States lead in the international gas markets given the new geopolitics of natural gas? As Donald J. Trump takes office as the forty-fifth president of the United States on January 20, 2017, his administration will have an opportunity to reassess US energy policy, specifically, its natural gas policy. This reassessment will not only be a by-product of a change in leadership in Washington, but is necessitated by the fundamental transformation of the world’s natural gas markets since President Barack Obama took office eight years ago. In 2011, the International Energy Agency proclaimed that the world energy markets were entering “the golden age of gas.”1 Since then, the natural gas markets have seen an influx of new gas sources, greater liquidity, a growing liquefied natural gas (LNG) trade, a buildup of gas transport infrastructure, and an increased appetite for natural gas as a cleaner fossil fuel alternative to oil or coal. The boom in US shale gas development, which also irreversibly altered America’s natural gas industry, spearheaded many of these worldwide changes. The United States emerged as the world’s leading gas producer in 2011 and as an LNG exporter in 2016, with US inaugural deliveries to Brazil, India, United Arab Emirates, Argentina, Portugal, Kuwait, Chile, Spain, China, Jordan, the Dominican Republic, and Mexico. In the coming years, the United States stands to become one of the world’s leading LNG exporters. The geopolitics of natural gas is already undergoing a significant shift. The emergence of new gas resources and the growth of LNG trade are challenging the half-century-long status quo of global gas relations. Traditional gas suppliers like Russia are seeing their influence wane, while gas-importing states have more flexibility and optionality in their import sources. US LNG exports add greater liquidity to the global natural gas markets and thus can help secure and diversify Europe’s supplies. Direct deliveries are also possible as per US early exports to Spain and Portugal. Moreover, US LNG can contain the influence of Russian gas behemoth Gazprom and Moscow’s use of gas supplies as a foreign policy tool. It can also court energy-hungry Asian powers like China, which has been trying to secure its natural gas imports and has looked to Russia as a potential supplier. If properly leveraged, America’s newfound energy prowess can be an invaluable tool of diplomacy and help ensure that US and allied leadership continues to guide the twenty-first century. While over the past few years, US energy policy has seen divisive partisan debate over energy production, exports, and how to address climate change, the benefits of the United States’ natural gas boom offer room for bipartisan agreement. The economic, climatic, security, and geopolitical gains awarded by the rise of US domestic energy production offer many benefits for the next US administration. While some would prefer to see more environmental regulation in domestic gas production, especially in regards to fracking, and others would prefer to boost production to maximize economic and energy security benefits, at this point neither the Democrats nor the Republicans would seek to block US LNG exports or hinder the American natural gas industry. Moreover, in light of climate change concerns, many regard gas as a cleaner fossil fuel that can serve as a bridge to renewables, potentially reducing carbon dioxide emissions.

## Uniqueness

### 2NC – Uniqueness

#### Republicans will win the midterm now – that’s Roche – the race is close, but the best poll gives the GOP an 80% chance thanks to Biden’s low approval rating.

#### And, Republicans win now – Dem enthusiasm is temporary.

**Co**hn 7/13 (Nate Cohn is The New York Times’s chief political analyst. He has discussed politics on CNN, MSNBC, C-SPAN, and NPR, “Poll Shows Tight Race for Control of Congress as Class Divide Widens,” The New York Times, 7-13-2022, <https://www.nytimes.com/2022/07/13/upshot/poll-2022-midterms-congress.html>) – LASA LC

With **President Biden’s approval rating mired** in the 30s and with nearly 80 percent of voters saying the country is heading in [the wrong direction](https://www.nytimes.com/2022/07/11/us/politics/biden-approval-polling-2024.html), all the ingredients seem to be in place for a **Republican sweep in the November midterm elections**. But Democrats and Republicans begin the campaign in a surprisingly close race for control of Congress, according to the first New York Times/Siena College survey of the cycle. Based on a New York Times/Siena College poll of 849 registered voters from July 5-7. Overall among registered voters, 41 percent said they preferred Democrats to control Congress compared with 40 percent who preferred Republican control. Among likely voters, Republicans led by one percentage point, 44 percent to 43 percent, reflecting the tendency for the party out of power to enjoy a turnout advantage in midterms. The results suggest that the wave of mass shootings and the recent Supreme Court decision to overturn Roe v. Wade have at least temporarily insulated the Democrats from an otherwise hostile national political environment while energizing the party’s predominantly liberal activist base. But the confluence of **economic problems and resurgent cultural issues** has helped turn the emerging class divide in the Democratic coalition into a chasm, as Republicans appear to be making new inroads **among nonwhite and working-class voters** — perhaps especially **Hispanic voters** — who remain more concerned about the economy and inflation than abortion rights and guns. For the first time in a Times/Siena national survey, Democrats had a larger share of support among white college graduates than among nonwhite voters — a striking indication of the shifting balance of political energy in the Democratic coalition. As recently as the 2016 congressional elections, Democrats won more than 70 percent of nonwhite voters while losing among white college graduates. With four months to go until the election, it is far too soon to say whether the campaign will remain focused on issues like abortion and gun control long enough for Democrats to avoid a long-expected midterm rout. If it does, a close national vote would probably translate to a close race for control of Congress, as neither party enjoys a clear structural advantage in the race. **Partisan gerrymandering has slightly tilted the map toward Republicans in the House**, but Democrats enjoy the advantages of incumbency and superior fund-raising in key districts. Recent unfavorable news for Democrats, in the form of [Supreme Court rulings](https://www.nytimes.com/interactive/2022/06/21/us/major-supreme-court-cases-2022.html), and some tragic news nationally might ordinarily mean trouble for the party in power, but that’s not what the results suggest. The first poll of the midterm cycle. The New York Times has released its first national survey of the 2022 midterm cycle. Here’s what to know: Biden’s struggles with Democrats. **President Biden is facing an alarming level of doubt from inside his own party**, with [64 percent of Democratic voters](https://www.nytimes.com/2022/07/11/us/politics/biden-approval-polling-2024.html?smid=tw-nytimes&action=click&pgtype=Article&state=default&module=styln-nyt-polling&region=MAIN_CONTENT_1&block=storyline_levelup_swipe_recirc&smtyp=cur) saying they would prefer a new standard-bearer in 2024. Only 26 percent of Democrats said the party should renominate him. A dark national mood. Voters nationwide gave Mr. Biden a [meager 33 percent job-approval rating](https://www.nytimes.com/2022/07/11/us/politics/biden-approval-polling-2024.html?action=click&pgtype=Article&state=default&module=styln-nyt-polling&region=MAIN_CONTENT_1&block=storyline_levelup_swipe_recirc), and only 13 percent said the nation was on the right track. Still, Mr. Biden maintained a narrow edge in a hypothetical 2024 rematch with Donald J. Trump: 44 percent to 41 percent. Some in G.O.P. are ready to leave Trump behind. As the former president weighs another White House bid, [nearly half of Republican primary voters](https://www.nytimes.com/2022/07/12/us/politics/trump-approval-polling-2024.html?action=click&pgtype=Article&state=default&module=styln-nyt-polling&region=MAIN_CONTENT_1&block=storyline_levelup_swipe_recirc) would prefer someone other than Mr. Trump for president in 2024, with a significant number vowing to abandon him if he wins the nomination. A tight race for Congress. Despite Mr. Biden’s low approval ratings, Democrats are roughly tied with Republicans ahead of the midterm elections. Among registered voters, [41 percent said they preferred Democrats](https://www.nytimes.com/2022/07/13/upshot/poll-2022-midterms-congress.html?action=click&pgtype=Article&state=default&module=styln-nyt-polling&region=MAIN_CONTENT_1&block=storyline_levelup_swipe_recirc) to control Congress compared with 40 percent who preferred Republicans. The class divide widens. Voters who said abortion, guns or threats to democracy were the biggest problem facing the country [backed Democrats by a wide margin](https://www.nytimes.com/2022/07/13/upshot/poll-2022-midterms-congress.html?action=click&pgtype=Article&state=default&module=styln-nyt-polling&region=MAIN_CONTENT_1&block=storyline_levelup_swipe_recirc), as Republicans make new inroads among nonwhite and **working-class voters who remain more concerned about the economy**. Americans are disillusioned with the government. A majority of Americans across nearly all demographics and ideologies **believe the U.S. government does not wor**k, with [58 percent of voters](https://www.nytimes.com/2022/07/13/us/politics/government-trust-voting-poll.html?action=click&pgtype=Article&state=default&module=styln-nyt-polling&region=MAIN_CONTENT_1&block=storyline_levelup_swipe_recirc) saying that the system needs major reforms or a complete overhaul. Young voters are fed up with their leaders. Just 1 percent of 18-to-29-year-olds strongly approve of the way President Biden is handling his job. And 94 percent of Democrats under 30 said they wanted another candidate to run two years from now. Young voters [were most likely to say they wouldn’t vote for either Mr. Biden or Mr. Trump](https://www.nytimes.com/2022/07/14/us/politics/youth-voters-midterms-polling.html?action=click&pgtype=Article&state=default&module=styln-nyt-polling&region=MAIN_CONTENT_1&block=storyline_levelup_swipe_recirc) in a hypothetical 2024 rematch.

#### Republicans win the house and senate now

Knightley 7/4 - (Isla Knightley, a betting expert who covers politics, "2022 House & Senate Election Odds: Democrats Facing Uphill Battle," Bookies, 7-4-2022, https://bookies.com/picks/senate-races-odds-tracker, Accessed 7-11-2022, LASA-AS)

**Republicans are considerable favorites** at online sportsbooks **to win the House of Representatives** in this fall’s midterm elections, but the U.S. Senate is shaping up to be a much bigger ask for the GOP, according to UK bookmakers. Popular British bookmaker Ladbrokes, installs the Republicans at -800 to clinch the House in November. The same sportsbook has the Democrats pegged as the +450 underdogs in this market. Whereas the betting frame for the rest of the midterm elections is mixed. While the **Republicans are clear favorites** at -400 **to win more the 50 seats in the Senate**, the Democrats are also favored to win in key battleground states, New Hampshire and Pennsylvania. Political betting isn’t legal in the United States but it is fair game with our neighbors across the pond. UK bookmakers regularly offer politics odds, also known as “specials,” such as these on a number of American political events and elections, including the upcoming 2024 US Elections. Locked at the head of the political odds to take control of the House, the Republicans at -800 have an implied probability of **88.9% to win it back**. It’s far from certain. But the GOP is buoyed by its strong performance in 2020 when it narrowed Democrat’s 35-seat lead to just nine.

#### Red wave means GOP takes control of congress

Brooks 7/12 (Emily Brooks, congressional reporter at The Hill, “GOP sees chances of midterm rout spike,” The Hill, 7/12/22, https://thehill.com/homenews/campaign/3553938-gop-says-cake-is-pretty-well-baked-for-house-takeover-as-they-eye-senate-states/)-SL

Poll after poll showing voter discontent with President Biden and the economy is cementing Republicans’ sense that a GOP House majority is all but inevitable, while boosting their hopes about taking control of the Senate and flipping some gubernatorial and state-level seats. “The cake is pretty well baked at this point in favor of the Republicans taking control of the House,” said GOP consultant John Thomas. “The Republicans would have to willfully work to screw it up. Doesn’t mean it’s impossible.” A New York Times survey highlighted on the paper’s front page on Monday punctuated the grim environment for Democrats. Just a quarter of Democratic voters said Biden should be the presidential nominee in 2024, and the sentiment that the U.S. is headed in the wrong direction has hit 77 percent, the highest since the height of the 2008 financial crash. The survey is in line with numerous other recent ones finding Biden’s underwater approval rating. In an environment like this, and barring any earth-shattering changes, analysts say, the biggest liability for swing-seat Republicans are themselves. And while there is near-universal optimism that Republicans will win the House, the Senate and governorships are less certain. “Absent a miracle, there is no chance [Democrats] hold the House in November, and their only hope in the Senate will be Republicans choosing terrible candidates, which they have proven very capable of doing,” said Rory Cooper, a veteran GOP strategist. Republicans need to net only one seat to win control of the Senate, but the electoral landscape there is trickier and more based on individual candidates and races than in the House. “I think those candidates have some work to do. If they can get it within striking distance, the wave should put them over,” Thomas said. Sarah Longwell, an anti-Trump GOP strategist, pointed to candidates such as Hershel Walker, the Trump-backed GOP Senate nominee in Georgia who was recently revealed to be the father of three previously unknown children, being liabilities for Republican hopes of winning key races. Though it is a “broadly very favorable environment for Republicans,” Longwell said, she could see a scenario where “Republicans do really well, they take the House, but they lose a lot of these individual Senate races because they’ve nominated cranks and extremists.” GOP operatives, however, point to Democrats signaling a poor strategy on their part in key races. Democratic political groups [spent around $5.5 million](https://www.9news.com/article/news/local/next/democrats-colorado-gop-primary-spending-backfired/73-50f35c58-a639-45c1-90d8-8913a2811e0e) trying to amplify the most conservative candidates in the Colorado GOP Senate primary, but failed in keeping construction company owner Joe O’Dea from becoming the nominee to challenge incumbent Sen. Michael Bennett (D). O’Dea’s win prompted Roll Call election analyst Nathan Gonzales [to move the race](https://rollcall.com/2022/06/29/rating-change-odea-win-means-colorados-bennet-faces-tougher-race/) from “solid Democratic” to “likely Democratic.” And Republicans say that many issues that Democrats are focusing on — such as abortion, revelations about former President Trump from the House Jan. 6 select committee and “Ultra MAGA” extremists — are not sticking. A [poll of likely voters](https://static1.squarespace.com/static/60f608b4d8590f6f84e05f56/t/62bb517f1f306f5b1c77a9f9/1656443263482/RSLC+June+2022+National+Battleground+Poll+.pdf) in swing states commissioned by the Republican State Leadership Committee, which supports down-ballot state-level candidates, and conducted in the days after the Supreme Court overturned Roe v. Wade found that more voters named inflation, the economy and crime as top issues than pointed to abortion. “While abortion is an issue people care about, the data makes clear that it is not among the top issues that will drive voting behavior in November. Instead, this election will remain about Biden’s failing economy,” a memo accompanying the poll said.

### U – Pres Approval Low

#### Dems lose midterms now.

[Buchholz](https://www.forbes.com/sites/katharinabuchholz/) 7/8/22 (Katharina Buchholz is a senior data journalist at Statista After earning her masters’ degree in journalism from the University of Colorado, she has worked for newspapers and reporting projects in the U.S. and Germany. Published 7/8/22, Accessed 7/14/22, *Forbes,* “President’s Party Up Against Poor Odds In The Midterms [Infographic]” <https://www.forbes.com/sites/katharinabuchholz/2022/07/08/presidents-party-up-against-poor-odds-in-the-midterms-infographic/?sh=19abfdfbf4ab>. NSH

As clear as the data on midterm losses for sitting presidents is, as unclear are the reasons behind it. Nobody really knows why the midterms are so hard for incumbents irrespective of the political climate, but depending on how a president is doing, he could be hit by either apathy or disappointment among his own supporters. Other than 9/11, national crises have not proven a good predictor for midterms either, which leave two more possible culprits: presidential approval and the state of the economy. Neither of these is bound to look very favorable for Joe Biden in November. A second poll by Gallup shows that Americans are not only enthusiastic about the upcoming election but have also given it “quite a lot” of thought. 48% said so this June compared with only 31% in the summer of 2014. Whether their interest in the current political issues will work in Biden’s favor remains to be seen.

#### Republicans win now – they are on the path to control Hispanic turnout

Bernal et. al 7/14/22 [Rafael Bernal is a staff writer at The Hill. Emily Brooks is a staff writer at The Hill. Mike Lillis is a senior staff writer at The Hill. The Hill – “GOP basks in growing Latino outreach success” - <https://thehill.com/homenews/house/3558283-gop-sees-chance-to-steal-hispanic-voters-from-democrats/>] Webb

**Republicans are actively courting Hispanic voters in key competitive House districts**, hoping to peel away voters from Democrats repeating their historical pattern of investing little and late in reaching out to Latinos. The GOP’s approach is a danger to Democrats, as **Hispanic voters are likely to play a key role in at least a dozen districts** in the November midterm elections. “It couldn’t be a starker contrast between Republicans and Democrats as we engage and do outreach to minority voters, and specifically the Hispanic community,” said Danielle Alvarez, communications director for the GOP. Hispanic Democrats in Congress outnumber Republicans 4 to 1, but the Republican Party has recruited a new generation of Hispanic candidates at breakneck speed, most notably in Texas, but also in states like Oregon and Virginia. The National Republican Congressional Committee says **it has recruited a total of 102 Hispanic candidates in this cycle**. Excitement about making inroads in the Hispanic community led Reps. Tony Gonzales (R-Texas) and Mario Diaz-Balart (R-Fla.) to launch the Hispanic Leadership Trust PAC in May, aimed at growing the number of Hispanic members in the House. “Step one is bringing back everybody that is Hispanic conservative Republican,” Gonzales said. The GOP this week seized on a flub by Jill Biden comparing the Hispanic community to breakfast tacos, which the first lady has since apologized for, to help fuel Republicans’ argument that Democrats are not in touch with Hispanic voters. Alvarez called the comment “disrespectful” and argued that it is “a window into how Democrats view Hispanics.” The Republican National Committee (RNC) started selling shirts that read “Not your breakfast taco.” Historically, most heavily Hispanic districts have had a deep Democratic lean, with the exception of districts with proportionately high Cuban American populations, which tend to lean Republican. But recent polling is buoying Republicans who see a chance to make real inroads with Hispanics amid national frustration over high gas prices and inflation. A New York Times-Siena College poll this month found that **only 41 percent of Hispanics said they intended to vote for Democrats in the upcoming midterms**, while 38 percent said they preferred GOP candidates. Statisticians warn that polling of Hispanic voters is particularly difficult, and national polls that use likely voter models have historically missed the mark. The Pew Research Center’s latest numbers, from March, on Hispanic voter intent show 50 percent of Hispanics intended to vote for a Democratic candidate, while only 28 percent intended to vote for a Republican. Pew is due to release a new survey including weighted Hispanic voter intent ahead of the midterms. Most observers agree that high Hispanic turnout is likely to favor Democrats and low turnout Republicans, a reflection that a broad majority of Hispanics are still more likely to vote Democratic. Nonetheless, the favorable polls are putting a spark into the GOP effort. “We never left the ground, and **we’ve always been engaging and having these conversations with Hispanic communities** and diverse communities across the country,” said Alvarez. Rep. Juan Vargas (D-Calif.) acknowledged “some inroads” by the GOP when it comes to attracting Latino voters, but quickly added that the trend has been “way overstated.” “Everyone has always looked at Latinos as this sort of singular group and not diverse. The truth of the matter is we’re as diverse as anybody else — may even more so,” said Vargas, who represents a huge swath of the border between California and Mexico. “People say, ‘Look, there’s all these Latinos voting Republican.’ And I say, ‘They always have.’ I mean, because of social issues they always have,” he said. “It’s not a big change, people are just noticing it now.” Republicans argue they started their 2022 outreach early by opening community centers where staff work to build relationships with Hispanic communities, recruit and train volunteers, register voters and turn them out to vote. The GOP Latino community centers have opened in places where Hispanics traditionally yield political power like Texas and Florida, but also in places where growing Hispanic communities are shifting election results, like Georgia, Pennsylvania, Nebraska and Wisconsin. Out of 30 RNC community centers targeting minority communities, 12 are Hispanic community centers. The centralized GOP outreach stands in contrast to a Democratic machinery that’s built a broad network of grassroots organizations and a solid power base in the 36-member Congressional Hispanic Caucus, but has struggled to inculcate an “early and often” Hispanic outreach mantra in its upper echelons, like the Democratic Congressional Campaign Committee or the House Majority PAC. The expanding GOP outreach, led by Hispanic Republicans, is eroding an image Democrats had cultivated of having a virtual monopoly on Hispanic representation. In the five Texan districts along the U.S.-Mexico border, all 10 major party House candidates are Hispanics with ties to local communities. A similar phenomenon is happening in Florida’s three southernmost districts, where all three Republican incumbents are Hispanic, as are the leading candidates in the Democratic primaries. Vargas allowed that the situation in Texas might be different, because of polls showing a number of Hispanic Democratic voters have recently jumped parties to support the GOP. But in Vargas’s mind, that switch is just an indication that **Texas Democrats haven’t done enough outreach to Latino voters in the state**. **“Outreach is a big deal**, absolutely,” he said. “The party has to do a much better job, and they haven’t.” Vargas said that Democrats in Texas are assuming Hispanic voters will vote Democratic. “I mean, they’re taking them for granted. We certainly don’t in California,” Vargas said. The GOP’s Hispanic outreach is aided by candidates who tend to follow party orthodoxy with more discipline than their Democratic counterparts. Alvarez said that “the extremism of the Democrats woke leftist movement” contributes to Hispanic voters moving toward the GOP, noting use of the term “Latinx” and mentioning education on gender identity and sexuality in elementary schools. “We’re actually more conservative than the average voter on these issues,” said Alvarez. New candidates like Rep. Mayra Flores (R-Texas), who won a special election to represent a formerly Democratic Rio Grande Valley district earlier this year, have hit the ground running on party messaging, using Twitter to lash out against Democrats and paint an image of an inevitable GOP wave among Latinos. “It’s really important to have not only the right message but the right candidates to deliver the message,” Alvarez said.

#### Republicans are poised to gain control of the Congress, but it’s close

Continetti 6/18 (Matthew, resident fellow at the American Enterprise Institute, founding editor of *The Washington Free Beacon,* contributing editor of *The Weekly Standard,* graduate of Columbia University, “Republicans Surf the Red Wave,” National Review, 6/18/2022, <https://www.nationalreview.com/2022/06/republicans-surf-the-red-wave/> )-cjtz

In January, FiveThirtyEight published a story with the headline, “Some Early Clues About How the Midterms Will Go.” The authors, Alex Samuels and Nathaniel Rakich, named four things to watch during the election year: President Biden’s job approval, the congressional generic ballot, special-election results, and individual election polls. Six months later, all signs point to a great night for Republicans in November. With one asterisk. Let’s look at some numbers. Job Approval. This week Biden dropped below 40 percent approval in both the FiveThirtyEight and RealClearPolitics averages of polls. His net approval is -14 points in both averages. The latest executive order is more a signal of the administration’s desire for expansive abortion access than a set of actionable policies. Take a moment to consider how terrible that is. According to the Gallup poll, at this point in earlier midterm cycles, Donald Trump was at -5 net approval, Barack Obama was at +2, and Bill Clinton was at +5. All three presidents went on to lose the House of Representatives. Clinton lost the Senate as well. Biden is much worse off than his immediate predecessors. “No president with an underwater net approval rating since World War II has ever lost fewer seats than Obama’s 13 in 2014,” wrote Samuels and Rakich. At this writing, Republicans only need to net nine seats to win the House. Negative job approval is a sure sign of impending defeat. And it will take a miracle for Biden’s standing to improve before Election Day. Congressional Generic Ballot. Since the beginning of the year, Republicans have led Democrats in both the FiveThirtyEight and RealClearPolitics averages of the congressional generic ballot. That lead is small — about three points — but stable. And it may underestimate the Republican advantage. Most pollsters are still conducting surveys of registered voters, who tend to lean more Democratic than the electorate that shows up to vote in November. Plus, Samuels and Rakich wrote, “Generic-ballot polling has historically tended to get worse for the president’s party as the cycle wears on.” Absent a deus ex machina in which a winged chariot is sent from the heavens to lower gas prices, end the war in Ukraine, lock up violent criminals, and secure the southern border, House Democrats are doomed. Special Elections. On June 14, Republican Mayra Flores trounced Democrat Dan Sanchez in a majority Hispanic congressional district on the Mexican border. Her victory wasn’t just evidence that the Hispanic vote is migrating to the GOP. It also supports the case for a Republican wave. “If a party consistently outperforms its typical margins in these irregularly scheduled elections—like Democrats did in 2017 and early 2018—it is usually a sign that the political environment is leaning in its direction,” Rakich wrote in April. The most recent margin in Texas’s 34th congressional district was five points for the Democrats. Flores beat Sanchez by eight points. That’s a 13-point swing toward the Republican Party. And the Texas special election followed similar elections in California and Alaska where Republicans also over-performed. When he wrote about special elections in April, Rakich warned that there wasn’t enough data to identify a trend. Well, to quote another election-watcher, I’ve seen enough. The results of special elections are in line with a Republican triumph on November 8. Individual Races. The toplines — stagflation, historic trends, Biden’s job approval, the generic ballot, enthusiasm — favor the GOP. The Democratic House is lost. Here’s the asterisk. Republicans need only a single pickup to win control of the Senate. But Republican Senate candidates are struggling. The first general-election poll in Pennsylvania has Democrat John Fetterman leading Republican Mehmet Oz by nine points. And Fetterman hasn’t campaigned since he was hospitalized for a stroke last month. The most recent poll in North Carolina has Democrat Cheri Beasley leading Republican Ted Budd by four points. The Republican candidates who are ahead aren’t ahead by much. The most recent poll in Ohio has Republican J. D. Vance leading Democrat Tim Ryan by three points. The latest poll in Georgia has Republican Herschel Walker tied with Democrat senator Raphael Warnock. Now it’s entirely possible that Republican Senate candidates will gain as they become better known, define their opponents, and benefit from the backlash against President Biden. It’s entirely possible the polls are off and that, as happened in Tom Cotton’s race in 2014, single-digit polling leads will turn into big wins on Election Day. Still, the Republican Senate team in 2022 isn’t as strong as it was eight years ago. The roster this year looks more like it did in 2010 and 2012. And those seasons were disappointing. No one wants to relive the frustration and fury of 2011 through 2015, when Republicans controlled only the House of Representatives. GOP Senate candidates need to recognize, quickly, that elections are won not in Mar-a-Lago but in the suburbs, as they surf the red wave headed toward Washington.

### U – Dem Turnout Down

#### Democrat Base turnout is low right now – 2020 isn’t spilling over

Siders 6-29 (David Siders, national political coordinator at POLITICO, MS from Northwestern, “Roe jolts the midterms: 5 takeaways from the 2022 election midpoint”, Politico, 6-29-2022, <https://www.politico.com/news/2022/06/29/roe-jolts-the-midterms-5-takeaways-from-the-2022-election-midpoint-00043082>) - aagg

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.”

### U – Trends

#### Republicans will win – polls and empirics

Montanaro 2022 -- Domenico Montanaro, senior political editor and previously served as political director and senior producer for politics and law at PBS NewsHour, “Republicans have the advantage with voters in 2022 elections, poll finds”, *NPR*, https://www.npr.org/2022/04/29/1095366671/npr-pbs-newshour-marist-survey-republicans-biden-democrats-midterms, April 29, 2022, accessed 7-11-2022//Tata

All signs are pointing to a difficult midterm election for President Biden and Democrats, and a new NPR/PBS NewsHour/Marist poll has fresh evidence of that. Of the 1,162 registered voters surveyed, 47% said they are more likely to vote for the Republican in their district, as opposed to 44% who said Democrats. (The poll has a margin of error of 3.7 percentage points, which means results could be almost 4 points higher or lower.) It's the first time in eight years that Marist's survey has found Republicans with an advantage on the congressional ballot test. Back then, months before the 2014 midterm elections, Republicans had a 5-point edge in the poll and then won control of both the House and Senate. This past November, Democrats had a 5-point advantage on the question, and traditionally, Democrats need a lead of at least a few points to do well or break even. That's because their voters are largely compacted in urban areas and because congressional districts across the U.S. are drawn in a way that broadly favors Republicans. When Democrats won control of the House in 2018, they had a 6-point edge in the poll, for example. In this survey, independents — an important swing group, particularly in suburban areas — said they favor Republicans by 7 points, 45% to 38%. There is a significant gender gap overall and in suburbs, with a majority of women favoring Democrats and a majority of men wanting Republicans in charge. Republicans with the edge on key issues Republicans are also favored on a raft of issues, including double-digit advantages on inflation, crime and national security. Inflation, in particular, is critical, considering Americans say it is their top concern. Of note, about three times as many independents say they think Republicans would do a better job controlling inflation as they say Democrats.

#### Republicans win midterms due to Trumpism

Ulmer 5/26/22 – (Alexandra Ulmer is a U.S. National Correspondent with Reuters. “Beyond Donald Trump, Trumpism is the winner in U.S. midterm primaries," Japan Times, 5-26-2022, <https://www.japantimes.co.jp/news/2022/05/26/world/us-midterms-trumpism/>) – LASA LC

The crushing defeat of David Perdue in Tuesday’s Republican gubernatorial primary in Georgia likely delighted Donald Trump’s adversaries, who have been keeping scorecards to measure the performance of election candidates backed by the former U.S. president. **Trump has weighed in on November’s midterm elections** like no former president, announcing more than **190 endorsements** and holding rallies with his proteges. The success of his endorsees is seen as a key sign of his continued influence over the party as he hints at another run for the White House in 2024. But political analysts and Republican strategists caution that any jubilation among Trump’s enemies over Perdue’s loss to Georgia Gov. Brian Kemp is short-sighted, and that any scorecard is a poor barometer for the state of Trumpism in the United States in 2022. While Trump’s candidates have had mixed success so far this year in party primaries, **many Republican voters still embrace Trump’s false claims of voter fraud** in the 2020 election, as well as his right-wing, “America First” populist ideology. And failure to win Trump’s endorsement has not stopped some Republican candidates from **going hard-right to try to win over his base**. “In 2016, Trump was really the only candidate running as that sort of populist. Now it’s increasingly what most Republican primary candidates sound like,” said Republican strategist Alex Conant. That underlines the continuation of the Trump-led metamorphosis of the Republican Party since he was voted out of the White House in 2020, even as some party leaders seek to move the party away from Trumpism, the strategists and analysts said. “I think the No. 1 thing Trump has absolutely changed in the party is that Republicans don’t even try playing nice anymore. My side has become more angry,” said Republican strategist Chuck Warren. The people’s ‘Make America Great Again’ Trump’s kingmaker status was put to the test this month when several high-profile, Trump-backed candidates faced Republican primaries in Ohio, Pennsylvania, North Carolina and Georgia. Around **two-thirds of high-profile candidates** backed by Trump **triumphed** in their contests in May, although some were running **unopposed or against weak challengers**. One race, the Republican senate contest in Pennsylvania between television personality Mehmet Oz, who received Trump’s endorsement, and former hedge fund executive David McCormick, has yet to be decided. In lobbying for the former president’s endorsement, both men cast aside their elite backgrounds to espouse the Trump-style populism that now resonates with Republicans. The primary was shaken up by Kathy Barnette, a conservative political commentator, who came from nowhere at the 11th hour to tighten a race that had until then appeared to be a two-man contest. While she finished a distant third in the primaries, analysts said she was emblematic of how Trump’s Make America Great Again movement has expanded beyond his control. “MAGA does not belong to President Trump,” Barnette said during a Republican debate last month, even as Trump spoke out against her. “Although he coined the word, MAGA actually belongs to the people.” Republican voters in Pennsylvania also backed Trump-endorsed far-right candidate Doug Mastriano for governor, who supports abortion bans with no exceptions and backs Trump’s false claims of election fraud. Mastriano won his contest. In North Carolina, **Republican voters powered Trump-backed Representative Ted Budd**, who voted to overturn Joe Biden’s election win, to victory in the state’s Republican Senate nomination. Georgia’s governor’s race, where Perdue was pummeled on Tuesday by Kemp, shows how **the Republican Party has shifted to the righ**t, irrespective of how Trump-endorsed candidates perform in these primaries. While Kemp did not entertain Trump’s conspiracy theories of 2020 election fraud, he did enact sweeping voting restrictions, limited abortions and expanded gun rights. But voters were only willing to follow Trump so far in backing flawed candidates in May’s nominating contests. In another race on Tuesday, for Georgia’s secretary of state position, some experts had forecast neither securing a majority, triggering a run-off. Instead, incumbent Brad Raffensperger narrowly defeated Trump-endorsed Rep. Jody Hice, who **amplified Trump’s baseless claims** that he actually won the Georgia presidential vote in 2020. In North Carolina, voters ousted scandal-plagued congressman Madison Cawthorn despite Trump’s last-minute plea to give him “a second chance.” And in Nebraska, Trump’s choice for governor, Charles Herbster, lost amid accusations that he had sexually harassed several women.

### U – Inflation

#### Rep are winning now, as more than half of Americans believe that the Dems aren’t doing enough for inflations

Hannah Fingerhut July 10, 2022 [wrote and edited highly-visible reports and blog posts based on statistical analyses of current and historical public opinion survey data on political values, policy issues, and attitudes toward government. <https://www.ourmidland.com/news/article/Inflation-expenses-rise-sharply-as-priorities-17295576.php>

WASHINGTON — Concerns about inflation and personal finances have surged while COVID has evaporated as a top issue for Americans, a new poll shows, marking an upheaval in priorities just months before critical midterm elections. **Forty percent of U.S. adults specifically name inflation** in an open-ended question as one of up to five priorities for the government to work on in the next year, according to a June poll from The Associated Press-NORC Center for Public Affairs Research. That's a sharp rise from 14% in December and less than 1% the year prior. In all, 77% mention the economy in any way, up from 68% in December. But just 10% specifically mention jobs or unemployment, as U.S. employers continue to hire despite high inflation and weak economic growth. Now, too, Americans increasingly call their personal finances a major issue: 44% mention it, up from 24% in December and 12% the year before. That includes more mentioning gas or energy prices (33% now vs. 10% in December) and food costs (9% vs. less than 1%). ACT NOW The poll of 1,053 adults was conducted June 23-27 using a sample drawn from NORC’s probability-based AmeriSpeak Panel, which is designed to be representative of the U.S. population. The margin of sampling error for all respondents is plus or minus 4 percentage points. Those shifts may be advantageous to Republicans as they campaign to win control of Congress in this year's midterms; the economy has increasingly been a sore subject for President Joe Biden. Still, the economy isn’t the only issue getting more attention this year. Many also prioritize issues that are core to Biden and Democrats’ agenda, including abortion, women’s rights and gun policy, which could help Democrats as they try to pad — or at least protect — their razor-thin majority. In a troubling sign for both parties, the poll finds many Americans say they think neither side of the aisle is better at focusing on the issues important to them or getting things done. Sara Rodriguez said she’s concerned about the impact of rising prices of goods, gas and oil on her household’s finances, especially because her income isn’t keeping up. “We’ve had a savings built up and we’re noticing that it’s definitely going down fast because we don’t make enough money to cover how much the cost of everything has risen,” the 43-year-old quality control coordinator in Bristol, Connecticut, said. Rodriguez and her husband and son have had to get to their workplaces and run errands using one car over the last couple of months because of her husband’s broken-down truck. “We just haven’t had the money to get it back on the road,” she said. The rise in concerns about the economy is paired with a steep decline in the percentage naming COVID-19 as a top issue, even as new variants continue to emerge: Now just 4% mention it, down from 37% in December 2021 and 53% in December 2020. Republicans are more likely than Democrats to mention inflation or personal finances as top issues, but the sharp changes since December are bipartisan. Daniel Collier, a 39-year-old construction worker in Waynesville, Missouri, thinks lowering gas prices should be a priority. “It’s hurt me financially,” he said. “I worry about being able to pay the rent, pay utilities.” He blames Biden for inflation and “poor” economic conditions, saying he thinks the president is “incompetent.” The poll shows 69% of Americans disapprove of how Biden is handling the economy, including 93% of Republicans and 43% of Democrats. In May, facing an inflation rate at a 40-year high, most Americans said in an AP-NORC poll that they worried about the impact of higher than usual prices on their finances. For 22-year-old Jakyra Green, rising prices have been prohibitive.

#### Republicans win now – they are gaining the support of the working class + minorities

Spady 7/14/22 [Aubrie Spady is a college associate for Fox News Digital. Fox News – “Polls show Democrats becoming party of elites as working class and minorities shift toward Republicans” – <https://www.foxnews.com/politics/polls-show-democrats-becoming-party-elites-working-class-minorities-shift-toward-republicans>] Webb

Republicans are starting to attract more voters in the working class, while Democrats are gaining more votes from wealthier Americans as midterm candidates make their priorities clear in the last four months before the election. The majority of voters consist of working-class citizens, a group that has historically leaned Democrat**. Minority voters are likely to see inflation as the country's greatest concern, but the Democratic Party has made clear its main priorities approaching the midterms are abortion, gun laws and climate.** This type of agenda is likely to appeal more to wealthier, suburban voters. The two parties are neck and neck with Hispanic voters on the generic congressional ballot after a New York Times-Siena College poll discovered 41% said they would vote Democrat and 38% Republican. **During the 2018 midterm election cycle, Democrats had a 47-point advantage among Hispanic voters, a number that has significantly dropped since the election.** NBC News conducted a poll this spring that found Democratic support among women with college degrees is up 28 points since 2010, rising from 10 points to 38 over the past decade. The party did not see a rise in any other demographic. With inflation on the rise and hitting a 40-year high of 9.1% in June, these middle-class voters are taking the hit and will be more likely to vote for a candidate this November who plans on making it a priority to tackle the issue. An Associated Press-NORC poll released in early July affirmed that most Americans' biggest concern is inflation, despite Democratic candidates centering campaigns around abortion and gun laws.

### U – Swing Voters

#### All signs point to a Republican win

**Greenblatt** 20**22** -- Alan Greenblatt, Senior Staff Writer who covers politics and policy issues for Governing, “You Don't Need to Be a Fortune Teller: Signs Point to GOP Sweep This Year”, *Governing*, <https://www.governing.com/now/you-dont-need-to-be-a-fortune-teller-signs-point-to-gop-sweep-this-year>, May 27, 2022, accessed 7-14-2022//Tata

The president's party always loses seats in midterms. This year, just about everything — fundraising, voter enthusiasm, demographic shifts, the issues mix — is going the right way for Republicans. For Democrats this year, the only real question is whether the elections will be only moderately bad or completely terrible. If you think like a weather forecaster, all kinds of data point to a major storm. By basically every metric you can think of — fundraising, candidate recruitment, voter enthusiasm, demographic shifts — a big wave is forming that will sweep hundreds of Democrats out of office, up and down the ticket. The main reason isn’t hard to suss out. Every president can count on his party losing seats in midterms, but President Biden’s approval ratings are particularly bad. On average, 41 percent of Americans approve of the job he’s doing, compared with 54 percent who disapprove. “That is one of the lowest marks of any president since World War II,” says Henry Olsen, a conservative analyst at the Ethics and Public Policy Center. “Unless that changes, I would expect a solid Democratic defeat.” Granted, President Donald Trump’s approval ratings were similarly bargain basement in 2018 — but then, Republicans lost control of the House that year, along with seven governorships. The more important comparison, at any rate, is not with Trump but with Biden himself. Biden won the presidency in 2020 by 4.5 points. If he’s down 13, that represents a huge drop in support, which seriously imperils his party. Swing voters have swung hard against Biden. His net approval rating among independents is roughly minus 20. That’s a group he carried in 2020 by 13 points, according to exit polls. We’ve already witnessed a demonstration of how the president’s numbers can drag down other Democrats. Last November, Biden’s net disapproval numbers were 12.5 percent points lower than his victory margin in 2020. Guess what? The swing from Biden’s share of the vote to that won in 2020 by the Democratic candidates for governor was 12 points. Gov. Phil Murphy managed barely to hold on in New Jersey, but Democrat Terry McAuliffe lost the governorship to Republican Glenn Youngkin in Virginia — a state Biden had carried a year earlier by 10 points. Now, Biden’s numbers are even lower than they were back in November. This means any Democrat who won their last election by less than double-digit margins should be nervous. That certainly includes vulnerable governors such as Tony Evers of Wisconsin and Laura Kelly of Kansas. “The president’s dismal ratings are what people care about the most,” says GOP consultant David Carney. “It could be a bloodbath up and down the ballot, from the school board to Congress."

### U – Swing States

#### Republicans win Arizona now --- registration proves

Murray 7/12 (Mark Murray is the senior political editor for NBC News, 07/12/2022, accessed 07/14/2022, NBC News, “Republicans outnumber Democrats in battleground Arizona, new statistics show”, https://www.nbcnews.com/meet-the-press/meetthepressblog/republicans-outnumber-democrats-battleground-arizona-new-statistics-sh-rcna37881)RMazhankou

Republicans **outnumber** Democrats in battleground Arizona, new statistics show The GOP holds its largest registration edge in the state since 2018. Democrats have flexed their political muscles in Arizona in the last two election cycles, winning Senate and presidential contests, and even threatening to primary Sen. Kyrsten Sinema, D-Ariz., over her centrist positions. But Arizona isn’t a blue state. Far from it. New voter registration statistics from the secretary of state’s office, first reported by ABC15, show Republicans outnumbering Democrats by nearly **4 percentage points** among active voters, 34.5% to 30.9% — or approximately 150,000 voters. It’s the GOP’s widest registration advantage in the state since 2018, ABC15 adds. Unaffiliated voters represent 33.7% of the state’s active voters — slightly behind the GOP but ahead of Democrats. Here's the breakdown of July 2022 voter registration numbers in the state per the Arizona Secretary of State (active voters): Republican: 1,433,650 (34.5%) Other: 1,399,954 (33.7%) Democratic: 1,284,651 (30.9%) Libertarian: 32,506 (0.8%) Two developments have helped Democrats win in Arizona — first Sinema in 2018, then Joe Biden and Sen. Mark Kelly, D-Ariz., in 2020 — despite that GOP registration advantage. One, Sinema (50%-47%), Biden (53%-44%) and Kelly (55%-45%) all won the independent voters, according to NBC News’ exit polls. And two, all three candidates peeled off about 10% of Republican voters, while holding on to almost all Democratic voters (96%-97%). Bottom line: Arizona is a purple state, where Democrats **need** independents and disaffected Republicans to win — in a state where the GOP holds the registration advantage.

