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#### Trump’s hard-line immigration policies generate anti-republican sentiment resulting in a narrow democratic victory in the midterms but a shift towards softer immigration policy swings voters.

FiveThirtyEight, 6/20 (Nate Silver – founder and editor in chief of FiveThirtyEight, Clare Malone – senior political writer for FiveThirtyEight, Perry Bacon Jr. – senior writer for FiveThirtyEight, and Micah Cohen – politics editor for FiveThirtyEight, “Can Trump Use Hard-Line Immigration Policies To Turn Out GOP Voters?”, FiveThirtyEight, 2018, <https://fivethirtyeight.com/features/can-trump-use-hard-line-immigration-policies-to-turn-out-gop-voters/>)

micah: We’re talking about immigration today. There’s a lot going on. The family separation issue, first and foremost, but also some House votes. There’s reporting that the White House wants to make immigration the issue for the 2018 midterms, and that they’re planning further hard-line immigration moves. From Tuesday’s Playbook: “The White House is making the conscious decision that divisive immigration policy — not a booming economy — should be the focus of the 2018 midterms. We can’t tell you how dumb many Republican leaders think this is.” So, here’s the question: Is that dumb? Will a hard-right immigration message and/or policy help the White House/Republicans in 2018? clare.malone (Clare Malone, senior political writer): In general elections, I think it’s going to hurt them. The current administration policy just seems miscalibrated — taking this really hard-line approach (separating children from families) that doesn’t even seem to appeal to the entire ideological base (i.e., most Americans, including about half of Republicans, think this is a bridge too far). And this issue could engender more anti-Republican sentiment come November. So there, I just made the Republican leaders’ argument. natesilver: There’s maybe a world in which the White House could use immigration dexterously as a “wedge issue” to turn out its base, but that’s not the world the White House inhabits. They’re too clumsy, too indifferent as to whether individual policies are popular and too eager to fight ideological battles that they might trick themselves into believing are good politics. perry (Perry Bacon Jr., senior writer): Can I briefly reject the premise here, that the White House has some brilliant strategy or is making a “conscious decision” to make the midterms about immigration? There is often “Trump-did-something-crazy-so-he-must-have a strategy” coverage that likely overstates Trump’s political planning and understates his desired policy goals, like stopping NFL players from kneeling or limiting immigration. natesilver: Yeah, I certainly think the Playbook/Axios/NYT “news analysis” style is too quick to attribute strategic motives instead of ideological ones. Or what may just be people being dumbasses and faking their way through the strategy. micah: I mean, they’re certainly pursuing a bunch of hard-line immigration policies. perry: I suspect a ton of Republican candidates will run on the economy in the fall. I have no idea what Trump will say during the fall campaign, but my guess is he doesn’t either. I doubt he has a message calendar that he’ll be following, like George W. Bush or Barack Obama might have had. natesilver: I guess one could argue that the economy (and maybe North Korea?) can be used to help Republicans hold ground among swing voters, but that won’t turn out the base. micah: Yeah … Nate, intentional or not, you said in one of these chats a few weeks ago that if you were a Republican strategist, you would focus on ginning up base turnout. That, most likely, Democratic base turnout will be high, and so the best strategy is probably to try to counter that with your own base. clare.malone: I said this on the podcast, but I guess it makes sense in some way to run all the Trumpy anti-immigrant ads, etc., now, during primary campaigns. But come September, you’d better have more of a message than that if you’re a Republican. perry: Yeah, I also think that the GOP should run on cultural issues. But I’m not sure we are seeing that right now, as opposed to an ex post facto explanation for a policy blunder. micah: OK, let’s leave aside intent for the moment though. natesilver: But that gets to the issue of clumsiness. Like, if you’re laser-focused on sanctuary cities, maybe you could do OK. Maybe you could use that issue as enough of a dog whistle to your base, without necessarily turning off moderates. But stuff like separating families at the border? Curtailing legal immigration? Shutting down the government over the wall? Those are extremely unpopular measures. clare.malone: This particular issue seems to have brought the various White House “wings” back into the foreground, and in the post-Bannon age, we mostly seem to have forgotten about the wings. But some people think this is great policy/politics (like White House policy adviser Stephen