#### Republicans win in Georgia now

McGuire 6/15(McGuire Woods Consulting 6/15/22 – “2022 Midterms: Top 10 States to Watch”, 6/15/2022, https://www.mwcllc.com/ideas/updates/articles/2022/5/2022-midterms-coverage)//CG

On May 24, 2022, Georgia voters went to the polls to cast their votes for the nominees they want to see represent their party in the November’s general election. Voter turnout was significantly higher among both parties compared to the previous midterm elections in 2018. The Republican Gubernatorial Primary resulted in a landslide victory for incumbent Brian Kemp despite former President Donald Trump endorsing his challenger, former Senator David Purdue. Gov. Kemp garnered 73.7% of the Republican vote. His victory sets up a rematch of the highly contested 2018 race against Stacey Abra3ms, who ran unopposed on the Democratic side. In the race for U.S. Senate, Herschel Walker easily secured the Republican nomination over a field of other GOP candidates, including state Agriculture Commissioner Gary Black. Walker was endorsed by former President Donald Trump shortly after announcing his campaign. This sets up a clash with freshman Senator Raphael Warnock, who cruised to victory in his Democratic primary. This race is poised to be crucial in deciding Senate control. The redistricting of Congresswoman Lucy McBath’s district prompted her to run in the neighboring 7th congressional district against Democratic colleague Carolyn Bourdeaux. McBath won the Democratic primary contest with 64% of the vote. She will now face either Michael Corbin or Mark Gonsalves in November’s general election. In the 6th district, the election for an open seat in Congress resulted in a runoff on the Republican side. The winner will take on Democrat Bob Christian in November. The winner of the Republican primary will likely be the next Congressman from the 6th District.

#### Republicans win in North Carolina now

Bass 6/23 – David Bass, journalist and communications professional with nearly two decades of experience in the world of PR, marketing, and publications, (“Budd Leads Beasly by 5% in New Poll of U.S. Senate Race in N.C.”, The California Journal, June 23, 2022, https://www.carolinajournal.com/budd-leads-beasley-by-5-in-new-poll-of-u-s-senate-race-in-n-c/)//CG

Republican candidate for U.S. Senate Ted Budd has a comfortable lead over Democratic opponent Cheri Beasley in North Carolina, according to the results of a new Civitas poll. Budd, who represents the state’s 13th congressional district, garnered 45% support among likely voters. That compares to 40% support for Beasley, a former chief justice of the N.C. Supreme Court. Green Party candidate Matthew Hoh secured about 1% and Libertarian candidate Shannon Bray 3%. Eleven percent remained undecided. [The results are in contrast to a recent WRAL News poll](https://www.wral.com/beasley-budd-in-close-race-for-us-senate-seat-wral-news-poll-shows/20330242/), which put Beasley ahead of Budd 44% to 40%. “North Carolinians have been thrown into an unstable economy courtesy of short-sighted monetary policy at the federal level. The Fed’s ‘print and run’ the economy hot approach is hitting voters in the most personal of ways, such as limiting their ability to feed and shelter their families and commute to work,” said John Locke Foundation President Donald Bryson. On the two races for seats on the N.C. Supreme Court, Republicans appear to be shoring up their advantage, with Republican candidates Richard Dietz and Trey Allen securing 49% support apiece compared to 38% support for Democrat Lucy Inman and 39% support for Democrat Sam Ervin. Republicans also shored up their advantage on the generic congressional and legislative race matchups, according to the survey’s results. Fifty-one percent would pick a Republican on a generic ballot for the General Assembly and 39% say they would pick a Democrat. For Congress, 51% would pick the GOP and 41% a Democrat. President Joe Biden’s approval rating continued to remain low at 33% compared to 60% who disapprove. Gov. Roy Cooper remained even in his performance rating, with 44% approving and 44% disapproving. Seventy-eight percent of respondents said Biden has “all” or “some” responsibility for inflation. Eighty-nine percent said inflation in the U.S. was “a huge problem.” The trendline continues downward on sentiment about whether the U.S. is headed in the right or wrong direction, with 22% saying right track and 72% saying wrong track. Seventy-seven percent believe the U.S. is currently in a recession, with 13% saying the nation is not. Asked which metric they believe most indicates whether the country is in a recession, the runaway favorite was “prices of goods and services” at 63%.

#### Republicans win in Georgia now

Ztio 7/2 (Salena Zito joined the Washington Examiner in 2016 as a Pittsburgh-based columnist and reporter and is also a columnist at the New York Post, 07/02/2022, accessed 07/11/2022, *New York Post*, “How Herschel Walker can still beat Raphael Warnock for Georgia’s Senate”, https://nypost.com/2022/07/02/herschel-walker-can-still-beat-raphael-warnock-for-georgia-senate/)RMazhankou

Walker is likable and personable, with an air of authenticity that helps him **connect** with voters. And this might just be his “secret” formula for winning the election. “He is very raw,” said Republican voter Joe Cobb, an executive from suburban Atlanta. “He’s like, ‘I’ve had mental issues’ and that’s hard for someone of his stature to do. “He’s not a politician,” he added. “In this day and age that plays to your strengths and not being a politician is Herschel’s strength.” Atlanta-based conservative radio host Erick Erickson agrees. The press, he said, doesn’t “understand how unsettled voters are over things like inflation, the border, crime, you name it. Voters don’t want to put the people back in office who caused this, so they’ll take a risk with the **outsider**.” Walker said that at every stage of his personal journey — whether it be football, business or politics — he has prayed. Faith, he said, is a cornerstone of everything he has achieved. When he decided to run for Senate, he said he listened to both God and voters across the state. “People were like, ‘What?’ I said, ‘Yeah, I want to hear what the people have to say, because when you go to Washington, you’re supposed to represent the people, not yourself.’ ” As he was going through his listening sessions, Walker found that “70% of the drugs coming into the United States goes through Atlanta, where you got human trafficking. Fentanyl is killing, it’s increasing crime, but yet we’re not even addressing it.” In 2010 the DOJ reported that the Atlanta area is the principal bulk cash consolidation center for Mexican drug-trafficking organizations operating in the eastern US. More recently, the Georgia Department of Public Health reported a 106% spike in fentanyl-related deaths between May 2020 and April 2021. Walker’s positions will become clearer when he eventually debates Warnock before the election. Because he refused to debate his Republican challengers in the primary, his performance will likely be heavily scrutinized. But, despite his unconventional background and lack of political experience, many Georgia political observers say this is Walker’s race to lose come November. Sure, he may be a bit messy, but “**everything** is working against the Democrats, **especially in Georgia,”** said Erickson, who despite early reservations is now fully behind Walker. “Spend some time in the state and you’ll understand why Warnock **is in trouble**.” Walker feels the same way about his face-off with Warnock. “As I told everyone,” he said, “Guys, I know I can beat this guy.”

#### Republicans win in Wisconsin now

Bauer 06/22 (Scott Bauer is an Associated Press Statehouse correspondent based in Madison, 06/22/2022, accessed 07/12/2022, AP News, “Wisconsin Democrats face hard road in Senate, governor races”, https://apnews.com/article/2022-midterm-elections-abortion-wisconsin-presidential-election-2020-0edb92e5e3470dd91838e479f9a669c9)RMazhakou

MADISON, Wis. (AP) — Wisconsin Democrats gathering for their annual state convention this weekend are focused on reelecting Gov. Tony Evers and defeating Republican Sen. Ron Johnson, but also know that history is **against them** in the midterm year and voters face high inflation, rising gas prices and growing concerns about a recession. The extent of how tight the election may be was made clear Wednesday with the latest Marquette University Law School poll. It showed Evers slightly ahead of his Republican challengers, while Johnson about even with each of the top Democrats running against him. But the poll also showed Republicans are more excited than Democrats about voting, a significant marker in a midterm election when turnout is lower than in a presidential year. The prospect for Johnson improved, and worsened for Evers, the lower the projected turnout in the poll. “Turnout **matters** in a game of inches in a state that has had so many close elections in recent years,” said Marquette pollster Charles Franklin. And in a bad sign for incumbents, a **majority** of poll respondents said they felt the state was headed in the wrong direction. Evers and Democrats know that the road ahead is a tough one — the last time a candidate for Wisconsin governor who was the same party as the president won was back in 1990 — but they believe they can overcome the headwinds. 2022 MIDTERM ELECTIONS “Whatever else is happening nationally, in Wisconsin Democrats are united and energized,” said Wisconsin Democratic Party Chairman Ben Wikler. Still, the Marquette poll showed 67% of Republicans **were very enthused** about voting compared with 58% for Democrats. “There’s this real sense that the future of our state and that the whole country is on the line and that Democrats casting their ballots in 2022 could affect the rest of all of our lives,” Wikler said. The Marquette poll showed President Joe Biden’s approval rating at 40%, with 57% disapproving, his **lowest** marks in Wisconsin since taking office. Evers’ approval rating was better at 48% while 45% disapproved.

#### Republicans win in Florida now

Cotterell 7/10(Bill Cotterell covers the capitol part-time for various publications but returned to the Democrat to resume writing columns in 2013, and he also writes occasional editorials for the newspaper, focusing on state government and politics, 07/10/2022, accessed 07/13/2022, *Tallahassee Democrat*, “Democrats’ problem: People aren’t buying their product”, https://www.tallahassee.com/story/opinion/2022/07/10/how-bad-democrats-florida-look-voter-registrations/10010224002/)RMazhankou

Of all the things the Florida Democratic Party has going against it in these midterm elections, voter registration looks like the most **ominous**. It’s not just the raw numbers, it’s the trend of political preferences. Things are going **up** for the GOP and **down** for the Democrats. Bottom line: A Republican registration advantage of about 200,000 when the primaries are held next month. Democrats have found some glimmer of hope in the Supreme Court’s abortion ruling. Agriculture Commissioner Nikki Fried encourages Republican and independent voters to become Democrats, and has hammered at U.S. Rep. Charlie Crist’s past “pro-life” positions, in their race to oppose Gov. Ron DeSantis this fall. Abortion is hot right now, but polls show inflation, gas prices and crime motivate **more** voters. And most who care strongly about it**, either way**, were already going to support the more liberal or conservative nominee in November. Division of Elections charts indicate the Democrats held a lead of 97,215 statewide two years ago. But by early 2021, the Republicans were on top by 43,102. And as of May 1, that lead rose to nearly 176,000. Over two years, total registration fell from 14.5 million to 14.2 million — mostly due to people dying, moving away or letting registration expire — but Republicans lost only 83,000 voters while Democratic registration was down by **over 356,000**. Republicans have run Florida since Gov. Jeb Bush beat Buddy MacKay in 1998, but it took a couple decades for registration to catch up with voter performance. President Obama carried the state twice, but so did Donald Trump in the most recent presidential races. The Democrats, already a stark minority in the state House and Senate, **didn’t even field candidates** in several legislative races this year. Not long ago, it was the GOP that let powerful Democrats go unopposed or put up hopeless long shot candidates. If you look at it like Ford vs. Chevy, or Coke vs. Pepsi, it seems Floridians just aren’t buying what the Democrats are offering. A recent Monmouth University poll pegged President Biden’s approval rating at **36%**, so there’s no reason to think Democratic fortunes will rebound soon. Inflation has driven up the prices of nearly all goods and services, including necessary items such as groceries. The cost of a gallon of milk is up 25% compared to pre-pandemic prices. According to a report by Moody's Analytics, American families pay $311 more each month, on average, for essential goods compared to one year […] Inflation, which the Biden White House called “transitory” last year, is running 8.6%. The Wall Street Journal recently reported that red states are far outpacing blue states in job recovery. Since the start of the pandemic, states run by Republicans have added 341,000 jobs while those run by Democrats were still down 1.3 million in May. Those aren’t numbers that swing states into the red or blue column, but the trend is a bragging point. Midterm elections are always bad for the president’s party. In 1994, President Clinton’s first midterm election, Republicans flipped eight seats in the Senate and 54 in the U.S. House and gained 10 governors. In President Obama’s first midterm, 2010, Republicans took over both chambers of Congress with a net gain of 63 seats. The GOP will **surely** win the House this year and the Senate is up for grabs. But there probably won’t be such a seismic shift this year — not because the Democrats are strong, but because the Republicans have nominated some bizarre people in other states. So, Florida is **no longer politically purple**. As Politico said in its Florida Playbook last week, “DeSantis’ prediction that Florida will no longer be a battleground state after this year’s election is moving closer into view.”

#### Republicans win in Nevada now

Greenwood 22 **(**Max Greenwood is a Florida-based reporter covering the 2022 midterms, 2024 presidential race and national political trends for The Hill, 06/20/2022, accessed 07/13/2022, The Hill, “The seven Senate seats most likely to flip in 2022”, https://thehill.com/homenews/campaign/3527999-the-seven-senate-seats-most-likely-to-flip-in-2022/)RMazhankou

Sen. Catherine Cortez Masto (D) is set to face off against former state Attorney General Adam Laxalt in November after the Trump-endorsed candidate clinched the GOP nomination this week. While Cortez Masto is an adept campaigner in her own right – she’s a former chair of the Democratic Senatorial Campaign Committee (DSCC) and a political mentee of the late Senate Majority Leader Harry Reid (D-Nev.) — she’s also facing a **tough environment** in a state that in many ways epitomizes some of the biggest challenges facing Democrats this year. Nevada has some of the **highest gas prices** in the country and the state’s economy — which depends heavily on tourism — took a **hit** as the COVID-19 pandemic prompted **shutdowns** of hotels, bars and restaurants. At the same time, the Senate race in Nevada is expected to test Democrats’ resilience among Latino voters, who make up a significant share of the state’s electorate. While those voters have long been a key Democratic constituency, there have been signs in recent years that that may be **starting to change**.

### AT: Uniqueness Overwhelms

#### Not over yet – Dems have a chance.

Herndon & Cohn 7/13 (Astead & Nate, The New York Times, “Could the Midterms Be Tighter Than Expected?” The Daily, July 13th, 2022, https://www.nytimes.com/2022/07/13/podcasts/the-daily/midterms.html?showTranscript=1)

So Nate, the assumption has always been, or at least it feels like, this entire year, has been that the Democrats are going to get absolutely creamed in the midterm elections, that they’ll lose seats in the House and they will probably lose the Senate as well. But you just released a poll that takes stock of the mood of the electorate, and it seems to implicate that the picture’s a little more complicated than that. Can you tell us about that poll? What did you find? Nate Cohn Yeah, we found Democrats doing, you know, not necessarily well, but maybe surprisingly well given that backdrop. Democrats and Republicans were tied on this poll question called the generic congressional ballot, which just asks whether you’d rather see Democrats or Republicans in control of Congress.

#### Not over yet – plan could be the “October surprise.”

Roche 22 [Darragh Roche, reporter for Newsweek; Published 7/10/22; Publisher, Newsweek “Democrat’s Best Case Scenario For Midterms”; https://www.newsweek.com/democrats-best-case-scenario-midterms-joe-biden-republicans-1722926 ; DOA 7/11/22]

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. 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](https://www.newsweek.com/democrats-worst-case-scenario-midterms-joe-biden-republicans-1722543). 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.

#### Midterms are susceptible to sway

**Rothenberg 6/28** -- Stuart Rothenberg, political analyst known for his biweekly political newsletter The Rothenberg Political Report, “A handful of voters will decide Senate control in 2022”, *Roll Call*, <https://rollcall.com/2022/06/28/a-handful-of-voters-will-decide-senate-control-in-2022%EF%BF%BC/>, June 28, 2022, accessed 7-14-2022//Tata

Voters in seven states will decide who controls the U.S. Senate in 2023-24: Arizona, Georgia, Nevada, New Hampshire, North Carolina, Pennsylvania and Wisconsin. If Republicans net even one seat in the fall midterms, they can block President Joe Biden’s judicial, diplomatic and executive branch appointees for the rest of his term. While some of those seven states have large populations — Pennsylvania is the fifth most populous, Georgia the eighth, North Carolina the ninth, Arizona the 14th, Wisconsin the 20th, Nevada the 32nd and New Hampshire the 41st, according to the 2020 census — only a handful of voters in each state will decide who wins their 2022 Senate races. That is because most voters are reliably Republican or reliably Democratic. They may well tell you that they are independents who cast their votes depending on their evaluation of the candidates, but that is usually poppycock. Most are closet partisans who vote consistently for one party or the other but like the idea of being “independent.” Since each of the seven states is almost evenly divided between Democrats and Republicans, those partisans generally don’t decide who wins. It is true swing voters — “soft” Democrats, and “soft” Republicans in those states who have the power to pick winners in any statewide contest. Traditionally, turnout in midterm elections is significantly below that in presidential years, so part of the parties’ electoral calculations includes their ability to turn out voters who otherwise would not show up at the polls in a typical midterm.

### AT: Roe v Wade

#### Roe isn’t enough to turn the tides of the Midterms- Reps still win.

Bump 7/8(Philip, national correspondent for The Washington Post, graduated from Ohio State University, “The Democrats haven’t turned the midterms around yet,” Washington Post, 7/08/2022, https://www.washingtonpost.com/politics/2022/07/08/democrats-havent-turned-midterms-around-yet/)-cjtz

When the Supreme Court released its anticipated decision in Dobbs v. Jackson Women’s Health Organization overturning Roe v. Wade, Democratic leaders were **mocked** for their immediate response: Ya gotta vote this November. “**That’s all you’ve got**?” an incredulous base replied. Telling Democrats to do what they did in 2020 and 2021 and give the party a majority? That was the plan? Well, most of it, yes. On Friday, President Biden signed an executive order offering some federal protections for abortion after the ruling, but otherwise, that same mantra: **vote**. You need to vote. In short order, though, frustration at the knee-jerk “it’s up to you on Election Day” crumpled a bit since, after all, Election Day is the point at which voters can reshape the direction of the country. In the weeks after the Dobbs verdict, some Democrats started to even get hopeful. Would anger at overturning Roe be enough to turn around the historic pattern of midterm elections going against new presidents? Was that an uptick in generic congressional ballot polling? Was enthusiasm surging? When I wrote Thursday about the likelihood that Republicans would fare well in November’s elections, I got a lot of pushback: Hadn’t this expectation reversed? So far, **the answer is no**. Sign up for How To Read This Chart, a weekly data newsletter from Philip Bump Let’s start with the generic ballot. This is a question pollsters use to gauge how the House will look after an election, asking respondents whether they plan to vote for the Democrat or Republican in their local House contest, but not by name. This year, Republicans opened up a healthy lead on this question, according to FiveThirtyEight’s polling average. Since Dobbs, Democrats have inched up a bit — 0.7 points, to be precise.

#### Republicans still predicted to win despite Roe v Wade issues --- inflation, gas prices, and Biden’s low ratings.

**Palmer 7-8-22**- (Ewan 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 Midterms” [https://www.newsweek.com/gop-midterms-house-senate-democrats-best-case-trump-abortion-1722650 Acessed 7-14-22](https://www.newsweek.com/gop-midterms-house-senate-democrats-best-case-trump-abortion-1722650%20Acessed%207-14-22)) -kg-

With exactly four months until the midterms, it is still the 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. With rising inflation, record-breaking gas prices and Biden's continuously low approval ratings, it has been long predicted that the Democrats will see particularly heavy losses this year, raising the potential of them losing majority power of both the House and the 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, and the 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 in Pennsylvania, Herschel Walker in Georgia, 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 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 reach, which means that the Republicans are unlikely to gain a filibuster proof 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. "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—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 and the Senate—and maintain their advantage in governor's races," Niven said.

## Links

### 2NC – Link

#### Extend Kuttner – plan saves the Dems by distracting voters from domestic failures. Alliance support is a political winner for Biden, which affects turnout. The link is empirical.

#### And, the plan will be perceived and foreign policy is a top priority – being tough on Russia is a win for Dems.

Lauter 22 (David Lauter is a senior editor at the Los Angeles Times, based in Washington, D.C, 03/11/22, accessed 07/13/2022, LA Times, “Essential Politics: War in Ukraine scrambles GOP and Democratic strategies for midterms”, https://www.latimes.com/politics/newsletter/2022-03-11/politics-war-ukraine-scrambles-plans-2022-midterm-election-essential-politics)RMazhankou

WASHINGTON — One constant from political figures in wartime is insistence that they’re not concerned about politics. Nonsense, of course. The domestic political impact of the war in Ukraine — now in its third week — has **scrambled** the two parties’ strategies going into this year’s midterm elections. Both have started to maneuver for advantage. No one knows whether either side will benefit come November — a lot depends on how voters end up perceiving the war’s course. But for President Biden and the Democrats, who have been tracking toward a significant defeat, attention to a foreign crisis could provide a badly needed **shakeup** of the campaign debate. An overwhelming issue “As a general rule, Americans don’t vote on foreign policy unless American men and women are dying in a war, but we’ve rarely had an international event not involving the United States directly that has so totally consumed our news and attention as the Russian invasion of Ukraine,” said Republican pollster and strategist Whit Ayres. “This war has become symbolic for the survival of democratic regimes against authoritarian dictatorships,” Ayres added. “That symbolism has given it a much broader meaning.” A poll this week by Navigator Research, a Democratic firm, found that 37% of American voters said they were “very closely” following news from Ukraine, and nearly 8 in 10 said they were following it at least somewhat closely — high numbers for a foreign issue. National security and foreign policy had jumped to the **top** of American concerns, tied with jobs and the economy, **displacing** worries about the coronavirus and inflation, the poll found. Amid that intense focus, Americans have clearly picked a side — **overwhelmingly favoring the Ukrainians**. That could be seen in Wednesday’s House vote to suspend oil imports from Russia, which passed 414-17 with just two of the chamber’s most left-wing Democrats, Reps. Cori Bush of Missouri and Ilhan Omar of Minnesota, and 15 right-wing Republicans voting no. That level of attention makes the Ukraine war the kind of event that could **significantly shift** U.S. politics. “Politics isn’t the most important thing right now,” said Democratic strategist Steve Schale, chief executive of the pro-Biden super-pac Unite the Country. But, he added, since 1992, “the only two midterm elections that were not absolute debacles for the incumbent president’s party were held during a window where there was something significant in the country that reshaped the conversation.” Those two were 1998, when voters rejected Republican efforts to impeach President Clinton and Democrats gained four seats, and 2002, when Republicans under President George W. Bush gained seats in the aftermath of the Sept. 11, 2001, terror attacks. Biden and the Democrats have a long way to go to emulate the midterm successes those two presidents enjoyed. A new Wall Street Journal poll released Friday continues to show Democrats trailing the GOP as the party voters say they expect to back in November. But polls have also shown an uptick in voters’ assessments of how Biden is doing his job. The change is just a few percentage points, but after nine months of nearly steady decline, it’s a welcome sign for the president. Ukraine has clearly contributed to the boost in Biden’s ratings. A poll by Morning Consult for Politico found this week, for example, that by 46% to 42%, voters approved of Biden’s response to the crisis. Voters’ assessments of how Biden has dealt with Ukraine have improved **notably** since last month and are also significantly higher than how they assess his presidency overall. The shift comes primarily from Democrats and independents; Republicans mostly remain highly critical of Biden. The Navigator poll, however, did identify a slice of Republicans, mostly moderately conservative men, who approve of Biden on Ukraine even as they disapprove of his performance otherwise. In any case, winning back wavering partisans and independent voters is a key task for Biden right now, one that could be critical in the small number of swing House districts and Senate elections in which the midterms will be most intensely contested. If voters continue to approve of Biden’s response, it could help with one of his key problems — the perception by many Americans that he’s not a strong leader. For now, the war has provided Democrats with at least a talking point to use on one of their other problems — the inflation that has swept through the U.S. economy. White House officials have worked overtime in recent days to blame Russian President Vladimir Putin for the increase in gasoline prices, labeling it “Putin’s price hike.” So far, that message has shown some traction, at least with Democratic partisans. A poll released Wednesday by YouGov found that Democrats, by 59% to 10% blamed Putin rather than Biden for the price increases. Republicans heavily blamed Biden, while independents were closely divided. Gas prices in the first nine months of Biden’s presidency rose from a nationwide average of $2.38 per gallon to $3.40, according to weekly data from the Energy Department. Since the Russian attack on Ukraine, prices nationwide have jumped to an average of $4.10, with more increases likely. Large majorities of Americans say they support the administration’s decision to ban imports of Russian oil, although it’s anyone’s guess whether that support will persist as motorists continue to struggle with high prices. The House vote to support the import ban reinforces the polling on another impact of the war — the degree to which Republicans have rejected former President Trump‘s favorable attitude toward Putin. Two weeks ago, I wrote that initial reactions to the war had isolated Trump. That trend has only deepened. “The brutality of Putin‘s assault has made the judgment of Putin’s apologists highly suspect,” said Ayres. Trump has repeatedly complimented Putin, including referring to the Russian leader’s rationale for the invasion as “genius.” A majority of Americans, including both Democrats and independents, although not Republicans, view Trump as “pro-Russia,” but see Biden and both parties in Congress as “pro-Ukraine,” the Navigator polling found. The 15 Republicans who voted against the oil import ban included several of Trump’s most outspoken supporters, including Reps. Marjorie Taylor Greene of Georgia, Matt Gaetz of Florida, Lauren Boebert of Colorado, Paul Gosar of Arizona and Madison Cawthorn of North Carolina, who in recent remarks to supporters called Ukrainian President Volodymyr Zelensky a “thug.” Elsewhere in the GOP, however, even party leaders who have strenuously avoided criticizing Trump, like House Minority Leader Kevin McCarthy of Bakersfield, have publicly split with his praise of Putin. “I do not think anything’s savvy or genius about Putin,” McCarthy said Wednesday when asked about Trump’s comments. Neither McCarthy nor the vast majority of Republican elected officials have explicitly criticized the former president, but Ukraine could emerge as an election **liability** for some of his acolytes. The first overt sign of that came this week in North Carolina, where former Gov. Pat McCrory aired the first ad of his campaign for the party’s Senate nomination. The spot attacked his chief opponent, Rep. Ted Budd, for being soft on Putin. The ad features a clip from a television interview in which Budd called Putin a “very intelligent actor.” “These are serious times and we need serious senators,” McCrory says in the ad. “I don’t compliment our enemies.” That was the first such use of Ukraine in a political attack in the current campaign year, but “if the dynamics continue on this same track,” said Ayres, it almost surely will not be the last.

### L – FP Focus

#### Biden will lose midterms on inflation – foreign policy key to shifting focus away

Walter 5/19 (Amy Walter is an American political analyst who is the editor and publisher of The Cook Political Report and a host of The Takeaway, “Can Democrats Turn Things Around?,” Cook Political Report, 5-19-22, <https://www.cookpolitical.com/analysis/national/national-politics/can-democrats-turn-things-around>)-AT

With just under six months to go until the November elections, the political environment looks as bleak as ever for Democrats. The President's job approval ratings remain mired in the low 40s, inflation has proven to be stubborn and persistent, and Americans are overwhelmingly pessimistic about the country's direction, with a whopping 75 percent saying they think the country is heading on the "wrong track." Do Democrats have any chance to turn things around in the time they have left? Earlier this cycle, we posited that there were a few things that could help boost Democrats' prospects: An improving political/economic climate. Unexpected gains from redistricting. A big event that would shift the focus of the election onto topics more favorable to Democrats. Contentious Republican primaries that produced flawed and bruised nominees. Already we know that option two is a no-go. Earlier this spring, it looked as if Democrats might come out of the decennial process with a gain of up to 4 seats. That rosy scenario has since been dashed by the courts in states like New York and Kansas. Instead, as my colleague David Wasserman has expertly documented, Republicans are poised to pick up two seats from redistricting.

### L – NATO

#### NATO Security Coop has bipartisan support, gives Biden a foreign policy boost.

Lange 3/30/22 (Jason Lange is a correspondent and writer who centers on economics and cybersecurity.) Published 3/30 22, Accessed 7/11/22, Reuters, “Majority of Americans back sending more troops to NATO in Ukraine crisis -Reuters/Ipsos”, <https://www.reuters.com/world/majority-americans-back-sending-more-troops-nato-ukraine-crisis-reutersipsos-2022-03-30/> NSH

WASHINGTON (Reuters) - A bipartisan 55% of Americans support sending more U.S. troops to Washington's NATO allies in central and eastern Europe in response to Russia's five-week old invasion of Ukraine, according to a Reuters/Ipsos poll completed on Tuesday. President Joe Biden has deployed thousands of additional troops to Europe to support North Atlantic Treaty Organization allies concerned by Moscow's war on its smaller neighbor. Biden has made clear no U.S. troops will be sent to Ukraine though Washington is supplying Kyiv with weapons and has aggressively sanctioned Russia's economy, including a ban on U.S. imports of Russian oil. Some 61% of Democrats and 54% of Republicans back further troop deployments to NATO countries, according to the Reuters/Ipsos poll conducted on Monday and Tuesday. On Tuesday, the Pentagon announced a new tranche of U.S. troops and military hardware bound for NATO allies, including 10 F-18 jets and more than 200 personnel heading to eastern Europe, including Lithuania. There are currently more than 100,000 U.S. troops in Europe, up from the roughly 80,000 before Russian troops moved into Ukraine. The poll also showed 61% of Americans feel U.S. sanctions on Russia are worth the price of higher fuel costs - even after gasoline prices surged at the onset of the war. That was almost unchanged from a Reuters/Ipsos poll conducted a month earlier, though gasoline prices have surged by nearly 20% since then to $4.24 per gallon, according to automobile club AAA. Some 47% of Americans approve of how Biden has handled the Ukraine crisis, well above the Democratic leader's 39% rating on the economy, the poll showed. Biden's overall popularity has sunk to the lowest levels of his presidency in recent weeks, a warning sign that his Democratic party could lose its razor-thin majorities in the U.S. Congress in the Nov. 8 midterm elections. The latest Reuters/Ipsos poll was conducted online, in English, throughout the United States, gathering responses from 1,005 adults. It has a credibility interval, a measure of precision, of about 4 percentage points.

### L – Russia

#### Fighting Russia with NATO gains support for dems

John Harwood 22, Award winning journalist as a White House correspondent, 3-13-2022, "Analysis: Biden's Ukraine leadership may not help Democrats at ballot box," CNN, <https://www.cnn.com/2022/03/13/politics/politics-midterms-biden-ukraine/index.html-> RayS

Biden’s State of the Union coupled notes of bipartisan unity around Ukraine with appeals to core Democratic constituencies he needs to energize. The White House expects his Supreme Court nomination of Ketanji Brown Jackson – who Republicans concede is headed for confirmation – to galvanize Black support this fall. More important is the dramatic shift in public attention to the war. Instead of wheedling Sen. Joe Manchin, the West Virginia Democrat who sank Biden’s Build Back Better bill in December, the President is confronting Russia’s murderous tyrant. Praise for his leadership from voices in both parties helps offset accusations of weakness and incompetence that stuck to Biden after last year’s chaotic withdrawal from Afghanistan. “Biden’s muscular reaffirmation of the U.S. commitment to NATO was crucial not just for Europe but for the world,” conservative columnist Mona Charen, a former White House aide to Ronald Reagan, wrote last week in The Bulwark. “If Ronald Reagan were still alive, he’d find little to criticize in the administration’s approach.” The crisis also affects intra-Republican politics. Former Vice President Mike Pence’s statement that the GOP can’t accommodate “apologists for Putin” squarely targeted former President Donald Trump, whose cozy relations with Russia suddenly offer Democrats a much larger target. “There’s a lot of potential for the focus on foreign policy to scramble things up,” observed Democratic data analyst David Shor. If Biden’s job approval could reach even 45% by this fall, Shor estimated, his party will have a chance to keep control of Congress. CNN’s average of major polls last week showed Biden at 43% approval. That’s 2 points below Shor’s minimum target, but 2 points higher than the previous average in February.

#### Russia is public enemy number 1, if it gets hurt, the plan will be popular.

Richard Wike et al 22, 4-6-2022, Doctorate in Political Sciences and well-respected researcher, "Seven-in-Ten Americans Now See Russia as an Enemy," Pew Research Center, https://www.pewresearch.org/global/2022/04/06/seven-in-ten-americans-now-see-russia-as-an-enemy/ -RayS

Russia’s invasion of Ukraine has led to a dramatic shift in American public opinion: 70% of Americans now consider Russia an enemy of the United States, up from 41% in January. And on this topic, Democrats and Republicans largely agree, with 72% of Democrats and 69% of Republicans describing Russia as an enemy. A new Pew Research Center survey, conducted March 21-27, finds that just 7% of U.S. adults have an overall favorable opinion of Russia. Only 6% express confidence in its leader, President Vladimir Putin. In contrast, 72% have confidence in Ukrainian President Volodymyr Zelenskyy. The ongoing war has brought renewed attention to NATO. Ukraine is not a NATO member, but it borders several member states, and NATO leaders have worked together in recent weeks to coordinate their responses to the crisis. Attitudes toward the alliance have grown more positive since Russia’s invasion: 67% express a favorable opinion of the organization, up from 61% in 2021. Meanwhile, 69% say the U.S. benefits a great deal or a fair amount from being a NATO member. While both Democrats and Republicans (including those who lean to each party) hold largely positive views about NATO and U.S. membership in the organization, Democrats are consistently more positive, especially liberal Democrats. For instance, 85% of liberal Democrats think the U.S. benefits a great deal or a fair amount from NATO membership; among conservative Republicans, only 51% hold this view. Still, partisan differences over NATO have shrunk somewhat over the past year. The share of Democrats and Democratic leaners with a favorable overall opinion of NATO has held steady at nearly eight-in-ten, but among Republicans and GOP leaners, positive views have increased from 44% in spring 2021 to 55% today. The partisan gap on Russia favorability has also decreased. In 2020 – the last time this question was asked – there was a 17 percentage point difference between the share of Democrats with a very unfavorable opinion of Russia and the share of Republicans with that view; now the gap is only 5 points. Democrats and Republicans are also now more closely aligned on views about the threat posed by Russia. In the current survey, 66% of Democrats and Democratic-leaning independents say Russia is a major threat to the U.S., similar to the 61% registered among Republicans and Republican-leaning independents. However, when this question was last asked in 2020, only 48% of Republicans considered Russia a major threat, compared with 68% of Democrats. These are among the key findings of a new survey conducted by Pew Research Center on the Center’s nationally representative American Trends Panel among 3,581 adults from March 21 to 27, 2022. Most Americans have a very unfavorable opinion of Russia Public opinion of Russia is overwhelmingly negative: **92%** of Americans say they have an unfavorable view of the country, including 69% who have a very unfavorable view. Since the last time this question was asked on Pew Research Center’s online panel in 2020, almost two years prior to Russia’s recent invasion of Ukraine, this strongly negative sentiment has increased by 28 percentage points. Before switching to online surveys, Pew Research Center tracked Americans’ ratings of Russia in phone surveys between 2007 and 2020. In that time, assessments of Russia were never very positive, but they turned sharply negative in the spring of 2014, immediately following Russia’s annexation of Crimea, which few countries have recognized – and never recovered. While negative sentiment toward Russia has increased substantially among both Democrats and Republicans since 2020, Republicans’ views have changed more drastically. Around a third of Republicans and Republican leaners had a very unfavorable view of Russia in 2020, compared with 67% who now hold this view – a 35 percentage point increase. In the same period, the share of Democrats with a very negative view of Russia increased by 23 points. A small partisan gap in views of Russia remains, but Republicans and Democrats are not as divided on Russia as they once were. Americans ages 65 and older (83%) are much more likely than adults under 30 (55%) to have a very unfavorable view of Russia. A large majority of Americans now see Russia as an enemy Changes in overall views of Russia have come alongside changes in how Americans perceive relations between the two countries. Just two months ago, Americans were more likely to describe Russia as a competitor of the U.S. rather than its enemy (49% vs. 41% at the time). Now, Americans overwhelmingly call Russia an enemy: 70% say so, with just 24% preferring to call Russia a competitor of the U.S. Merely 3% of Americans see Russia as a partner, down from 7% two months ago. While broad cross-sections of Americans primarily see Russia as the United States’ enemy, those ages 65 and older are especially likely to hold this view, with 83% saying so. And while a majority of the youngest adults polled agree that Russia is an enemy (59%), they are far more likely than older adults to label Russia as a competitor. More educated Americans are also particularly likely to name Russia an enemy – 77% of those with a postgraduate degree say this, while roughly two-thirds of both those with some college education and those with a high school degree or less education say the same. While Democrats and Republicans largely agree that Russia is an enemy, there are some differences between partisan and ideological camps. Moderate and liberal Republicans are the least likely to name Russia an enemy (63% say this), while liberal Democrats are the most likely (78%). Perception of Russia as a major threat at all-time high With most Americans viewing Russia as an enemy, the share who believe that Russia is a threat to the U.S. is higher now than it has ever been since the Center first began polling on this topic in 2008. Overall, 64% of Americans say that Russia’s power and influence is a major threat to their country, 30% say it is a minor threat and only 5% say Russia is not a threat. Mirroring overall views of Russia, Americans became more wary of the country in 2014, when just over half said it was a major threat to the U.S. At that time and in 2016, Republicans were more likely than Democrats to be concerned. This partisan difference both widened and flipped in following years, however, with Democrats much more likely than Republicans to view Russia as a major threat in each survey between 2017 to 2020. Since then, the share of Republicans who see Russia as a threat has increased, narrowing the partisan gap. Though views of Russia as a major threat have shifted somewhat over time, the share of Americans who say Russia is not a threat to U.S. interests has never been higher than 10%. Majorities of adults in all age groups see Russia as a significant threat, but this view is even more common among adults ages 65 and older (70% vs. 57% among those ages 18 to 29). Amid Russia-Ukraine war, Americans positive on NATO, though partisan divides persist As NATO faces increased scrutiny in light of Russia’s invasion of Ukraine, the political and military alliance is seen in a positive light by most Americans. Two-thirds have a favorable opinion of NATO. This marks a significant increase from the roughly six-in-ten who said the same of the organization in 2020 and 2021. Prior to 2020, U.S. opinion of NATO was somewhat mixed. Roughly half or more of Americans expressed a favorable view of the organization, with opinion ranging from 49% in 2013 and 2015 to 64% in 2018. However, these figures are from phone surveys and are not directly comparable to more recent online American Trends Panel data. While Democrats and Republicans are both generally more favorable toward NATO than not, Democrats and Democratic-leaning independents are more likely than Republican counterparts to have a positive view. About eight-in-ten (78%) Democrats see NATO in a positive light, compared with 55% of Republicans. This pattern was observed in 2021, though Republicans have grown somewhat more favorable on NATO since this question was last asked.

### L – Ukraine

#### Americans support work in Ukraine, this boosts dems if plan passes

Shibley Telhami 22, 3-31-2022, "What do Americans think of the Russia-Ukraine war and of the US response?," Brookings, https://www.brookings.edu/blog/order-from-chaos/2022/03/31/what-do-americans-think-of-the-russia-ukraine-war-and-of-the-us-response/ -RayS

It turns out that large majorities of Americans are indeed following the Russian invasion closely, according to our University of Maryland Critical Issues Poll. The poll was carried out online between March 16 to 28, 2022 by Nielsen Scarborough, who used a nationally representative sample of 1,320 adults with a margin of error of +/- 2.7%. It found that 40% of respondents say they are following the crisis “very closely,” and another 45% say they are following somewhat closely. Here are twelve takeaways: 1 Americans clearly view Ukraine as being far more friendly than Russia, even if most Americans don’t simply consider Russia to be an enemy or Ukraine to be a full ally. Thirty-four percent of respondents say Russia is an enemy, including 30% of Republicans and 40% of Democrats, while 38% say Russia is an “unfriendly country,” and 24% say it is neither friendly nor unfriendly. Nineteen percent consider Ukraine an ally, while a slight majority of 54% consider Ukraine a “friendly country,” and 25% consider it neither friendly nor unfriendly. 2 Large bipartisan majorities remain opposed to sending U.S. troops to Ukraine, even if the conflict persists. Sixty-five percent oppose sending troops, including 68% of Republicans and 62% of Democrats. At the same time, a large majority, 83%, supports supplying the Ukrainian army with military equipment, including 82% of Republicans and 86% of Democrats. Similarly, 89% of those polled support continuing to impose tough sanctions on Russia, including 85% of Republicans and 95% of Democrats. 3 If the Russian invasion persists, small bipartisan majorities will support a no-fly zone over Ukraine, even as large majorities of Americans express concern about the possibility of fighting Russians and of nuclear conflict. Fifty-six percent of respondents say they support enforcing a no-fly zone over Ukraine, including 52% of Republicans and 61% of Democrats. Despite this view, most respondents also expressed overwhelming concern about potential U.S. military confrontation with Russia (61% were “very” concerned and another 28% were “somewhat concerned”). Nuclear fears also weighed heavily: 58% were also “very concerned” and another 24% “somewhat concerned” about potential nuclear confrontation with Russia. 4 Americans view the U.S. response to the Ukraine crisis more favorably than unfavorably but are divided in their attitude along party lines. Forty-nine percent say their opinion of the U.S. reaction has been favorable, including 31% of Republicans and 69% of Democrats, compared to 31% who express unfavorable opinions, including 49% of Republicans and 13% of Democrats. A further 20% express neither favorable nor unfavorable opinions. Most Americans, 51%, say the U.S. reacted at the “appropriate level,” but a majority of Republicans, 56%, say the U.S. has “underreacted.” Two-thirds of Americans support U.S. President Joe Biden’s decision to end importing Russian energy, including 56% of Republicans and 80% of Democrats. 5 Most Americans, including majorities of Democrats and Republicans, say they are prepared to pay some price in energy costs and inflation for supporting Ukraine, but not in American lives. Seventy-three percent say they are at least somewhat prepared to pay higher energy costs, including 88% of Democrats and 58% of Republicans, while 65% are at least somewhat prepared to see increased inflation, including 78% of Democrats and 51% of Republicans. At the same time, 68% of Americans are “not at all” (41%) or “not much” (27%) prepared to accept loss of lives of U.S. troops. This holds across the partisan American divide, but Republicans are much more likely to “not at all” accept casualties (47%), compared to Democrats (33%). 6 U.S. policy toward Ukraine has impacted the public perceptions of Biden and former President Donald Trump more negatively than positively, driven by highly partisan attitudes. Thirty-six percent say they now have more favorable views of Biden, 23% say their views are unaffected, while 41% say they have more negative views, including 80% of Republicans. Thirty-four percent say they now have more positive views of Trump, 26% say their views were unaffected, while 40%, including 72% of Democrats, say they have more negative views of Trump. 7 Although U.S. government messaging on Ukraine has been partly focused on defending democracy around the world, most Americans across the partisan divide don’t believe the U.S. is now a good model for democracy. Only 27% say that democracy in the U.S. is a good example for other countries to follow, including 28% of Democrats and 29% of Republicans. A large majority, 61%, say the U.S. “used to be a good example but has not been in recent years”, including 64% of Republicans and 58% of Democrats. 8 Americans are divided on whether their country should be leading the international opposition to the Russian invasion, with 47% saying the U.S. should be the one to lead (42% of Republicans and 55% of Democrats), while 53% say it should not (58% of Republicans and 45% of Democrats). 9 Overwhelmingly, Americans across the partisan divide blame Russia for the crisis and few blame Ukraine. At the same time, a significant percentage also blame the U.S. Ninety-eight percent say Russia is to blame, 29% say Ukraine bears at least some of the blame, and 36% say the U.S. bears at least some of the blame, including half of Republicans. 10 While Americans say NATO’s expansion played a role in Russian behavior, most don’t think this was the key to Russia’s invasion of Ukraine. Thirty-eight percent say the expansion of NATO played a key role in the Russian invasion of Ukraine, 41% say NATO expansion played “a small but not a key role,” while 21% say it played no role. 11 Most Americans (57%) say the post-Cold War era has ended. Among those who hold that view, most blame Russian behavior, but a smaller majority also blame American behavior. Ninety-two percent say Russian behavior contributed to the demise of the post-Cold War era (64% say “a lot” and 28% say “somewhat”), while 73% say American behavior contributed (30% say “a lot” while 43% say “somewhat”).

#### Working with Ukraine is top priority

Christina Wilkie 22, Bachelor earner and white house reporter, 3-21-2022, “Biden’s leadership on Russia will be a bright spot in a gloomy State of the Union,” CNBC, https://www.cnbc.com/2022/03/01/bidens-leadership-on-russia-is-a-bright-spot-in-a-gloomy-state-of-the-union.html-RayS

On Ukraine, Biden and his foreign policy team are leading the rest of the world, revitalizing the NATO alliance and stepping up to the challenge that Russian President Vladimir Putin poses to the rules-based international order — one that has maintained relative peace in Europe for nearly 80 years. On Tuesday morning, tens of thousands of Russian troops were surrounding the Ukrainian capital, Kyiv. Farther to the east, Russian forces shelled a public square in Kharkiv, Ukraine’s second-largest city, killing hundreds. In response to the invasion, a loose coalition of large and small democracies around the world has banded together to impose severe restrictions on Russia’s central bank and sanctioned its richest citizens, its airlines and its state-run media. The goal of the effort is to isolate Moscow and force the Kremlin to pay a high price economically for launching a war of choice. Biden and the United States have been at the forefront of this coalition, which includes G-7 members, NATO allies, rich countries such as Japan and developing countries such as Ghana and even traditionally neutral countries such as Switzerland and Monaco. White House press secretary Jen Psaki said Biden will “talk about the steps we’ve taken to not only support the Ukrainian people with military and economic assistance, but also the steps he’s taken to build a global coalition imposing crippling financial sanctions on President Putin, his inner circle and the Russian economy.” Biden will also address “the importance of the United States as a leader in the world — standing up for values and standing up for global norms,” she told reporters Monday. In just the past week, Biden has held scores of leader-to-leader calls with U.S. and NATO allies to coordinate both U.S. support for Ukraine and sanctions on Russia. He has also deployed thousands of U.S. troops to help shore up the defenses of NATO member states to whom Russia poses the most immediate threat. At the same time, Biden’s secretaries of state and defense have requested and distributed hundreds of millions of dollars worth of additional weapons to Ukrainian troops and humanitarian aid to refugees fleeing the front lines. This combined U.S. military, diplomatic, economic and humanitarian response has earned praise for Biden from both Democrats and Republicans. “President Biden’s leadership in the Ukraine crisis has been truly impressive,” conservative intellectual Bill Kristol tweeted Monday. Even more importantly, early polls show that average Americans of all parties are coalescing around support for Ukraine and opposition to Russia’s invasion.

### L – China

#### Republicans can only counter China sufficiently – Dems weak, GOP holding China accountable

Brennan 21 (David is currently Newsweek's Diplomatic Correspondent covering world politics and current affairs from London. Prior to joining Newsweek in early 2018, he reported on British politics and global current affairs as a staff writer at International Business Times. Originally from London, David graduated from the University of Cambridge in 2012.) “On China, Republicans split between engaging with Joe Biden or eviscerating him.” *Newsweek.* 2-17-2021. https://www.newsweek.com/china-republicans-split-between-engaging-joe-biden-eviscerating-him-1569850 //RK

A group of Republican lawmakers has issued a damning assessment of President [Joe Biden](https://www.newsweek.com/topic/joe-biden)'s early China strategy, as the party considers how to push the new administration toward a tougher line on Beijing and punish it if it fails. The 120-member Republican Study Committee released a briefing document on Tuesday summarizing Biden's approach to China as: "Bad policies, bad personnel." The group, chaired by Indiana Rep. Jim Banks, is the largest conservative caucus in the House. Banks has said he plans to use its clout to influence China policy. The committee lauded Biden's predecessor [Donald Trump](https://www.newsweek.com/topic/donald-trump) as "the first president to take on Communist China in a generation," holding Beijing to account "for stealing U.S. intellectual property, infiltrating the U.S. education system, hijacking international organizations and spreading disinformation about the COVID-19 pandemic." Long-term concerns about Chinese behaviour converged under Trump, prompting bipartisan agreement that Beijing represents a problem to be addressed. Previous administrations had hoped that engaging with the Chinese Communist Party would encourage a more liberal regime while swelling U.S. coffers. But Beijing used its new-found wealth and influence to entrench its authoritarianism at home and push for new territory and power abroad. The CCP is unapologetic about its [human rights abuses](https://www.newsweek.com/biden-confronts-xi-taiwan-unfair-trade-trump-tariffs-review-looms-1568478) and [assertive in its territorial disputes](https://www.newsweek.com/xi-jinping-wants-emulate-mao-thinks-u-s-will-back-down-taiwan-ex-australia-pm-1569546). Its attempts to dodge blame for the coronavirus pandemic have also rankled with democracies worldwide. On the campaign trail, Biden vowed to be tough on China, seeking to dodge allegations from Trump and other critics that he would return to a softer, more cooperative relationship with Beijing. "The Biden administration has already taken a number of disastrous steps to undo President Trump's success in countering China," the Republican Study Committee claimed in its memo. "The Biden team so far has exhibited a pattern of weakness and a return to Obama's failed approach of engaging rather than holding China accountable for its bad behavior. "The Biden administration's foreign policy team is overwhelmingly made up of a number of individuals who either have had links to the CCP, or have a record of weak statements and actions on confronting it." "Despite tough talk on China, such as Secretary Blinken saying that Trump was right to take a tougher approach to China, the Biden administration's actions have shown they will do the opposite," the committee said. Not all [Republicans](https://www.newsweek.com/topic/republicans) are taking such a combative stance. In the [Senate](https://www.newsweek.com/topic/senate), some GOP members are looking to build bridges with the Biden White House to create a bipartisan Beijing strategy. Anger at Chinese trade practices, human rights abuses, territorial expansion and propaganda output were one of the few things that united the two parties during Trump's term. With Washington, D.C. still divided, this may be one of the few flags around which both parties can rally in the coming years. After Biden's first call with President [Xi Jinping](https://www.newsweek.com/topic/xi-jinping), Senator Jim Risch of Idaho—the ranking Republican on the Senate Foreign Relations Committee—told Newsweek he was encouraged by the president's mention of human rights abuses and other American grievances. "I am glad to see that President Biden increasingly views China as a serious competitor to the United States, and that he raised Taiwan, coercive economic practices and human rights," Risch said. "I'm also encouraged by the China policy review currently underway at the Department of Defense. COVID-19 has taught us that the Chinese Communist Party is willing to undermine global health to preserve its standing, and that fact demands a cautious approach towards pursuing cooperative initiatives with China, whether on climate change or other issues." Whether their approach is combative or cooperative, Republicans are set to keep the pressure on Biden and his team. The party saw China as [a vote winner](https://www.newsweek.com/republicans-want-china-define-2020-election-securing-victory-trump-1526651) in last year's election. The economic impact of the pandemic, concerns over globalization and the decline of U.S. manufacturing, plus traditional worries about military hegemony, are a potent combination. Add to this the increasingly well-publicized human rights [abuses in Xinjiang](https://www.newsweek.com/uyghurs-wait-nervously-biden-china-policy-genocide-continues-1553155) and Hong Kong. "China must be our top foreign policy priority," Risch said, adding that he had introduced the STRATEGIC Act, which calls for a clear strategy for competing with Beijing and coordinating with allies in Europe. "I plan to conduct congressional oversight of the Biden administration's China policy and strategy for the entire Indo-Pacific region," Risch said. "The challenges China poses are an American issue and I expect the Biden administration and Congressional [Democrats](https://www.newsweek.com/topic/democrats) to work across the aisle on effective, concrete and politically sustainable policies that have the support of the American people."

#### Republicans resilient on China – basis of midterm GOP ads

Mccormick 22(John a national political reporter who has covered every presidential campaign since 2000. He joined The Wall Street Journal in May 2019 after working for Bloomberg News, the Chicago Tribune, the Des Moines Register and the Rochester Post-Bulletin.) “China Is Frequent Topic, Especially for GOP, in Midterm Campaign Ads .” *WSJ.* 5-2-2022. https://www.wsj.com/articles/china-is-frequent-topic-especially-for-gop-in-midterm-campaign-ads-11651489201 //RK

Criticism of China is emerging as a popular topic in this year’s midterm congressional campaign ads, especially in Rust Belt states where the loss of manufacturing jobs to Asia and elsewhere have placed economic stress on voters. Television ads mentioning China—some of which have drawn criticism from Asian-American groups—are running most heavily in Pennsylvania, Ohio, West Virginia and Wisconsin. Some of that can be attributed to the timing of primaries: Ohio’s is Tuesday, followed by Pennsylvania and West Virginia later in May, while Wisconsin’s is Aug. 9. Roughly one in nine ads aired so far this year in all House and Senate races have mentioned China, a Wall Street Journal analysis of broadcast-television and national cable data from the ad-tracking firm AdImpact shows. That isn’t far behind [mentions of inflation](https://www.wsj.com/articles/inflation-gets-a-starring-role-in-gop-congressional-campaign-ads-11648373402?mod=article_inline), another topic Republicans are especially eager to talk about.Of the almost 34,000 airings that have touched on China, more than 80% were sponsored by Republicans or conservative-leaning groups. The U.S. wants to counter China’s influence around the world by providing everything from infrastructure to vaccines and green energy. WSJ’s Stu Woo explains how the plan, dubbed Build Back Better World, aims to compete with China’s Belt and Road Initiative. Photo composite: Daniel Orton“China is a symbol of how a lot of people perceive Ohio economically, especially the manufacturing sector,” said former Ohio Democratic Gov. Ted Strickland, who used China in his own 2016 ads for an unsuccessful U.S. Senate bid. “I do think it has a lot of power.” [Criticism of China was a staple](https://www.wsj.com/articles/trump-campaign-targets-china-and-portland-not-just-biden-11595649660?mod=article_inline) of former President [Donald Trump](https://www.wsj.com/topics/person/donald-trump)’s failed 2020 re-election campaign, with frequent mentions of trade actions he had taken as well as the “China virus” expression that he used to refer to Covid-19 as he sought to blame the country for the pandemic and the [economic damage it caused](https://www.wsj.com/articles/coronavirus-job-and-death-toll-is-widespread-in-michigan-we-are-talking-about-a-very-deep-hole-11592914330?mod=article_inline). There are incentives for criticism of the Asian giant: Nearly three-quarters of voters in [a Wall Street Journal poll](https://www.wsj.com/articles/wsj-poll-biden-ukraine-inflation-midterms-11646975533?mod=article_inline) in March said China was the nation’s largest economic threat, while a 52% majority said it presented the biggest security threat. Ohio and Pennsylvania, where China-related ads have run most frequently so far, are hosting two of the most contentious U.S. Senate primaries on the GOP side. The two states have also easily recorded the most spending so far this year on political ads. The top campaign sponsor so far this year of TV ads mentioning China is celebrity surgeon Mehmet Oz. As part of his effort to win [Pennsylvania’s Republican primary](https://www.wsj.com/articles/dr-oz-hedge-funder-david-mccormick-flood-pennsylvania-airwaves-in-negative-ads-11650979639?mod=article_inline) for U.S. Senate, he has aired more than 8,300 spots that have mentioned China. Scoops, analysis and insights driving Washington from the WSJ's D.C. bureau. In one that has been running in five Pennsylvania media markets, the Oz campaign calls his leading opponent, David McCormick, the former chief executive of hedge-fund giant Bridgewater Associates, “pro-China” and cites that as a reason Mr. Trump endorsed Mr. Oz. Asked last week in a debate to respond to attack ads claiming he has profited from China, Mr. McCormick sought to minimize his dealings there and said he had “done business around the world in 20 countries, including 2% of our b[usiness in China](https://www.wsj.com/articles/ray-dalios-bridgewater-raises-1-25-billion-for-its-largest-china-fund-yet-11637759912?mod=article_inline). Mr. Oz’s campaign-ad mentions of China are more than double the number of airings for the next closest candidate, Democratic Rep. Tim Ryan of Ohio. Mr. Ryan, now seeking his party’s endorsement for Senate, has cast the U.S. relationship with China in stark terms. “It is us versus China,” Mr. Ryan says in [a recent ad](https://twitter.com/TimRyan/status/1508795783210016772?s=20&t=XIY_xRd6KQZ7dFD2ibM4xg). “America can never be dependent on communist China.” Mr. Ryan’s ad drew criticism from the AAPI Victory Fund, a super political-action committee that aims to mobilize Asian-American and Pacific Islander voters. In [a statement](https://twitter.com/AAPIVictoryFund/status/1509582488355721225), the group described the spot as “rife with sinophobic rhetoric” and called for an end to such language at a time when hate crimes against Asian-Americans are on the rise.

### L - Emerging Tech

#### They also want to hammer Biden for lack of action on emerging tech

Gould 21 [Joe Gould. "23 Republicans urge Biden to work with allies on tech to combat China". 1-28-2021. Defense News. https://www.defensenews.com/congress/2021/01/28/23-republicans-urge-biden-to-work-with-allies-on-tech-to-combat-china. 6-23-2022.] - AL

WASHINGTON ― Nearly two dozen Republican lawmakers are calling on President Joe Biden to engage with allies on emerging technologies like 5G networking and artificial intelligence in the face of China’s advancements. House Armed Services Committee ranking member Mike Rogers, House Foreign Affairs Committee ranking member Mike McCaul, and House Science, Space and Technology Committee ranking member Frank Lucas signed a letter to Biden urging him to maximize alliances to counter “China’s vision for tech authoritarianism and protect our own economic and national security interests.” The message to Biden signals an avenue for bipartisan cooperation, just days after Secretary of State Antony Blinken appeared supportive of U.K. Prime Minister Boris Johnson’s efforts to forge a D-10 group of democracies ― South Korea, India and Australia, plus the G-7 nations ― to cooperate on 5G and vulnerable supply chains. In his confirmation hearing last week, Blinken said: “Bringing concerned countries together, the digital democracies together in an appropriate forum, is the place to start.” “I don’t want to minimize the challenge. We obviously have disagreements among democracies about a lot of profound questions about how technology is used, so we’ve got some work to do just to get our own collective house in order,” he said. Western allies, under pressure from President Donald Trump, agreed to exclude Chinese tech giant Huawei from their 5G networks, claiming an espionage risk, something the company has denied. Since then, the European Union signed a long-promised investment deal with China last month despite the public concerns from the incoming Biden administration. The Republican lawmakers, referencing Johnson in their letter, recommended raising the issue of China’s tech authoritarianism through the G-7 and NATO ― but also expanding engagements with allied democracies, and creating and hosting new international groups dedicated to democratic cooperation on technology. They also called for the development of an allied network to encourage cooperation among companies in allied states to scale emerging technologies, and for the U.S. to help allies establish governmental bodies like the Committee on Foreign Investment in the United States to review foreign investments and prevent the transfer of allied technologies. McCaul, who chaired the House’s Republican-only China Task Force, called on Biden to prioritize investments in domestic manufacturing of next-generation semiconductor chips in his expected infrastructure plan. McCaul has sponsored legislation to boost funding for basic research. “We must work with our allies to ensure that our supply chain is secure and the future of technology is safely out of the hands of the [Chinese Communist Party],” McCaul said in a statement. Democratic lawmakers have also raised alarms over China’s development of emerging technologies. After a report last month that Huawei tested AI software that could recognize Uighur minorities and alert police, Democratic Sen. Bob Menendez, the incoming Senate Foreign Relations Committee chairman, tweeted the following: “A shocking reminder that #China continues to flout the ethical development of emerging technologies. The US must lead an effort with our allies to ensure the proper use of the digital domain predicated on the values of openness, stability, security, & protection of human rights.”

### L – Democracy

#### Democracy initiatives are a winner – it helps Biden rejuvenate image.

Herndon & Cohn 7/13 (Astead & Nate, The New York Times, “Could the Midterms Be Tighter Than Expected?” The Daily, July 13th, 2022, https://www.nytimes.com/2022/07/13/podcasts/the-daily/midterms.html?showTranscript=1)

So we have a poll that shows, on the one hand, better overall polling for Democrats in this moment than we might expect. But they also have these very serious political challenges that they’re facing, including an unpopular president and a voter coalition that shows real signs of erosion. What is the path forward here for Democrats? Are candidates supposed to go to voters and say, hey, you don’t like the president, but you should like me instead? Nate Cohn Well, in the short term, they don’t have too many other cards to play. Joe Biden is unpopular. The economy is not in a great place. Unless the president can figure out a way to rejuvenate his political standing, get costs under control, help the economy, and so on, it’s hard to see them getting out of that fundamental problem. So in the meantime, they happen to have three solid issues that appeal to a really important part of their base in democracy, abortion, and gun control. And it’s worth noting that, in a midterm environment, that can get you pretty far. The midterm elections are lower turnout. The electorate tends to be better educated. More ideologically consistent voters are likelier to show up in that sort of election.

### L - Distraction

#### Plan helps dems—distracts voters from GOP favoring trends and inflation

Bunch 22—Senior writer for the Philadelphia Daily News focusing on social injustice and inequality (Will Bunch, Tribune Content Agency, “OPINION: Here’s the message that wins the midterms for Democrats, if they’re not afraid.,” 03-04-22, EBSCO Host Database)// SBM

Mar. 4--It hasn't aired yet, but I want to share with you the political ad that could win the 2022 midterm [elections](https://go.gale.com/ps/retrieve.do?tabID=News&resultListType=RESULT_LIST&searchResultsType=MultiTab&hitCount=1&searchType=AdvancedSearchForm&currentPosition=1&docId=GALE%7CA695588194&docType=Article&sort=Relevance&contentSegment=ZXBK-MOD1&prodId=SUIC&pageNum=1&contentSet=GALE%7CA695588194&searchId=R1&userGroupName=sher72354&inPS=true) for the Democrats -- even with all the doom and gloom about President Biden's approval rating and all the historical trends that favor the GOP. For reasons that will be clear in a minute, I'm not using the candidate's name. The TV spot starts with one of the most dramatic and best-known soundbites in American history: the Rev. Dr. Martin Luther King Jr. at the Lincoln Memorial in 1963, proclaiming, "I have a dream that my four little children will one day live in a nation where they will not be judged by the color of their skin but by the content of their character." The ad then switches to the candidate, dressed smartly but casually -- not in a fleece vest, though! -- and sitting in front of a blackboard in a school classroom. He looks into the camera. "I want an America where every child learns those words and what they mean," the candidate says. "That's why I was shocked when my opponent and other Republicans in our state voted for a bill that would keep American heroes like Martin Luther King [picture of King on the Selma-to-Montgomery march] and Rosa Parks [shot of Parks, sitting on a city bus] out of our schoolhouses. I'm sick and tired of the [politicians](https://go.gale.com/ps/retrieve.do?tabID=News&resultListType=RESULT_LIST&searchResultsType=MultiTab&hitCount=1&searchType=AdvancedSearchForm&currentPosition=1&docId=GALE%7CA695588194&docType=Article&sort=Relevance&contentSegment=ZXBK-MOD1&prodId=SUIC&pageNum=1&contentSet=GALE%7CA695588194&searchId=R1&userGroupName=sher72354&inPS=true) trying to ban books from our [libraries](https://go.gale.com/ps/retrieve.do?tabID=News&resultListType=RESULT_LIST&searchResultsType=MultiTab&hitCount=1&searchType=AdvancedSearchForm&currentPosition=1&docId=GALE%7CA695588194&docType=Article&sort=Relevance&contentSegment=ZXBK-MOD1&prodId=SUIC&pageNum=1&contentSet=GALE%7CA695588194&searchId=R1&userGroupName=sher72354&inPS=true) and gag our teachers in their classrooms. That's not just wrong -- it's straight-up un-American." Then, a tone shift as images from the war in Ukraine, including everyday citizens defending their homeland against Russian invaders, fill the screen. "We are all inspired by people around the globe, fighting for their freedom. It's time we fight for [democracy](https://go.gale.com/ps/retrieve.do?tabID=News&resultListType=RESULT_LIST&searchResultsType=MultiTab&hitCount=1&searchType=AdvancedSearchForm&currentPosition=1&docId=GALE%7CA695588194&docType=Article&sort=Relevance&contentSegment=ZXBK-MOD1&prodId=SUIC&pageNum=1&contentSet=GALE%7CA695588194&searchId=R1&userGroupName=sher72354&inPS=true) here in the [United States](https://go.gale.com/ps/retrieve.do?tabID=News&resultListType=RESULT_LIST&searchResultsType=MultiTab&hitCount=1&searchType=AdvancedSearchForm&currentPosition=1&docId=GALE%7CA695588194&docType=Article&sort=Relevance&contentSegment=ZXBK-MOD1&prodId=SUIC&pageNum=1&contentSet=GALE%7CA695588194&searchId=R1&userGroupName=sher72354&inPS=true). I want to make it easier for you to vote, not harder. Let's make our schools about learning, not censorship." The music begins to swell, with emotional frames of voters, kids in classrooms. "I'm running for Congress to fight to protect the American way." There's a reason you haven't seen this TV spot yet, even if you're a political obsessive like me. It hasn't been filmed, and -- given the tortured history of [Democratic Party](https://go.gale.com/ps/retrieve.do?tabID=News&resultListType=RESULT_LIST&searchResultsType=MultiTab&hitCount=1&searchType=AdvancedSearchForm&currentPosition=1&docId=GALE%7CA695588194&docType=Article&sort=Relevance&contentSegment=ZXBK-MOD1&prodId=SUIC&pageNum=1&contentSet=GALE%7CA695588194&searchId=R1&userGroupName=sher72354&inPS=true) political thinking and strategy over the last 40 years -- it might never be. I made it up, because I think the political party that -- for all its well-documented flaws -- wants to take the United States forward instead of backward into some Stone Age of white supremacy is missing a golden opportunity to push a message that connects with a majority of Americans. We all know the conventional wisdom about what is certain to happen when the nation votes in November. The historical precedent is that the party holding the White House gets clobbered, as happened to Donald Trump in 2018 and Barack Obama in 2010 -- a notion now cemented by President Biden's low approval rating and voter unease over high levels of inflation. Yet often the lofty conventional wisdom fails to notice changes at ground level. The post-2020 Census reapportionment process that was supposed to give an added edge to Republicans didn't actually do that. More important, the current political zeitgeist is radically different than it was during 2021 s off-year elections in Virginia, Florida, and other states. For one thing, the news is dominated by shock and outrage over Vladimir Putin's barbaric invasion of Ukraine -- a constant reminder of Donald Trump and other top Republicans who spent years as Putin apologists, or worse, as well as the risks of authoritarianism over democracy. But perhaps more important, Republicans who saw some gains last year running against [education](https://go.gale.com/ps/retrieve.do?tabID=News&resultListType=RESULT_LIST&searchResultsType=MultiTab&hitCount=1&searchType=AdvancedSearchForm&currentPosition=1&docId=GALE%7CA695588194&docType=Article&sort=Relevance&contentSegment=ZXBK-MOD1&prodId=SUIC&pageNum=1&contentSet=GALE%7CA695588194&searchId=R1&userGroupName=sher72354&inPS=true) that addresses racism or LGBTQ rights now seem guilty of a major overreach. The extent of that GOP overreach can be seen both in the sheer number of bills that Republicans are introducing in statehouses across America -- so-called gag orders about what teachers can say in their classrooms -- at a rate of roughly three a day, according to PEN America, as well as outrageous local examples, like the Tennessee school board that pulled the anti-Holocaust graphic novel Maus out of the curriculum. Now, there is polling evidence that most Americans don't like what they are seeing. Last month, a CBS News poll found resounding majorities of voters oppose any kind of book bans -- for example, 83% say that books should never be banned for criticizing U.S. history -- and also support classroom teaching about racism or other historical topics, even those with the potential to make some students uncomfortable. Basically, the CBS News respondents acknowledged that America has made some progress on racial issues but also believe that racism persists and that these issues should be discussed in classrooms. That's very much the opposite of what TV pundits are saying, as well as the trend of GOP governing in the nation's red states. There is a tendency, or course, to write off polling data on sensitive topics around race. Aren't there some voters who say one thing to a pollster and behave differently in the [voting](https://go.gale.com/ps/retrieve.do?tabID=News&resultListType=RESULT_LIST&searchResultsType=MultiTab&hitCount=1&searchType=AdvancedSearchForm&currentPosition=1&docId=GALE%7CA695588194&docType=Article&sort=Relevance&contentSegment=ZXBK-MOD1&prodId=SUIC&pageNum=1&contentSet=GALE%7CA695588194&searchId=R1&userGroupName=sher72354&inPS=true) booth? But let's look at the politician who in 2021 became the avatar of the fight over antiracism education, Virginia's new Republican governor, Glenn Youngkin. Taking office in January, Youngkin surprised voters with some of his extreme actions, which including a Day One executive order aimed at eliminating "divisive concepts" from classrooms, and even a tip line for parents to report on their kids' teachers. The result? After little more than a month in office, Youngkin is already under water, with just 41% of Virginians approving of his performance and 43% disapproving. War in Ukraine demands that all of us pick a side: democracy or decadence -- Will Bunch Clearly, there's an opportunity here for Democrats. The party's inclination in recent times is to go after voters with a rational appeal rather than an emotional one. In 2022, Democrats' conundrum is that despite a slew of positive data around job creation and the broad economy, most voters say they aren't feeling it, and they're concerned about inflation and high gas prices. In today's climate, the best pitch for Democrats is an emotional one -- that the Republicans are the party of banning books and gagging teachers. Could anything be more against American values, the ones our grandfathers fought for in World War II?

#### Any of Biden’s accomplishments can distract voters from inflation crisis – Biden looking to use plan as pivot

Cook and Litvan 5/10 (Nancy Cook Laura Litvan, Nancy Cook is a White House reporter at Bloomberg News and Laura Litvan is a reporter and editor at Bloomberg, "Inflation Is So Bad Democrats Want Biden to ‘Do More’ for Midterms," Bloomberg, 5-10-2022, https://www.bloomberg.com/news/articles/2022-05-10/inflation-rate-haunts-biden-democrats-ahead-of-2022-midterms) -AT

Inside the administration, there’s a sense of frustration, doom, and some say magical thinking about inflation, but no clear path on the best way for the White House to grapple with an economic phenomenon that’s been more severe and lasted longer than officials expected. Unfortunately for Biden and Democrats, the lesson from the 1970s and ’80s is that US presidents are quite limited in what they can do on their own to tamp down price pressures. In the approach to November’s midterm elections, Ron Klain, Biden’s chief of staff, has argued that the president and his allies should talk more about the president’s accomplishments, especially the remarkable [rebound in employment](https://www.bloomberg.com/news/live-blog/2022-05-05/u-s-employment-report-for-april), along with laws he signed to provide families with [pandemic relief](https://www.whitehouse.gov/american-rescue-plan/) and [rebuild US infrastructure](https://www.whitehouse.gov/bipartisan-infrastructure-law/). Klain also advocates that Biden contrast his policies with Republican proposals on taxes and the deficit.

#### Biden is losing on the economy - passing policies can shift the midterm narrative away from inflation

Robillard 4/12(Kevin Robillard is a is a senior political reporter for HuffPost "Inflation Is The Only Political Issue. Democrats Need An Answer.," HuffPost, 4-12-2022, https://www.huffpost.com/entry/inflation-only-political-issue-democrats-need-an-answer\_n\_6254bebae4b0e97a3515908e) -AT

Inflation is a global problem, but the rate of inflation has been higher in the United States than in Europe. Economists generally point to skyrocketing demand since the introduction of coronavirus vaccines, coupled with supply chain issues. Conservatives, and some liberals, also argue the administration’s American Rescue Plan added to the problem. Voters are not pleased with how either party is handling the inflation debate, but Democrats, who hold the presidency and narrow control of both chambers of Congress, are set to pay more of a political price unless Biden and party leadership can rapidly squelch inflation or change the dominant narratives about the economy. A major problem? Democrats aren’t sure what they can do. Biden plans to travel to Iowa on Tuesday to announce a new EPA rule allowing gas stations to sell 15% ethanol-blend gasoline this summer ― normally they are allowed to sell up to 10% because of pollution concerns ― which should help ease demand and lower prices for gasoline. He has also worked to uncork supply chains at ports and in the trucking industry. Biden has already announced plans to release 180 million barrels of oil from the Strategic Petroleum Reserve and has worked to battle consolidation in the agriculture industry to bring down food prices. The White House has also repeatedly pointed to policies included in the Build Back Better package that Sen. Joe Manchin (D-W.Va.) killed late last year ― giving Medicare the power to negotiate prescription drug costs, providing subsidies for child care ― as possible solutions. But the chances of resurrecting portions of the package remain somewhere between nonexistent and murky.

### L – Disinformation

#### Plan solves disinformation, which hurts Republicans

Panetta & Haltiwanger 6/9 - (Grace Panetta and John Haltiwanger, Senior politics reporters at Business Insider with a focus on elections and security, "Top Senate Democrats sound the alarm about Russian interference in the 2022 midterms," Business Insider, 6-9-2022, https://www.businessinsider.com/senate-dems-sound-the-alarm-about-russian-interference-in-2022-2022-6, LASA-AS)

Prominent right wing figures in the US, including Fox News host Tucker Carlson, have echoed Russia's propaganda and disinformation on Ukraine. Russian state TV has recycled and applauded Carlson's commentary, which reaches millions of Americans — he hosts the most-watched show on cable news in the US. As Russia gathered tens of thousands of troops on Ukraine's border in the lead-up to the invasion in late 2021, Carlson parroted Moscow by blaming NATO for Putin's aggression toward Kyiv. Carlson said NATO only existed to "torment" Putin, claiming that the authoritarian leader "just wants to keep his western borders secure." Russia's invasion of Ukraine was ultimately an unprovoked assault on a sovereign nation, which is why much of the world has rallied behind Kyiv and against Moscow. After the invasion, Carlson also pushed a discredited Russian conspiracy theory that the US was funding bio-weapons development at labs in Ukraine. The false bio-labs story also found an audience on far right social media channels in the US, among other platforms and forums, highlighting the myriad ways disinformation can spread in today's world. "People are asking if the far right in the US is influencing Russia or if Russia is influencing the far right, but the truth is they are influencing each other," Thomas Rid, a professor at Johns Hopkins University and expert on Russian disinformation, told the New York Times in March, adding, "They are pushing the same narratives." There are no signs that the Ukraine war will end at any point in the near future. As the conflict continues and the economic consequences of it are felt more acutely by Americans, the circumstances could provide an ideal avenue for the proliferation of Russian disinformation in the US — sowing further discord across the country amid a period of historic political divisions.

#### The DHS suspects Russia of developing new campaigns to skew US elections through disinformation--- promises a Republican midterm victory.

Carvin 7/11/2022- (Stephanie Carvin teaches international relations at Carleton University and is a contributing author to the Centre for International Governance Innovation.“ U.S. Authorities Brace for Russian Interference in Midterms” <https://www.newsweek.com/us-authorities-brace-russian-interference-midterms-opinion-1722779> Accessed 7/11/22 -kg-

While millions have been captivated by the dramatic testimony in the congressional hearings into the Jan. 6, 2021, insurrection in Washington, D.C., Western officials are looking ahead to how threats to democratic processes, particularly elections, may unfold in advance of the 2022 midterm elections. In particular, officials from the Department of Homeland Security (DHS) have issued warnings that Russia is seeking to exploit real or perceived election irregularities to sow doubts about the legitimacy of democratic systems. According to media reports, such efforts may include small-scale hacks of local election authorities, designed to draw notice, and then the exploitation of the discovery of those cyber intrusions to raise doubts about the legitimacy of election results. Such tactics will complement and amplify conspiracy theories, promoted by former President Donald Trump and his followers, that "the system is rigged" and unfair. For Russia to engage in these tactics would represent another evolution in its overall strategy to undermine confidence in Western democratic systems—a strategy that has come a long way since 2016. At that time, Russia sent human sources to gather information about the U.S. political system—to find ways to support Trump's presidential campaign using social media. This activity was bolstered through a "hack and dump" effort, where Russian-backed actors broke into the accounts of Democratic Party officials in order to "leak" their data in ways that amplified conspiracies around the party and Hillary Clinton. These "malinformation" campaigns (whereby malicious actors use "information that stems from the truth but is often exaggerated in a way that misleads and causes potential harm") have evolved. In 2017, Russian-backed hackers obtained access to 9 gigabytes of then-presidential candidate Emmanuel Macron's documents and published them on the internet. However, this time the hackers were more ambitious in their approach, seeking to plant fake information within the stolen messages. That "information" included fraudulent claims that Macron held offshore accounts in the Cayman Islands to evade taxes. Other countries have also raised concerns that Russia (and other authoritarian states) no longer seek to sway elections for particular candidates but are instead engaged in a long-term strategy of discrediting democratic institutions. By doing so, they likely aim to increase dysfunction and division within Western countries and lessen the appeal of democracy worldwide.However, the recent DHS warning is so far the most specific, and may reflect an effort to "prebunk" the threat—that is, to call out malicious behavior before it occurs to disrupt it or mitigate its impact. In addition, it's important not to overplay the "Russian bot" narrative. Humans have agency and are more likely to be swayed by domestic actors and influencers than by anonymous social media accounts. However, online disinformation networks have developed over the last decade, many fed by Russian-amplified antisemitic, anti-LGBTQ+, anti-immigrant and anti-globalist conspiracy theories. As a growing far-right media ecosystem and political actors have adopted these narratives, they have become more potent. Given Trump's continuing loud championing of the idea that the 2020 election was stolen, we can expect domestic actors in Western countries to adopt these narratives should a Russian hack (deliberately or not) be discovered. Accordingly, election officials will have to be prepared to be as transparent as possible with the public and to issue warnings in advance of and possibly during elections. Governments need to do their best to secure election systems and the networks behind them to try to prevent hacks in the first place. Social media companies, many of which have a very mixed track record in dealing with misinformation, disinformation and malinformation on their platforms, will need to look for coordinated inauthentic activity promoting false narratives. Finally, and most concerning, governments will need to prepare for increasing attacks, some violent, on democratic and other societal institutions. In recent weeks there has been media reporting documenting the abuse of election workers in the United States who are seen as part of a great conspiracy to steal elections. A Reuters investigation found more than 100 examples of threats of death or violence to election workers by Trump supporters, resulting in only four arrests. While this abuse is disturbing on its face, it has a wider impact: These threats may make it hard to recruit the election volunteers and front-line workers on whom Western democratic systems rely. Moreover, when election results are disputed, individuals who are convinced their votes have been stolen may attack the very institutions that play a role in solving disputes and settling matters. Already there have been numerous threats against judges involved in hearings of individuals accused of participating in the Jan. 6 attack on Capitol Hill. Similarly, in Canada, judges presiding over trials involving so-called freedom convoy supporters have received threats to their physical safety. The existence of networks of individuals primed to receive and believe conspiracy-driven narratives, and of adversarial states willing to exploit them for their own ends, presents a real challenge for Western countries. As Russia seeks to distract North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) democracies from their efforts in Ukraine, we can expect further efforts to amplify and encourage domestic extremists who seek to remedy their grievances through the threat of violence.

#### Midterms face cybersecurity challenges

Cassidy 7/7 - (Christina A. Cassidy, Reporter for AP's state government team with a focus on voting election administration and efforts to secure U.S. elections, "Election officials face security challenges before midterms," AP NEWS, 7-7-2022, https://apnews.com/article/2022-midterm-elections-russia-ukraine-voting-presidential-local-89f03587e105290deddc647d43dd6960, LASA-AS)

BATON ROUGE, La. (AP) — Election officials preparing for the upcoming midterms face a myriad of threats, both foreign and domestic, as they look to protect voting systems and run a smooth election while fighting a wave of misinformation that has been undermining public confidence in U.S. elections. The nation’s top state election officials gathered Thursday for the start of their annual summer conference, with a long list of challenges that begins with securing their voting systems. While a top concern heading into the 2020 presidential election was Russia or another hostile nation waging a disruptive cyberattack, the landscape has expanded to include ransomware, politically motivated hackers and insider threats. Over the last year, a small number of security breaches have been reported at local election offices in which authorities are investigating whether office staff improperly accessed or provided improper access to sensitive voting technology. Jen Easterly, who leads the nation’s cybersecurity agency, said Russia, China and North Korea remain “very dynamic and complex cyber threats” and that criminal gangs pushing ransomware were also a concern. But she noted election security officials could not afford to prioritize one over the other.“We can’t just worry about one thing because if we focus too intently on one set of threats, we’re very likely to miss them coming from another direction,” Easterly told reporters, after a series of private meetings with state election officials. The U.S. Cybersecurity and Infrastructure Security Agency has been conducting physical assessments for state and local election officials, which includes site visits and reviews of security procedures such as video surveillance and access controls. Physical security has always been a concern but an onslaught of threats since 2020 targeting election officials have added urgency to the effort. State and local election officials have reported being harassed in person and receiving death threats over social media and text message. “We’re seeing an exodus of people in the field. And some of it does relate to just the physical security threats that they’re facing,” said Kim Wyman, who leads election security efforts for the cybersecurity agency. “And what we’re trying to do with this is give them tools to be able to to deal with that.”

#### Cybersecurity threats will undermine midterms (fix tag\*)

Marks 22 - (Joseph Marks, Reporter for The Cybersecurity 202 newsletter focused on the politics of cyber, "Election officials want more funds to combat midterm election cyber threats," Washington Post, 2-17-2022, https://www.washingtonpost.com/politics/2022/02/17/election-officials-want-more-funds-combat-midterm-election-cyber-threats/, LASA-AS)

Election officials are facing a barrage of cybersecurity threats as the midterms approach. But chances are slim that Congress will pitch in any money to help out. Their wish list includes: More cyber testing for election office computer networks. Cyber training for election workers and volunteers. Better physical security to ensure outsiders and rogue staffers can’t monkey with election machines so they’re unsafe to use. That’s on top of money they need for a suite of non-cyber challenges, including replacing staff who’ve quit amid a wave of death threats against election workers, inspired by former president Donald Trump’s false claims of election fraud, as Mike DeBonis and Amy Gardner report. Recent challenges The money crunch is a common dilemma for election officials who’ve faced one crisis after another in recent years, including Russian interference in the 2016 contest, the coronavirus pandemic and disinformation campaigns about elections from foreign and domestic sources. Congress has kicked in to help — including about $800 million for election security between 2016 and 2020 along with another $400 million to run safe elections during the coronavirus pandemic. But that’s only a fraction of what officials have said is necessary to make elections as secure as possible. “When election officials don’t have sufficient funds to run elections, they have to make tough choices and the truth is those choices can adversely impact the accessibility and security of elections,” David Levine, an election integrity fellow at the German Marshall Fund’s Alliance for Securing Democracy, told me. The big ask Election funding proposals have ranged from $20 billion sought by Democratic election officials to a more modest request for $5 billion in the next budget cycle. The Bipartisan Policy Center has suggested spending about $400 million annually on elections and focusing on ideas favored by Republicans and Democrats. But bipartisan consensus is a long way off. Most Democratic proposals link election security efforts with measures to make voting easier — which Republicans oppose. Republicans, who’ve generally been skeptical of federal funding for elections, aren’t keen on pitching in more money regardless.