Miller), and a lot of other people (like Homeland Security Secretary Kirstjen Nielsen) are trying to get their way around a pretty ugly policy while not getting the president mad at them. It just seems sort of like a) bad politics and b) perhaps a sign of bad internal organization. natesilver: I do wonder how much of it is borne out of a view — from Trump and from other senior officials in the White House — that the polls are fake and the media outrage is fake and they have their finger on the true pulse of American opinion. perry: I think that’s closer to where I am. They are doing this because they believe in deterring illegal immigration by basically any means necessary. But they also believe the backlash is overstated by a press that is often hypercritical of them. micah: OK, I’m going to play devil’s advocate. clare.malone: Great movie. micah: Forget the separating families — that’s prima facie horrible and seems like bad politics too. But isn’t the idea that Republicans need something beyond the economy and North Korea actually correct? clare.malone: Why? Rule of threes? micah: Yup. haha, no… Because the GOP base isn’t as enthused as the Democratic one right now. clare.malone: You’re saying they need something that tides over the tribal identity issue. natesilver: So talk about Colin Kaepernick or some shit. clare.malone: ^^^^ Or just focus on wall funding. You don’t need to do this child separation thing. natesilver: The wall is pretty darn unpopular, though. clare.malone: I would guess it’s more popular than separating 2,000 kids from their parents. perry: Sanctuary cities/MS-13/NFL national anthem protests — these are all issues that 1. Trump wants to tweet/talk about instead of reciting boring economic stats; and 2. play into the negative partisanship stuff that will be used for base turnout. But talking about how terrible San Francisco or Nancy Pelosi is would do the trick as much as sanctuary cities. I don’t think Republicans need immigration policies necessarily to gin up negative partisanship, as much as they need reminders to their base that “Democrats are the party of all that stuff you hate.” Republicans know Trump wants to talk about this kind of stuff anyway, so they have to find a way to make that part of the 2018 strategy. micah: But it’s interesting to me that some of you — Nate, at least — seem to think that the NFL anthem stuff or Pelosi stuff is maybe a better option than immigration. (Again, put aside separating families — I feel like they’ll have to retreat on that pretty soon.) perry: There are very few immigration ideas that unify all Republicans. The national anthem issue, in contrast, is very unifying among Republicans: 86 percent of Republicans say kneeling during the national anthem is “never appropriate,” according to a Washington Post-Kaiser Family Foundation poll earlier this year. So is anti-Pelosi sentiment: 72 percent of Republicans view her unfavorably, according to a recent Ipsos poll. clare.malone: Couldn’t he talk about wall stuff or, I don’t know, talk about E-Verify, things like that? I can’t help but think that coming up with a more refined Trumpian take on immigration could help them through both the primaries and the general. perry: Republicans probably should run on identity issues writ large, with some anti-immigration rhetoric as a part of that. That kind of messaging is challenging for Democrats. Do Joe Manchin or Claire McCaskill want to defend sanctuary cities? natesilver: I think when you asked me to put my Republican strategist hat on a few weeks ago, Micah, the tricky part wasn’t finding something that turns out your base, but something that turns out your base without simultaneously hurting you among swing voters and also turning out the Democratic base. Lots of people might think Trump’s NFL stance is sort of dumb, but it’s not likely the sort of thing that’s going to turn out Democrats to vote or that will greatly influence a swing voter’s decision. micah: I bet the same is true for sanctuary cities, E-Verify, etc. clare.malone: Basically, they picked the worst possible issue angle to make the story. I know politicians get a lot of shit for poll-testing things but … there’s a reason to do it! micah: “Should we do terrible shit to children?” Yes No Not sure Yeah, that question could have saved everyone a lot of heartache. perry: Trump seems to be in some danger of overlearning lessons from 2016. I don’t think he won the general election because of the wall and the Muslim ban. (The primary, yes.) I do think, in general, that it helped that he was seen as taking on the cultural left. I also think it’s different when you are the person running the government and implementing policy. I’m not sure people voted for Stephen Miller-ism, even if Miller thinks they did. clare.malone: Do we attribute any of this to, say, Chief of Staff John Kelly checking out and no one being awake at the wheel when it comes to this kind of across-the-board strategy stuff? I’m a little curious as to how this actually got this far without the ramifications being thought through. micah: I tend to ignore most of this kind of reporting, but there have been some stories lately about Kelly basically giving up. natesilver: Didn’t Kelly mention the child separation policy last year as part of a plan to deter immigration? perry: I think this policy was thought through. There is a lot of reporting about the administration having long considered it. clare.malone: Yeah, fair point. I take that back. But in general, who’s doing the political strategy thinking? Miller? If so, yikes. micah: No one? perry: Miller and Trump are driving this. There is some reporting to indicate that. micah: But Miller is thinking in terms of policy, not politics, right? clare.malone: Right. I mean politics. Who’s driving that? No one maybe? natesilver: I wonder if the fact that Trump has had a few successes — or at least things he can claim to be successes — is making him feel as though he can be a little bolder. clare.malone: Yeah, but this was in motion before North Korea. perry: Miller thinks the politics are fine here. So does Trump. They think they won because of this stuff in 2016 and that they are doing pretty well now and this is a media storm that will blow over. clare.malone: I think my point is, if Miller is your person running overall political strategy, not just policy, that’s a problem. He’s an ideologue. perry: Yeah, Clare, you make an important point: Are there are any establishment-style people left at the White House to say no to this kind of thing? Kelly favors get-tough immigration policies. But even if he opposed this, he could not kill it. He has limited power, particularly now. natesilver: It would be sort of ironic if Republicans were on track to just barely hold the House — and maybe make gains in the Senate — because of an improving economy, but Trump blew it over a border wall fight and a trade war with China. Or maybe not “ironic” — just that I think that’s a plausible course of events. micah: That seems like the likely course of events! perry: To switch this a bit, the Democrats I talk to really want this campaign to be about health care/tax cuts/cronyism — anything but this race/identity stuff. Their general view is that every day talking about health care is good for them, and that every day talking about cultural stuff broadly is good for Trump (minus this exact policy). Are they right? micah: Yeah, I guess I do worry a little bit that we’re underrating how hard-line an immigration policy Americans will support — Republican in particular, but also white Democrats. I just feel like maybe this is an area where I actually don’t trust the polling all that much? 😬 clare.malone: Immigration? micah: Yeah. natesilver: I don’t know — maybe the fact that we’re in a Manhattan office building watching the World Cup and eating food from a fancy falafel place makes us out of touch with Real America™. But maybe that out-of-touchness manifests itself in applying our own stereotypes to Real America™ instead of trusting the polling. clare.malone: Well, Democrats seem to be steering clear of immigration stances on the campaign trail beyond “protect Dreamers and kids.” natesilver: Most people in Real America (where several of us are from, after all!) have fairly nuanced views toward immigration. micah: I’m actually thinking of white Democrats more than anyone else. clare.malone: What I’m saying is that Democrats are in primary mode on immigration too. They can’t be seen as being too appeasing to Republicans on the issue because the GOP is popularly viewed as having gone full-throttle ideological/racial on that issue by a lot of Democratic base voters. perry: The polling is fine. But maybe the questions are not quite framing the right discussion. The underlying question is really: “Do we have too many immigrants in America?” And I think that question is more contested than, “Should we separate kids from their parents at the border?” There is a sliver of Democrats who want to see decreased immigration levels, although that bloc is declining pretty sharply as immigration has become more an issue dividing the parties and the Democrats are generally the pro-immigration party now. Per Gallup, the majority of Republicans are in the reducing immigration camp. And I agree with Micah’s implication, that if immigration were not such a party-line issue, we might see some Democrats express doubts about current immigration levels. But in this environment, Trump has made the questions so simple. “Are you for kids who have lived here their entire lives staying here?” (The Dreamers debate essentially.) “Do you want kids split from parents?” Those are not hard questions for Democrats. micah: Totes agree. perry: The current framing of this issue, with Trump’s hard-line proposals being discussed, unifies Democrats but divides Republicans. It’s not the kind of wedge you want if you are the Republican president, with a huge megaphone and an ability to change the newscycle with a single tweet.