#### Disinformation will target US elections—red states are passing voting laws to try and minimize fraud

ARIANA FIGUEROA 6/22/22 (ARIANA FIGUEROA covers the nation's capital for States Newsroom. Her areas of coverage include politics and policy, lobbying, elections and campaign finance, “U.S. House members warned about disinformation in upcoming campaigns,” Missouri Independent, https://missouriindependent.com/briefs/u-s-house-members-warned-about-disinformation-in-upcoming-campaigns/)-AM//7-14-22

Rep. Teresa Leger Fernandez, D-N.M., said that this is not the first time targeted disinformation has been used in elections. She pointed to the 2016 election, where Black and Latino voters were targeted, receiving text messages that they could cast their vote for Democratic candidate Hillary Clinton on their phones instead of going to a voting location. “Electoral lies do have consequences,” Fernandez said. She asked Yosef Getachew, the Media & Democracy Program director at the government watchdog group Common Cause, how Congress can make sure that presidential electors are accurately certifying election results. The House panel looking at the Jan. 6, 2021, attack on the U.S. Capitol is examining slates of pro-Trump [“fake electors”](https://wisconsinexaminer.com/2022/02/02/trumps-fake-electors-heres-the-full-list/) in seven states. Getachew said that Congress needs to tackle election reform, and pointed to Republican-led states that are enacting restrictive voting laws in response to the 2020 presidential election. Since 2021,18 states have passed 34 restrict­ive voting laws, [according to the Brennan Center for Justice.](https://www.brennancenter.org/our-work/research-reports/voting-laws-roundup-may-2022) He added that states are also moving to pass election interference laws that could change how elections are conducted and how results are determined. Six state legis­latures — Alabama, Arizona, Flor­ida, Geor­gia, Kentucky, and Oklahoma — have passed nine elec­tion inter­fer­ence laws, [according to the Brennan Center for Justice.](https://www.brennancenter.org/our-work/research-reports/voting-laws-roundup-may-2022)The ranking Republican on the panel, Rep. Bryan Steil, R-Wis., said there were more pressing issues to hold a hearing on and that the federal government should not be determining what is true and what is false. “Americans are capable of forming their own opinions,” he said. Steil criticized the Biden administration for trying to put together a Disinformation Governance Board that aimed to combat disinformation.

## Internals

### Suburban Voters Key

#### Suburban Voters are key to Democrat success – they turned the tides in 2018

Manchester 2/16(Julia Manchester, Political Reporter at The Hill, Master's degree in political science from American University's School of Public Affairs, “Democrats seek midterm course-correct in suburbs”, The Hill, 2/16/22, <https://thehill.com/homenews/campaign/594439-democrats-seek-midterm-course-correct-in-suburbs/>) – aagg

Democrats are seeking a course correction in the suburbs ahead of November’s midterms as recent elections show the voting bloc beginning to trend Republican. Suburban voters helped boost Democrats during the 2018 midterms in what was seen as a rebuke of then-President Trump. That rebuke continued in 2020, as the group proved valuable to President Biden’s victory, as well as Democratic wins down the ballot. But last year’s elections in Virginia and New Jersey saw Republicans make gains with the demographic, thanks in part to mounting frustration with rising prices, coronavirus restrictions and education-related issues. Republicans are working to again pin the blame for those frustrations on Democrats ahead of November. Democrats, meanwhile, are working to persuade suburban voters they can be trusted with the issues voters care about most. Polling shows Democrats have their work cut out for them. A Harvard CAPS-Harris Poll survey released last month showed that 57 percent of suburban voters said they are more likely to vote for a Republican candidate in the midterms, while 43 percent said they would be more likely to vote for a Democratic candidate. Meanwhile, a Reuters-Ipsos poll released last month showed Biden losing ground with the suburban voters who helped elect him in 2020. Only 41 percent of suburban voters said they approved of the job the president was doing. “The reality of these midterms is they’re going to be difficult for Democrats as they sort of historically are for the party in power in Washington,” said Heather Williams, executive director at the Democratic Legislative Campaign Committee. New Jersey Gov. Phil Murphy (D), who also serves as the vide chair of the Democratic Governors Association and who won reelection in 2021 by a far narrower margin than expected, conducted a series of focus groups in the Garden State to further understand why constituents were exhibiting signs of discontent. The New York Times reported last week that the governor’s advisers found widespread frustrations pertaining to public health measures.

#### Suburban Women are key for Democrat victory – 2020 proves

Balz and Sotomayor 5/16(Don Balz, Chief Correspondent covering national politics since 1978, Master’s in communications from University of Illinois, Marianna Sotomayor, Congressional Reporter covering the house, Masters in Strategic Communication from George Washington University, "Key demographics for the 2022 midterm elections”, Washington Post, 5/16/22, <https://www.washingtonpost.com/politics/interactive/2022/demographics-voters-2022-midterms/>) – aagg

In almost every election, suburban voters play a critical role, and they will again in November. During the Trump years, many suburban voters, especially women, shifted toward the Democrats. A primary reason was the revulsion many of them felt toward President Donald Trump. Democrats hoped that shift signaled a more permanent alignment, and it’s true that some college-educated White women became a key part of the Democratic constituency. But what happened in the 2021 Virginia gubernatorial race raised doubts about their reliability as Democrats. Then-candidate and now-Gov. Glenn Youngkin was able to move the suburban vote back in the Republicans’ direction. “They weren’t flaming liberals,” GOP pollster Whit Ayres said of the suburban women who backed Democrats in 2018 and 2020. “There was a reaction against Trump.” Today, said GOP pollster Kristen Soltis Anderson, “They’re quite up for grabs.” Democratic pollster Celinda Lake agreed that her party’s candidates cannot take suburban women for granted in November. “Women elected Biden for stability and in reaction to Trump," she said. “They really rejected his style of leadership. But we had one woman say in a focus group, ‘I just want to get off this roller coaster.’ ” Under Biden so far, she added, "They’re getting no help in doing that.” Lake offered that assessment before the leak of a Supreme Court draft ruling that would overturn Roe v. Wade. That decision, if it comes early this summer, would give Democrats an issue to counter Republicans in the competition for the votes of suburban women. Republican strategists argue that unlike in 2020, they can now rely on suburban men turning out for their candidates after seeing many anti-Trump GOP voters swing back to the party this cycle. “Suburban women have moved so far the opposite direction, we’re not going to get all of them back right away. But if we can at least win back a good amount of the suburban men that we lost and some of the suburban women, that’s a formula for us to win in pretty much every state that we need to win in,” said a Senate GOP strategist, who spoke on the condition of anonymity so they could speak openly about the races they are working on. The bottom line is that any notable move by suburban voters in the direction of the Republicans this fall will prove costly to Democratic hopes of holding down their losses. But a Supreme Court decision overturning Roe v. Wade could counter GOP efforts to woo suburban women.

#### Suburban women k2 midterms – Roe v. Wade proves

**Beckwith and Korte** 20**22**-- Ryan Teague Beckwith, Reporter in Bloomberg News' Washington, D.C., Gregory Korte, national political correspondent for Bloomberg News, “1 voting group holds key to midterms after abortion leak: Suburban women”, *The Virginian-Pilot*, <https://www.pilotonline.com/government/elections/vp-nw-suburban-women-midterms-abortion-20220504-uf4v3bwrcfftrk4ub4wr5goqjm-story.html>, May 4, 2022, accessed 7-14-2022//Tata

Suburban women could now tip the balance in the midterm elections that will decide control of Congress after a leaked draft opinion indicated the Supreme Court was poised to overturn Roe v. Wade. Their votes helped determine the winner in the last two presidential contests. With Republicans in position to seize the House and Senate, the race is on to shock into action those with the most at stake on an issue that has become a fiercely contested partisan issue. The fight to win them over and get them to the ballot box will be most heated in the 24 states where bans would take immediate effect. But both Republican and Democratic strategists say that the country is in uncharted territory on an issue where public policy has been relatively stable since the landmark decision almost four decades ago. It remains to be seen if it’s a strong enough factor to influence key races and displace inflation as the biggest worry among a slice of the population struggling with the spiraling cost of living and ideologically slotted at the political center. Even though a large majority of women say abortion should be legal in all or most cases, Democrats will have to convince them that it is more pressing than every other issue boosting Republicans’ odds in November. President Joe Biden defeated Donald Trump in 2020 by winning over women outside urban centers and with strong support from them in places like Georgia. Republicans, who generally cheer the Supreme Court’s decision, had sought to make Biden’s poor approval rating and inflation the top issues for voters. The GOP has also tried to erode Democrats’ advantage among women with issues like school closures, curricula and mask mandates for schoolchildren. Melita Easters, executive director of Georgia WIN List, which seeks to elect Democratic women who favor abortion rights, said that the court’s decision would dramatically boost turnout among women in the November midterm elections. Democrats currently control both chambers by a razor-thin majority. “Suburban areas where women have been on the fence and voted either way based on the candidate, this is going to push them to Democrats,” she said. Biden won suburban women 59% to Trump’s 40%, according to AP VoteCast, a survey of more than 110,000 voters. Vicky Hausman, co-founder of Forward Majority, which seeks to win Democratic state legislative races, pointed to the Virginia governor’s race last year, where she said a strong focus on protecting abortion rights by Democratic candidate Terry McAuliffe boosted turnout but was not enough for him to beat Republican Glenn Youngkin, who focused on education issues. “In Virginia last year, it was a key issue for Democrats, but not a big enough wedge to win,” she said. Republicans were already reminding voters on Tuesday that other issues were driving their voters. “This is an important issue to many people,” said Florida Senator Rick Scott, chairman of the National Republican Senatorial Committee. “But so is inflation, so is crime, so is the border. People are going to be passionate about this and we ought to be passionate about what we believe in.” The draft Supreme Court decision overturning Roe was published by Politico Monday night, so it’s still too soon to show up in polling, and state laws would not change until the decision is issued, potentially in late June or early July. The high court’s final opinion could also be less dramatic than the draft by Justice Samuel Alito. But strategists say that the issue is most likely to be a major factor in four states with competitive governor’s races where bans would immediately go into effect this summer if Roe is overturned: Arizona, Georgia, Michigan and Wisconsin. That’s especially true in Georgia, where incumbent Republican Gov. Brian Kemp, currently leading in polls, signed the abortion ban into effect in 2019. An Atlanta Journal-Constitution poll in January showed more than two-thirds of Georgia voters wanted Roe v. Wade to remain in place. A higher turnout among abortion rights supporters in governor’s races could also boost Senate candidates in competitive races in Arizona, Georgia and Wisconsin. Women tend to hold more liberal positions on abortion than men, but are also more polarized on the issue. A third of all women say abortion should be legal in all cases, while 19% of men hold that position. At the other end, 18% of women say abortion should be illegal in all cases, compared to 13% of men. Opinions on the 1973 Supreme Court decision have remained largely consistent over the years. A 2021 Gallup poll found 58% opposed overturning Roe v. Wade, a nearly identical numbers to results on the same question in 1989. But the enthusiasm gap on the issue has grown over the past two decades, with 30% of self-described “pro-life” voters saying they would vote for a candidate only who shares their views on abortion, according to Gallup. Only 19% of voters who favor abortion rights similarly insist that candidates they support hold their views. In 2000, those numbers were roughly equal at 20% or so. That could change if Roe v. Wade is overturned.

### Youth Voters Key

#### Youth Voter Turnout is key for victory – Biden needs to find way for progress

Brownstein 3/22(Ronald Brownstein, Senior Policy analyst at CNN, Atlantic Media’s editorial director, “Youth turnout could save, or sink, Democrats in 2022”, CNN, 3/22/22, <https://www.cnn.com/2022/03/22/politics/young-voters-democrats-midterms-biden/index.html>) – aagg

Soaring turnout and big margins among young voters were central to the Democratic victories in the 2018 congressional and 2020 presidential elections. But with many young people expressing disenchantment with President Joe Biden’s performance, preserving those advantages looms as one of the biggest challenges facing Democrats in the 2022 midterms. There’s widespread concern among Democrats that turnout for young people this November could fall back from its gains in 2018 toward the meager levels that contributed to the party’s crushing losses in the 2014 and 2010 midterm elections. “If you accept the status quo with young people, it’s not going to go great,” says Democratic pollster Ben Tulchin. “Turnout is not going to be good.” Most Republicans are expecting exactly that sort of decline, driven both by waning enthusiasm for Biden and diminishing concern about Donald Trump, whose visibility has dimmed since he left the White House. “We are seeing that younger voters who were voting in some of these elections because of Trump don’t seem to be inspired by Biden, and I think their turnout will fall back to traditional levels,” says GOP consultant John Brabender. Some structural dynamics may help to sustain youth turnout this fall. Many experts note that the large youth turnout of 2018 and 2020 creates momentum for continued participation, because people who register and vote in one election are more likely to vote in the next. Over the past two elections, Democrats and nonpartisan groups have built a significant organizational infrastructure to engage more young voters, and those efforts are continuing through 2022. “The elevated youth turnout and the elevated youth registration and participation that we saw from ’16 to ‘18 to ‘20 is not magic,” says Nsé Ufot, chief executive officer of the New Georgia Project, a non-profit voter registration and mobilization group founded by Stacey Abrams. “It is absolutely a direct result of our investment and our labor and targeting that particular group.” et many strategists focusing on the youth vote agree that these factors may not be enough to prevent a significant fall-off without changes in the political environment. One key for Democrats will be finding ways to raise the visibility of Trump, who was deeply unpopular with the youngest voters. Even more important may be Biden finding ways to generate more progress than he has so far on issues important to younger generations, particularly combating climate change and reducing the burden of student debt. “My stern warning to the Biden administration and Democrats is you have to take this seriously, because if we do go back to a 2010 or 2014 model where they really fall off it’s going to make it very difficult for us in November,” says Tulchin, who served as the pollster for Bernie Sanders during the 2020 primary campaign, when the senator from Vermont dominated Biden among younger voters.

### Base

#### Base turnout is key for Democrat Victory – without leftist turnout loss is inevitable

Milligan 6-3(Susan Milligan. Senior political writer at U.S. News & World Report. She has covered domestic and foreign politics for 35 years, from New York City Hall to the Albany statehouse, and from Eastern Europe and the Middle East to Congress and the White House, “Midterm Math Works Against Democrats With Senate at Stake”, US News, 6-3-22, <https://www.usnews.com/news/the-report/articles/2022-06-03/midterm-turnout-math-works-against-democrats-with-senate-at-stake>) - aagg

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. 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.

## Impacts

### 2nc – Impact

#### Extend that a GOP win “gridlocks” government which is key to stock markets and business confidence – that’s Klebnikov 22.

#### Independently, a Dem win would ruin the economy.

Crowley 22 (Monica Crowley is Assistant Secretary for Public Affairs for the U.S. Department of the Treasury from 2019 – 2021, “Red States Lead Economically, Despite Biden”, *Newsweek*, <https://www.newsweek.com/red-states-lead-economically-despite-biden-opinion-1693601>, 4/4/22, accessed 7-13-2022) AC

President Joe Biden's **disastrous economic policies**—higher taxes, uncontrolled spending, oppressive regulations, suffocation of our energy sector—are sending the U.S. economy into a **slowdown**. His assault on economic freedom is giving us skyrocketing **inflation**, an ongoing **labor crunch** and continuing disruptions to the supply chain—all of which are crippling an already fragile recovery. Despite these darkening economic clouds, however, there is a bright spot: red states. Since pandemic restrictions began to recede in mid-2020, states led by Republican governors and state legislatures have been engines of economic dynamism. Month after month, red states have **outperformed** the national economic recovery and continue to outshine their blue state counterparts. Consider the most recent state jobs report for February. Once again, states with Republican governors took 15 of the top 20 spots for jobs recovered since the onset of the COVID-19 pandemic, and 17 of the top 20 have GOP-led legislatures. In fact, nine Republican states have emerged from the pandemic with more jobs than when the pandemic hit: Arizona, Arkansas, Florida, Georgia, Idaho, Montana, Tennessee, Texas and Utah. And 12 states with Republican-controlled legislatures are now seeing record-**low unemployment rates**. It's a prime example of why policy matters. Biden might try to take credit for this economic comeback, but any progress made is despite—not because of—his destructive policies. Democrats insisted on keeping our country locked down without justification in order to amass ever-greater power and control. They ran mom-and-pop shops into the ground, sinking life's savings, destroying livelihoods and **shattering dreams**. Long after the acute crisis had ended, Democrats disincentivized work by actively paying Americans to stay home. Many blue states continued to offer an additional $300 per week on top of normal state unemployment payments. This additional cash didn't expire until September 6, 2021—a year and a half after the start of the pandemic. It's no wonder that as many as 1.8 million Americans turned down jobs, with an estimated 37% of workers making more money from unemployment and other state benefits than they would from actually working a job.In fact, unfilled job openings are still at a near-record high and employers are struggling to fill open positions. A recent survey found that 48% of small businesses were hiring or trying to hire, and 93% said there were "few or no qualified job applicants." The latest data still show a staggering 11.3 million job openings, even though there are 6.2 million unemployed Americans trying to find a job. Employees aren't the only resource businesses are **struggling** to find. Thanks in large part to Biden's out-of-control spending, inflation has hit its **highest mark** in 40 years. More than 25% of small businesses say inflation is the number one problem they face. Everything from gas to groceries now costs dramatically more, making it pricier for businesses to get the supplies they need—if they can get them at all. The supply chain crisis has caused delays and shortages, making it difficult for businesses to get certain goods and often resulting in higher prices for those of us trying to buy things. All of this has created a **hostile business environment** that has killed jobs and unnecessarily slowed our economic recovery. To make matters worse, the Federal Reserve is going to try—belatedly—to rein in galloping inflation by tightening the money supply. That is likely to create a perfect economic storm of little-to-no growth accompanied by high inflation, resulting in a painful recession. But thanks to pro-growth policies—lower taxes, fewer regulatory burdens, no mandates and greater individual liberty—the recovery in states with Republican leadership has been noticeably faster and more significant. Not only have red states returned to, or exceeded, their pre-pandemic employment numbers, but residents are also seeing higher incomes. Nine of the top 10 states with the greatest personal income growth in 2021 are led by Republican governors.

#### US economic collapse causes nuclear war---loose nukes and terrorists.

Mann ’14 [Eric; 2014; special agent with a United States federal agency, a special assistant for a U.S. Senator and served as a presidential appointee for the U.S. Congress, Graduate Degree in Homeland Security at Georgetown; “Austerity, Economic Decline, and Financial Weapons of War: A New Paradigm for Global Security,” https://jscholarship.library.jhu.edu/bitstream/handle/1774.2/37262/MANN-THESIS-2014.pdf]

The conclusions reached in this thesis demonstrate how economic considerations within states can figure prominently into the calculus for future conflicts. The findings also suggest that security issues with economic or financial underpinnings will transcend classical determinants of war and conflict, and change the manner by which rival states engage in hostile acts toward one another. The research shows that security concerns emanating from economic uncertainty and the inherent vulnerabilities within global financial markets will present new challenges for national security, and provide developing states new asymmetric options for balancing against stronger states. The security areas, identified in the proceeding chapters, are likely to mature into global security threats in the immediate future. As the case study on South Korea suggest, the overlapping security issues associated with economic decline and reduced military spending by the United States will affect allied confidence in America’s security guarantees. The study shows that this outcome could cause regional instability or realignments of strategic partnerships in the Asia-pacific region with ramifications for U.S. national security. Rival states and non-state groups may also become emboldened to challenge America’s status in the unipolar international system. The potential risks associated with stolen or loose WMD, resulting from poor security, can also pose a threat to U.S. national security. The case study on Pakistan, Syria and North Korea show how financial constraints affect weapons security making weapons vulnerable to theft, and how financial factors can influence WMD proliferation by contributing to the motivating factors behind a trusted insider’s decision to sell weapons technology. The inherent vulnerabilities within the global financial markets will provide terrorists’ organizations and other non-state groups, who object to the current international system or distribution of power, with opportunities to disrupt global finance and perhaps weaken America’s status. A more ominous threat originates from states intent on increasing diversification of foreign currency holdings, establishing alternatives to the dollar for international trade, or engaging financial warfare against the United States.

### Gridlock Good

#### Gridlock preserves status quo – stocks thrive

Sears ’21(Steven M. Sears is the president and COO of [Options Solutions](https://www.marketswiki.com/wiki/index.php?title=Options_Solutions&action=edit&redlink=1), a specialized, asset-management firm that was created to help high-net-worth investors add conservative options trading strategies to their portfolios. He also is a contributing columnist at Barron’s where he writes the Striking Price, “Wall Street Likes Gridlock in D.C. Here’s How to Play It”, 11/5/21, <https://www.barrons.com/articles/wall-street-gridlock-kkr-stock-51635986501>**)** SM

The greatest investment opportunity in the world might be America’s political dysfunction and division. The outcome of various state elections on Tuesday suggests that the November 2022 midterm Congressional elections might lead to even more gridlock in Congress. If that happens, the stock and options market should flourish as investors position for the end of legislation that targets businesses and the wealthy. The inability of Democrats to win the governor’s office in Virginia—a state handily won by President Joe Biden—and the closeness of other state races, suggests that whatever the Federal Reserve does to interest rates may be overshadowed by Congressional gridlock. The next few months will be critical in seeing how this nascent thesis evolves, but Washington’s wish to regulate Wall Street and raise taxes suddenly seems less certain to come true. The 2022 midterm elections are a long way off for investors, but politicians and their campaign operatives likely feel extraordinary urgency and risk. The midterms will contest 34 of 100 Senate seats, and the entire House of Representatives. If the Republicans gain control of even one house of Congress, Biden will become powerless to accomplish much of anything, and many investment-risk factors will fade. “Wall Street loves gridlock in Washington because it tends to preserve the status quo,” Michael Schwartz, Oppenheimer & Co.’s chief options strategist, told *Barron’s.* Schwartz noted that political developments are a potential antidote to the normalization of the Fed’s easy-money policies. Until someone invents a way to make targeted investments on political dysfunction, the financial sector remains one of the top ways to position. Finance is heavily regulated and the inability of Congress to pass restrictive laws generally means banks and brokerage firms thrive. We have previously recommended financial stocks as a way to [benefit from higher rates](https://www.barrons.com/articles/fed-policy-shift-buy-bank-stocks-51628755201?mod=article_inline), and brokers, such as [Interactive Brokers](https://www.barrons.com/market-data/stocks/ibkr) (ticker: IBKR) as [a way to profit](https://www.barrons.com/articles/in-a-frothy-stock-market-this-might-be-your-best-move-51634803202?mod=article_inline) from volatility and trading volumes. Those approaches still make sense, as does private equity, but for a slightly different reason. Investing in private equity companies expresses confidence in the ability of those firms to proactively deal with whatever develops. Consider [KKR & Co.](https://www.barrons.com/market-data/stocks/kkr) (KKR), a company we [last highlighted in late April](https://www.barrons.com/articles/kkr-stock-is-near-its-high-it-still-has-room-to-run-51619692202?mod=article_inline) when the stock was around $56.71. Since then, the stock has surged, and the company continues to seem well positioned. [KKR just reportedbetter-than-expected earnings](https://www.wsj.com/articles/kkr-earnings-rise-as-private-equity-portfolio-climbs-11635850320?mod=Searchresults_pos1&page=1), while distributable earnings, or cash that could be returned to shareholders, spiked. For the third quarter, distributable earnings totaled $925.1 million, or $1.05 a share, up from $452.8 million, or 53 cents a share in the same year-ago period. Investors who like the looks of those earnings can consider harnessing the stock in the options market. With KKR at $83.31, investors can sell the March $80 put for about $4.50 and buy the March $85 call for about $5.20. The risk reversal—that is selling a put and buying a call with a higher strike price but same expiration—positions investors to buy the stock at a lower price, while enabling them to participate in any gains. Should KKR be below $80 at expiration, investors are obligated to buy the stock or adjust the position in the options market to avoid assignment. If the stock is at $100, for instance, the call is worth $15. During the past 52 weeks, the stock has ranged from $35.32 to $83.44. Shares are up 106% this year. Without doubt, the trade expresses great confidence in KKR, but faith in the company has been well rewarded since the company was first mentioned here in August 2016 as a stock that was reversing years of mixed performance. *Steven M. Sears is the president and chief operating officer of Options Solutions, a specialized asset-management firm. Neither he nor the firm has a position in the options or underlying securities mentioned in this column.* **Email:** [editors@barrons.com](mailto:editors@barrons.com)

#### Gridlock prevents business uncertainty, winners and losers, and encourages forward thinking

Fisher Investments 4/22 **(**Fisher Investments Canada uses historical information to analyze current market activity, uncovering the difference between potential and possible outcomes, writes for the Financial Post, “Why markets like political gridlock, according to Fisher Investments Canada”, 4/7/22, <https://financialpost.com/sponsored/fisher-investments/why-markets-like-political-gridlock-according-to-fisher-investments-canada>**)** SM

How do elections influence equities? Many commentators we follow seem to have preconceived notions of which candidate or party is best for markets. But in Fisher Investments Canada’s view, equities don’t prefer any party or politician. We suggest investors set this view of party and personality aside. Instead, we think it is most helpful to assess political developments the way our research shows markets do: Will elections likely result in gridlock or not? Whilst it may seem counterintuitive, political gridlock is often a positive development for equities, in our view. Fisher Investments Canada defines gridlock as political conditions that make it difficult for a government to pass legislation. In our experience, many investors hate gridlock since it means governments don’t do much. We think most voters understandably want elected officials to get things they like done. But in our view, that preference for action can also make it harder to see political activity the way equities do—as we will explain. Gridlock can take various forms. One common version is a multiparty coalition with little ideological alignment. For example, Germany’s recently elected coalition combines left-leaning and right-leaning parties. They may command a majority on a combined basis, but our research shows the scope of action they agree on is narrow and centrist—not radical and sweeping—with little likely to get done. But we have seen ideologically aligned multiparty coalitions at loggerheads, too—when a far-left or far-right party differs from their more moderate counterparts in policy emphasis and implementation, as with the leftist and centre-left parties in Spain’s and Portugal’s governments. Similarly, we find minority governments are by definition gridlocked, as they must get dissenting parties’ support or agreement to abstain from voting to pass legislation—as is the case in Canada currently. Even in one-party majority governments, gridlock can stymie leadership’s agenda. Fisher Investments Canada has observed intraparty gridlock—divisions within the majority party—can also block government action. We saw this often in former U.S. President Donald Trump’s first two years, when his Republican Party had a majority in America’s Congress. We are seeing it again now under President Joe Biden’s Democratic Party, which also has majorities in both chambers of Congress. A leader with weak political capital may not be able to push bills through, either—even with a majority, a leader’s flagging popularity may result in a leadership struggle that often means legislative activity grinds to a halt, like in the UK now. Whatever gridlock’s form, it typically does two things. One, it can block big proposed legislation. Two, it can water down major proposals by forcing politicians to compromise—resulting in something less extreme versus initial expectations. Our research shows equities in competitive developed nations generally favour gridlock. Big legislative change (from any party) creates uncertainty, which we think can upset equities. Gridlock, in our view, reduces this likelihood. It prevents lawmakers from radically altering property rights or creating winners and losers through legislation, regulations and other government levers. This can reduce uncertainty over future tax rates, government interference, labour laws and other factors potentially affecting corporate profits. In our experience, all major change—no matter how well-intentioned—risks creating winners and losers. Behavioural finance research shows people hate losses more than they enjoy equivalent gains—a phenomenon psychologists term myopic loss aversion or prospect theory.[i] This can generate net negative sentiment when legislation creates winners and losers. Investors—and voters—aren’t always rational, according to prospect theory. Big change may benefit a party or parties’ constituents, but myopic loss aversion shows those who don’t benefit tend to take it much harder, which can outweigh any feeling of gain. For markets, this cognitive bias means any sweeping legislation—regardless of party—risks being a headwind. Additionally, big shifts in laws and rules governing commerce can complicate businesses’ ability to plan and invest. We think gridlock—for equities—lowers political uncertainty overall. So, how does a typical election cycle affect equities? We find elections often drive big emotions, as politicians cater to constituents’ biases, sowing uncertainty—who will and won’t benefit? This weighs on risk taking. When everything is up in the air, subject to change, it is difficult to see through the fog. In our experience, the prospect of political change can weigh on investors’ moods—e.g. uncertainty can make it harder for businesses to plan longer term. Not knowing what the political environment will be—and how it may affect businesses—can hamper their ability to make investment decisions, committing capital and resources. This could weigh on growth until the air clears and firms have more certainty to pursue big, strategic projects. But if the vote results in gridlock, lawmakers likely won’t be able to accomplish as much as they promised on the campaign trail. The election outcome plus gridlock lowers political uncertainty, giving businesses more clarity to proceed with long-term expansion and allowing them to take more risk than they otherwise might. This may be disappointing to some—and encouraging to others—but for markets, we think gridlock establishes a political environment in which little will likely change. That allows forward-looking markets to see further ahead, knowing the business framework firms are operating under probably won’t be toppled anytime soon. Our long read of history suggests politicians’ and government actions can be unpredictable. Gridlock cuts down on the uncertainty, leaving one less risk for equities to ponder—and an underappreciated market tailwind, in our view. Investing in equity markets involves the risk of loss and there is no guarantee that all or any capital invested will be repaid. Past performance is no guarantee of future returns. International currency fluctuations may result in a higher or lower investment return. This document constitutes the general views of Fisher Investments Canada and should not be regarded as personalised investment or tax advice or as a representation of its performance or that of its clients. No assurances are made that Fisher Investments Canada will continue to hold these views, which may change at any time based on new information, analysis or reconsideration. In addition, no assurances are made regarding the accuracy of any forecast made herein. Not all past forecasts have been, nor future forecasts will be, as accurate as any contained herein.

#### Smarter decisions with gridlock in politics – solve economic growth.

**Conerly ’18 (**Dr. Bill Conerly is a business-focused economist, Forbes contributor, and Duke Ph.D. He connects the dots between the economy and business decisions, “Post-Election Economic Forecast: Political Gridlock Will Be Good For Business”, 11/7/18, <https://www.forbes.com/sites/billconerly/2018/11/07/post-election-economic-forecast-political-gridlock-will-be-good-for-business/?sh=114609947968>**)** SM

The economy will do well with government control divided between Democrats and Republicans. I didn’t always believe this, but a decade ago I was persuaded by the late economist William A. Niskanen. "Our federal government may work better (well, less badly) when at least one house of Congress is controlled by the opposing party," he wrote. "Divided government is, curiously, less divisive. It’s also cheaper. The basic reason for this is simple: When one party proposes drastic or foolish measures, the other party can obstruct them. The United States prospers most when excesses are curbed, and, if the numbers from the past 50 years are any indication, divided government is what curbs them." Excesses have been evident since the election of Donald Trump, not only from the president’s Twitter account but also from his opponents. We’ve seen huge deficits from the party that used to be tight-fisted. We’ve seen draconian immigration actions. Global trade relations are in turmoil. Maybe some gridlock will be good for us. Niskanen, writing in 2006, found only two eras of fiscal restraint since World War II: the last six years of Eisenhower’s administration, and the last six years of the Clinton administration. In both eras, the opposition party controlled Congress. War also seems to be absent from periods of divided government. Niskanen also wrote: "In 200 years of U.S. history, every one of our conflicts involving more than a week of ground combat has been initiated by a unified government. Each of the four major American wars during the 20th century, for example—World War I, World War II, the Korean War, and the Vietnam War—was initiated by a Democratic president with the support of a Democratic Congress. The current war in Iraq, initiated by a Republican president and backed by a Republican Congress, is consistent with this pattern." Major government changes are likely to be stable when they are developed by divided government, Niskanen also argued. He cited Reagan tax cuts, approved by a Democrat-controlled House of Representatives. A more modern example is Obamacare, passed during one-party control, which the other party vowed to repeal as soon as possible. Although that repeal didn’t happen, the country continues to suffer from uncertainty about health care policy. The economy is not managed by the government, but by millions of individuals and companies trying to make the best choices for themselves. When the government does take action in the economic sphere, it’s not entirely for the public interest. We learned this from Niskanen’s most lasting contributions to economics, his theory of bureaucracy, part of public choice economics. He said that people in government are human, and their decisions will at least partially reflect their own ambitions. Bureaucrats want larger budgets and influence. Looking forward to 2019 and 2020, expect less extravagant federal spending growth—at least a little bit. Don’t expect major tax cuts again. Look for deregulation to continue in those areas where Congressional approval is not needed. This direction will be good for the economy. A president can do a good bit of mischief all by himself. Barack Obama campaigned in 2008 against too much presidential power accorded to George W. Bush, but changed his tune after he held power. A Democrat-controlled House of Representatives will not grant additional discretionary authority to the president, though they will be unable to roll back power granted by existing laws. Foreign trade is an area where past Congresses granted the president wide latitude—much to the regret of many existing members. Look for continued controversy here. Immigration is an area ripe for compromise, and maybe the odds are a little better now. But just a little. Nobody thinks current law is ideal, and nobody thinks current law is being enforced. But this may be too thorny an issue for Congress to resolve. That means immigration will continue to be low, exacerbating the tight labor market that has been caused by economic growth and demographic change. I recently wrote that the economy would probably not go into recession in 2019, but that we should all be prepared for the possibility. I stand by that statement even after the election results.

### GOP Solves Growth

#### Republican win good—key to economic stability and high employment rates

Rainey 21**—**Senior employment and immigration reporter for POLITCO (Rebecca Rainey, POLITICO, "Red states lead economic recovery, giving GOP ammo against Biden’s spending plans,” 6-24-2021, <https://www.politico.com/news/2021/06/24/gop-states-fight-uneven-recovery-495762>)// SBM

States with Republican governors are leading the recovery from the Covid-19 economic shock, complicating President Joe Biden’s push for a new sweeping infusion of federal aid. Of the 15 states that have returned to pre-pandemic levels of economic activity, 12 are led by Republican governors, [Federal Reserve data](https://www.philadelphiafed.org/surveys-and-data/regional-economic-analysis/state-coincident-indexes) shows. Of the 10 states reporting the lowest levels of activity since January 2020, seven — including New York, Pennsylvania and Illinois — are run by Democratic governors. Businesses, economists and policymakers are divided over whether conservative governors’ policies on jobless benefits and Covid-19 restrictions — many of them chose not to issue stay-at-home orders at all — are actually helping their economies or if their states’ industries simply didn’t fall as far behind during the pandemic. Red states are also reporting lower unemployment numbers. Still, the uneven recovery and the lackluster job growth reported in both April and May have given Republicans ammunition to repudiate Biden’s expensive aid plans. They’ve also ignited concerns among conservatives that the federal assistance — especially the $1.9 trillion American Rescue Plan that passed without GOP support in March — should have focused more on who needed help the most. “Across the board, there could have been a lot better use of the funds being more targeted,” Rachel Greszler, an economist at the Heritage Foundation, said. Congress should have linked unemployment insurance to workers’ earnings or allowed states to use federal aid to dole out their own benefits based on what the labor market required “in the ways that they thought would work best for them,” she said. The seven states that chose to not issue a stay-at-home order last year — Arkansas, Iowa, Nebraska, North Dakota, South Dakota, Wyoming and Utah — were all led by GOP governors. Republican-led states were also early to ease pandemic business restrictions and mask mandates: Missouri, Montana, Iowa and Alaska were some of the first states to peel back their business requirements in January and February. Texas, Arizona, Arkansas, New Hampshire and Wyoming followed in March. Of those states, Montana, New Hampshire, Arkansas, South Dakota, Utah, Missouri and Nebraska returned to pre-pandemic levels of economic activity in April and reported lower unemployment than the national 5.8 percent rate in May. By comparison, states that still have some coronavirus restrictions in place, including California, Connecticut and Hawaii, saw the highest rates of unemployment in the country in May and were still producing less in April than they did pre-pandemic. Washington lawmakers sent direct checks to millions of middle- and lower-income Americans and supplemented state unemployment benefits with extra weekly payments and coverage for workers traditionally ineligible for jobless aid. They also doled out $1 trillion in forgivable government-backed loans to small businesses under the Paycheck Protection Program, initially on a first-come, first-served basis. Other economists question whether Congress could have maneuvered as precisely as Greszler suggested to rescue the economy in the beginning, facing a flood of business closures and tens of millions of layoffs caused by the pandemic health restrictions. “There isn’t a lot of nuance that you can use in policy when you’re trying to get money out the door as quickly as possible and adjust for the local situations for every worker in the state,” said Daniel Zhao, senior economist at Glassdoor. “It’s very difficult to get aid out to everybody who needs it at the same time, and in a way that was actually targeted through individual situations.” The uneven nature of the recovery partly reflects the diversity of state economies. States like New York, California, Hawaii and Nevada that rely heavily on tourism, as well as food and accommodations, are some of the deepest in the economic hole and have the longest way to go, according to the Federal Reserve’s April State Coincident Index, which estimates economic conditions based on local employment and wage data matched to states’ GDP trends. As of April, Hawaii’s economic activity is 13 percent below where it was in January 2020, according to the index. Activity in Nevada and New York is also still down near 10 percent compared to before the pandemic. Florida, down just 1 percent, is doing better. But states including Utah, Idaho, South Dakota and Nebraska that rely largely on food processing and manufacturing — industries deemed essential and required to stay open during the pandemic — are getting back to normal much more quickly. “What we’re seeing is the states that were down the most at the beginning are still down the most, and those were basically the states that rely most on travel,” said Michael Ettlinger, founding director of the Carsey School of Public Policy at the University of New Hampshire. “There’s just more destruction, if you will, in those states, and it’s just going to take longer to come back.” The edge that GOP-led states such as Georgia, Mississippi, Arizona, and Missouri enjoy in rebounding from the pandemic has fueled Republican attacks against Biden’s policies. More than two dozen GOP governors have moved to end supplemental unemployment benefits funded by the federal government, citing labor shortages they say are triggered by the generosity. In Congress, Republican lawmakers are using a similar argument against Biden’s plans to spend $4 trillion shoring up the nation’s infrastructure and expanding social programs. “Our focus should be rebuilding the economy as quickly as possible, not subsidizing it,” said Sen. Mike Rounds (R-S.D.), who cited the extension of unemployment benefits [as a reason for voting against](https://www.kotatv.com/2021/03/07/sen-rounds-believes-covid-relief-package-disincentivizes-returning-workforce/) an aid package pushed through by Democrats in March. Some economists say it’s unclear if generous unemployment benefits are a factor keeping jobs from being filled. [A June analysis](https://www.uschamber.com/series/above-the-fold/data-shows-worker-availability-sinking-toward-historic-lows-all-over-again) from the U.S. Chamber of Commerce itself found the ratio of available workers to job openings is about what it was pre-pandemic. Before Covid, “businesses were struggling to fill openings because the available workers lacked the skills businesses needed,” senior economist Curtis Dubay wrote. “That issue persists now.” [And a May analysis](https://www.hiringlab.org/2021/05/27/job-search-activity-jumps-states/)from the hiring website Indeed’s chief economist, Jed Kolko, found that job search activity in states ending the federal benefits saw a short, temporary jump on the platform shortly after governors announced they would do so. Economists, as well as the Biden administration, also say issues such as continuing day care struggles for parents, lingering fear of contracting the virus, and an economy that seems like it has gone from zero to 60 in a matter of weeks are probably having the strongest effect. “We’ve got this kind of race to the bottom, state-after-state, with Republican governors … ending benefits, and frankly, misleading people,” Senate Finance Chair Ron Wyden (D-Ore.) said. “They tried to make a big deal out of saying we’re cutting the $300 extra. That’s just not true. They’re cutting extra a week, they’re cutting the gig workers out, if someone has exhausted the state benefits.” With [about 4 million Americans](https://tcf.org/content/commentary/fact-sheet-whats-stake-states-cancel-federal-unemployment-benefits/) — disproportionately workers of color and women — facing “an income practically of zero … that makes the need for federal reform much more serious,” he said. “This crazy quilt of state systems that offer differing levels of data, unemployment benefits and approaches on reopening to me highlight the need, the urgency of fundamental reform,” Wyden said. He’s advocating for [an overhaul of the unemployment system](https://www.finance.senate.gov/chairmans-news/wyden-bennet-unveil-unemployment-insurance-overhaul) that would unite all states under one benefits infrastructure and create automatic triggers linking benefits to economic conditions, among other things. Senate Majority Leader Chuck Schumer and Wyden last year proposed extending the jobless benefit program until a state’s unemployment rate fell below 6 percent, but Republicans were hesitant to support a long-term extension of taxpayer-funded unemployment aid. If Congress had enacted that proposal last July, 27 states would currently have a low enough unemployment rate to phase out the extra $300 in extra benefits under the program. “Hopefully what this drives is a conversation after the pandemic is over on how to improve our safety net,” Zhao said, “not just in terms of expanding it but also making sure that it’s actually reaching the people it needs to and reaching them quickly when help is needed.”

#### History shows Republican midterms victory will solve economy.

Abott 5/9/22 (Andrew Abott. Writer and Public affairs consultant. “Can a November Red Wave Save the U.S Economy Like Gingrich’s 94 Win?” Amac. May 9, 2022. https://amac.us/can-a-november-red-wave-save-u-s-economy-like-gingrichs-94-win/)

Today, Republican leaders should explicitly remind Americans of this history, and point out to voters that they have a similar opportunity before them. Just as George H.W. Bush handed his predecessor an economy that was rapidly recovering from recession only to have it wrecked by a Democrat president tacking left, Donald Trump gave Biden the strongest economic recovery in history. As we know, Biden proceeded to quickly squander it. Just as in 1994, however, the election of large Republican majorities in the House and Senate would produce an immediate change in the national morale and economic culture. Biden’s weak economy would begin turning around the day after the election. The results would be seen instantly. Coupled with a legislative agenda of strong pro-growth policies, a Republican Congress could go a long way toward saving the U.S. economy, creating jobs, and producing a rapid return to prosperity. And who knows—perhaps Biden would even have the sense to take a page out of Bill Clinton’s book, and race back to the political center to save his presidency, and the economy along with it.

### Impact – Econ

#### Economic collapse causes great power war

Tkacik, 20 --- PhD from the University of Maryland and a JD from Duke, professor of government at Stephen F Austin State University (4/21/2020, Michael, “Ingredients in place for new great power war; The Covid-19 pandemic may be the final toxin in a deadly political mix,” <https://asiatimes.com/2020/04/ingredients-in-place-for-new-great-power-war/>, accessed on 11/16/2020, JMP)

World War II 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?

#### Economic decline causes nuclear war

Stein Tønnesson 15, Research Professor, Peace Research Institute Oslo; Leader of East Asia Peace program, Uppsala University, 2015, “Deterrence, interdependence and Sino–US peace,” International Area Studies Review, Vol. 18, No. 3, p. 297-311

Several recent works on China and Sino–US relations have made substantial contributions to the current understanding of how and under what circumstances a combination of nuclear deterrence and economic interdependence may reduce the risk of war between major powers. At least four conclusions can be drawn from the review above: first, those who say that interdependence may both inhibit and drive conflict are right. Interdependence raises the cost of conflict for all sides but asymmetrical or unbalanced dependencies and negative trade expectations may generate tensions leading to trade wars among inter-dependent states that in turn increase the risk of military conflict (Copeland, 2015: 1, 14, 437; Roach, 2014). The risk may increase if one of the interdependent countries is governed by an inward-looking socio-economic coalition (Solingen, 2015); second, the risk of war between China and the US should not just be analysed bilaterally but include their allies and partners. Third party countries could drag China or the US into confrontation; third, in this context it is of some comfort that the three main economic powers in Northeast Asia (China, Japan and South Korea) are all deeply integrated economically through production networks within a global system of trade and finance (Ravenhill, 2014; Yoshimatsu, 2014: 576); and fourth, decisions for war and peace are taken by very few people, who act on the basis of their future expectations. International relations theory must be supplemented by foreign policy analysis in order to assess the value attributed by national decision-makers to economic development and their assessments of risks and opportunities. If leaders on either side of the Atlantic begin to seriously fear or anticipate their own nation’s decline then they may blame this on external dependence, appeal to anti-foreign sentiments, contemplate the use of force to gain respect or credibility, adopt protectionist policies, and ultimately refuse to be deterred by either nuclear arms or prospects of socioeconomic calamities. Such a dangerous shift could happen abruptly, i.e. under the instigation of actions by a third party – or against a third party. Yet as long as there is both nuclear deterrence and interdependence, the tensions in East Asia are unlikely to escalate to war. As Chan (2013) says, all states in the region are aware that they cannot count on support from either China or the US if they make provocative moves. The greatest risk is not that a territorial dispute leads to war under present circumstances but that changes in the world economy alter those circumstances in ways that render inter-state peace more precarious. If China and the US fail to rebalance their financial and trading relations (Roach, 2014) then a trade war could result, interrupting transnational production networks, provoking social distress, and exacerbating nationalist emotions. This could have unforeseen consequences in the field of security, with nuclear deterrence remaining the only factor to protect the world from Armageddon, and unreliably so. Deterrence could lose its credibility: one of the two great powers might gamble that the other yield in a cyber-war or conventional limited war, or third party countries might engage in conflict with each other, with a view to obliging Washington or Beijing to intervene.

### Impact – Inflation

#### GOP solves inflation – Biden failed

Rubin 6/14– Richard Rubin, reporter focusing on the intersection of taxes, politics and economics at The Wall Street Journal, “Republicans Aim to Combat Inflation With Tax, Trade Policies”, *The Wall Street Journal*, https://www.wsj.com/articles/gop-offers-tax-trade-policies-aimed-at-combating-inflation-11655222400, June 14, 2022, accessed 7-13-2022//Tata

WASHINGTON—Congressional Republicans are beginning to detail their plans to combat inflation and soften its impact on households, indicating some tax, trade and regulatory policies they might pursue if they take control of the House and Senate in this fall’s midterm elections. Sen. Chuck Grassley (R., Iowa) on Tuesday is proposing to adjust a tax-code provision for inflation and reduce some taxes on investments. Meanwhile, Republicans on the House Ways and Means Committee are outlining their anti-inflation agenda, calling for rescinding unused federal spending, reducing regulation and negotiating new trade agreements. The policies offer a preview of the fall midterm election campaign, where inflation is likely to be one of the core issues on voters’ minds as Republicans try to regain control of the House and Senate. But in the closely divided Congress, it is difficult to design politically viable legislative proposals that remove money from the economy or significantly reduce costs for businesses and households. “The Biden administration has offered no real solutions—just more Washington spending and higher taxes on Main Street businesses that will fuel higher prices in the future,” said Rep. Kevin Brady (R., Texas), the top Republican on the Ways and Means Committee. Republicans have focused on inflation, which hit 8.6% in May for its highest level since 1981, as Democrats’ greatest vulnerability this fall. They have argued that the Biden administration’s policies, including its push to enact a $1.9 trillion pandemic aid package in early 2021, have helped fuel price increases. President Biden has contended his policies spurred job growth and have helped fight the pandemic. He has also been calling out Republicans for lacking clear policies to fight inflation. He has emphasized the importance of the Federal Reserve but has also called for Congress to pass a law to subsidize household costs such as prescription drugs and child care as prices rise. “My plan is to make concrete—concrete, common-sense steps to bring down the biggest expenses that families are facing,” Mr. Biden said in a speech last month. The president has been trying to link Republicans to an idea from Sen. Rick Scott (R., Fla.) to impose minimum income taxes on all Americans. Mr. Scott last week reframed that proposal as a work requirement. The newest fiscal proposals from Republicans fit more squarely into conservative economic ideology, though all would be difficult to get through a divided Congress and past Mr. Biden, who would be able to veto any legislation passed by a Republican-controlled Congress. Mr. Grassley said his plans would encourage savings and cool demand as a way to combat inflation. He would change the income threshold for the 3.8% investment-income tax created in Obamacare. It currently starts once income reaches $200,000 for an individual and $250,000 for a married couple and doesn’t rise each year like other tax code provisions. He would raise the latter threshold to $400,000 and index both to inflation. Mr. Grassley would also exempt interest income from taxation—up to $300 for individuals and $600 for married couples. He would expand a tax credit for middle-income households to save for retirement and more than double the income levels at which capital gains and dividend income starts being taxed so that the 0% tax bracket for that investment income would end when income reaches $89,075 for individuals and $178,150 for married couples. “When people are encouraged to save, the more you save, it reduces demand. That helps inflation,” he said. “Hopefully the November elections make a big change and we’re able to move on these things in the next Congress.” Mr. Grassley would pay for those changes by extending—without indexing for inflation—the $10,000 cap on the state and local tax deduction. The House outline includes policies that Republicans have advocated before, including rescinding unused federal spending, extending expiring tax cuts, increasing energy production and removing some regulations. Extending tax cuts set to lapse after 2025 could put more money into the economy and be inflationary, but Republicans will advocate that as a way to spur growth.

#### Unchecked inflation triggers global war and disrupt the international liberal order

-High costs cause political upheaval

-Hikes in IRs disrupt fragile states

-Forces US retrenchment which emboldens rivals

Brands 1-20-2022, Distinguished Professor at Johns Hopkins University’s School of Advanced International Studies (Hal, “Inflation’s Biggest Risk Is Geopolitical Unrest,” Bloomberg, https://www.bloomberg.com/opinion/articles/2022-01-20/inflation-s-biggest-risk-is-geopolitical-unrest)

Inflation isn’t just a domestic problem. Sure, year-on-year inflation hitting 7%, the highest rate in four decades, is threatening to derail Joe Biden’s presidency. As my Bloomberg colleague John Authers has written, the inflationary trend appears broad and durable. Yet now as before, inflation is a geopolitical phenomenon, which is rooted partly in rising global tensions and could have deeply corrosive effects on the U.S.-led world order. That’s what happened the last time the U.S. faced this problem, from the late 1960s to the early 1980s. “To all Americans,” Ronald Reagan said while running for president in 1980, inflation had become "something as violent as a mugger, as frightening as an armed robber and as deadly as a hit man." The causes were closely tied to global affairs. In the late 1960s, the combined costs of the Vietnam War and President Lyndon B. Johnson’s Great Society programs sent prices rising. In the 1970s, the chief drivers were soaring energy costs and supply disruptions caused by the Yom Kippur War of 1973 and then the Iranian revolution of 1978-1979. It was a vicious cycle: Geopolitical upheaval caused economic upheaval, which then added to the underlying global instability. High oil costs and scarce supplies caused ruptures within the democratic world, as Japan, France and other U.S. allies scrambled to cut bilateral deals with oil producers. Inflation ate away at an American defense budget that was already falling as a result of post-Vietnam retrenchment. Secretary of State Henry Kissinger worried that economic chaos might destabilize the Western world. It certainly contributed to a general malaise in America and other advanced democracies, feeding fears that the Soviet Union — then benefitting from record oil prices — might win the Cold War after all. “Can Capitalism Survive?” Time magazine famously asked in 1975. Only when the Federal Reserve finally broke the inflationary cycle with bone-crushing interest rates did the U.S. regain its geopolitical footing. Today, rising energy costs are again pushing prices higher. The messy divorce of economies between the U.S. and China is disrupting supply chains and generating inflationary pressure. The economic messiness provoked by another geopolitical breakup — Brexit — isn’t helping matters. Not least, the inflation surge has resulted from the massive stimulus that governments pumped into their economies in response to Covid, the greatest global crisis of this century. In countries where there is lots of revolutionary kindling, inflation can provide the fatal spark. Historically, rising prices contributed to political upheavals such as the French Revolution, which touched off a quarter-century of war in Europe, and the Arab Spring, whose effects are still roiling the Middle East. This month, a doubling of fuel prices triggered protests, revolt and then Russian-backed repression in Kazakhstan. There’s probably more of this to come. In late 2021, the Food and Agriculture Organization at the United Nations reported that global food prices had reached their highest point in a decade. Look out for geo-economic turbulence, as well. Argentina, the European Union, Russia and other countries have restricted the export of commodities such as grain to keep domestic food prices manageable. If Washington ratchets up interest rates to tame rising prices, it could unintentionally batter deeply indebted countries that have already lost years, even decades, of economic progress due to Covid. Indeed, when the Fed slayed inflation in the early 1980s, a decade-long Latin American debt crisis was part of the collateral damage. Finally, there is the question of what will happen to the U.S. Biden isn’t entirely wrong to argue that inflation is actually a sign of strength: The U.S. economy rebounded quickly from Covid, fueling demand that is outstripping supply. Yet inflation is rarely a good-news story. Inflation is psychologically demoralizing because it makes growth meaningless, and stagnation crippling, for people whose real wages are in decline. It fosters a sense that the people are victims of forces that their leaders cannot control. It gives credence to arguments that America’s true problems are at home, rather than abroad, and thus threatens to create a more distracted, inward-looking superpower just as global threats are intensifying. The damage isn’t hypothetical: As John Ferrari of the American Enterprise Institute points out, the U.S. defense budget is already at risk of being strangled by the “inflation anaconda.” The 5% bump that Congress approved for the Pentagon this year sounds impressive, but only until one considers that inflation is running at 7% and the military is particularly exposed to rising costs for energy and materials such as steel. As inflation builds up, Pentagon is forced to build down — just as China is racing to expand its military capabilities, Russia is threatening a major conflict in Eastern Europe and relations with Iran deteriorate. The Biden administration appears to be recognizing, perhaps belatedly, that rising prices pose a severe threat to its domestic agenda and political fortunes. Inflation may also have nasty geopolitical effects in a world that hardly seemed stable before.

### GOP Solves China

#### Republicans agenda focused on hurting China – social media attacks

Magnier 22 (Mark Magnier is a US correspondent based in Washington. Before joining the Post, he worked for the Wall Street Journal in China and for the Los Angeles Times in India, China and Japan. He’s covered the Chinese economy, China and India’s explosive rise and conflicts in Iraq, Pakistan and Afghanistan.) “Republican lawmakers in US focus more on China in online posts, study says.” *South China Morning Post.* 7-15-2021 https://www.scmp.com/news/china/article/3141153/republican-members-us-congress-focus-more-china-social-media-posts-study //RK

There may be a bipartisan consensus on tougher US policy toward China, but Republican lawmakers tend to focus on China’s negative behaviour and attributes, employing terms like “propaganda”, “spy” and “lie” on social media, according to a Pew Research Centre analysis. The report released on Wednesday also found that a relatively small number of Republicans accounted for the majority of postings, often hammering away repeatedly at the same themes. Meanwhile, Democratic counterparts focused more on attacks on Asian-Americans. “It’s not a coincidence that Republicans showed a lot of interest since 2019 in China and Democrats on Asian-American issues,” said Federico de Jesus, founder of FDJ Solutions, a political and communications consultancy. “Republican members of Congress not only want to cater to Trump. They also want to persuade their people that they’re not being a wuss [on China] even as they end up spreading conspiracy theories.” According to the Pew study, just 56 lawmakers out of 535 in Congress generated 16,060 posts mentioning China or the Chinese people from January 2020 through April 2021. Of those 56, 54 were Republican. The offices of Republican senators Marco Rubio of Florida, Ted Cruz of Texas and Tom Cotton of Arkansas, among the moctive Republican communicators on China, did not respond to a request for comment. In cases where lawmakers from both parties referred to China – as with Covid-19, for instance – the language employed was often very different, Pew found. Republicans tended to use terms such as “Communist Party”, “[hold] accountable”, “investigation” and “lie”, while Democrats tended to use “Chinese virus” – often in the context of decrying its use and the prejudice it generated.Former president Donald Trump and members of his administration often referred to the pandemic as the “Chinese virus”, “Wuhan virus” or “kung flu”, a framing that analysts said deflected attention from Trump’s policy missteps and fuelled attacks on Asian-Americans.“For Republicans in particular, China serves as a convenient target for political attacks, often without regard for the impact those words may have on Chinese-Americans and others,” said Brett Bruen, president of Global Situation Room, a crisis management firm. “We should talk about policy differences and security concerns,” added Bruen, formerly White House head of global engagement. “Our leaders need to be much more responsible in such a combustible environment.”

#### Republican party is more tough on China than Dems – tariffs, covid, and negative views

Dawsey 22 (Josh, A political enterprise and investigations reporter for The Washington Post. He joined the paper in 2017 and previously covered the White Hous e. Before that, he covered the White House for Politico, and New York City Hall and New Jersey Gov. Chris Christie for the Wall Street Journal. He graduated from the University of South Carolina) “Many GOP candidates are bashing each other for ties to China.” *Washington Post*. 5-11-2022. <https://www.washingtonpost.com/politics/2022/05/11/republicans-china-primaries/> //RK

The advertisement strikes an ominous tone from a familiar voice: Donald Trump inveighing against American companies sending their jobs to China. But the advertisement is from Trump foe and Georgia Gov. Brian Kemp, who is campaigning against David Perdue — the candidate the former president has picked to win in Georgia. The spot accuses Perdue of outsourcing jobs in the private sector as a CEO before becoming a candidate for the Senate in Georgia. “We tested a number of hits, and that was the best-polling one — the outsourcing to China,” said Cody Hall, Kemp’s communications director. In Georgia, a state more than 7,000 miles from China, it has been a centerpiece of Kemp’s campaign in paid advertising and messaging. Ties to China — even spurious, misleading or hyperbolic ones — have become an albatross for GOP candidates across the country in 2022 races and an animating presence in campaign stops and advertisements, with much of the Republican Party holding increasingly negative views of China after two years of the coronavirus and Trump’s rhetoric against the country. Campaign strategists and candidates in a number of states said that tying candidates to China has become a prime attack in a GOP primary — with candidates seeking to differentiate themselves as they largely hew to Trump’s political agenda. In Pennsylvania, Mehmet Oz has repeatedly slashed his foe David McCormick for conducting business deals with China as hedge fund CEO, while McCormick and his allies have attacked Oz for making money off Chinese state TV and using Chinese products for his companies. When Trump criticized McCormick last Friday night at a rainy rally, he lampooned him for being too kind to China in one of his most scorching attacks. The attacks have stretched from Texas to Ohio to Missouri, with candidates making aggressive and sometimes misleading claims about their opponents’ views on China. “There are China remnants in all these primaries,” said Tony Fabrizio, a prominent pollster who works for Trump and is working in many of this year’s contested primary states. “If you coddle China, or you are soft on China, that makes you not so much America first and not so tough,” Fabrizio said. “Being tagged as soft on China is not a good thing. Trump focused and catalyzed some of it. But China has been seen as the primary world foe for at least the last decade or more.” In a poll Fabrizio conducted earlier this year, he said, Republican voters overwhelmingly viewed China as more of a national security threat than Russia, even as Russia launched missiles into Ukraine and killed thousands of civilians in a brutal land war. A March [poll](https://www.thechicagocouncil.org/commentary-and-analysis/blogs/partisan-divides-china-continue-grow) by the Chicago Council on Global Affairs found that 75 percent of Republicans said China’s development as a world power represented a “critical threat” to U.S. interests, up from 67 percent in 2020 and 42 percent in 2018. It is a shift from decades past, when many Republicans took a more conciliatory tone toward China. Michael Pillsbury, one of Trump’s informal advisers who was slated to be his ambassador to the country if he had won a second term, said it once was different. “It is something quite new — Republicans used to be the party of business and free trade,” Pillsbury said. “And I remember during the early considerations of President Trump — putting heavy tariffs on China — there were voices within the White House and within the party that this goes against Republican traditions.” The current mood toward China, Pillsbury said, is darker than it has been in decades in the United States. Pillsbury and others note that many of the candidates launching the attacks have not delivered succinct policy positions on what they would do differently, and that some of the attacks seem to be fearmongering. There is a confluence of reasons Republicans have escalated their anti-China rhetoric, according to strategists and candidates. The party’s supporters listened to Trump bad-mouth China throughout his term, even as he struck a more conciliatory tone behind the scenes. There is deep frustration among some Rust Belt states that Chinese imports have cost American jobs and deflated towns. And there is palpable and widespread blame on China for the coronavirus, which was first detected in the Chinese city of Wuhan. “The part of commonality across the MAGA baseis being tough on China,” said Jason Miller, a longtime Trump adviser. “It is interwoven in the trade message, but it’s more that Republicans see China as an existential threat to all of Western civilization.” Trump’s team polled last year on various messages for his rallies, and learned that attacking China was among the most popular with his supporters. Trump started calling for reparations from China over the coronavirus, receiving raucous cheers at his rallies — with no enforcement mechanism provided. In addition to Trump, who is weighing a reelection bid, other potential 2024 presidential candidates have focused on China, with former secretary of state Mike Pompeo and others offering harsh rhetoric against the country. It has been much less of an issue in Democratic primaries. In Pennsylvania, McCormick’s work at the hedge fund Bridgewater — and its extensive business dealings with China — have been a key part of Oz’s message. Before running for the Senate, McCormick’s Bridgewater “raised the equivalent of $1.25 billion for its third investment fund in China,” according to the Wall Street Journal.Let’s go China!” two men paid by the Oz campaign, dressed in vests and calling themselves “finance bros,” cheered in one ad. They called him the “Wolf of Westport,” a reference to the affluent Connecticut town near New York City where Bridgewater is headquartered.McCormick has been criticized frequently by Oz’s campaign for his 2007 remarks on China while serving as a top Treasury Department official in the George W. Bush administration. “When China succeeds, the United States succeeds,” McCormick said, speaking in Beijing.Some McCormick allies said they viewed his Chinese business ties as his greatest disadvantage when he started the campaign; his first move was to write an op-ed for Fox Business defending himself and promising to be more aggressive on China.“That’s why I believe it is past time for America’s leaders to confront head-on the Chinese Communist Party (CCP), which poses the greatest economic and national security threat to the United States,” McCormick wrote.McCormick campaign spokesperson Jess Szymanski said in a statement: “Dave’s battle-tested experience will make him one of the strongest Senators in Washington in holding China accountable and restoring pro-growth, America First policies.”For their part, McCormick and his team have put together an extensive book of research attacking Oz for some for his investments in China. For example, Oz made money when his television show was syndicated in the country and acquiesced to Chinese state TV rules in order for the show to be broadcast. “The Dr. Oz show has aired in over 100 countries for over 13 years to provide life-changing health information to millions of people across the globe,” said Brittany Yanick, a spokesperson for Oz. “Dr. Oz’s stance on China is unequivocal — the Chinese Communist Party’s malign actions both within their own country and on the world stage are reprehensible.” And when Oz launched a bedding company, he contracted with a firm in China to make many of its products. Pillows, mattresses and mattress toppers, among other things, were all made in the country through a partnership with the company Malouf. That allowed Oz to make between $1 million and $5 million, according to a financial disclosure he filed. Oz’s campaign defended the items being made in China, saying it was difficult to find materials to make such products in the United States.

#### Republicans will reinstate Trump administration sanctions against China

Sibley 21 (Nate Sibley is a research fellow at the Hudson Institute’s Kleptocracy Initiative, “Republicans Can Embrace Much of Biden’s Anticorruption Plan”, Wall Street Journal, https://www.wsj.com/articles/republicans-can-embrace-much-of-biden-anticorruption-plan-kleptocracy-russia-china-corruption-11639339155, 12/12/21. Accessed 7-14-22) - AC

Even in the fractious current Congress, Republicans have been leaders in what must be one of the last bipartisan initiatives with any serious momentum, as evidenced by the launch of a bipartisan Caucus Against Foreign Corruption and Kleptocracy in June and of the U.S.-led Interparliamentary Alliance Against Kleptocracy in December. Rep. Maria Salazar (R., Fla.), whose family suffered at the hands of kleptocratic regimes in Cuba and Nicaragua, has become a powerful voice for adjusting U.S. anti-money-laundering regulations to end abuse of the American financial system. “These are not faraway problems for the United States; corrupt money also destroys American lives,” she said at a recent hearing. Republicans’ role has often been to restrain Democratic colleagues from measures that impose harsh regulation on U.S. businesses or violate reasonable privacy expectations. A recent bipartisan success: Included in the January defense authorization was a ban on anonymous shell companies. The bill mandated the creation of a U.S. corporate beneficial-ownership register accessible only to American law enforcement and banks, as opposed to the open public registers of Europe. Mr. Biden has done more than any previous president to highlight the threat of authoritarian kleptocracy. But he also needlessly surrendered Afghanistan to a theocratic narco-gang, green-lit Russia’s Nord Stream 2 pipeline, and nixed sanctions on the so-called Navalny 35 group of Vladimir Putin’s henchmen. He now appears poised to abandon Ukraine, which has persevered against Kremlin-backed oligarchy. The Treasury Department has yet to impose sanctions on anyone approaching the stature of Russian oligarch Oleg Deripaska. A future Republican administration and Congress could build on the Biden initiative. They could acknowledge that the biggest kleptocracy of all is run by the Chinese Communist Party. Egregious intellectual-property theft, economic blackmail of foreign countries and businesses, rampant bribery on the Belt and Road Initiative: China’s emergence as a global power shows what happens when thieves hold the reins of the world’s second-largest economy. Meanwhile, the Cuban-Venezuelan criminal enterprise continues to consume Latin America, and Tehran uses whatever cash it can get to spread terror across the Middle East. Buoyed by stronger anti-money-laundering defenses at home, Republicans could take a powerful offensive line against these regimes by reinstating the maximum pressure campaigns of the Trump administration—deploying the full force of U.S. sanctions and law enforcement against dictators who rob their own people and use the proceeds to threaten global security.

#### Republicans will not just prioritize China, but will be the toughest on China

Murphy 22 (Rory Murphy is the vice president of government affairs at the U.S. China Business Council, “U.S. midterm elections and China policy”, SupChina, https://supchina.com/2022/07/14/u-s-midterm-elections-and-china-policy/. Accessed 7-14-22) – AC

Sure. Let’s assume Republicans take at least one chamber of Congress. They’ve made it quite clear that China is not going to go away as an issue. The House Republican Task Force on China put out a report, I believe, last September. Outlines a lot of their priorities, what they would like to pursue should they be in charge. I think I would encourage all of you to read through that. There’s a lot of ideas in there and I think all of them are on the table. Anchoring that effort in the House next year would be this assuming the outbound investment proposal we discussed earlier does not make it into a final China package this year. It’ll likely be the anchor of some legislative effort on China next year. That is our expectation. From a business perspective, there’s a constant political risk, reputational risk doing business. There’s an increase of interest, it seems, among lawmakers of both parties, but I’d say probably more so Republicans to call out companies, call out institutions on issues related to China. You have in the Senate, regardless of who seemingly every Senate Republican is positioning themselves to run for the White House in 2024, and that creates a dynamic where lawmakers are trying to position themselves as the toughest on China. And so, there’s arms race of policies that we’ll need to contend with. From a business perspective, that creates a lot of uncertainties. There’s a dynamic where it’s hard to push back on bad policies, even if you are a lawmaker who wants to get the policy right. The second that somebody puts out a policy that’s objectively bad, and there’s a lot of good policies, right policies that should be pursued, but some are, we would say objectively bad, it’s hard to question it, let alone oppose it because you’re at risk of being labeled as “weak on China.” From a political calculus, it just makes things really tricky. So, there’s a reputational risk for businesses that there could be an increase of them being called out outside of the legislative process. Then this constant uncertainty of what bills are going to be introduced, and how will they be enacted into law? It’s harder to forecast what will be approved, what won’t be than it was five, six years ago.

#### GOP victory causes a budgetary shift from social spending towards defense

Marcelli et al 22 [Solita Marcelli Chief Investment Officer Americas Tom McLoughlin Head of Fixed Income Americas Nadia Lovell Senior Equity Strategist Americas ElectionWatch 2022 US midterm elections 21 April 2022 Chief Investment Office GWM Investment Research This report has been prepared by UBS Financial Services Inc. https://www.ubs.com/content/dam/WealthManagementAmericas/cio-impact/3717874%20ElectionWatch%202022%20US%20midterm%20elections.pdf] 6-26-2022

Election Outlook

The probability of a GOP sweep has increased but the competitiveness of some elections in November will depend upon the identity of each party’s nominees. Procedural rules in the Senate prevent narrow majorities from exercising broad discretion over legislation without the consent of the minority. There are two exceptions: judicial appointments and budget reconciliation.

Policy Implications

Taxes: No substantive changes to tax law but the R&D tax credit will be addressed if it is not already addressed in 2022. Companies now have to amortize R&D expenses over 5 years instead of the year it was made.² Defense: Spending increases more significantly under this scenario. Bipartisan consensus on an adversarial posture toward China persists. The R&D tax credit is an important issue for the defense industry under all three scenarios. Agriculture: Enacted by Congress roughly once every five years. A new bill will pass but GOP may demand cuts to supplemental nutrition assistance programs. Climate: Nothing substantive passes. Debt Limit: Contentious negotiations before default deadline. Limit is raised but GOP demands concession on social spending.

### Impact – Readiness

#### GOP victory increases defense spending and deterrence – key to readiness.

Pletka ‘22 [Danielle Pletka is a distinguished senior fellow at the American Enterprise Institute and co-host of the podcast What the Hell is Going On? 6-2-2022 “The Republicans Could Win the U.S. Midterms. Here’s What that Means for the World,” Foreign Policy, accessed 6-27-2022, https://foreignpolicy.com/2022/06/02/gop-congress-midterms-foreign-policy-ukraine-taiwan/]

Last month’s vote in the U.S. Congress to appropriate $40 billion in additional military and budgetary assistance for Ukraine laid bare fissures in the Republican congressional caucus: 11 of 50 Senate Republicans voted against the bill, as did 57 of 208 House Republicans. Was the Ukraine vote a harbinger of Republican national security squabbles to come? Was it a partisan vote against anything associated with President Joe Biden? Or was it a one-off reflecting a poorly drafted bill with too much extraneous baggage? More importantly, who will hold the foreign-policy reins in the likely Republican House (and possibly Senate) majority to come in 2023—the isolationists or the internationalists? Political pundits agree Republicans are likely to win back the House of Representatives and have a good shot at the Senate in the November 2022 midterm elections. That could—caucus permitting—propel House Minority Leader Kevin McCarthy to the speakership and Senate Minority Leader Mitch McConnell to the post of majority leader. Of the two, McConnell is the known quantity—an experienced legislator and parliamentarian and an old-school internationalist whose foreign-policy views were forged in the crucible of the Cold War. McCarthy, not so much. Indeed, it’s probably most accurate to say his foreign policy was forged in the crucible of former President Donald Trump. As previous Republican speakers have learned to their displeasure, the Republican Party in today’s House is less a caucus and more a raucous battle for primacy. Former Speaker John Boehner struggled against rebellious Tea Party upstarts, his successor Paul Ryan struggled against the self-named Freedom Caucus, and McCarthy is unlikely to have much fun either. In the minority, the Republican Party tends—emphasis intended—to stand together because the Democratic speaker and the executive in the White House are deemed public enemies No. 1 and No. 2. But with the majority comes the battle to control the agenda. Domestic policy will likely dominate the politicking in Congress: inflation, crime, education, the border. But Russia’s invasion of Ukraine, like so many conflicts before it, has proved that as much as politicians wish to focus on “nation building here at home,” global realities intrude. Ukraine is the tip of the iceberg, but Republicans have their eye on plenty of other issues as well, including relations with China, the question of defending Taiwan, the continued isolation of Russia, the Middle East (think energy, Iran, and Israel), and, more broadly, defense spending. But before the substance of the foreign-policy challenge hits the House and Senate floors, the ideological question merits examination. American Enterprise Institute scholar Colin Dueck divides the Republican Party’s foreign policy into three schools: foreign-policy activists, foreign-policy hard-liners, and foreign-policy noninterventionists. Looking back, it’s clear that so-called foreign-policy activists dominated Republican national security policymaking for much of the post-World War II era. These were the leaders who believed, as both Presidents Ronald Reagan and George W. Bush regularly underscored, that the United States is not simply one nation among many but that it is a beacon of freedom to the world, a “shining city on a hill.” Foreign-policy activists underwrote the Reagan Doctrine, the principle that the United States should lend a hand to all those hoping to halt the advance of communism wherever they were, including in Afghanistan, Nicaragua, Angola, El Salvador, and Grenada. Bush faced different challenges, but his underlying faith in U.S. power and values was similar. Rather than fighting communism, what Bush dubbed his “Freedom Agenda” took on the tyrannies that he believed fueled Salafi-jihadis. Yet his efforts were neither clearly thought through nor appropriately resourced. Worse yet, Bush could not convincingly argue that he was advancing U.S. national interests in every case. For the activist school, Bush’s Iraq War proved to be their swan song. Though the Iraq War offered an “I told you so” moment for the Republican Party’s isolationist wing, its immediate beneficiaries were President Barack Obama and the Democratic Party’s own “End the endless wars” crowd—or so it seemed at first. But the intervening years offered the Republican Party’s noninterventionists ample fodder: the disastrous war in Libya and the horrifying killing of a U.S. ambassador in Benghazi, the withdrawal from Iraq and the resulting rise of the Islamic State, the civil war in Syria and the ensuing cataclysmic refugee crisis. These crises were not the primary reason for Trump’s election, but they didn’t hurt his campaign. Rather, they—together with Obama’s self-labeled signature foreign-policy achievement, the Iran nuclear deal—offered an opportunity for Trump. “Donald Trump’s political achievement in 2016 was to sense the possibility for a new [Republican] coalition unseen since before World War II,” Dueck writes. “He did this not by reiterating libertarian foreign-policy preferences. Rather, he combined non-interventionist criticism of ‘endless wars’ with hardline stands on China, jihadist terrorism, anti-American dictatorships in Latin America, and US defense spending.” This is a sweet spot for Republican foreign policy, and understanding the reluctant internationalism of most of the party’s voters—a repudiation of the embarrassed anti-Americanism of the Democratic Party’s far left and the activist internationalism that has heretofore characterized the Republican Party leadership—will be key to geolocating a new Republican Congress’s preferred national security policy. A unifying theme for the Republican Party will be the challenge presented by China. It sells well with the base, and with trade liberalization off the table for the moment (for both parties), the question of China will likely come down to economic disengagement and Beijing’s threat to Taiwan. A case in point is a recent letter co-written by Joe Manchin and Shelley Moore Capito (respectively the Democratic and Republican senators from West Virginia) urging Biden to include Taiwan in his newly proposed Indo-Pacific Economic Framework. Republican signatories to the letter included James Risch, who is likely to be the chair of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee in a new Republican-held Senate; Roger Wicker, the likely chair of the Senate Armed Services Committee; Marco Rubio, the likely chair of the Senate Select Committee on Intelligence; and most of the Republican members of the current Senate Appropriations Committee. Notably, several of the Senate’s more ardent Trump supporters, including Marsha Blackburn and Kevin Cramer, also joined the letter. (A similar House effort was also joined by likely future national security heavyweights, including probable House Foreign Affairs Committee Chair Michael McCaul.) Defense spending will be another key theme for the Republican Party. House and Senate Republicans have repeatedly slammed Biden’s defense spending as inadequate to address the country’s many national security challenges and have only escalated those charges since Russia’s invasion of Ukraine. McConnell has called for a 5 percent increase in defense spending above inflation, and McCarthy has been equally energetic. Both understand—as Trump did—that investing in the military can be cast as a deterrent as well as a down payment on victory in any eventual conflict. And here again, the base is with them. Ditto for energy security: While there is a bipartisan constituency for pivoting away from the Middle East—and a growing bipartisan opposition to renewing the Iran nuclear deal—Republicans are less focused on climate change issues and more on basic pocketbook challenges. That will mean more enthusiasm for restoring American energy independence, avoiding unnecessary bickering with Saudi Arabia (still a major swing producer of oil), and easing regulations on U.S. oil and gas production. But what about Ukraine and cases like it? What about those 11 in the Senate and the 57 in the House? What about the conservative powerhouse think tank the Heritage Foundation and its political action committee drawing a line in the sand against the $40 billion Ukraine aid package? Like Heritage, Sen. Mike Braun finessed his opposition based not on the policy of aiding Ukraine but on the cost of doing so and the spiraling U.S. debt. Sen. Rand Paul, a perennial opponent of U.S. overseas engagement, pinned his “no” vote on the lack of an inspector general in the bill to oversee how the funds are spent. That’s fair enough, but it’s hard to picture every one of those “no” votes switching tack if presented with a better or cleaner bill—not when the Republican Party’s rising stars include the likes of Senate candidate J.D. Vance, who during his campaign said, “I gotta be honest with you, I don’t really care what happens to Ukraine one way or another.” It’s relatively easy to predict that a Republican majority will continue to support arming and aiding Ukraine, because the vote has already happened. And though a significant minority of the Republican caucus voted no, it was a minority. But there are harder cases (though not just for the Republicans): the looming Chinese threat to Taiwan, for one. Sure, there’s a majority in both houses for including Taiwan in trading arrangements, and there are vocal advocates in both chambers for ending the U.S. policy of “strategic ambiguity” toward Taipei. But where will the Republican Party be on defending Taiwan in the event of a Chinese attack? Will isolationists on both left and right actually have the power to steer a course? On its face, the answer appears to be no, but the devil is, proverbially, in the details. Sanctions on China would hit the Republican base hard, raising costs for basic goods even higher. As with all such crystal ball gazing, sorting the powerful from the merely loud will be a chore. Republican Rep. Marjorie Taylor Greene is ever-so-vocal and enjoys a substantial Twitter following, but she has little clout in the House of Representatives. Paul is consistently isolationist, but few ask how he will vote as they decide their stance on major issues. More importantly, the majority of the Republican Party is not actually with them. Case in point: The TV host Tucker Carlson, pocket deity of Trump nostalgics, initially came out swinging against NATO’s condemnations of Russian President Vladimir Putin’s attack on Ukraine, but he soon tempered his position once it became clear that ranging himself on the side of the Russian dictator was a losing cause. Similarly, while all eyes focus on the Vances and Greenes, there actually remains a strong hawkish contingent in the Republican Party that is well represented on Capitol Hill, including by Sens. Tom Cotton, Rubio, and Ted Cruz, as well as Reps. Mike Gallagher, Elise Stefanik, and likely incoming House Armed Services Committee Chair Mike Turner, among others. Although these members may not be interventionists in the style of George W. Bush, there should be no question that they are national security hawks keen on defending both U.S. interests and U.S. allies. That will almost certainly mean efforts to increase the defense budget; pressure to increase the quality, consistency, and speed of arms deliveries to Ukraine; and an even harder line on China, potentially including additional sanctions on Beijing (notwithstanding grumbling from certain quarters).

#### Maintaining effective warfighting capabilities key to sustain global peace and prevent extinction

Barnett 11, Former Senior Strategic Researcher and Professor in the Warfare Analysis & Research Department, Center for Naval Warfare Studies, U.S. Naval War College (Thomas P.M., The New Rules: Leadership Fatigue Puts U.S., and Globalization, at Crossroads, [www.worldpoliticsreview.com/articles/8099/the-new-rules-leadership-fatigue-puts-u-s-and-globalization-at-crossroads](http://www.worldpoliticsreview.com/articles/8099/the-new-rules-leadership-fatigue-puts-u-s-and-globalization-at-crossroads))

Events in Libya are a further reminder for Americans that we stand at a crossroads in our continuing evolution as the world's sole full-service superpower. Unfortunately, we are increasingly seeking change without cost, and shirking from risk because we are tired of the responsibility. We don't know who we are anymore, and our president is a big part of that problem. Instead of leading us, he explains to us. Barack Obama would have us believe that he is practicing strategic patience. But many experts and ordinary citizens alike have concluded that he is actually beset by strategic incoherence -- in effect, a man overmatched by the job. It is worth first examining the larger picture: We live in a time of arguably the greatest structural change in the global order yet endured, with this historical moment's most amazing feature being its relative and absolute lack of mass violence. That is something to consider when Americans contemplate military intervention in Libya, because if we do take the step to prevent larger-scale killing by engaging in some killing of our own, we will not be adding to some fantastically imagined global death count stemming from the ongoing "megalomania" and "evil" of American "empire." We'll be engaging in the same sort of system-administering activity that has marked our stunningly successful stewardship of global order since World War II. Let me be more blunt: As the guardian of globalization, the U.S. military has been the greatest force for peace the world has ever known. Had America been removed from the global dynamics that governed the 20th century, the mass murder never would have ended. Indeed, it's entirely conceivable there would now be no identifiable human civilization left, once nuclear weapons entered the killing equation. But the world did not keep sliding down that path of perpetual war. Instead, America stepped up and changed everything by ushering in our now-perpetual great-power peace. We introduced the international liberal trade order known as globalization and played loyal Leviathan over its spread. What resulted was the collapse of empires, an explosion of democracy, the persistent spread of human rights, the liberation of women, the doubling of life expectancy, a roughly 10-fold increase in adjusted global GDP and a profound and persistent reduction in battle deaths from state-based conflicts. That is what American "hubris" actually delivered. Please remember that the next time some TV pundit sells you the image of "unbridled" American military power as the cause of global disorder instead of its cure. With self-deprecation bordering on self-loathing, we now imagine a post-American world that is anything but. Just watch who scatters and who steps up as the Facebook revolutions erupt across the Arab world. While we might imagine ourselves the status quo power, we remain the world's most vigorously revisionist force. As for the sheer "evil" that is our military-industrial complex, again, let's examine what the world looked like before that establishment reared its ugly head. The last great period of global structural change was the first half of the 20th century, a period that saw a death toll of about 100 million across two world wars. That comes to an average of 2 million deaths a year in a world of approximately 2 billion souls. Today, with far more comprehensive worldwide reporting, researchers report an average of less than 100,000 battle deaths annually in a world fast approaching 7 billion people. Though admittedly crude, these calculations suggest a 90 percent absolute drop and a 99 percent relative drop in deaths due to war. We are clearly headed for a world order characterized by multipolarity, something the American-birthed system was designed to both encourage and accommodate. But given how things turned out the last time we collectively faced such a fluid structure, we would do well to keep U.S. power, in all of its forms, deeply embedded in the geometry to come. To continue the historical survey, after salvaging Western Europe from its half-century of civil war, the U.S. emerged as the progenitor of a new, far more just form of globalization -- one based on actual free trade rather than colonialism. America then successfully replicated globalization further in East Asia over the second half of the 20th century, setting the stage for the Pacific Century now unfolding.

### GOP Solves Energy Security

#### Republicans ensure US Energy Security

Rodgers 22 (Cathy Anne McMorris Rodgers is an American politician who is the U.S. representative for Washington's 5th congressional district, 6/29/22, accessed 7/13/22, Targeted News Service, “McMorris Rodgers Warns of Global Socialist Price Controls On Energy” https://mcmorris.house.gov/posts/watch-mcmorris-rodgers-warns-of-global-socialist-price-controls-on-energy)SaadK

FLIP THE SWITCH ON AMERICAN ENERGY PRODUCTION "We're going to flip the switch on for American energy after the Republicans win the majority in November. "We're going to be very aggressive embracing, unleashing American energy. "I've introduced legislation with my colleague Bruce Westerman, who heads up the resources committee for the Republicans. It is the American Energy Independence from Russia Act. "It would immediately say yes to exporting LNG to our allies around the world. Europe is desperate for natural gas. We have lots of natural gas. "It would restart the oil and gas leasing on federal lands and waters here in the United States of America [and] immediately approve the Keystone XL pipeline. "It would require the President to submit an energy security plan because we know that energy security is the foundation for national security. "And it would restock our strategic petroleum reserves. "These are the policies that would unleash American energy, that would flip the switch. It would bring down gas prices here in the United States, help hard-working American families, and also help our allies around the world that are desperate for American leadership." SOCIALIST PRICE CONTROLS DON'T WORK "We know that price controls don't work." [...] "We know that it was tried in the 70's and it just resulted in long lines and more scarcity of supply. "We also know right now, when you think about doing this globally, that Russia is selling more oil to China and India. "[Russian President Vladimir] Putin is continuing to sell oil, funding his military, propping up his economy, while our President and G7 [leaders] are talking about some kind of price controls. They need to confront the reality of the situation and unleash American energy."