#### Dem house is necessary to impeach Trump.

Jonah Goldberg, 6/14/2017. National Review senior editor and bestselling author and columnist and fellow of the National Review Institute. His nationally syndicated column appears regularly in scores of newspapers across the United States. Named one of the top 50 political commentators in America by The Atlantic magazine “Trump Will Probably Be Impeached if Republicans Lose the House” <http://www.nationalreview.com/article/448590/democrats-take-back-house-2018-trump-probably-impeached>

Unless it steps up soon, Democrats will probably take back the majority in 2018 — and take down the president. The 1998 midterm election was a debacle for Republicans, particularly then-speaker of the House Newt Gingrich. Since Reconstruction, no president had seen his party gain seats in the House in a midterm election six years into his presidency. Gingrich, who made the election a referendum on impeaching President Bill Clinton, resigned after the loss. Clearly, voters had sent the signal, “Don’t do it.” The White House thought it had dodged a bullet. But one morning, over Thanksgiving break, then–White House chief of staff John Podesta was running in Washington’s Rock Creek park when it hit him: GOP leaders are “not going to let their members off the hook. They’re going to beat and beat and beat on them until they vote for impeachment.” It fell to Podesta to tell the still-celebrating White House staff that the midterms meant nothing, that the push to impeach the president in the House was a runaway train that could not be derailed. “This thing is rigged,” Podesta announced at a Monday-morning staff meeting. “We are going to lose.” President Trump’s White House could use a John Podesta about now. Because no one seems to have told Trump’s team that the Democrats are every bit as committed to impeaching Trump as the GOP was to impeaching Clinton. The difference, of course, is that the Democrats don’t control the House — yet. If they did, as the Washington Examiner’s Byron York rightly noted recently, impeachment proceedings would already be underway. And if the Democrats take back the House in 2018, it won’t matter to most members whether the country as a whole supports impeachment, because the voters who elected them — and the donors who supported them — will be in favor of it. (A recent Public Policy Polling survey found that 47 percent of Americans support impeachment while 43 percent oppose it.) Personally, I think it would be folly to impeach the president given what we know now. But that’s meaningless. The phrase “high crimes and misdemeanors” notwithstanding, the criteria for impeachment have little to do with criminal law and everything to do with politics. If 218 members of the House think it is right — or simply in their political interest — to impeach the president, he can be impeached. Whether two-thirds of the Senate decides to remove the president from office is also an entirely political decision. Given the likely composition of the Senate after the next election, however, that remains unlikely. Then again, who knows? Given how Trump responds to criticism and political pressure, would you want to bet that the tweeter-in-chief would be a model of statesmanlike restraint during an impeachment ordeal? So many of his current problems are the direct result of letting his ego or frustration get the better of him. What fresh troubles would he mint when faced with removal from office? What might he say under oath to the special counsel? Clinton, recall, was impeached and disbarred because he perjured himself in a deposition.

#### Impeachment’s key to prevent North Korea, SCS, and Middle East nuclear war.

Andy Schmookler, 3/26/2017. Award-winning American author, public speaker, social commentator, and radio talk show host. “Impeachment Delayed is America Imperiled,” Blue Virginia. http://bluevirginia.us/2017/03/impeachment-delayed-america-imperiled

It looks to me increasingly likely that the Trump presidency will end with his removal from office through impeachment (despite the effort of the Republicans to protect him.) The question is, when? The other day, on The Last Word with Lawrence O’Donnell, the discussion of the Trump-Russia connection arrived at the point that the FBI investigation must of course take precedence over the investigations by Congress. That’s because congressional hearings and investigations could interfere with the ability of the FBI to build its cases and then to prosecute those who have committed criminal acts. Then it was said that the completion of the FBI investigation would likely take another year or two. But this is no time to let the mills of justice grind slowly. The passage of time compounds the danger that the Trump presidency is posing to the nation. The paramount danger here is the threat of war. Threatening clouds hang over the world at present, and the United States can ill afford to have Donald Trump’s hand on the helm. It is hardly Trump’s fault that the problem with North Korea is gradually coming to a head: American presidents