#### Republicans preempting Energy Security action NOW.

Ferguson 22 (Drew Ferguson is an American politician who is the U.S. representative for Georgia's 3rd congressional district, 3/7/22, accessed 7/11/22, Rep. A. Drew Ferguson (R-GA) News Release, “CONGRESSMAN FERGUSON: ENERGY SECURITY IS NATIONAL SECURITY”, <https://ferguson.house.gov/news/documentsingle.aspx?DocumentID=3703)SaadK>

U.S. Congressman Drew Ferguson (R-Ga.), Chief Deputy Whip of the House Republican Conference and a member of the House Energy Action Team (HEAT), recently cosponsored H.R. 6886, the Powering America through Domestic Energy (PADE) Act. This bill would ban the importation of crude oil and petroleum products from the Russian Federation and bar President Biden from declaring and implementing a moratorium on the use of hydraulic fracturing or on oil and gas leasing on federal lands without Congressional approval. "As Vladimir Putin continues his brutal, unjust war against Ukraine, our nation's need for energy independence has never been greater," Ferguson said. "The U.S. currently imports 600,000 barrels of Russian oil a day, sending millions of dollars to Putin's tyrannical regime. Every gallon of Russian oil has Ukrainian blood on it. Instead of powering Putin, America and our allies should be fueled by American energy, and we must respond by replacing Russian oil and gas with clean American resources by increasing domestic production to regain our energy independence. It's clear that **energy security is national security**, and the PADE Act is a good first step toward ending dependency on Russian resources while increasing American energy independence."

#### US Energy Security negates Climate Change

Nyman 22 (Jonna Nyman, Department of Politics and International Relations, Lecturer at University of Leicester, University Road, 1/2022, accessed, 7/14/2022, Journal of International Relations and Development, “Rethinking energy, climate and security: a critical analysis of energy security in the US” <https://doi.org/10.1057/jird.2015.26)SaadK>

Understanding the complicated relationship between energy, climate and security is vital both to the study of international relations and to ensure the continued survival of a world increasingly threatened by environmental change. Climate change is largely caused by burning fossil fuels for energy, but while discussions on the climate consider the role of energy, energy security debates largely overlook climate concerns. This article traces the separation between energy and climate through an analysis of US energy security discourse and policy. It shows that energy security is continually constructed as national security, which enables very particular policy choices and prioritises it above climate concerns. Thus, in many cases, policies undertaken in the name of energy security contribute directly to climate insecurity. The article argues that the failure to consider securing the climate as inherently linked to energy security is not just problematic, but, given global warming, potentially harmful. Consequently, any approach to dealing with climate change has to begin by rethinking energy security and security more broadly, as national (energy) security politics no longer provides security in any meaningful sense.

#### US Energy Security is NEEDED for Global Stability.

Green 22 (Mark Green spent 16 years as national editorial writer for The Oklahoman in the paper’s Washington bureau. Previously, Mark was a reporter, copy editor and sports editor at an assortment of newspapers. He earned his journalism degree from the University of Oklahoma and master’s in journalism and public affairs from American University, 2/17/22, accessed 7/14/22, API, “American Energy Leadership: Stability, Security, Positive Influence” <https://www.api.org/news-policy-and-issues/blog/2022/02/17/american-energy-leadership-stability-security-positive-influence)Saadk>

Conversely, when American energy isn’t leading, the U.S. and its allies may face severe challenges when you consider the essentiality of energy to economic growth, national security and environmental progress. This has been underscored as Europe faced a mid-winter cutoff of some or all of the natural gas it gets from by Russia – in the event Moscow decided to use energy as a weapon in the Ukraine crisis. This is in Russia’s [recent history](https://nam04.safelinks.protection.outlook.com/?url=https%3A%2F%2Fwww.cnbc.com%2F2022%2F02%2F09%2Fenergy-expert-dan-yergin-on-russia-ukraine-tensions-gas-prices.html&data=04%7C01%7CChristmanJ%40api.org%7C60402904208247b36b5108d9f216f181%7C2df2418fe75f46f0898d65f4eeecb14b%7C0%7C0%7C637807002633824362%7CUnknown%7CTWFpbGZsb3d8eyJWIjoiMC4wLjAwMDAiLCJQIjoiV2luMzIiLCJBTiI6Ik1haWwiLCJXVCI6Mn0%3D%7C3000&sdata=I%2B6%2F%2FFGI%2Fr07XCpPYzEK7ozuKSRvXL9yZYI9Hn96Sig%3D&reserved=0). As things simmered in Europe, American liquefied natural gas (LNG) cargoes streamed across the Atlantic. For example, the U.S. Energy Department reports the U.S. exported 60.3 billion cubic feet of LNG to the United Kingdom in [December](https://www.energy.gov/sites/default/files/2022-02/LNG%20Monthly%20December%202021_0.pdf), roughly double the amount shipped in [November](https://www.energy.gov/sites/default/files/2022-02/LNG%20Monthly%20November%202021_1.pdf). According to [IHS Markit](https://nam04.safelinks.protection.outlook.com/?url=https%3A%2F%2Fnews.ihsmarkit.com%2Fprviewer%2Frelease_only%2Fid%2F5017853&data=04%7C01%7CChristmanJ%40api.org%7C60402904208247b36b5108d9f216f181%7C2df2418fe75f46f0898d65f4eeecb14b%7C0%7C0%7C637807002633824362%7CUnknown%7CTWFpbGZsb3d8eyJWIjoiMC4wLjAwMDAiLCJQIjoiV2luMzIiLCJBTiI6Ik1haWwiLCJXVCI6Mn0%3D%7C3000&sdata=IErlY76wQHapEMn%2Fufv2s447f7kYcAhX04fIYODuZTA%3D&reserved=0), LNG exports to Europe in January supplied higher volumes (34% of Europe’s total supply) than Russian pipelined natural gas, which decreased from 30% to 40% of Europe’s supply to just 17%. The largest share of those LNG exports came from the United States, the report said. [Dustin Meyer](https://nam04.safelinks.protection.outlook.com/?url=https%3A%2F%2Fwww.api.org%2Fnews-policy-and-issues%2Fblog%2F2022%2F01%2F28%2Fevents-in-europe-underscore-need-to-support-us-lng-exports&data=04%7C01%7CChristmanJ%40api.org%7C60402904208247b36b5108d9f216f181%7C2df2418fe75f46f0898d65f4eeecb14b%7C0%7C0%7C637807002633824362%7CUnknown%7CTWFpbGZsb3d8eyJWIjoiMC4wLjAwMDAiLCJQIjoiV2luMzIiLCJBTiI6Ik1haWwiLCJXVCI6Mn0%3D%7C3000&sdata=giur%2BAJg6DDxV1%2Fd%2FzK1%2FCOEBLkIWr1JJgVG6vwzlbc%3D&reserved=0), API vice president for Natural Gas Markets, said last month that American energy was stepping up: “During this acute period of demand squeeze, the U.S. is not only exporting at record levels but has actually ramped up additional LNG capacity – responding to meet our allies’ demand when they need it the most.” This is significant – for Europe’s safety and global stability – and makes the case for policies that support and strengthen American energy leadership. In a letter to the editor of the Wall Street Journal, [API Senior Vice President Frank Macchiarola](https://nam04.safelinks.protection.outlook.com/?url=https%3A%2F%2Fwww.wsj.com%2Farticles%2Fbiden-oil-gas-ukraine-russia-lng-11644451023&data=04%7C01%7CChristmanJ%40api.org%7C60402904208247b36b5108d9f216f181%7C2df2418fe75f46f0898d65f4eeecb14b%7C0%7C0%7C637807002633824362%7CUnknown%7CTWFpbGZsb3d8eyJWIjoiMC4wLjAwMDAiLCJQIjoiV2luMzIiLCJBTiI6Ik1haWwiLCJXVCI6Mn0%3D%7C3000&sdata=qnwNdCkeTgxMS08%2Bj8Nk5FP8QYtGh50iRgAat69CHk4%3D&reserved=0) wrote that American energy can play a critical role with backing by the right policies in Washington:

#### Republicans will solve climate change and inflation problems with energy legislation.

**Josh Siegel ‘22** (Josh Siegel was a reporter at the Washington Examiner he’s been the lead author of Daily on Energy, “House Republicans to introduce climate change strategy with eye on midterms,” Politico, <https://www.politico.com/news/2022/06/01/house-republicans-to-introduce-climate-change-strategy-with-eye-on-midterms-00036481>, 6/1/2022)

House Republicans are preparing to release a six-part strategy to try to tame surging gasoline prices and to combat climate change that calls for increasing production of all types of energy and sets no greenhouse gas targets. The plan to be released Thursday is the product of an “energy, climate, and conservation task force” created by top House Republican Kevin McCarthy last year that he tasked with devising a policy agenda to address climate change **should Republicans capture the** House in the 2022 **midterm elections**. “We are **creati**ng a clear coherent **energy strategy** that returns the U.S. to an **emissions reduction trajectory** as opposed to what we are seeing under the Biden administration, which is failing every test, whether it be affordability, emissions or security,” Rep. Garret Graves (R-La.), the chair of the 17-member task force, told POLITICO in an exclusive interview previewing the plan. The strategy released by House Republicans contains few new policy ideas and is meant instead to provide a high-level overview of how the party would **address** the challenges of **record-high energy prices worsened by Russia’s war in Ukraine while reducing global emissions**. The strategy is consistent with McCarthy’s effort in recent years to develop the party’s climate change platform and messaging to challenge Democrats and the Biden administration, with an eye toward winning support from young people and suburban voters who polls show are increasingly concerned worried about the issue. The GOP is betting that promoting private sector innovation to curb emissions without targeting fossil fuels that are the biggest source of greenhouse gases will enable the party to win competitive oil and gas producing House districts won by Democrats in 2020. The task force report, shared with POLITICO, contains six pillars: “Unlock America’s Resources,” “Beat China and Russia,” “Let America Build,” “Build Resilient Communities,” “American Innovation” and “Conservation with a Purpose.” Without those themes, Republicans aim to pursue the party’s well-trodden policy ideas such as promoting domestic production and export of “all of the above” energy resources, **including oil and gas, along with zero-carbon technologies such as wind, solar, small modular nuclear reactors, hydrogen and carbon capture**. They also want to streamline permitting to reduce obstacles to **building clean energy** and traditional energy infrastructure, including pipelines, LNG terminals and mines to produce critical minerals. House Republicans say they plan to introduce new legislation next Congress that corresponds to each of the six policy areas should the GOP take control of the chamber. The report, however, is also notable in what it does not include. House Republicans continue to resist setting a specific emissions reduction target. They oppose policies to reduce fossil fuel use, including regulations, taxes, or mandates. And Graves said House Republicans, unlike at least some GOP counterparts in the Senate, are skeptical of the government extending and expanding clean energy tax credits that the renewable industry says are critical to helping them deploy zero-carbon power at the scale needed to address climate change. “Are we open to looking at strategies that nudge technologies to economic sustainability? Yes. But a lot of that can be achieved through R&D partnering with innovators,” said Graves, who represents an oil and gas district experiencing sea level rise and is currently the ranking GOP member of the Democratic-led Select Committee on the Climate Crisis. In leaning too much into fossil fuels to counter Biden’s more aggressive climate agenda, Republicans risk turning off swing voters in states and districts already feeling the effects of climate change, with forecasts predicting a brutal summer for wildfires, extreme heat and drought.

### Impact – Energy Security

#### Energy security key to the hege – both military and economic strength depend on energy independence.

Dan Brouillette ‘21. 15th Secretary of the U.S. Department of Energy. Secretary Brouillette has three decades of experience in both the public and private sector. “Economic and National Security Impacts under a Hydraulic Fracturing Ban: Report to the President”. United States Department of Energy. January 2021. <https://www.energy.gov/sites/prod/files/2021/01/f82/economic-and-national-security-impacts-under-a-hydraulic-fracturing-ban.pdf>, accessed 7-13-2021

The U.S. shale revolution has been the single most significant contributor to enhancing U.S. energy security. As a result of U.S. oil and natural gas production strength and resilience, the U.S. is far less impacted by global oil price shocks, consumers and manufacturers enjoy the benefits of reliable, affordable power, and energy is an important foreign policy tool. Instituting a ban on hydraulic fracturing would introduce several national security uncertainties. Fundamentally, energy security can be defined in a national security context using a three-tiered approach to national security itself. That is, national security as the functionality of military capabilities and security services at the primary level; as the functioning of critical domestic energy supplies and services at the secondary level; and as economic well-being and prosperity at the most removed, longest-term level. 66 A ban of HF would affect all three levels of this national security paradigm. While the ban itself would not directly induce a lessening of the national security posture, it would introduce more uncertainties, requiring additional scenario planning as the U.S. and our allies’ reliance on foreign oil and natural gas would increase. On the most basic level, national security assets are still largely dependent on liquid hydrocarbon fuel sources to power the engines of U.S. military vehicles and technologies. Aircraft require the lion’s-share of these resources, meaning that the bulk of the U.S. military’s forward-projection capabilities are reliant upon affordable and abundant fuel sources. Likewise, ground and sea-based military capabilities (except for nuclear-powered aircraft carriers and submarines) are also dependent on ready access to these fuels. From a training and readiness perspective to power-posture and actual combat operations, maintaining a steady and secure supply of fuels is necessary for the modern military and security apparatus. Activities, such as a ban, that would reduce the secure and reliable domestic source of these fuels would insert uncertainty into the energy supply chain. Beyond the primary level, the safety and reliability of the broader energy supply infrastructure and resources also plays a key role in overall national security. Severe supply disruptions to the overall economy, whether from natural disasters, confrontational tradecraft, or even open hostilities, could result in domestic unrest. There are several potential chokepoints in international trade routes, largely shipping lanes that could be used to cut off fuel supplies to the U.S. economy in the short-to-mid-term. Additionally, and less dramatically, a trade embargo, like the 1970’s OPEC oil embargo, could have a similar effect. While these outcomes would not directly result from a HF ban, increases in reliance on foreign sources of fuel would expose and exacerbate vulnerabilities. Finally, a thriving and growing economy provides the most significant and most enduring bulwark against national security threats. As was stated in the United States Senate’s Global Economic Security Strategy of 2019, “the national security of the United States depends in large part on a vibrant, growing, and secure United States economy;”67 As has been described in detail throughout the report, a potential HF ban is projected to have an impeding effect on overall economic growth, and to ultimately reduce the number of jobs, wages and tax revenues collected. These effects would compound over time, eventually weakening the economy and national security. Enacting a nationwide ban on the technology that has unlocked America’s energy revolution jeopardizes newfound gains in energy security and poses a significant threat to America’s national security. Hydraulic fracturing and horizontal drilling are directly responsible for most domestic oil and natural gas production. Taking away hydraulic fracturing technology from America’s oil and natural gas industry removes the primary technique needed to efficiently and responsibly extract abundant U.S. energy resources. Without new wells brought online, U.S. natural gas and oil production would rapidly fall, reversing the past decade's energy security gains. Importantly, the U.S. would lose its energy independence, and, since demand for reliable, affordable energy would remain, America would again turn to the Middle East and Russia for imports. An important asset in diplomacy would be sidelined and allies across the globe – from Southeast Asia to Europe and South America – would be cut off from a valuable, trusted energy trading partner.

#### US hege solves nuke war.

Thomas **Henricksen 17**. Emeritus senior fellow at the Hoover Institution “Post-American World Order,” Hoover Institution, <http://www.hoover.org/research/post-american-world-order>.

The tensions stoked by the assertive regimes in the Kremlin or Tiananmen Square could **spark a political or military incident** that might set off a chain reaction leading to a **large-scale war**. Historically, powerful rivalries nearly always lead to at least skirmishes, if not a full-blown war. The anomalous Cold War era **spared** the United States and Soviet Russia a direct conflict, largely from concerns that one would trigger a **nuclear exchange destroying** both states and much of **the world**. Such a repetition **might** reoccur in the unfolding three-cornered geopolitical world. It seems safe to acknowledge that an ascendant China and a resurgent Russia will persist in their geo-strategic ambitions. What Is To Be Done? The first marching order is to dodge any kind of perpetual war of the sort that George Orwell outlined in “1984,” which engulfed the three super states of Eastasia, Eurasia, and Oceania, and made possible the totalitarian Big Brother regime. A long-running Cold War-type confrontation would almost certainly take another form than the one that ran from 1945 until the downfall of the Soviet Union. What prescriptions can be offered in the face of the escalating competition among the three global powers? First, by **staying militarily and economically strong**, the United States will have the resources to **deter** its peers’ **hawkish behavior** that might otherwise **trigger** a **major conflict**. Judging by the history of the Cold War, the coming strategic chess match with Russia and China will prove tense and demanding—since **all the countries boast nuclear arms** and long-range ballistic missiles. Next, the United States should widen and sustain willing **coalitions** of **partners**, something at which America excels, and at which China and Russia fail conspicuously. There can be **little room for error** in fraught **crises among nuclear-weaponized** and **hostile powers**. Short- and long-term standoffs are likely, as they were during the Cold War. Thus, the playbook, in part, involves a **waiting game** in which each power looks to its rivals to suffer grievous internal problems which could entail a collapse, as happened to the Soviet Union.

### Key to dem win 2024

#### Loss in midterms key to Dem win in 2024

Bai 6/22(Matt Bai, politics columnist, “Why losing the midterms isn’t the worst thing for Democrats,” The Washington Post, 6/6/22, https://www.washingtonpost.com/opinions/2022/06/06/democrats-losing-midterms-success-2024/)-SL

The good news is that getting blown out in 2022 may well be the **only path** you have **to holding the White House in 2024**. I’m not saying the costs of a Republican takeover in November won’t be steep in the short run. These aren’t the conservative revolutionaries of 1994 or even tea-party types of 2010. This is the mutant-gene version of a Republican uprising, a full-on crazy-eyed dystopian movement of conspiracists and authoritarians. Brace yourself for no end of mindless investigations, assaults on the electoral system and nativist proposals — a virtual “peach tree dish” for paranoia as governance, to quote Rep. [Marjorie Taylor Greene](https://www.washingtonpost.com/food/2022/06/03/lab-meat-politics/?itid=lk_inline_manual_8) (R-Ga.). But everything we know about modern politics suggests that the best way — maybe the **only way** — for a Democrat to be reelected is to also be the last guy standing between the broad American electorate and a whole lot of Republican crazy. There’s a pattern here. After narrowly winning the presidency in 1992, Bill Clinton immediately set about trying to rewrite the social contract and embroiling himself in distracting cultural issues. He became the first Democrat in almost 50 years to [lose control](https://history.house.gov/Institution/Presidents-Coinciding/Party-Government/) of both chambers in the ensuing midterm elections. Clinton [moderated his message](https://www.washingtonpost.com/archive/lifestyle/1995/11/28/how-to-triangulate-an-oval-office/3ecaa027-820c-4e4b-b7e7-e45bf0e584c1/?itid=lk_inline_manual_13) and stared down the new Republican majority over its [shutdown](https://www.washingtonpost.com/history/2021/09/30/1995-government-shutdown-federal-workers/?itid=lk_inline_manual_13) of the federal government. He was reelected easily. Twelve years later, Barack Obama swept into office on another Democratic wave, went on his own government-expansion bender and suffered his own stinging midterm rebuke. **Recast** as the lone bulwark **against Republican radicalism,** Obama was returned to office by a comfortable margin. Biden, similarly, has spent most of the past two years trying to satisfy the ascendant left of his party — the cringy-sounding “Squad” and so forth — in a mostly vain effort to enact some kind of sweeping agenda. The party in charge has spent inordinate amounts of time talking about police reform and college loan forgiveness, while the rest of the country worries far more about rising crime and the [price of gas](https://www.washingtonpost.com/us-policy/2022/06/01/gas-tax-holiday/?itid=lk_inline_manual_16) and groceries. No one at the White House will say this out loud, certainly, but the fact is that **losing control** of the House (and possibly the Senate) in November would instantly **make** the presidency a more manageable job. It would curb the power of the Sanders-Warren wing, freeing Biden to pursue the kind of mainstream liberal agenda — his landmark infrastructure law being a good example — that the voters thought they were getting in the first place. Meanwhile, a newly emboldened Republican majority — like space junk orbiting its Trumpian star — will gravitate even more strongly toward antidemocratic themes of election fraud and intolerance. Like Clinton and Obama before him, Biden will have the chance to **rebrand himself** as the grown-up standing firm against bullies and extremists.

#### Maintaining effective warfighting capabilities key to sustain global peace and prevent extinction

Barnett 11, Former Senior Strategic Researcher and Professor in the Warfare Analysis & Research Department, Center for Naval Warfare Studies, U.S. Naval War College

(Thomas P.M., The New Rules: Leadership Fatigue Puts U.S., and Globalization, at Crossroads, [www.worldpoliticsreview.com/articles/8099/the-new-rules-leadership-fatigue-puts-u-s-and-globalization-at-crossroads](http://www.worldpoliticsreview.com/articles/8099/the-new-rules-leadership-fatigue-puts-u-s-and-globalization-at-crossroads))

Events in Libya are a further reminder for Americans that we stand at a crossroads in our continuing evolution as the world's sole full-service superpower. Unfortunately, we are increasingly seeking change without cost, and shirking from risk because we are tired of the responsibility. We don't know who we are anymore, and our president is a big part of that problem. Instead of leading us, he explains to us. Barack Obama would have us believe that he is practicing strategic patience. But many experts and ordinary citizens alike have concluded that he is actually beset by strategic incoherence -- in effect, a man overmatched by the job. It is worth first examining the larger picture: We live in a time of arguably the greatest structural change in the global order yet endured, with this historical moment's most amazing feature being its relative and absolute lack of mass violence. That is something to consider when Americans contemplate military intervention in Libya, because if we do take the step to prevent larger-scale killing by engaging in some killing of our own, we will not be adding to some fantastically imagined global death count stemming from the ongoing "megalomania" and "evil" of American "empire." We'll be engaging in the same sort of system-administering activity that has marked our stunningly successful stewardship of global order since World War II. Let me be more blunt: As the guardian of globalization, the U.S. military has been the greatest force for peace the world has ever known. Had America been removed from the global dynamics that governed the 20th century, the mass murder never would have ended. Indeed, it's entirely conceivable there would now be no identifiable human civilization left, once nuclear weapons entered the killing equation. But the world did not keep sliding down that path of perpetual war. Instead, America stepped up and changed everything by ushering in our now-perpetual great-power peace. We introduced the international liberal trade order known as globalization and played loyal Leviathan over its spread. What resulted was the collapse of empires, an explosion of democracy, the persistent spread of human rights, the liberation of women, the doubling of life expectancy, a roughly 10-fold increase in adjusted global GDP and a profound and persistent reduction in battle deaths from state-based conflicts. That is what American "hubris" actually delivered. Please remember that the next time some TV pundit sells you the image of "unbridled" American military power as the cause of global disorder instead of its cure. With self-deprecation bordering on self-loathing, we now imagine a post-American world that is anything but. Just watch who scatters and who steps up as the Facebook revolutions erupt across the Arab world. While we might imagine ourselves the status quo power, we remain the world's most vigorously revisionist force. As for the sheer "evil" that is our military-industrial complex, again, let's examine what the world looked like before that establishment reared its ugly head. The last great period of global structural change was the first half of the 20th century, a period that saw a death toll of about 100 million across two world wars. That comes to an average of 2 million deaths a year in a world of approximately 2 billion souls. Today, with far more comprehensive worldwide reporting, researchers report an average of less than 100,000 battle deaths annually in a world fast approaching 7 billion people. Though admittedly crude, these calculations suggest a 90 percent absolute drop and a 99 percent relative drop in deaths due to war. We are clearly headed for a world order characterized by multipolarity, something the American-birthed system was designed to both encourage and accommodate. But given how things turned out the last time we collectively faced such a fluid structure, we would do well to keep U.S. power, in all of its forms, deeply embedded in the geometry to come. To continue the historical survey, after salvaging Western Europe from its half-century of civil war, the U.S. emerged as the progenitor of a new, far more just form of globalization -- one based on actual free trade rather than colonialism. America then successfully replicated globalization further in East Asia over the second half of the 20th century, setting the stage for the Pacific Century now unfolding.

#### Heg solves arms races, land grabs, rogue states, and great power war

Brands 18 [Hal, Henry Kissinger Distinguished Professor at Johns Hopkins University's School of Advanced International Studies and a senior fellow at the Center for Strategic and Budgetary Assessments." American Grand Strategy in the Age of Trump." Page 129-133]

Since World War II, the United States has had a military second to none. Since the Cold War, America has committed to having overwhelming military primacy. The idea, as George W. Bush declared in 2002, that America must possess “strengths beyond challenge” has featured in every major U.S. strategy document for a quarter century; it has also been reflected in concrete terms.6

From the early 1990s, for example, the United States consistently accounted for around 35 to 45 percent of world defense spending and maintained peerless global power-projection capabilities.7 Perhaps more important, U.S. primacy was also unrivaled in key overseas strategic regions—Europe, East Asia, the Middle East. From thrashing Saddam Hussein’s million-man Iraqi military during Operation Desert Storm, to deploying—with impunity—two carrier strike groups off Taiwan during the China-Taiwan crisis of 1995– 96, Washington has been able to project military power superior to anything a regional rival could employ even on its own geopolitical doorstep.

This military dominance has constituted the hard-power backbone of an ambitious global strategy. After the Cold War, U.S. policymakers committed to averting a return to the unstable multipolarity of earlier eras, and to perpetuating the more favorable unipolar order. They committed to building on the successes of the postwar era by further advancing liberal political values and an open international economy, and to suppressing international scourges such as rogue states, nuclear proliferation, and catastrophic terrorism. And because they recognized that military force remained the ultima ratio regum, they understood the centrality of military preponderance.

Washington would need the military power necessary to underwrite worldwide alliance commitments. It would have to preserve substantial overmatch versus any potential great-power rival. It must be able to answer the sharpest challenges to the international system, such as Saddam’s invasion of Kuwait in 1990 or jihadist extremism after 9/11. Finally, because prevailing global norms generally reflect hard-power realities, America would need the superiority to assure that its own values remained ascendant. It was impolitic to say that U.S. strategy and the international order required “strengths beyond challenge,” but it was not at all inaccurate.

American primacy, moreover, was eminently affordable. At the height of the Cold War, the United States spent over 12 percent of GDP on defense. Since the mid-1990s, the number has usually been between 3 and 4 percent.8 In a historically favorable international environment, Washington could enjoy primacy—and its geopolitical fruits—on the cheap.

Yet U.S. strategy also heeded, at least until recently, the fact that there was a limit to how cheaply that primacy could be had. The American military did shrink significantly during the 1990s, but U.S. officials understood that if Washington cut back too far, its primacy would erode to a point where it ceased to deliver its geopolitical benefits. Alliances would lose credibility; the stability of key regions would be eroded; rivals would be emboldened; international crises would go unaddressed. American primacy was thus like a reasonably priced insurance policy. It required nontrivial expenditures, but protected against far costlier outcomes.9 Washington paid its insurance premiums for two decades after the Cold War. But more recently American primacy and strategic solvency have been imperiled.

THE DARKENING HORIZON For most of the post–Cold War era, the international system was— by historical standards—remarkably benign. Dangers existed, and as the terrorist attacks of September 11, 2001, demonstrated, they could manifest with horrific effect. But for two decades after the Soviet collapse, the world was characterized by remarkably low levels of great-power competition, high levels of security in key theaters such as Europe and East Asia, and the comparative weakness of those “rogue” actors—Iran, Iraq, North Korea, al-Qaeda—who most aggressively challenged American power. During the 1990s, some observers even spoke of a “strategic pause,” the idea being that the end of the Cold War had afforded the United States a respite from normal levels of geopolitical danger and competition. Now, however, the strategic horizon is darkening, due to four factors.

First, great-power military competition is back. The world’s two leading authoritarian powers—China and Russia—are seeking regional hegemony, contesting global norms such as nonaggression and freedom of navigation, and developing the military punch to underwrite these ambitions. Notwithstanding severe economic and demographic problems, Russia has conducted a major military modernization emphasizing nuclear weapons, high-end conventional capabilities, and rapid-deployment and special operations forces— and utilized many of these capabilities in conflicts in Ukraine and Syria.10 China, meanwhile, has carried out a buildup of historic proportions, with constant-dollar defense outlays rising from US$26 billion in 1995 to US$226 billion in 2016.11 Ominously, these expenditures have funded development of power-projection and antiaccess/area denial (A2/AD) tools necessary to threaten China’s neighbors and complicate U.S. intervention on their behalf. Washington has grown accustomed to having a generational military lead; Russian and Chinese modernization efforts are now creating a far more competitive environment.

Second, the international outlaws are no longer so weak. North Korea’s conventional forces have atrophied, but it has amassed a growing nuclear arsenal and is developing an intercontinental delivery capability that will soon allow it to threaten not just America’s regional allies but also the continental United States.12 Iran remains a nuclear threshold state, one that continues to develop ballistic missiles and A2/AD capabilities while employing sectarian and proxy forces across the Middle East. The Islamic State, for its part, is headed for defeat, but has displayed military capabilities unprecedented for any terrorist group, and shown that counterterrorism will continue to place significant operational demands on U.S. forces whether in this context or in others. Rogue actors have long preoccupied American planners, but the rogues are now more capable than at any time in decades.

Third, the democratization of technology has allowed more actors to contest American superiority in dangerous ways. The spread of antisatellite and cyberwarfare capabilities; the proliferation of man-portable air defense systems and ballistic missiles; the increasing availability of key elements of the precision-strike complex— these phenomena have had a military leveling effect by giving weaker actors capabilities which were formerly unique to technologically advanced states. As such technologies “proliferate worldwide,” Air Force Chief of Staff General David Goldfein commented in 2016, “the technology and capability gaps between America and our adversaries are closing dangerously fast.”13 Indeed, as these capabilities spread, fourth-generation systems (such as F-15s and F-16s) may provide decreasing utility against even non-great-power competitors, and far more fifth-generation capabilities may be needed to perpetuate American overmatch.

Finally, the number of challenges has multiplied. During the 1990s and early 2000s, Washington faced rogue states and jihadist extremism—but not intense great-power rivalry. America faced conflicts in the Middle East—but East Asia and Europe were comparatively secure. Now, the old threats still exist—but the more permissive conditions have vanished. The United States confronts rogue states, lethal jihadist organizations, and great-power competition; there are severe challenges in all three Eurasian theaters. “I don’t recall a time when we have been confronted with a more diverse array of threats, whether it’s the nation state threats posed by Russia and China and particularly their substantial nuclear capabilities, or non-nation states of the likes of ISIL, Al Qaida, etc.,” Director of National Intelligence James Clapper commented in 2016. Trends in the strategic landscape constituted a veritable “litany of doom.”14 The United States thus faces not just more significant, but also more numerous, challenges to its military dominance than it has for at least a quarter century.
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## Uniqueness Answers

### Dems take Senate Now

#### Non unique - Democrats take the Senate now – key swing states go Democrat

Enten 7-5 (Harry Enten, Senior Data Reporter at CNN, Former Senior Political Writer at FiveThirtyEight, “Here's why Democrats could keep the Senate”, CNN, 7/5/22, <https://www.cnn.com/2022/07/05/politics/democrats-senate-2022-republicans-house/index.html>) - aagg

Don't write off the Senate Democrats just yet Perhaps, the biggest polling shock this past week came from the state of Georgia. A Quinnipiac University poll found Democratic Sen. Raphael Warnock with a 10-point lead over Republican Herschel Walker, 54% to 44%. The result was far better for Warnock than the long-term average for the race (which has either candidate up by a point or two, depending on how the average is calculated). But even the average indicates that Warnock could win, despite Biden's approval rating being well below 40% in the Peach State. The Georgia race is among several in 2020 battleground states that the national environment suggests should be leaning Republicans but polling on the ground suggests otherwise. It's an indication that the outcome for Senate control isn't close to being finalized. The 2022 Senate map is rather small. Of the 35 seats up this cycle, I would categorize less than 10 of them at this point as competitive -- i.e., where each side has a better than 10% chance of winning. A few races could make the difference either way. I base that assessment off a simple data model that looks at state-level polling, national indicators (i.e., the generic congressional ballot and the President's approval rating), the past presidential vote, whether the election was a midterm or not, and expert race ratings (by, say, the Cook Political Report). All told, the model indicates that the most likely outcome is for Republicans to pick up a seat or two. That's enough for a majority, as the GOP needs a net gain of just a seat for control. Considering past errors of the model, it suggests that Republicans have a roughly 3-in-5 shot at winning back the Senate. The reason the model is so high on Senate Democrats compared with what you might expect given the national environment is simple: the state-level polling in swing states. Recent public data has looked surprisingly strong for Democrats in places such as Arizona, Georgia, Nevada, New Hampshire and Pennsylvania.

#### Non UQ - Supreme court deicisons have caused leftist backlash

Cohn 22 [Nate Cohn, NYT Chief Political Analyst ; Published 7/13/2022, New York Times ; <https://www.nytimes.com/2022/07/13/upshot/poll-2022-midterms-congress.html> “Poll shows Tight Race for Control of Congress as Class Divide Widens”; DOA 7/14/22]

Recent unfavorable news for Democrats, in the form of [Supreme Court rulings](https://www.nytimes.com/interactive/2022/06/21/us/major-supreme-court-cases-2022.html), and some tragic news nationally might ordinarily mean trouble for the party in power, but that’s not what the results suggest. The survey began 11 days after the Supreme Court’s decision to overturn Roe v. Wade, when cellphones were still buzzing with news alerts about the mass shooting in Highland Park, Ill. In an open-ended question, those who volunteered that issues related to guns, abortion or the Supreme Court were the most important problem facing the country represented about one in six registered voters combined. Those voters preferred Democratic control of Congress, 68 percent to 8 percent. Some of the hot-button social issues thought to work to the advantage of Republicans at the beginning of the cycle, like critical race theory, have faded from the spotlight. Only 4 percent of voters combined said education, crime or immigration was the most important issue facing the country. The Times/Siena survey is not the first to suggest that the national political environment has improved for Democrats since the Supreme Court overturned Roe. On average, Democrats have gained about three points on the generic congressional ballot [compared](https://fivethirtyeight.com/features/maybe-dobbs-did-change-the-race-well-need-more-time-to-know-for-sure/) with surveys taken beforehand. In the wake of the court’s ruling, the poll finds greater public support for legal abortion than previous Times/Siena surveys. Sixty-five percent of registered voters said abortion should be mostly or always legal, up from 60 percent of registered voters in September 2020. The proportion of voters who opposed the court’s decision — 61 percent — was similar to the share who said they supported Roe v. Wade two years ago. Democrats are maintaining the loyalty of a crucial sliver of predominantly liberal and highly educated voters who disapprove of Mr. Biden’s performance **but care more about debates over guns, democracy and the shrinking of abortion rights than the state of the economy.**

#### Non UQ - Subtle polling trends show Dems are gaining ground after roe, even if republicans are up now trends are in the right direction

Panetta 22 [Alexander Panetta, Washington correspondent for CBC news ; “Will Abortion Upend American Politics? Here’s what the early polling tells us” ; DOA 7/14/22 ; Published by CBC news <https://www.cbc.ca/news/world/abortion-american-politics-early-polls-1.6451553>]

The latest Morning Consult poll, from May 6 to 9, found a sudden tightening of the so-called enthusiasm gap after months of Republicans expressing far greater eagerness to vote this year. It showed that the percentage of Democrats describing themselves as "extremely enthusiastic" about voting this year jumped eight percentage points from two weeks ago**. Younger voters are key:** They're especially supportive of abortion access, and their level of enthusiasm increased in the latest Morning Consult poll. Last month, Republicans held a more daunting advantage, with their voters 12 percentage points more likely to call themselves extremely enthusiastic, compared with seven points now. And respondents across different surveys were also more likely to describe abortion as a top issue for them in determining their vote this fall. "It could be a leading indicator of something," said Kathy Frankovic, a representative of the YouGov firm. "There are some inklings that things could be changing. But we really need to wait." There are such inklings in different polls. The Monmouth University Polling Institute says abortion [has surged to the top tier of issues](https://www.monmouth.edu/polling-institute/reports/monmouthpoll_US_051222/) voters find important, suddenly ranking alongside the economy and ahead of other topics. The same pollster says [opinion](https://twitter.com/emmakinery/status/1524407525415739395?s=21&t=qCsHr1fsKEvSH2XyaQJ44A) of the Supreme Court has plunged. There are other data points telling a similar, albeit subtle, story. YouGov finds abortion still ranking as far less important than the economy, but it's climbed up the priority list, particularly for Democrats — going from the top priority of just two per cent of Democratic voters to 10 per cent. "That's [a] pretty big shift," Frankovic said. That's why Easley offers three caveats to his broader takeaway that the current numbers don't look promising for Democrats. His first caveat is that sudden burst of passion. That's a shift, with the wobbling economy and their party struggling to pass signature promises through Congress. Of the looming abortion fight, Easley said: "It has revved up Democratic intensity a little bit." His second caveat? Even a small shift in public opinion could make a difference in one or two close Senate races, and that could decide who controls that powerful chamberThen there's his third and final caveat: that nothing has happened yet

### Thumper – Trump

#### Trump will enter the race – guarantees Dems win.

**Drucker 6/19** (David, senior political correspondent for the Washington Examiner, previously reported for CQ Roll Call and the Los Angeles Daily News, “Trump 2024 launch before November midterm elections could become a problem for GOP,” Washington Examiner, 6/19/2022, <https://www.washingtonexaminer.com/news/campaigns/trump-2024-launch-november-midterm-problem-gop)-> cjtz

Top Republicans are keeping a wary eye on Donald Trump, worried the former president might announce a 2024 bid before Election Day this year, distracting voters from President Joe Biden’s embattled leadership and galvanizing Democratic turnout. With speculation rising that Trump could declare for president before the midterm elections to box out GOP competitors, some Republican strategists and party insiders are anxious. They fret the move would transform a referendum on Biden poised to generate a massive Republican electoral wave on Nov. 8 into a more evenhanded debate between the president, reeling from skyrocketing inflation and myriad crises, and his polarizing predecessor. The fear is not so much that Trump’s direct injection into the midterm campaign turns Biden into a popular president and makes 2022 a Democratic year. Rather, Republicans are concerned the 45th president’s early candidacy would dilute Republican messaging focused on Biden and boost moribund Democratic enthusiasm, shrinking the size of the red wave in a manner that tempers GOP gains in the House and Senate. “Trump being front and center could affect GOP gains in the House by five seats or so,” said Jeff Burton, a Republican strategist in Austin, Texas. “But it could really affect the Senate, which could end up 50/50 again based on how the seats are looking.” “Anything, and I mean anything, that takes the focus off the miserable job Joe Biden is doing is bad for Republicans,” added Josh Holmes, former chief of staff to Senate Minority Leader Mitch McConnell (R-KY) and co-host of Ruthless, a podcast popular among conservatives. Earlier this month, NBC News reported Trump was mulling whether to announce a 2024 bid this summer. Traditionally, Democrats and Republicans planning to run for president wait for the midterm elections to conclude before making overt moves to build their operation, let alone launch a campaign. But the former president’s considerations of an early reveal are based at least in part on a desire to preserve his advantage over multiple other Republicans preparing to run. Despite Trump’s popularity with grassroots Republicans, he would face competition in the 2024 primary. Prominent Republicans who are signaling Trump’s entry into the contest would not preclude them from running include his former running mate, former Vice President Mike Pence; his former secretary of state, Mike Pompeo; and a political ally, Sen. Tom Cotton (R-AR) — among others who are traveling to key early primary states and taking steps to mount White House bids. For Republican politicians and operatives fixated on the election at hand, Trump running for president is not necessarily concerning, versus when he announces. They want a clean shot at Biden and Democrats in Congress so that they have the best opportunity to run up the score and win governing majorities. The Democrats are defending a five-seat House majority. Their Senate advantage rests on Vice President Kamala Harris’s tiebreaking vote. “It would not be in the president’s best interest to launch his campaign that early — and it would definitely be a distraction [in terms of] the midterm elections,” one House Republican said, requesting anonymity to speak critically of Trump. Republicans are hoping the allure of taking credit for a big Republican victory in the midterm elections will forestall an early 2024 announcement. “If Trump is smart, he will get that and declare victory for the largest possible win after it happens,” said a Republican strategist advising several candidates on the 2022 ballot. “The problem is that all Republican candidates would suddenly have to answer a new question — and they’d all prefer to only be talking about Joe Biden," this strategist added. "We need an election that’s a pure plebiscite on Biden’s job approval, an election in which the conversation is about Biden and Biden alone.” With Biden’s job approval ratings cratering at just under 40% and Republicans leading Democrats on the generic ballot 46.4% to 43%, Republicans are positioned for significant gains this fall in Congress and contests for office at the state and local levels.

### Thumper – Inflation

#### Inflation thumps – Foreign policy is nowhere near top issues for voters, even in “Democratic Favorable” agenda

Fingerhut 7-8 (Hannah Fingerhut, Senior writer at the Associate Press, editor at PBS, “Inflation, personal expenses rise sharply as election priorities, poll suggests”, PBS, 7/8/22, <https://www.pbs.org/newshour/politics/inflation-personal-expenses-rise-sharply-as-election-priorities-poll-suggests>) – aagg

Concerns about inflation and personal finances have surged while COVID has evaporated as a top issue for Americans, a new poll shows, marking an upheaval in priorities just months before critical midterm elections. Forty percent of U.S. adults specifically name inflation in an open-ended question as one of up to five priorities for the government to work on in the next year, according to a June poll from The Associated Press-NORC Center for Public Affairs Research. That’s a sharp rise from 14 percent in December and less than 1 percent the year prior. In all, 77 percent mention the economy in any way, up from 68 percent in December. But just 10 percent specifically mention jobs or unemployment, as U.S. employers continue to hire despite high inflation and weak economic growth. Now, too, Americans increasingly call their personal finances a major issue: 44 percent mention it, up from 24 percent in December and 12 percent the year before. That includes more mentioning gas or energy prices (33 percent now vs. 10 percent in December) and food costs (9 percent vs. less than 1 percent). Those shifts may be advantageous to Republicans as they campaign to win control of Congress in this year’s midterms; the economy has increasingly been a sore subject for President Joe Biden. Still, the economy isn’t the only issue getting more attention this year. Many also prioritize issues that are core to Biden and Democrats’ agenda, including abortion, women’s rights and gun policy, which could help Democrats as they try to pad — or at least protect — their razor-thin majority.