since the 1990s have been attempting to prevent North Korean weapons from posing a nuclear threat to our Asian allies and to the United States. The agreements reached have not worked. The hope that the regime would collapse have not been fulfilled. And over the years, the North Korean stock of nuclear bombs has increased, and it has made great progress toward acquiring the means of delivering atomic weapons to ever more distant targets. Soon, the American mainland itself may be vulnerable to nuclear attack from a rogue regime and its psychologically unstable leader. The question of how to deal with North Korea, and with the Chinese government that props up Kim’s evil regime, poses a challenge as difficult as anything American diplomacy – and the American military — have faced in a very long time. Literally millions of lives are at stake. And if there were easy answers, Clinton or Bush or Obama would have come up with them. In such a delicate situation, we cannot afford to have a man with such an attenuated connection with reality, animated by such primitive passions of dominance and vengeance, as our commander in chief. Another potential flashpoint concerns the South China Sea. Here, too, Trump is not responsible for the problem: China, with its rising power, has been asserting sovereignty over waters to which other nations have legitimate claims, and the Chinese have brushed away the finding by an international tribunal in the Hague rejecting China’s claims. History has shown that the most dangerous threats to world peace emerge out of the confrontation between an established hegemon (like the United States) and an ascendant power (like China). How to navigate toward a rebalancing of the international order that accommodates new realities in relative power is another major challenge for diplomacy—one that the world disastrously failed in 1914 and again in 1939. Donald Trump is hardly the man [person] on whom we can safely rely to find our way through this potential flashpoint for major-power confrontation. And who knows what other areas of potential conflict may arise while the FBI takes another year or two to complete its investigation? (There are a few clouds developing in the Middle East, where the Russians have reportedly told Israel that its “freedom to act” regarding Syria is over. Once before, at the end of the Yom Kippur War in 1973, a conflict between Israel and its Arab neighbors led the U.S. and the Soviet Union to escalate their level of nuclear alert to a level hardly reached hardly at all otherwise during the forty years of the Cold War.) Every day that Donald Trump is president, America is spinning the chamber in a dangerous game of Russian roulette. The question needs to be asked: How important is the successful prosecution of a few individuals in comparison with the successful navigation of potential international confrontations between nuclear powers? This is not like the slow-moving process by which a 1972 break-in led to the 1974 resignation of Richard Nixon. Nixon, for all his faults, was an intelligent person with a sophisticated knowledge of international affairs. (And at his elbow was another adept diplomat – Henry Kissenger –and not a let’s-destroy-the-world nut-job like Stephen Bannon.) With Nixon, unlike with Trump – at least until his drunken ravings at the very end – we had a commander-in-chief who, for all his faults, knew what was real and what was fantasy, and knew what he was doing. But if it is decided that the FBI’s investigation really should take precedence, even if that would delay Congress’s learning what Congress and the people should know about the possibly treasonous collusion of the Trump campaign in the attack on our elections by an adversary of the United States, then another route to a speedy conclusion of the Trump crisis should be taken. Fortunately, there is such another route: although the most spectacular reason why this President should be removed likely lies in the collusion between the Russians and the Trump campaign, that it is not the only impeachable offense we have every reason to believe that Trump has committed. There is also the issue of the “emoluments clause.” Just from what is publicly known, it would appear clear enough that Trump has violated that clause of the Constitution. The Government Ethics Office gave Trump clear warning that his total divestiture was required, lest his conflicts of interest bring him into violation of the emoluments clause. But Trump disregarded that warning. And bit by bit, the news has added to a pile of evidence that these conflicts of interest are real, are many, and are corrupting the presidency. So, if the Russia-Trump scandal does not provide the means to remove this unstable and incompetent commander-in-chief quickly – because of the FBI investigation, or for whatever other reason – the security of the nation requires us to proceed with all deliberate speed to avail ourselves of any other means available for getting that job. And it would seem that the violation of the emoluments clause provides that means.