#### Nothing can change perception of inflation.

Rappeport 7/14/22 [Alan Rappeport is an economic policy reporter at The New York Times, based in Washington. He covers the Treasury Department and writes about taxes, trade and fiscal matters. Mr. Rappeport has master’s degrees from the London School of Economics and the Columbia University Graduate School of Journalism. He has a bachelor’s degree from Emory University.https://www.nytimes.com/2022/07/14/us/politics/democrats-republicans-inflation-midterms.html] CB

WASHINGTON — Triple-digit gasoline bills. Bulging hamburger prices. A Fourth of July holiday that broke the bank. **Prices are rising** at the fastest rate in four decades, a painful development that has **given Republicans a powerful** talking point just months **ahead of the midterm election**s. With control of Congress very much in play, Republicans are investing heavily in a blitz of campaign advertisements that portray a dark sense of economic disarray as they seek to make inflation a political albatross for President Biden and Democrats. According to Kantar’s Campaign Media Analysis Group, candidates running in House, Senate and governor races around the country have spent nearly $22 million airing about 130,000 local and national television ads that mention inflation from early April through the beginning of July. Inflation was the 10th most common issue mentioned by Democrats and 11th most common for Republicans, according to the data, underscoring how critical the issue is to both parties this election cycle. ADVERTISEMENT Continue reading the main story The data released Wednesday showing that prices in June climbed 9.1 percent over the past year gave Republicans fresh ammunition against Mr. Biden and his party, ammunition that includes faulting Democrats for passing a $1.9 trillion stimulus package last year and efforts to push through additional spending in a sweeping climate and economic package known as “Build Back Better.” The **intensifying focus on inflation is already weighing on Mr. Biden’s poll number**s. A New York Times/Siena College poll this week showed his approval at a meager 33 percent, with 20 percent of voters viewing jobs and the economy as the most important problem facing the country. Inflation and the cost of living followed closely behind. The poll also showed that the race for control of Congress is surprisingly tight. While gas prices have fallen from their $5 a gallon peak and there are signs that inflation might be slowing, consumers are unlikely to feel better off anytime soon. Gas prices are still much higher than they were a year ago, with the average national price for a gallon at $4.60 versus $3.15 in 2021, according to AAA. Image Voters view jobs and the economy as among the most important issues facing the country. Voters view jobs and the economy as among the most important issues facing the country.Credit...Hiroko Masuike/The New York Times “It’s a very negative thing politically for the Democrats,” said Jason Furman, an economist at Harvard University and former Obama administration economic adviser. “My guess is that the negative views about inflation are so deeply baked in that nothing can change in the next few months to change them.” The White House, while acknowledging the pain that inflation is causing, has tried to deflect responsibility, saying that it is a global problem and attributing it to shortages of food and oil stemming from Russian President Vladimir V. Putin’s invasion of Ukraine. On Wednesday, Mr. Biden called the latest Consumer Price Index “out-of-date” given the recent fall in gas prices and said the data “is a reminder that all major economies are battling this Covid-related challenge, made worse by Putin’s unconscionable aggression.” 8 Signs That the Economy Is Losing Steam Retail sales. The latest report from the Commerce Department showed that retail sales fell 0.3 percent in May, and rose less in April than initially believed. Consumer confidence. In June, the University of Michigan’s survey of consumer sentiment hit its lowest level in its 70-year history, with nearly half of respondents saying inflation is eroding their standard of living. The housing market. Demand for real estate has decreased, and construction of new homes is slowing. These trends could continue as interest rates rise, and real estate companies, including Compass and Redfin, have laid off employees in anticipation of a downturn in the housing market. Start-up funding. Investments in start-ups have declined to their lowest level since 2019, dropping 23 percent over the last three months, to $62.3 billion. The stock market. The S&P 500 had its worst first half of a year since 1970, and it is down nearly 19 percent since January. Every sector of the index beyond energy is down from the beginning of the year. Copper. A commodity seen by analysts as a measure of sentiment about the global economy — because of its widespread use in buildings, cars and other products — copper is down more than 20 percent since January, hitting a 17-month low on July 1. Oil. Crude prices are up this year, in part because of supply constraints resulting from Russia’s invasion of Ukraine, but they have recently started to waver as investors worry about growth. The bond market. Long-term interest rates in government bonds have fallen below short-term rates, an unusual occurrence that traders call a yield-curve inversion. It suggests that bond investors are expecting an economic slowdown. However, Treasury Secretary Janet L. Yellen has acknowledged that the pandemic aid package contributed to inflation by spurring demand in the economy. Last month, she admitted that she was “wrong” to describe price increases as “transitory.” **Republicans have latched** **on to that as proof that** Democrats and **the Biden administration misled voters** **and** mishandled the economy and to claim — despite a strong labor market and other signs of economic health — **that the nation is on the verge of economic collapse**. An ad funded by One Nation, a nonprofit group aligned with Senate Minority Leader Mitch McConnell of Kentucky, links rising prices to the $1.9 trillion American Rescue Plan that Democrats passed last year. The ad is aimed at Senator Mark Kelly, Democrat of Arizona, and describes him as the “deciding vote” for the bill that passed the Senate 50 to 49 with no Republican “Their spending spree worsened inflation,” the narrator said as images of a gas station and grocery store flashed across the screen. Clips of empty food shelves and a gas station pump meter ticking higher are the backdrop for an ad supporting Ohio Gov. Mike DeWine, a Republican. The TV ad opens with a pointed critique of the president’s handling of the economy: “Joe Biden’s inflation is crushing Americans.” The National Republican Congressional Committee highlighted the soaring sticker prices of hamburgers, buns, propane and gasoline in an ad assailing Representative Dina Titus, a Nevada Democrat, who is running against Mark Robertson, a Republican who is an Army veteran and a business owner. “Democrats’ harmful economic policies are making everything more expensive, and there’s no end in sight,” the narrator said as images of Ms. Titus and Mr. Biden appeared before a backdrop of $100 bills.

### Thumper – Laundry List

#### Voter’s don’t care about Russia anymore – less then 1% cited it as an important problem to the US

Gallup 6/22 (Gallup Inc, a global analytics and advice firm that helps leaders and organizations solve their most pressing problems, “Most Important Problem”, Gallup Inc, 6/22/2022, <https://news.gallup.com/poll/1675/Most-Important-Problem.aspx>) - aagg

What do you think is the most important problem facing the country today?

Recent trend

Jun 22 May 22 Apr 22 Mar 22 Feb 22

%

%

%

%

%

ECONOMIC PROBLEMS (NET) 40 37 39 35 30

High cost of living/Inflation 18 18 17 17 10

Economy in general 13 12 12 11 11

Fuel/Oil prices 5 3 6 4 1

Lack of money 1 1 \* 1 1

Unemployment/Jobs 1 1 2 1 2

Federal budget deficit/Federal debt 1 1 1 1 2

Recession 1 \* \* -- --

Gap between rich and poor 1 1 2 2 2

Foreign trade/Trade deficit \* \* \* -- --

Wage issues \* 1 1 \* \*

Taxes \* \* 1 \* 1

NON-ECONOMIC PROBLEMS (NET) 66 68 67 68 72

The government/Poor leadership 18 19 20 22 20

Guns/Gun control 8 1 1 \* 1

Crime/Violence 6 4 2 1 3

Immigration 5 8 7 5 8

Unifying the country 5 5 4 5 6

Ethics/moral/religious/family decline 4 3 2 2 2

Race relations/Racism 3 6 4 5 4

Poverty/Hunger/Homelessness 3 2 3 3 3

School shootings 2 -- -- -- --

Judicial system/Courts/Laws 2 2 2 2 4

Environment/Pollution/Climate change 2 2 2 2 2

Healthcare 2 3 4 3 3

Energy/Lack of energy sources 2 1 3 3 \*

Education 1 2 1 1 2

Coronavirus/Diseases 1 2 4 3 13

Lack of respect for each other 1 3 2 1 2

Foreign policy/Foreign aid/Focus overseas 1 2 1 2 1

Abortion 1 5 1 -- \*

Elections/Election reform 1 \* 1 1 \*

Welfare 1 1 -- \* \*

Situation with Russia 1 3 5 9 2

### Thumper – Roe v Wade

#### Overturning of Roe V Wade has change Rep political agenda and deterred them away from the midterm elections

Alex seitz-wald & Jonathanallen7/6/22 **[**Political Reporter at NBC News and MSNBC Washington, District of Columbia, United States500+ connections <https://www.nbcnews.com/politics/2022-election/abortion-politics-complicate-republican-midterm-message-voters-rcna36851>] CB

WASHINGTON — Republicans are torn between their policy goals and political ones in the wake of the Supreme Court’s ruling overturning Roe v. Wade, with activists’ rush to capitalize on the ruling running into the political reality that abortion rights remain popular in many of this year's midterm battlegrounds. “I don’t think this alters the midterm advantage for Republicans because of Biden’s economic woes,” said former Virginia Republican Rep. Tom Davis. “But **in a cycle that is all about turnout, it is a net benefit for Democrats. Angry voters vote**.” For months, all signs have been pointing to a landslide victory in November for Republicans. But some in the GOP now worry that even if they retake the House and make overall gains, **abortion politics could cost them a handful of key races** — and with a 50-50 Senate, every race matters. Democrats call for more action on gun safety after Highland Park mass shooting JULY 6, 202203:54 “This a massive gift to the Democrats and one they could not have conjured up for themselves,” said veteran GOP strategist Mike Madrid, noting the portion of Americans saying they want Democrats in control of Congress has risen in polls taken since the decision. “With inflation as high as it is, for the first time I think it’s a jump ball. The Democrats are now back in it.” “If I were a betting man,” Madrid added. “I would say Republicans pick up a majority, but maybe it’s not as big as it could or should be.” GOP candidates in key battleground states want to focus on inflation and make the election a referendum on an unpopular president, but that may be complicated now that conservative officials are rushing to outlaw abortion in many states, finally given the chance to do so after decades of trying.

#### With the overturning of Roe V wade the Democrats are capitalizing from the publics discontent and making it the main model of their midterm campaign

Julia Manchester 6/25/22[Political Reporter at The Hill, Master's degree in political science from American University's School of Public Affairs. <https://thehill.com/homenews/campaign/3536409-roe-v-wade-ruling-injects-new-urgency-into-midterms-for-democrats> CB]

The Supreme Court’s **decision to overturn Roe v. Wade** catapulted the issue of abortion rights directly into the midterms campaign on Friday, with **Democrats seeking to put the issue front and center**. Democratic candidates up and down the ballot issued their reactions in a slew of statements following the decision, while the party’s national campaign apparatus rolled out a website designed to “help voters channel anger into action and organize with local coordinated field campaigns.” While issues like rising inflation, crime and the flow of migrants over the U.S. southern border have dominated campaign rhetoric on the GOP side, **Democrats are hoping to use the high court’s decision to galvanize their own bases.** “This fall, Roe is on the ballot. The right to privacy is on the ballot,” President Biden said at a press conference following the decision’s release on Friday. Democrats and abortion rights advocates point to what they say is conservatives’ goal to ban abortion nationwide. “They won’t give up unless voters stop them. The stakes in November’s midterm elections are higher than ever for reproductive health and rights, including abortion,” Planned Parenthood said in a statement on Friday. In swing states and districts across the country**, Democratic candidates** rolled out their own statements hitting **their Republican opponents over the issue**. In Wisconsin, Senate candidate and Lt. Gov. Mandela Barnes (D) called for the filibuster to be abolished so Roe could be “the law of the land.” Fellow Wisconsin Democratic Senate candidate Alex Lasry also called for the filibuster to be abolished, accusing Republicans of “embracing extremism.” In Pennsylvania, Democratic Senate nominee and Lt. Gov. John Fetterman (D) drew a clear contrast with his Republican opponent Mehmet Oz on the issue. “I will protect abortion rights. Dr. Oz will take them away. It’s that simple,” Fetterman said. In Texas, which has an abortion trigger law that will go into effect within the next month, Democratic gubernatorial candidate Beto O’Rourke released a video calling for voters to support his campaign amid news of the ruling. “We have to focus on the way in which we are going to overcome this,” O’Rourke said. “The only way to do this is to win political power.” At the House level, Democratic candidates and incumbents also issued reactions leaning into the issue. Incumbent Rep. Elaine Luria (D-Va.), who is facing a contentious election bid in the commonwealth’s 2nd Congressional District, condemned the decision along with Gov. Glenn Youngkin’s (R) announcement that he will seek a 15-week abortion ban following the decision. “And there it is,” Luria tweeted. “Republicans in Virginia have a plan to remove existing protections for women to make decisions about their body.” In Texas’s 15th Congressional District, Democratic nominee Michelle Vallejo released a statement calling for Roe v. Wade to be codified into law. “**We need representa**tives that will codify Roe V. Wade and **advocate every single day for our right to choose**,” Vallejo. “I will do everything in my power as the next congresswoman from TX15 to be a champion for Texas women and families.” The issue is also poised to play a role in competitive state legislature races, like in Michigan, Arizona, Pennsylvania, Texas, Georgia and North Carolina. “**Republican** majorities in these state legislatures are in for a **rude awakening** **when they start taking away people’s rights**,” said Vicky Hausman, co-founder of Forward Majority, a Democratic group that works elect Democrats to state legislatures. “We see a great deal of outrage driven by this decision and that outrage is happening exactly where Democrats need to be winning in these key districts that present a path to a majority in state legislatures,” she continued. Former Vice President Mike Pence seemed to confirm those concerns when he called for a nationwide abortion ban on Friday. “Having been given this second chance for Life, we must not rest and must not relent until the sanctity of life is restored to the center of American law in every state in the land,” Pence said in a tweet. Republican National Committee Chairwoman Ronna McDaniel also rolled out a statement exclaiming “Life wins!” “As this debate now returns to the states and the American people, we know there is still much work ahead. Republicans will continue to advocate for life, uphold the law, and stand against an extreme Democrat Party’s pro-abortion agenda,” McDaniel said. However, other Republicans are signaling they intend to stay laser-focused on their messaging regarding inflation, crime and the border. “Today’s Supreme Court ruling returns the issue of abortion to the states and allows voters to decide whether they agree with Democrats’ extreme support for taxpayer-funded late term abortion,” said Samantha Bullock, spokeswoman for the National Republican Congressional Campaign Committee. “This ruling does nothing to change the fact that voters’ top concerns are rising prices, soaring crime, and the disaster at the southern border,” she continued. Pennsylvania Republican gubernatorial nominee Doug Mastriano downplayed the ruling, saying in a statement that Democrats want to use the Supreme Court’s decision on Roe to distract voters from issues that matter more to them. “People in this area and in my part of the state across the border here are struggling to make ends meet and they don’t care about those issues over there,” Mastriano, who’s up against Democrat Josh Shapiro, said. “They want to have security. They want crime to be down. They want to be able to put food on the table and gas in their cars.” Democrats say they are keenly aware of the role other issues, like inflation, are playing in campaign discourse, but argue that abortion access is an economic and health care issue. “We can walk and chew gum at the same time,” said Nevada Attorney General Aaron Ford (D), who also serves as co-chair of the Democratic Attorneys General association. “This is an important issue. It is not something that takes second seed to any of the other issues and nor do other issues take second seed to this.” **Anti-abortio**n organizations are signaling they want to play a **leading role in the midterms**. On Thursday, the conservative anti-abortion group Susan B. Anthony Pro-Life America launched a $2 million digital ad buy in Arizona, Georgia, Florida, Michigan, North Carolina, Nevada, Pennsylvania and Wisconsin for two weeks. “This is going to be hugely mobilizing for pro-life Americans, who have now seen the fruition of their past political engagement, especially the last 10 years when we’ve focused heavily on Senate races and the White House to give us this court,” said Mallory Carroll, vice president of communications at Susan B. Anthony Pro-Life America. The Hill’s Morning Report — Biden leaves Jan. 6 behind with high-stakes Middle East trip The Memo: Jan. 6 panel looks to build on big Hutchinson moment “We’re talking to pro-life Americans, who don’t always vote in non-presidential election years, and people we’ve identified as being persuadable, so the infamous women in the suburbs, Hispanic voters, Black voters [and] traditional Democratic voting groups,” she continued. But Democrats and abortion rights groups are pouring in money as well. In April, the Planned Parenthood Federation of America and Planned Parenthood Action Fund announced a $16 million paid media campaign “to educate and increase urgency around the abortion access crisis facing the country.” “This is more than a Democratic issue,” Ford said. “You have several folks who are Republicans and Independents who support a right to an abortion and who I think will be concerned about the fact that the Supreme Court has now for the first time in our country removed a constitutional right.”

#### Roe v Wade is a winning point for Dems but no momentum for GOP voters

Enten 7/10 [Harry Enten is a Senior Data Reporter and the host of CNN's "Margins of Error" podcast, where he specializes in data-driven journalism. CNN – “Democrats get bounce in polls after Roe v. Wade is overturned,” July 10, 2022 <https://www.cnn.com/2022/07/10/politics/democrats-polls-abortion-biden-boris-johnson/index.html>] Webb

Multiple polls conducted since the Supreme Court's ruling overturning Roe v. Wade find that **broad majorities of the public disapprove** and suggest that in the immediate aftermath **of the ruling**, the decision could be more motivational for Democrats than Republicans. In a new Monmouth University survey released on Tuesday, 60% of US adults disapprove of the Supreme Court's decision to overturn Roe v. Wade, with just 37% approving. There's also a significant intensity gap: 53% of Americans strongly disapprove of the ruling, including 84% of Democrats, compared with 29% who strongly approve, including 58% of Republicans. That's similar to the finding of two other polls conducted after the ruling: an NPR/PBS NewsHour/Marist survey (56% of US adults oppose the court's decision, 40% support it) and a CBS News/YouGov survey (59% of US adults disapprove, 41% approve). In the CBS/YouGov survey, 52% overall call the decision a step backward for America, compared with 31% who see it as a step forward. In that poll, 51% also say it will make the lives of most American women worse, compared with 18% who say it will make their lives better. Democrats are more apt to call it a step backward (77%) than Republicans are to say it's a step forward (64%), and while three-quarters of Democrats say it will make life for American women worse (76%), only 33% of Republicans see the ruling as making life better for American women. Just shy of half of US adults, 46%, say it would bother them a lot if abortion were banned in certain states, according to the Monmouth poll, with Democrats 60 percentage points more likely than Republicans to say they would be bothered a lot, 78% vs. 18%. An 85% majority overall say that any such state bans should include exceptions in cases of rape, incest, or when the life of the mother is at risk; 72% say it would bother them a lot of state abortion bans did not include such exceptions. It's still too early to draw strong conclusions about what effect the decision might have on the outcome of the midterm elections. Future polling will show whether the ruling leads to significant and lasting changes either on which party voters prefer, or on which side's voters are more likely to turn out. Most Democrats in the CBS/YouGov poll report that the decision left them feeling upset (78%) and angry (72%), while a somewhat smaller majority of Republicans describe themselves as happy (60%). Half (50%) of Democrats said in the CBS/YouGov poll that the decision makes them more likely to vote in the midterms, compared with just 20% of Republicans who said the same. While this question does not provide an accurate gauge of actual shifts in voters' intention to turn out, it suggests that Democrats are currently more likely than Republicans to consider the Supreme Court's decision a good reason for voting later this year.

### No Link Uniqueness

#### Non-Unique: Working with Ukraine on cybersecurity now.

Baksh 22, 2-1-2022, Mariam Baksh, reporter on federal cyber security, "The U.S. is Working to Improve Ukraine's Cyber Defenses in the Face of Russian Threat" NextGov, <https://www.nextgov.com/cybersecurity/2022/02/us-working-improve-ukraines-cyber-defenses-face-russian-threat/361456/-> RayS

Deputy National Security Advisor for Cyber and Emerging Tech Anne Neuberger will meet with European allies this week as part of an effort to shore up Ukrainian cyber defenses in case of an attack from Russia. “We have been working closely with Ukrainians to harden their defenses, and we will continue to do so in the days ahead,” senior administration officials told reporters Tuesday. “That being said, significant improvements in resilience don’t happen in weeks, and we are realistic about what we can achieve, and also [are] focused on ensuring we have incident response capacity available to them, if needed. The [National Security Council] has been talking to various European counterparts to coordinate that.” The officials said Neuberger will first travel to Brussels to meet with European Union counterparts and members of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization and then also head to Warsaw to meet with eastern flank NATO members. The effort is coming just weeks after White House officials credited diplomatic channels it established with Russia for the arrest of an individual they believe was responsible for attacking Colonial Pipeline. At the time, the administration said they had not attributed a cyberattack on Ukrainian government websites to Russia. On Monday, officials from Russia and the U.S. publicly squared off over Ukraine’s autonomy in a heated exchange during a U.N. Security Council meeting and western allies are on edge for cyber offenses that they warn could have targets outside Ukraine. “Across all of these engagements, our focus is on ensuring that the United States and our Allies and partners are prepared for any cyber-related contingency and prepared to respond in the current environment,” the senior administration officials said Tuesday. “We will also discuss how we will coordinate and support Ukraine, and each other, in the event that cyberattacks occur.”

### Republicans Lose Key States Now

#### Republicans lose Arizona now --- abortion restrictions unpopular

Bolton 22 (Alexander Bolton is a Staff Writer at The Hill, 06/29/2022, accessed 07/14/2022, The Hill, “The Senate races that could be impacted by end of Roe v. Wade”, <https://thehill.com/homenews/senate/3540603-the-senate-races-that-could-be-impacted-by-end-of-roe-v-wade/>)RMazhankou

Arizona The three leading Republican candidates running to challenge incumbent Sen. Mark Kelly (D) have supported the court’s reversal of Roe v. Wade, giving Democrats ammo in the fall. Arizona has a law dating back to 1901 banning abortion unless one is needed to save the life of a mother. And Gov. Doug Ducey (R) signed a law in March banning abortion after 15 weeks, creating some confusion over which law would take precedent. Pro-abortion rights protesters held rallies in Phoenix, Flagstaff and Tucson after the court handed down its decision in Dobbs. Police fired tear gas at protesters outside the fenced-off state Capitol in Phoenix. A poll by OH Predictive Insights of more than 900 registered Arizona voters in May found that 41 percent said abortion should be legal under any circumstance, 46 percent said it should be legal in certain circumstances and 13 percent said it should be illegal in all circumstances. Three in 5 Arizona voters said they would be very or somewhat impacted by a candidate’s stance on abortion.

#### Republicans lose Georgia now

Lemon 07/14 (Jason Lemon is a journalist and writer focusing primarily on U.S. political news as well as cultural and religious topics that intersect with politics, 07/14/2022, accessed 07/14/2022, *Newsweek*, “Raphael Warnock Beats Herschel Walker Among Georgia Independents: New Poll”, https://www.newsweek.com/raphael-warnock-beats-herschel-walker-among-georgia-independents-new-poll-1724732)RMazhankou

Democratic Senator Raphael Warnock leads his Republican opponent Herschel Walker among Georgia's independent voters as well as among the state's voters overall in a new poll—suggesting that the incumbent is **well positioned** to maintain his seat in November's election. In January 2021, Warnock narrowly defeated GOP Senator Kelly Loeffler in a special runoff election, helping Democrats flip the Senate blue. As the legislative chamber remains evenly split, with Vice President Kamala Harris holding the power to cast tie-breaking votes, Warnock losing his seat in November without Democrats simultaneously picking up another would shift control of the Senate back to the Republicans. New polling carried out by AARP from July 5 to 11 showed Warnock **ahead** with independent voters in Georgia as well as with the state's electorate overall. In the survey, Warnock had the support of 48 percent of independent voters, compared with 45 percent who said they'd back Walker, a former football star who has been endorsed by former President Donald Trump. That's **a 3-point lead** for the incumbent Democrat among independents in Georgia. Herschel Walker and Raphael Warnock Republican Senate candidate Herschel Walker is trailing Democratic Senator Raphael Warnock among Georgia's independent voters and the state's voters overall, according to new polling. Above left, Walker waves to fans as he walks onstage during pre-race ceremonies at a NASCAR event on July 10 in Hampton, Georgia. Above right, Warnock attends a Morehouse College event on February 19 in Atlanta. Similarly, Warnock led by 3 points among voters overall. The Democrat had the backing of 50 percent of all likely voters, compared with 47 percent who supported Walker. The poll surveyed 1,197 voters. A late-June poll by Quinnipiac University showed Warnock with a substantially wider lead. In that survey, the senator received support from 54 percent of registered voters and Walker garnered the backing of just 44 percent—**a difference of 10 points**. That poll surveyed 1,497 voters and has a margin of error of plus or minus 2.5 points. The current Real Clear Politics average of Georgia polls, which takes into account data from January through late June, shows a close race, however. Warnock narrowly leads by about 1.6 percent. The senator has the support of about 47.8 percent of Georgians, and Walker is backed by about 46.2 percent. Warnock won his seat in 2021 with 51 percent of the vote to Loeffler's 49 percent. Just ahead of that runoff, President Joe Biden became the first Democratic presidential candidate to win in Georgia since 1992, beating Trump by less than 12,000 votes. Democrats aim to maintain their **momentum** in Georgia in the 2022 midterm election. Meanwhile, Republicans hope to win back Warnock's seat and get back control of the Senate.

### Can’t Predict

#### Too early to predict midterms

Morini 22 (Marco Morini, Professor of Political Science, “The road to the midterm elections: still a blurred picture,” Aspenia Online international analysis and commentary, 5/31/22, https://aspeniaonline.it/the-road-to-the-midterm-elections-still-a-blurred-picture/)-SL

Historically, the president’s party loses votes in midterm elections. For instance, in the 19 midterms between 1946 and 2018, the president’s party gained in the share of the House popular vote just once. The notable exception happened in 2002 when Republicans won the popular vote by 4.6 points, 4.3 points higher than four years earlier. But the context of that midterm election was highly unusual: it was just one year after 9/11 and President George W. Bush was still extraordinarily popular. The results of the Virginia and New Jersey gubernatorial elections last year and the current low approval rating of President Biden may also suggest that a “red wave” is coming in November. However, it is not only bad news for Democrats. In the 35 races for the Senate, 21 seats are currently occupied by Republicans and only 14 by the Democratic Party. Moreover, six Republican senators will not seek re-election: Shelby (Alabama), Blunt (Missouri), Burr (North Carolina), Portman (Ohio), Inhofe (Oklahoma), and Toomey (Pennsylvania); while only one Democrat, Patrick Leahy (Vermont) retired. In total, 15 Republicans and 13 Democrats are running for re-election. Crucially, in contrast to 2018, when Democrats were defending 10 seats in states that Donald Trump won in 2016, Democrats are holding no seats in any state that was won by Trump in 2020. Meanwhile, Republicans are defending two seats (Pennsylvania and Wisconsin) in states that Biden won in 2020, compared to just one seat (Nevada won by Hillary Clinton in 2016) that was up for election in the 2018 cycle. Primary elections with no current senators running are ongoing; however, the real “battle” for the Senate majority seems to be concentrated in five key states: Arizona, Georgia, Nevada, Pennsylvania and Wisconsin. Republicans are targeting the first three states, where incumbent Democrats are fighting for a difficult re-election; the Democratic Party has a significant chance of winning the last two, where the GOP will try to keep its seats in states where Biden narrowly prevailed in 2020. For the House election, the picture is still quite blurred. Many primaries are still to be held and at least 49 representatives (as of 25 May 2022) have announced that they will be retiring (31 Democrats, 18 Republicans). One additional complication is that since these elections will be the first conducted after the post-2020 census redistricting, several districts may lack an incumbent or might even have multiple incumbents. The general prediction is that Republicans have a high chance of taking control of the House after six years of Democratic majorities. However, in current politics, six months are an eternity: inflation, war in Ukraine and the COVID-19 pandemic may be very different from what they are now, and Biden’s approval ratings are already providing signs of revival. After reaching a record-low 41% of positive views in February, three months later the RealClearPolitics average favorability rating positions him three points up, with a general impression that his administration’s reaction to the Russian invasion is starting to pay off in terms of popularity.

## Link Answers

### No Links

#### No link – Voters don’t care about foreign policy, won’t distract from inflation

**Cook 22’** (Charlie Edwards Cook, an American political analyst who specializes in election forecasts and political trends, “Foreign Policy Unlikely to Save Democrats in the Fall,” Cook Political Report, 2-24-22, <https://www.cookpolitical.com/analysis/national/national-politics/foreign-policy-unlikely-save-democrats-fall)-AT>

Given how monolithic partisans are in their approval ratings and actual voting, it is always useful to look only at independents, the ‘jump ball’ Americans. Biden’s overall rating among them was 35 percent (5 points below his approval among all adults). His best marks were on dealing with the coronavirus (45 percent approval), followed by foreign policy (37 percent), Russia (35 percent), and the economy (30 percent). It is pretty clear the president and his administration’s denial of the threat of inflation and slow reaction to it was exceedingly damaging to him. (While we are on the subject, it is fascinating to see Senate Democrats, after so passionately advocating for more infrastructure spending this past year, propose suspending the gasoline tax for the rest of the year, no matter that the gas tax is the primary regular funding source for transportation infrastructure. Panic is never pretty.) While we don’t know the trajectory that the Russia/Ukraine crisis will take, and there are many factors that can impact on midterm elections, we do know that in the absence of a large number of U.S. military deaths, Americans rarely vote on foreign-policy issues, particularly in midterms. The state and direction of the economy, particularly change in real disposable personal income, is far more determinative. Turnout and the relative levels of enthusiasm between the two parties’ bases is key. There was a big gap heading into the 2018 midterm elections with, as usual, the party out of power much more motivated going into the fall of that year—though the Brett Kavanaugh Supreme Court nomination did a lot to close the gap in predominantly rural areas, which helped Republicans actually score a net gain in the Senate while getting hosed (a political science term) in the House. Right now, Democrats are the party suffering from a lack of motivation among their base. If someone wanting a read on a midterm is only going to watch two things, it should be a president’s approval rating and the generic congressional ballot test, both pretty good barometers of which way the wind is blowing and whether it’s light, moderate, or heavy.In my view, Biden and his team are handling this incredibly challenging crisis far better than many other things over the last year. But this is unlikely to save Democrats from what is increasingly looking to be a pretty horrible midterm election.

#### Voters value domestic issues over NATO, no link, and domestic issues deck fo po solvency.

Stokols 5/30/22 (Eli Stokols is a White House reporter based in the Los Angeles Times’ Washington, D.C., bureau. Published 5/30/22,, Accessed 7/13/22, L.A. Times, “News Analysis: Bold in shoring up democracy abroad, Biden is criticized as timid on the domestic front”, <https://www.latimes.com/politics/story/2022-06-30/biden-bold-with-nato-but-measured-at-home>) NSH

President Biden’s five days of meetings in Europe and the bold actions undertaken by the U.S. and its Group of 7 and NATO allies reflect an abrupt sea change in the West’s approach to its own defense in response to Russia’s invasion of Ukraine. The conclusion of a historic summit here saw members of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization [ratify a new strategic concept](https://www.latimes.com/politics/story/2022-06-29/nato-summit-biden-commits-more-us-forces-europe) that will maintain a stronger military presence in Eastern Europe and the formal invitation of Finland and Sweden to join the alliance. That came on the heels of a G-7 summit in the Bavarian Alps where leaders [committed billions more to Ukraine’s defense](https://www.latimes.com/politics/story/2022-06-27/implored-by-zelensky-biden-and-g-7-allies-will-increase-ukraine-defense-aid-economic-support) and agreed to work toward imposing price caps on Russian oil to further stymie the country’s ability to fund its war. “This summit was about strengthening our alliance, meeting the challenges of the world as it is today,” Biden said Thursday during a news conference, adding that “the world is changing. And NATO is changing as well. Allies across the board are stepping up, increasing defense spending.” “The United States,” he added, “is rallying the world to stand with Ukraine.” But the president, resolute in defense of global democracy, has been slower to respond to changes tearing at the democratic fabric of his own country, some say. His summit meetings were overshadowed by the [Supreme Court ruling striking down Roe vs. Wade](https://www.latimes.com/politics/story/2022-06-24/supreme-court-overturns-roe-vs-wade-frees-states-to-outlaw-abortion) and a blockbuster congressional hearing at which a [former aide to President Trump testified](https://www.latimes.com/politics/story/2022-06-28/jan-6-hearing-day-6) about how Trump’s behavior on Jan. 6, 2021, contributed to the violent insurrection at the Capitol. Biden’s conviction in Bavaria and Madrid is not likely to improve his low standing with voters fixated on pocketbook issues. But it did offer a sharp contrast with what critics see as his hesitation in seeking to shore up democratic institutions in the United States. “We talk about democracy being in crisis in other countries. Democracy is in crisis in the United States, and it doesn’t always feel like this White House understands that,” said Amanda Litman, the founder of Run for Something, a progressive organization that helps young people run for elected office. At Biden’s NATO news conference, his final event before returning to Washington, the questions he received focused as much on domestic issues as the foreign policy moves he and allies made this week. Asked about a [poll](https://apnews.com/article/inflation-russia-ukraine-biden-covid-health-b6d1751b2554555f7246f9e914b87c59) showing 85% of Americans believing that the country is on the “wrong track,” he was defiant, attributing their frustrations over inflation to Russia’s war in Ukraine and the Supreme Court. “America is better positioned to lead the world than it ever has been,” he said. “The one thing that has been destabilizing is the outrageous behavior of the Supreme Court.” Again urging Americans to channel their frustrations into voting in November’s midterm elections, Biden renewed his call for Congress to codify abortion protections into federal law, saying for the first time that he supports an exception to the Senate’s 60-vote filibuster rule so that legislation can advance with just 50 votes to preserve women’s reproductive rights. “If the filibuster gets in the way, like on voting rights, it should be provided an exception for this action,” he said. That position could help soften some of the rising frustration toward Biden on the left in the wake of the court’s Roe decision. But Democrats don’t appear to have the 50 votes needed to change the filibuster requirement and pass federal abortion protections. Although he [forcefully denounced the ruling](https://www.latimes.com/politics/story/2022-06-24/watch-live-biden-speaks-on-supreme-courts-roe-vs-wade-decision) as a “tragic error,” his administration has been clearer spelling out what the president won’t do, ruling out a proposal to situate abortion clinics on federal land and the possibility of adding justices to a Supreme Court dominated by conservatives, three of whom were appointed by his predecessor. Many prominent Democrats, including Massachusetts Sen. Elizabeth Warren and Rep. Alexandria Ocasio-Cortez of New York, have expressed disappointment that Biden hasn’t seemed to share their outrage or sense of urgency in helping women in peril. Asked Thursday whether he would call a public health emergency as Warren and others have called for, Biden demurred, saying only that he plans to meet Friday at the White House with a group of governors to discuss actions at the state level. When a reporter questioned whether he was the best messenger to lead his party’s response following the Roe ruling, Biden offered a somewhat glib response. “I’m the president of the United States of America,” he said with a grin. “That makes me the best messenger.” By comparison, Biden’s commitment to defending Ukraine “as long as it takes” was articulated more forcefully, even as he acknowledged the effects on American consumers and the global economy. Asked how long Americans should tolerate paying more for gas as a result of the war in Ukraine, he was blunt, repeating himself: “As long as it takes so Russia cannot in fact defeat Ukraine and move beyond Ukraine,” he said. “This is a critical, critical position for the world.” Republicans, a few of whom attended the summit and met with Biden before he left Madrid, have largely supported the president’s response to Ukraine. Nevertheless, many have also blamed him for rising gas prices and the inflation that’s been exacerbated by the war. “There’s more of a bipartisan spirit when it comes to NATO than any of Biden’s domestic challenges,” said Ash Jain, an expert on democracies at the Atlantic Council. The juxtaposition between how Biden carries himself abroad alongside like-minded allies and at home is evidence that the president faces more constraints and political challenges within the American political system. “It’s just a much harder environment to operate in and the solutions are much more complicated,” Jain said. Despite the seriousness of the commitments outlined this week by G-7 and NATO allies, Biden’s political weakness at home — and that of other G-7 leaders, who’ve seen their own support and governing coalitions wobble in recent weeks — could work to Russian President Vladimir Putin’s benefit over time, as the autocrat seeks to outlast the West on the battlefield. NATO allies continue to express concern about America’s political instability. They worry about making commitments to Biden that might be cast aside should he lose reelection in 2024. “The other leaders want to know what is he is going to do about a Supreme Court stripping away people’s rights, about these efforts by Trump and others to attack American institutions,” said Brett Bruen, a former National Security Council official in the Obama administration. “He has not had a great plan, and if he doesn’t, the domestic quagmire can become a major drag on what he’s able to accomplish internationally.” Presidents have more latitude to act in foreign affairs than on domestic matters, where they are more constrained by Congress and the courts. But Biden’s reluctance to consider structural changes to the Constitution has been a source of frustration among the base of his party long before the Supreme Court’s Roe decision. “Even if there are some very real structural barriers in place, we need to see the White House and the president feel the same rage and fury and frustration that we do,” said Litman, the progressive organizer. “We need to see that he sees the crisis and is unafraid to do whatever it takes within his power because he’s asking us to sacrifice and organize.” With Democrats narrowly controlling the evenly divided Senate thanks to Vice President Kamala Harris’ ability to break a tie vote, Biden nevertheless has seen much of his legislative agenda derailed. Until Thursday, he had been reluctant to call on Democratic leaders to change the filibuster rule requiring 60 votes to advance legislation — after briefly doing so in a failed effort to pass voting rights protections — to codify the right to an abortion in federal law. The gusher of new revelations about Trump’s role in fomenting the mob that attacked police officers and stormed the Capitol in a brazen attempt to halt the Senate’s certification of Biden’s electoral victory only adds to the pressure on the administration. Pressure on the Justice Department to prosecute the former president — and Biden’s potential 2024 challenger — has grown in recent weeks. Biden’s trepidation about such actions, aides confirm privately, mostly have to do with a sense that they would be perceived as political opportunism and exacerbate the country’s polarization.But with an approval rating of just 39%, Biden and Democrats are facing a potentially disastrous mid-term election — especially if frustrated progressive voters opt not to turn out.

### Link Turns

#### Plan unpopular – hurts Biden and dems

Nomaan Merchant and Hannah Fingerhut 22, reporter on foreign policy and reporter on public opinion, 2-23-2022, "Majority in U.S. oppose major role in Russia-Ukraine conflict, says AP-NORC poll," PBS NewsHour, <https://www.pbs.org/newshour/politics/majority-in-u-s-oppose-major-role-in-russia-ukraine-conflict-says-ap-norc-poll-> RayS

WASHINGTON (AP) — There’s little support among Americans for a major U.S. role in the Russia-Ukraine conflict, according to a new poll, even as President Joe Biden imposes new sanctions and threatens a stronger response that could provoke retaliation from Moscow. Biden has acknowledged a growing likelihood that war in Eastern Europe would affect Americans, though he has ruled out sending troops to Ukraine. Gas prices in the U.S. could rise in the short term. And Russian President Vladimir Putin has a range of tools he could use against the U.S., including cyberattacks hitting critical infrastructure and industries. “Defending freedom will have costs for us as well, here at home,” Biden said Tuesday. “We need to be honest about that.” Just 26 percent say the U.S. should have a major role in the conflict, according to a new poll from The Associated Press-NORC Center for Public Affairs Research. Fifty-two percent say a minor role; 20 percent say none at all. The findings are a reminder for Biden and fellow Democrats that while the crisis may consume Washington in the coming months, pocketbook issues are likely to be a bigger priority for voters heading into the midterm elections. A December AP-NORC poll showed that Americans are particularly focused on economic issues, including rising inflation. The Biden administration has argued that supporting Ukraine is a defense of fundamental American values and has made a concerted effort to declassify intelligence findings underscoring the dangers it sees for Ukraine and the wider European region. But the survey shows widespread public skepticism of the U.S. intelligence community.

### AT: Turnout

#### Turnout is a myth – Democrat base turnout isn’t enough for the win

Teixeira 6-16 (Ruy Teixeira, Senior fellow at the Center for American Progress, Co-founder at the Liberal Patriot, “Turnout Myths Are the Democrats' Drug of Choice”, theliberalpatriot, 6/16/22, <https://theliberalpatriot.substack.com/p/turnout-myths-are-the-democrats-drug>,) - aagg

There are, however, a number of reasons why this turnout fix is highly unlikely to work and, in fact, borders on the delusional. 1. Some Simple Math. Start with this: when Democrats persuade a voter to switch sides, that nets two votes for the Democrats (one less for the Republicans, one more for the Democrats). When Democrats turn out one more voter to vote Democratic that is, of course, a net of only one vote for them. But it’s really worse than that. Typically, Democrats think of increased base turnout in terms of turning out more voters from various pro-Democratic demographic groups—young voters, black voters, Hispanic voters, college-educated whites, whatever. But not all the voters in these groups favor the Democrats so mobilization of more voters from a given group may well net less than one vote per additional voter. For example, looking at current Congressional ballot preferences, Democrats might net only a third of a vote for every additional Hispanic or young voter, six-tenths of a vote from every additional black voter and just a sixth of a vote from every additional college-educated white voter. The math looks even more unfavorable when the following is considered: Democrats tend to assume that nonvoters from a given demographic are the same politically as voters from the same group….except they don’t vote. But a mountain of political science evidence shows that’s not so. Nonvoters, controlling for demographics, tend to be less ideological and, very importantly, if they do vote tend to swing in the direction of the prevailing political environment—which of course is currently terrible for the Democrats and likely to be so on election day. This means the “yield” for the Democrats from higher turnout could be even less than the data above indicates. Finally, the general assumption seems to be that an aggressively polarized election will juice turnout among Democratic-leaning constituencies....but (somehow) not on the other side. That’s not the way it works. The other side gets to vote too so dialing it up to 11 on the Democratic positions may mobilize the other side just as much—maybe more!—than the left’s side. Once again, the basic math on the turnout-driven strategy is much less favorable than most Democrats assume. 2. The Empirical Record. The evidence for turnout patterns driving Democrats’ electoral fate is extremely thin as conclusively demonstrated in The Turnout Myth: Voting Rates and Partisan Outcomes in American National Elections by political scientists Daron Shaw and John Petrocik. Recent election results bear this out. Take the 2020 election. That election presented a very stark choice to voters. And it was indeed a high turnout election. The problem: everyone’s turnout went up, including among groups Democrats would have preferred stayed home. The net result of higher turnout did not significantly boost Democratic fortunes; if anything Republicans may have a benefitted a bit more from the higher levels of turnout. This helps explain why Biden’s 2020 victory was so much narrower than anticipated and why the election saw Democrats lose ground in the House and in state legislatures Closer to the present, look at the Virginia 2021 gubernatorial election. The highly-polarized election, where Republican Glenn Youngkin beat Democrat Terry McAuliffe in a heavily blue-trending state, was a very high turnout election. Under the state’s newly liberalized voting laws, the number of votes cast in this governor’s race was 25 percent higher than in any previous race. Turnout was strong everywhere, including in important Democratic areas like northern Virginia, black precincts and college towns, but also surged in redder areas of the state. The real reason why McAuliffe lost was, above all, vote-switching—in other words, persuasion. According to a detailed vote history analysis by Civis Analytics, vote-switching from 2020 to 2021 accounted for about 80 percent of the shift away from the Democrats in the gubernatorial election. Finally, cast your mind back to the 2018 midterm election where the Democrats did so well. In that election, the Democrats took back the House (a net 40-seat gain), carried the House popular vote by almost nine points and flipped seven Republican-held governorships. Turnout in that election was outstanding, topping 49 percent — the highest midterm turnout since 1914 and up 13 points over the previous midterm, in 2014 — and the demographic composition of the electorate came remarkably close to that of a presidential election year. (Typically, midterm voters tend to be much older and much whiter than those in presidential elections.) This was due both to fewer presidential “drop-off” voters (people who voted in 2016 but not 2018) and to more midterm “surge” voters (those who voted in 2018 but not 2016). Nonetheless, the overwhelming majority of the Democrats’ improved performance came not from fresh turnout of left-of-center voters who typically skip midterms, but rather from people who cast votes in both elections — yet switched from Republican in 2016 to Democratic in 2018. The data firm Catalist, whose numbers on 2018 are the best available, estimates that around 90 percent of the Democrats’ improved performance came from persuasion — from vote-switchers — not turnout. In its analysis, Catalist notes, “If turnout was the only factor, then Democrats would not have seen nearly the gains that they ended up seeing … a big piece of Democratic victory was due to 2016 Trump voters turning around and voting for Democrats in 2018.” It is hard to avoid the conclusion that higher turnout is not the Holy Grail for the Democrats, either in this coming election or in future ones. Instead, it is time for them to recover the lost art of persuasion. It may be too late in the current cycle for this to be done or done enough to make a difference. But done it will have to be if Democrats are serious about creating a durable majority that can carry their agenda forward. As I have noted previously, Democrats may be better off accepting they will take their lumps in 2022 (while attempting to minimize the damage) but use the election as a teachable moment. That teachable moment should be, above all, about re-acquainting the party with the actually-existing demographics and politics of the country they live in. Given patterns of educational and geographic polarization, they are now at a crippling disadvantage in what remains an overwhelmingly working class and non-urban country. There are simply too many districts and states in the country where polarization redounds to their disadvantage and makes them uncompetitive. That is not a problem that can be solved by “mobilizing the base”. It calls instead for expanding your coalition by persuading more working class and non-urban voters you share their values and priorities.

### AT: Interference

#### Foreign interference won’t affect outcomes—no external internet accessibility and too many built in redundancies.

Shaban 16 [Hamza Shaban, Hamza Shaban is a technology policy reporter for BuzzFeed News and is based in Washington, D.C. State Election Officials Confront Fears Of Election Day Hacking, BuzzFeed, 9-9-2016, Accessible Online at https://www.buzzfeed.com/hamzashaban/state-election-officials-confront-fears-of-election-day-hack?utm\_term=.tkb76qeB8#.ju2VRwDeK] SW 9-14-2016

A month after 20,000 private emails from the Democratic National Committee were published online, election officials across the country received a series of warnings from the FBI: Hackers were targeting states’ election websites and, in at least one case, were able to steal voter registration data. The Department of Homeland Security has since created an election cybersecurity action campaign, and US intelligence officials have begun investigating the possibility of a covert Russian intelligence operation that seeks to undermine the integrity of the American election. But despite the growing concerns over foreign meddling coming from Congress, intelligence experts, and the Clinton campaign, state election officials say American voters have little to fear. “There are over 9,000 jurisdictions that operate elections at a very local level, so that’s both a blessing and a curse,” Denise Merrill, Connecticut’s secretary of state and president of the National Association of Secretaries of State (NASS), a nonpartisan organization that represents the country’s top state election officials, told BuzzFeed News. “It really saves us from worrying too much about cybersecurity — we have other concerns, but that’s kind of not one of them.” Merrill was appointed by NASS to join Homeland Security’s special working group on election cybersecurity. The group’s goal is to build closer ties between the federal government and local election officials, and also to consider designating state voting systems as “critical infrastructure,” akin to dams and power grids, granting election offices additional resources and protections from the federal government. Merrill, along with the secretaries of state and election officials representing California, Florida, Ohio, Minnesota, Colorado, and Iowa, told BuzzFeed News that pre–Election Day simulations, paper trail audits, and the fact that voting machines are not connected to the web provide strong safeguards to the electoral system. State election officials emphasized that the recent hack into voter registration databases differs from the risks faced by their offices, because these databases aren’t directly tied to voting on Election Day and because voting machines cannot be accessed remotely through the internet. “That’s the voter registration system, which is not at all connected to the actual voting,” Merrill said, adding that in almost every state, voter registration is completed on paper. “There are backup paper systems for every process in our election, and that means cybersecurity is not the concern that it’s being portrayed to be nationally.”

## Impact Answers

### AT: Econ Internal

#### The economy improves after midterms regardless of who wins.

Klebnikov 22(Sergei Klebnikov is a senior reporter at Forbes covering markets and business news. Published 1/19/22, Accessed 7/14/22, *Forbes,* “Here’s What Happens To The Stock Market If Republicans Take Congress In November”, <https://www.forbes.com/sites/sergeiklebnikov/2022/01/19/we-looked-at-how-the-stock-market-performs-during-midterm-election-yearsheres-how-2022-may-be-worse/?sh=40f0813d2562>. NSH

The equity party continues well into a president’s third year in office when there’s a push to stimulate the economy ahead of the next election. It’s no coincidence that the best market returns come during that period; the S&P 500 rises an average 16% in that third year. What’s more, in the six months after midterm elections—from November to April—the S&P 500 has gained 14.3% on average and has risen in price 95% of the time. “Very often you'll see a positive reaction to midterm elections regardless of which party wins,” says Stack.

### AT: Econ Impact

#### Economic decline doesn’t lead to war – counterexamples, rational actors, motivation

Walt 20 (Stephen M. Walt is a professor of international relations at Harvard University. “Will a Global Depression Trigger Another World War?” Foreign Policy. Published 5-13-20, accessed 7-21-21. 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.

#### Economic decline doesn’t cause war – stats prove

Clary 15 Christopher Clary, Ph.D. in Political Science from MIT, Postdoctoral Fellow, Watson Institute for International Studies, Brown University, “Economic Stress and International Cooperation: Evidence from International Rivalries,” April 22, 2015, http://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract\_id=2597712

Do economic downturns generate pressure for diversionary conflict? Or might downturns encourage austerity and economizing behavior in foreign policy? This paper provides new evidence that economic stress is associated with conciliatory policies between strategic rivals. For states that view each other as military threats, the biggest step possible toward bilateral cooperation is to terminate the rivalry by taking political steps to manage the competition. Drawing on data from 109 distinct rival dyads since 1950, 67 of which terminated, the evidence suggests rivalries were approximately twice as likely to terminate during economic downturns than they were during periods of economic normalcy. This is true controlling for all of the main alternative explanations for peaceful relations between foes (democratic status, nuclear weapons possession, capability imbalance, common enemies, and international systemic changes), as well as many other possible confounding variables. This research questions existing theories claiming that economic downturns are associated with diversionary war, and instead argues that in certain circumstances peace may result from economic troubles.

#### No econ 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.

### Gridlock Bad

#### Political gridlock bad--- affects infrastructure

Fishbane & Tomer ’19(Lara, Adie, Adie Tomer is a Senior Fellow at Brookings Metro and leads the Metropolitan Infrastructure Initiative. Tomer is an expert in infrastructure policy and urban economics, with a particular focus on transportation and digital technology issues, Lara Fishbane is a former senior research assistant with the Metropolitan Policy Program at Brookings, “Political gridlock blocks infrastructure progress and costs our economy”, 4/25/19, <https://www.brookings.edu/blog/the-avenue/2019/04/25/political-gridlock-blocks-infrastructure-progress-and-costs-our-economy/>) SM

Infrastructure talks are heating up again. In just the last week, 2020 presidential candidate Amy Klobuchar pitched a trillion-dollar infrastructure proposal while the Trump administration and Congress continue to flirt with major infrastructure packages. This kind of thinking reflects clear public support for greater investment. While these concepts and conversations suggest bipartisanship could deliver infrastructure reform, the current state of national politics delivers anything but an infrastructure boost. Put bluntly, when political discord leads to infrastructure failure, it doesn’t just deepen our distrust of government—it also takes our economy down with it. After all, it was only months ago when fights between House Democrats and the Republican White House spilled over into our airports. With public employees and contractors forced to work without pay during the budget shutdown, it was little surprise that TSA security officers and air traffic controllers started calling in sick. Then, 35 days after the shutdown began, LaGuardia Airport closed due to staffing shortages. The budget fight ended just hours later. While the budget fight may be over (for now), our political system is regularly causing less perceptible but more sustained disruptions to our road, water, and other physical networks. We can no longer afford this kind of unnecessary economic harm due to short-sighted politics. This administration’s trade and tariff policies serve as a potent example of self-inflicted economic harm. Since the Trump administration applied tariffs on imported steel and aluminum, the cost index for steel mill products alone rose by almost 14 percent from March 2018 to January 2019. This directly impacts our state departments of transportation, their local peers, and water authorities who all rely on steel and aluminum to construct major capital projects. As Mark Niquette at Bloomberg reported, states from California to Michigan to Virginia have already seen certain project costs jump by millions of dollars. Meanwhile, steel and aluminum manufacturers in the U.S. have been hit hard by the costs, needing to lay off workers to close budget gaps. Price increases can act as a fiscal virus, infecting an agency’s entire project pipeline. Since infrastructure agencies work on tight budgets and are naturally capital-constrained, there’s only so much construction to go around. So, when current projects start costing significantly more, agencies have no choice but to delay other projects. If the tariffs remain in future years—and the politically-motivated rhetoric suggests the president will keep them—the effects will only compound as more projects are either delayed or outright scrapped. The net result: lower quality infrastructure than if the country never instituted the new tariffs. Oddly enough, while the president pushes a trade war to boost global competitiveness, our domestic infrastructure will be less prepared to power our economy once the war is over. Politics disrupting our infrastructure stretches far beyond tariff fights. For example, the U.S. Department of Transportation has now twice delayed promised capital grants to local transit agencies. Similarly, Congress and the Federal Aviation Administration cannot agree on how to manage and comprehensively fund a new satellite-based air traffic control system. They’re all guaranteed ways to raise infrastructure costs in the long-term and reduce public trust today. That’s why these next two- and four-year periods are so important at the federal level. For the nearly two years remaining on President’s Trump term, there is a major negotiation coming with congressional Democrats around our next surface transportation bill, if not a larger infrastructure package. If the two parties can craft a bill that boosts investment around long-run needs—from resilience to electrification to digitalization—and reduce tariff impacts in the process, we’ll all be in a better place. Washington has the chance to give long-run certainty to our state and local partners, who build all the projects and pay the majority of costs, anyway. But if political compromise doesn’t happen—and we have our doubts—the pressure will only be higher on the next Congress and president to deliver a more collaborative, bipartisan vision for the country’s future. It’s why we’re not just watching what happens on the Hill these next couple years, but why we all should carefully watch the infrastructure and trade platforms put together by the Democratic candidates for president. Of course, everyday Americans use infrastructure systems that remind us what political compromise can deliver. The national highway network is still one of the world’s great capital projects. The commercial air network is the busiest and safest in the world. We’ve grown accustomed to clean water access and are shocked when it fails. But we have to remember how easily our politics can upend high-functioning infrastructure. As the budget fight grounded planes at one of the busiest airports in our nation’s biggest city, stacking up on the runway, the image said it all. Unnecessary gridlock eventually drags us all down.

#### Gridlock is bad – stops change and solving problems, Congress must cooperate

Clark ’20 (Suzanne P. Clark is an American business executive. She is currently the president and CEO of the U.S. Chamber of Commerce, the first woman to hold that office, “Gridlock simply isn’t an option for business. We shouldn’t accept it from Washington, either” , 10/7/20, <https://www.dialogueproject.study/perspectives/suzanne-p-clark>) SM

WE MUST ALL STRENGTHEN THE ‘GOVERNING CENTER’ In business, building consensus is a fact of life. The companies, both large and small, that ultimately succeed are those propelled by a can-do spirit and a relentless drive for solutions. And the executives who lead them must bridge divides and rally teams around shared goals every day in order to boost productivity, support morale, serve customers, and drive growth. These leaders welcome various viewpoints and vigorous exchanges of ideas because it’s often through the questioning and challenging that breakthroughs are achieved and innovations are discovered. Gridlock is not an option for business, and it shouldn’t be an option for the elected officials who run our government. Voters rightly expect results from the men and women who represent them. And businesses—of all sectors and sizes whose interests the U.S. Chamber represents—expect our leaders to work through differences and make smart policy decisions that will allow them to invest, hire, and grow. We need a Washington that works, driven by men and women who work together, to help rebuild our country and ensure all its citizens have equal opportunity to succeed. In today’s polarized political environment, this is easier said than done. For many, compromise is a four-letter word and consensus is a fantasy. But that does not have to be the case—and given the sobering slate of challenges before us, it cannot be. We need a Washington that works, driven by men and women who work together, to help rebuild our country and ensure all its citizens have equal opportunity to succeed. Challenges of the magnitude we face—an economic crisis caused by the pandemic and a national reckoning over systemic inequalities—should compel our leaders to rise to the moment. They can reject the tribalism that has fractured not only our political system but also our society. They can lead with constructive discourse in pursuit of real solutions. That requires listening to all viewpoints. Negotiating in good faith acknowledges the skills, knowledge, and perspectives others bring to the table—including those with whom you disagree. Shutting them out of the conversation will not build the good will needed to achieve compromise. Our leaders also must focus on achieving an outcome, not getting credit (or assigning blame). This is easier when operating from the assumption that everyone fundamentally shares the same goals of helping people and solving problems, even if ideas on how to get there differ. When it comes to serving our country, our leaders will succeed as a group, or fail as a group—regardless of party affiliation. Inevitably, there will be issues where the gulf seems too wide. That is why we need a strong governing center, populated by lawmakers from both parties who have the courage to reach across the aisle and build consensus. We know these leaders exist—and they are crucial to restoring a well-functioning government. In order to help grow the governing center, the Chamber recently revamped its congressional scorecard for the first time in 40 years. Now lawmakers can earn the Chamber’s support not only by voting for the business position on key bills, but also by demonstrating bipartisanship and legislative leadership. We were proud to recognize the 59 Democratic and Republican members of Congress who earned the highest scores by these measures at our first annual Governing with Distinction Awards earlier this year. We are committed to championing them and growing their ranks. Such leaders have long been part of our legacy. As President George W. Bush said in his moving eulogy for Rep. John Lewis, “John and I had our disagreements, of course. But in the America John Lewis fought for, and the America I believe in, differences of opinion are inevitable elements and evidence of democracy in action.” Collegiality and cooperation—not just in politics, but across the public discourse—will be needed to confront the most daunting set of challenges in decades: a global pandemic, a devastated economy, and deep-seated inequality of opportunity. These crises are intertwined, and if we don’t work together to address them, they will compound the problems dividing our country.

### AT: Energy Security

#### Foreign competition and the switch to renewables make long-term energy independence impossible.

Haley **Zaremba 21**. Writer and journalist based in Mexico City. She has extensive experience writing and editing environmental features. "The Four Biggest Threats To U.S. Energy Independence". OilPrice. 5-20-2021. https://oilprice.com/Energy/Energy-General/The-Four-Biggest-Threats-To-US-Energy-Independence.html accessed 7-21-2021

**2. Competition** All of the developments in the global clean energy transition outlined above mean that sitting on top of massive petroleum reserves **no longer translates** to **global power** and **influence** like it used to. Clean energy, in many ways, is a democratizing development in global energy industries, as practically anyone with the infrastructure can produce their own energy relatively cheaply. Of course, while generally true, this is a gross oversimplification. Even renewable energy and electric vehicles require finite resources that certain countries have in spades and which others do not. This will likely be a **major geopolitical factor** in the **energy landscape** of the future--but it won’t be in the United States’ favor. A clean energy resource war could be brewing between the first and second biggest economies in the world. Renewables are currently reliant on lengthy supply chains for finite **rare earth minerals** and metals including lithium and cobalt, and at present **China** is **in control** of more than **90 percent** of some of these **essential resources.**  While China has been keen to become energy independent and energy secure for a long time now, renewables have emerged as the nation’s clearest path to achieving that goal, as well as to establishing Beijing as one of the major energy-industry superpowers of the world, if not the outright global leader. While the United States will still be able to produce plenty of its own energy through natural gas and its own clean energy production, there is no doubt that the United States’ overall **energy independence** and **exporting power** will fade right along with the **shale revolution** as other powers around the globe **expand their own energy production capacity.**

#### Oil dependence doesn’t cause war.

Meierding 16—Assistant Professor at the Naval Postgraduate School [Emily, “Dismantling the Oil Wars Myth,” *Security Studies*, 25(2): 258-288, Emory Libraries]

These findings indicate that oil wars, as conventionally conceived, do not exist. Oil is an extremely valuable natural resource. However, invasion, occupation, international, and investment costs reduce the payoffs of seizing foreign resources. Profiting from seized oil is difficult at best and impossible at worst. As a result, petroleum prizes are not sufficiently valuable for oil to be a significant contributor to leaders’ decisions for international war. Consequently, a territory’s petroleum endowments are a poor predictor of its ability to inspire interstate conflict. These observations have positive implications for contemporary disputes in oil-rich regions like the South China Sea, East China Sea, eastern Mediterranean, and Arctic, as they suggest that competition over these territories’ oil resources will not lead to intense militarized conflicts. However, one might counter this optimistic assessment by arguing that the contemporary contests are not analogous to the historical cases. The greatest difference between them is that, in the current disputes, political authority is ambiguous; multiple countries have legitimate claims to contested territories. Consequently, in these areas, an aggressor would not be seizing “foreign” oil. This distinction would reduce occupation costs, as local resistance would be more restrained.140 Invasion costs would also be lower, since most of the resources at stake in these contests are prospective; there is less oil infrastructure for aggressors and targets to destroy.141 These arguments have some merit. However, prospective resources also generate higher investment costs, as countries must explore for oil instead of just producing it. The total payoffs that an aggressor can accrue from prospective resources are also very uncertain. In addition, international costs remain high, as the international community condemns the use of force in all territorial disagreements, including those where political authority is ambiguous. Hence, the costs of aggression should still deter contemporary adversaries from fighting for oil. This is not to say that current disputes in purportedly oil-rich regions will never escalate. However, if they do, it will be for other, more pressing reasons. The resultant conflicts will not be oil wars

### AT: Readiness

#### Readiness impact cards are lobbying tactics.

Adams 18 Gordon Adams, professor of international relations at American University's School of International Service and is a distinguished fellow at the Stimson Center. [The Military’s 'Readiness' Scam Worked Again, 2-14-2018, https://foreignpolicy.com/2018/02/15/the-militarys-readiness-scam-worked-again/]

For the next two years, at least, the American public should be spared the U.S. Defense Department’s **wailing about “readiness.”** After seven years of teeth-gnashing and garment-rending, the military is finally getting what it wants: more money than ever. The Donald Trump administration’s defense budget request for fiscal year 2019 is out, less than a week after Congress cut an overall deal on spending levels for 2018 and 2019. Unlike the domestic spending part of the administration’s budget request, the defense numbers aren’t dead on arrival — in fact, the military can count on getting every cent. The congressional deal set **new levels for defense**, agreeing to $700 billion for national defense in 2018 and $716 billion in 2019. That’s nearly $165 billion more than the military had anticipated prior to this year. The United States is back to defense spending, in constant dollars, that is higher than the peak spending levels under Ronald Reagan. Only in 2010, at the height of the wars in Iraq and Afghanistan, was defense spending higher. It’s worth thinking about why defense spending is about to explode. It’s not because of some revolutionary change in the global security environment — aside from those pesky North Koreans and their nukes, America has never been so secure. It’s not because the U.S. military’s effectiveness has declined; it remains the most powerful force in the world, highly capable and very ready. The reason the Pentagon’s budget is now on a long-term upswing is because the military has spent years **loudly lobbying** for such an increase while complaining about an alleged “readiness crisis.” Complaining works, at least when the military does it, because politicians in both parties **fear the military’s wrath**. Partisan gridlock can still impede efforts to bump up the military’s resources, but now that Republicans are in control of Congress and the White House, there are no more hurdles standing in the way. None of this is to suggest, however, that the congressional generosity will buy Americans more security or a better force than the one they have today. Every military leader in history has wanted more resources at his or her disposal. U.S. secretaries of defense have been especially adamant since 2011, when the Budget Control Act first set limits on both defense and domestic spending. The tears shed by the Pentagon went beyond complaining about those pesky budget caps. They also touched on declining military readiness, units that weren’t combat ready, Chinese military expansion, and just about anything else that defense officials thought might put the spending train back on the tracks. All the Pentagon’s complaints **ignored** the **reality** that since 2001 the military has been receiving tens, and sometimes even hundreds, of billions of dollars in additional funding — above and beyond the budget caps — thanks to a **special slush fund, the O**verseas **C**ontingency **O**perations account. That money is supposed to be designated for emergencies, but both the Pentagon and the Congress have routinely used this budget for nonemergency purposes, such as paying, training, and supporting existing troops (all normally in the Pentagon’s base budget) and buying equipment already in the long-term defense plan. Nevertheless, the military has complained that its readiness is in tatters. And after all those years of deployments, military officials testifying to Congress could always come up with a sad anecdote about planes being cross-decked to an outgoing carrier, fighters not ready to fly, or missing pilots. U.S. policymakers have seen this movie many times before. I experienced it myself in the 1990s, when the brass was displeased with the budget levels set by the Bill Clinton administration and whined about readiness problems to the Office of Management and Budget, where I worked. My follow-up with the Pentagon’s civil servants made it clear that the measures they were using were rigged to show low levels of readiness; they set standards that called units “ready” only if they had every capability imaginable to fight a major ground war, and they counted as “unready” units that were back from deployments and had missed a training slot for that big war, one they would soon be scheduled to receive. We knew the Pentagon was using **manipulated numbers to bludgeon us** with demands for more funding. Nevertheless, we caved: In 1994, we added more than $20 billion to the defense budget, not really to fix readiness but to try to make the issue go away before the midterm elections that year. (It didn’t work, by the way.) Four years later, we did it again, busting previous budget commitments to add billions of dollars more. (For an excellent analysis of that fight, read This War Really Matters: Inside the Fight for Defense Dollars by the late George C. Wilson, once the premier Pentagon correspondent for the Washington Post.) Plus ça change, plus c’est la même chose — the more things change, the more they stay the same — as military parade leaders in France might say. Today, once again, the U.S. military stands on the brink of **an alleged readiness crisis**, and more money is needed, pronto. **The trail of tears became so deep** that it caught up Republicans and Democrats (always eager to portray themselves as “tough on national security”). It caught up in the lachrymose flow virtually all of the think tank preachers at the American Enterprise Institute, the Heritage Foundation, the Center for a New American Security, and large panels of bipartisan heavyweights reviewing the Pentagon’s four-year defense studies. Everyone in Washington seems to have been swept up in the tide; even some of the most careful, independent analysts are on board. As Todd Harrison of the Center for Strategic and International Studies noted, “We are stretched too thin.… We are trying to do too much with the size force that we have all around the world.” All this hand-wringing is happening about a ground force that, after nearly two decades of war, is **highly experienced** and **primed** — and largely back at home; a Navy that is larger than any other navy in the world and the only one with global reach; an Air Force that is **larger** and **more technologically advanced** than any other, flying, bombing, tanking, airlifting globally. **America’s is the only military** that has **global basing**, **logistics**, **communications**, **transportation**, and **intelligence**; **nobody else**, not the Chinese and certainly not the Russians, **comes even close**. But this is Washington, where the policy and analytical sheep gather under one tree to be safe from the storm of political criticism. The British novelist Lawrence Durrell comes to mind: “How nugatory and how glum / The endomorphs of scholarship / Like hippos on a sinking ship / Stand bum to silly bum.” (Just replace scholarship with politics and the comparison is apt.) So, on what will the Pentagon spend this largesse? The last time the Pentagon got this kind of fiscal bump-up — in 1981-1982 under Reagan — bureaucrats and military officers were reaching into desk drawers to dust off plans they never thought would be funded. As Reagan might have said, “There they go again.” There is now a lot of discussion of funding going into training, equipment maintenance, and repair personnel. But the big bucks, according to the Pentagon’s own briefing, will go into conventional military equipment. That means more F-35s and F-18s than planned, a new presidential helicopter, Navy surveillance planes and destroyers, Marine helicopters, space launch rockets, tank modifications, another Army multipurpose vehicle, and a joint tactical vehicle the Army, Marines, and Air Force can all use. Basically, the services will soon have shiny new hardware. There will also be a push to modernize the country’s nuclear arsenal. This will be done under the guise of “enhanced deterrence,” but really this amounts to a game of maintaining appearances and “keeping up with the Joneses” — or the Russians, Chinese, and North Koreans. The strategic reasons for this effort are meager; the reality is that the United States has **more than enough deterrent force today** and all the additional nuclear forces in the world will only undermine deterrence and stimulate even more arms racing. All this will be combined with accelerated investments in sea- and ground-based missile defense systems, which have yet to prove themselves, despite decades of testing and billions of dollars invested. The contribution of all this spending to solve an alleged “readiness crisis” is not obvious. It’s worth heeding what Defense Secretary James Mattis promised after the deal was signed: “I am very confident that what the Congress has now done, and the president is going to allocate to us in the budget, is what we need to bring us back to a position of primacy.” **An unobtainable primacy**, of course, is not the same thing as readiness.

#### No impact---American power isn’t key to global stability.

Christopher **Fettweis 17**. Associate Professor of Political Science at Tulane University. “Unipolarity, Hegemony, and the New Peace,” Security Studies, 26:3, 423-451, 5-8-2017, http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/09636412.2017.1306394, accessed 7-17-2021

Conflict and Hegemony by Region Even the most ardent supporters of the hegemonic-stability explanation do not contend that US influence extends equally to all corners of the globe. The United States has concentrated its policing in what George Kennan used to call “strong points,” or the most important parts of the world: Western Europe, the Pacific Rim, and Persian Gulf.64 By doing so, Washington may well have contributed more to great power peace than the overall global decline in warfare. If the former phenomenon contributed to the latter, by essentially providing a behavioral model for weaker states to emulate, then perhaps this lends some support to the hegemonic-stability case.65 During the Cold War, the United States played referee to a few intra-West squabbles, especially between Greece and Turkey, and provided Hobbesian reassurance to Germany’s nervous neighbors. **Other**, equally plausible **explanations exist for stability** in the first world, including the presence of a common enemy, democracy, economic interdependence, general war aversion, etc. The looming presence of the leviathan is certainly among these plausible explanations, but only inside the US sphere of influence. Bipolarity was bad for the nonaligned world, where Soviet and Western intervention routinely exacerbated local conflicts. Unipolarity has generally been much better, but whether or not this was due to US action is again **unclear**. Overall US interest in the affairs of the Global South has dropped markedly since the end of the Cold War, as has the level of violence in almost all regions. There is less US intervention in the political and military affairs of Latin America compared to any time in the twentieth century, for instance, and also less conflict. Warfare in Africa is at an all-time low, as is relative US interest outside of counterterrorism and security assistance.66 Regional peace and stability exist where there is US active intervention, as well as where there is not. **No direct relationship seems to exist across regions**. If intervention can be considered a function of direct and indirect activity, of both political and military action, a regional picture might look like what is outlined in Table 1. These assessments of conflict are by necessity relative, because there has not been a “high” level of conflict in any region outside the Middle East during the period of the New Peace. Putting aside for the moment that important caveat, some points become clear. The great powers of the world are clustered in the upper right quadrant, where US intervention has been high, but conflict levels low. US intervention is **imperfectly correlated** with stability, however. Indeed, it is conceivable that the relatively high level of US interest and activity has made the security situation in the **Persian Gulf** and broader **Middle East worse**. In recent years, substantial hard power investments (Somalia, Afghanistan, Iraq), moderate intervention (Libya), and reliance on diplomacy (Syria) have been **equally ineffective** in stabilizing states torn by conflict. While it is possible that the region is essentially unpacifiable and no amount of police work would bring peace to its people, it remains hard to make the case that the US presence has improved matters. In this “strong point,” at least, **US hegemony has failed to bring peace**. In much of the rest of the world, the United States has not been especially eager to enforce any particular rules. Even rather incontrovertible evidence of genocide has not been enough to inspire action. Washington’s intervention choices have at best been erratic; Libya and Kosovo brought about action, but much more blood flowed uninterrupted in Rwanda, Darfur, Congo, Sri Lanka, and Syria. The US record of peacemaking is not exactly a long uninterrupted string of successes. During the turn-of-the-century conventional war between Ethiopia and Eritrea, a highlevel US delegation containing former and future National Security Advisors (Anthony Lake and Susan Rice) made a half-dozen trips to the region, but was unable to prevent either the outbreak or recurrence of the conflict. Lake and his team shuttled back and forth between the capitals with some frequency, and President Clinton made repeated phone calls to the leaders of the respective countries, offering to hold peace talks in the United States, all to no avail.67 The war ended in late 2000 when Ethiopia essentially won, and it controls the disputed territory to this day. The Horn of Africa is hardly the only region where states are free to fight one another today without fear of serious US involvement. Since they are choosing not to do so with increasing frequency, something else is probably affecting their calculations. Stability exists even in those places where the potential for intervention by the sheriff is minimal. Hegemonic stability can only take credit for influencing those decisions that would have ended in war without the presence, whether physical or psychological, of the United States. It seems hard to make the case that the relative peace that has descended on so many regions is primarily due to the kind of heavy hand of the neoconservative leviathan, or its lighter, more liberal cousin. **Something else appears to be at work**.

### AT: Dems win 2024

#### Midterm results can’t be used to predict the 2024 election

**Skelley and Yi** (Geoffrey Skelley and Jean Yi, election analyst at FiveThirtyEight and a former politics intern at FiveThirtyEight, “Stop Using The Midterms To Predict Presidential Elections”, FiveThirtyEight, February 25, 2022, <https://fivethirtyeight.com/features/stop-using-the-midterms-to-predict-presidential-elections/)-> LASA IS

But while a strong Republican performance in 2022 might influence Biden’s thinking on 2024, it’s a mistake to expect the midterm result to predict how the country will vote in the ensuing presidential election. As the chart below shows, there’s little relationship between the margin in the national popular vote for the U.S. House in a midterm election and the national popular vote margin in the next presidential contest. So whatever happens in the House this November, don’t expect it to forecast the results of the next presidential race. More often than not, midterm and presidential results have been miles apart. For instance, in 1994, the GOP captured Congress in the midterm “Republican Revolution” amidst then-President Bill Clinton’s poor approval ratings, winning the House popular vote by about 7 percentage points. But in 1996, Clinton ended up claiming a sleepy reelection victory by 8.5 points over Bob Dole — a swing of more than 15 points. In fact, on average, there’s been a swing of about 12 points from the midterm to the subsequent presidential contest. That said, midterm elections and their following presidential races have sometimes run close together: Democrats swept back into power in the 2006 midterm election with an 8-point edge in the House vote, for instance, and then-President Barack Obama won by a similar 7-point margin nationally in 2008. In fact, midterm and presidential elections have run closer together in recent years — but importantly, there is still not much of a relationship despite this. Rather, this seems to be happening because landslide presidential wins are increasingly a thing of the past. Instead, lopsided midterm results for the party not in the White House are increasingly becoming the norm, then followed by highly competitive presidential races.

#### GOP win locks in Trump’s victory in 2024—independently wrecks democracy

Mershon (Tony Mershon, student at Ohio State University, “Midterm Elections for Statewide Election Officials Could Spell Trouble for 2024”, Democratic Erosion, February 14, 2022, https://www.democratic-erosion.com/2022/02/14/midterm-elections-for-statewide-election-officials-could-spell-trouble-for-2024/) – LASA IS

In the aftermath of the 2020 Presidential election and President Trump’s attempt to subvert its results, there has been an increased focus on the oft overlooked statewide position of secretary of state. During his attempts to subvert the results of the election, President Trump put pressure on secretaries of state across the country to undermine the results in their respective states. As the midterm elections draw near, and with many Secretary of State positions on the ballot, the former President is endorsing candidates in key battleground states who agree with his claims of fraud in the 2020 Presidential election. If they are appointed to office, these candidates could undermine the nation’s free and fair elections in 2024. The secretary of state responsibilities include the management and oversight over elections within their respective state. While they run with the affiliation of a political party, the office tends to act in a bureaucratic sense and does not get involved with partisan conflicts. The position had very little spotlight until the aftermath of the 2020 presidential election when former President Trump attempted to overturn the results of the election. This is most evidently seen in his call to Georgia Secretary of State Brad Raffensperger, a Republican, to “find” about 11,000 ballots needed to flip the results in the state from a Trump loss to a win. Raffensberger refused President Trump’s demand, and the election in Georgia was certified as a Biden victory, supported by several recounts that reinforced the same result. With current officials across both parties refusing to help President Trump overturn the election, he has begun to endorse candidates for Secretary of State who support his claim of fraud. With the 2022 midterm elections approaching, 27 secretary of state seats are up for election across the nation. Within these races there are 21 candidates in 18 states who deny the validity of the last Presidential election’s results. Of these, Trump has endorsed three candidates for the position in Arizona, Georgia, and Michigan: three competitive states from the last election cycle. One such example is Arizona state Representative Mark Fincher, who attended the January 6 riot and has introduced a bill to decertify Arizona’s 2020 election. Even in Georgia, Raffensperger faces a primary challenge from U.S Rep Jody Hice, who is seeking the position to “aggressively pursue voter fraud.” While these candidates actively sow doubt about the previous election, they are attempting to be elected to control the next ones. If elected, they can use their office to skew and manipulate election results in Trump’s favor if he runs again in 2024. If elected, Secretaries of State who support baseless claims of election fraud will weaken U.S democracy by undermining the country’s free and fair elections. President Trump’s current attempt to put supporters of his claims of fraud into secretary of state offices across the country would enable him to politicize election institutions, decrease faith in the stability of elections, and potentially overturn unfavorable results. If these hyper-partisan candidates are elected, it would mark a stark change in the office of secretary of state, making it a much more political body. Instead of acting in a nonpartisan manner, these new secretaries would be able to use the powers of their office for the benefit of Trump’s election attempts. While there are concerns that these candidates could take action against election results, they would also diminish faith in America’s democracy and electoral system. A January 2022 poll from Quinnipiac found that 58 percent of Americans believe that the country’s democracy is under the threat of collapse. Since the Secretary of State leads elections in each state, if there is not faith in them to properly fulfill their duties, there is little chance that the public would believe that elections are free and fair. With a majority of Americans believing that democracy is under threat, it is important that the people in charge of elections are able to instill the public’s trust in the electoral system’s ability to uphold democracy. It would be a hard task to strengthen democracy while those in charge of elections are actively supporting notions of fraud. Furthermore, if Trump runs once again in 2024, supporting Secretaries of State in key states could potentially help undermine election results, in the guise of security, in their states to reverse results in favor of Trump. Altogether, these factors demonstrate the threat that these candidates can potentially have to U.S democracy.

### Impact Turn – Populism

#### Republican win lead to populism

Ulmer 5/26/22 – (Alexandra Ulmer is a U.S. National Correspondent with Reuters. “Beyond Donald Trump, Trumpism is the winner in U.S. midterm primaries," Japan Times, 5-26-2022, <https://www.japantimes.co.jp/news/2022/05/26/world/us-midterms-trumpism/>) – LASA LC

The crushing defeat of David Perdue in Tuesday’s Republican gubernatorial primary in Georgia likely delighted Donald Trump’s adversaries, who have been keeping scorecards to measure the performance of election candidates backed by the former U.S. president. **Trump has weighed in on November’s midterm elections like no former president, announcing more than 190 endorsements and holding rallies with his proteges**. The success of his endorsees is seen as a key sign of his continued influence over the party as he hints at another run for the White House in 2024. But political analysts and Republican strategists caution that any jubilation among Trump’s enemies over Perdue’s loss to Georgia Gov. Brian Kemp is short-sighted, and that any scorecard is a poor barometer for the state of **Trumpism in the United States in 2022.** While Trump’s candidates have had mixed success so far this year in party primaries, **many Republican voters still embrace Trump’s false claims** of voter fraud in the 2020 election, as well as his right-wing, **“America First” populist ideology**. And failure to win Trump’s endorsement has not stopped some Republican candidates from going hard-right to try to win over his base. “In 2016, Trump was really the only candidate running as that sort of populist. Now it’s increasingly what most Republican primary candidates sound like,” said Republican strategist Alex Conant. That underlines the continuation of the Trump-led metamorphosis of the Republican Party since he was voted out of the White House in 2020, even as some party leaders seek to move the party away from Trumpism, the strategists and analysts said. “I think the No. 1 thing **Trump has absolutely changed in the party** is that **Republicans don’t even try playing nice anymore.** My side has become more angry,” said Republican strategist Chuck Warren. The people’s ‘Make America Great Again’ Trump’s kingmaker status was put to the test this month when several high-profile, Trump-backed candidates faced Republican primaries in Ohio, Pennsylvania, North Carolina and Georgia. Around two-thirds of high-profile candidates backed by Trump triumphed in their contests in May, although some were running unopposed or against weak challengers. One race, the Republican senate contest in Pennsylvania between television personality Mehmet Oz, who received Trump’s endorsement, and former hedge fund executive David McCormick, has yet to be decided. In lobbying for the former president’s endorsement, both men **cast aside their elite backgrounds to espouse the Trump-style populism that now resonates with Republicans.** The primary was shaken up by Kathy Barnette, a conservative political commentator, who came from nowhere at the 11th hour to tighten a race that had until then appeared to be a two-man contest. While she finished a distant third in the primaries, analysts said she was emblematic of how Trump’s Make America Great Again movement has expanded beyond his control. “MAGA does not belong to President Trump,” Barnette said during a Republican debate last month, even as Trump spoke out against her. “Although he coined the word, **MAGA actually belongs to the people**.” Republican voters in Pennsylvania also backed Trump-endorsed far-right candidate Doug Mastriano for governor, who supports abortion bans with no exceptions and backs Trump’s false claims of election fraud. Mastriano won his contest. In North Carolina, Republican voters powered Trump-backed Representative Ted Budd, who voted to overturn Joe Biden’s election win, to victory in the state’s Republican Senate nomination. Georgia’s governor’s race, where Perdue was pummeled on Tuesday by Kemp, shows how the Republican Party has shifted to the right, irrespective of how Trump-endorsed candidates perform in these primaries. While Kemp did not entertain Trump’s conspiracy theories of 2020 election fraud, he did enact sweeping voting restrictions, limited abortions and expanded gun rights. But voters were only willing to follow Trump so far in backing flawed candidates in May’s nominating contests. In another race on Tuesday, for Georgia’s secretary of state position, some experts had forecast neither securing a majority, triggering a run-off. Instead, incumbent Brad Raffensperger narrowly defeated Trump-endorsed Rep. Jody Hice, who amplified Trump’s baseless claims that he actually won the Georgia presidential vote in 2020. In North Carolina, voters ousted scandal-plagued congressman Madison Cawthorn despite Trump’s last-minute plea to give him “a second chance.” And in Nebraska, Trump’s choice for governor, Charles Herbster, lost amid accusations that he had sexually harassed several women. But what is already clear, analysts say, is that Trump’s winning 2016 strategy to seize on the issues **bitterly polarizing** Americans is increasingly being emulated by Republican candidates this year and enthusiastically embraced by party supporters. **The spread of this right-wing populism** may ultimately open the door for more challengers to Trump’s vice-like grip on the party ahead of the next presidential election, said Conant, the Republican strategist.