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#### Dems are winning now – voter enthusiasm and mobilization prove

Golshan, 7/11 (Tara, “Will Brett Kavanaugh turn out the Republican base in 2018? Republicans aren’t sure.” Vox. 2018. <https://www.vox.com/2018/7/11/17553792/brett-kavanaugh-republican-base-2018-midterms>)

But is Kavanaugh the kind of win that can stop a so-called “blue wave” election year? Endangered Sen. Dean Heller certainly seemed to think so back in March, when he correctly predicted that Supreme Court Justice John Kennedy would retire, musing a Supreme Court nomination could motivate the Republican base — and possibly save his fraught reelection bid. “Republicans are going to have an opportunity now to put another Supreme Court justice in place, which I’m hoping will get our base a little motivated because right now, they’re not very motivated,” Heller said during a private event, then, according to audio obtained by Politico. “But I think a new Supreme Court justice will get them motivated.” But Republican senators are reluctant to repeat Heller’s thoughts this week. “Don’t know, don’t know,” Sen. Jeff Flake (AZ), who is retiring rather than face the brutal 2018 election cycle, told Vox on Tuesday of the prospects of motivating Republican voters. “I think people will say it’s a strong pick.” This was repeated by Sen. Lamar Alexander (TN), the chair of the Senate Republican Conference, who said, “we’ll see.” Sen. Roger Wicker (MS) said, “well, I’m not sure.” Matt Mackowiak, a conservative political strategist, also wasn’t certain. “Generally, I don’t think the Supreme Court is all that important in midterms — it was more important in this presidential election because there was an understanding there would be a couple openings and Trump and Hillary Clinton had such different ideas on what a judge should be,” he said. Sen. Cory Gardner (CO), who is the chair of the National Republican Senate Committee — the official campaign arm for Senate Republicans — alluded to the impact this Supreme Court vote will have on the 2018 midterms, but for Democrats. “You’ve got red-state Democrats who are up for election this year that are going to be faced with some pretty significant challenges with this vote,” Gardner said. “I think it’s a hot potato that’s really going to affect people going into November.” Trump’s promise to appoint conservative judges was big in 2016. Will it be in 2018? Trump’s promise to appoint conservative judges to the bench was crucial in 2016. It gained him the backing of many key Republicans, like Sen. Ted Cruz (R-TX) who reversed his disavowal of Trump into full-fledged support for this very reason. And Trump has delivered. He has had more judicial vacancies to fill than any president in recent history and he has been filling them at a fast pace. Senate Majority Leader Mitch McConnell has prioritized the effort as well, even extending the Senate’s working period through August — when lawmakers typically go home for the month — to push through more judicial confirmations. “For people that care about this, Trump is hitting home run after home run after home run,” Mackowiak said. “You could make an argument that legislatively, Trump’s record has been more narrow. His record is going to be the use of executive order, and then second, it’s going to be the judges. This is going to be the single most important part of the legacy.” Even Never Trumpers, like Wisconsin’s conservative commentator Charlie Sykes, make the case that Trump’s success with his first Supreme Court nomination of Neil Gorsuch has given Republicans something to sell to voters. “Walk through the litany of Trump outrage and disgust and slurs, and they’ll come back with ‘but Gorsuch — at least we got Gorsuch,’” Sykes told NBC. But Republicans face a very clear obstacle in November: Their voters aren’t as excited about the midterm elections as Democrats are. According to a Pew Research Report, Democratic enthusiasm for the 2018 midterms is much higher than they were in 2014. The share of enthusiastic Democratic voters is much higher this year than it was at about this point in 2014 (37 percent) or 2010 (42 percent). Fifty-five percent of registered Democratic voters say they are more enthusiastic about voting than usual — compared to 50 percent of Republicans. More conservative Republicans are more enthusiastic to vote than moderate Republicans. The timing of this Supreme Court nominee’s vote will likely be very close to Election Day. That’s not uncommon; the list of justices confirmed in a midterm election year includes Justices Antonin Scalia in 1986, Stephen Breyer in 1994, and Elena Kagan in 2010. In Scalia’s and Breyer’s cases, the minority party won back the majority in the elections. Meanwhile, Democrats are mobilizing, too Conservatives have mobilized voters to end what was perceived as a more liberal judiciary in the mid-20th century, for decades. Now Democrats want to flip the script, energizing the base around Kavanaugh’s appointment — and would likely be the most conservative Supreme Court in a generation. As Vox’s Ella Nilsen reported, liberal activists are organizing the resistance to Kavanaugh’s nomination around health care: The center of their focus is a new threat to undermine the ACA: a lawsuit arguing preexisting condition bans should be unconstitutional. The lawsuit, which Vox’s Dylan Scott reported on last month, was initially brought by conservative states. But the Trump administration recently signed on in another push to destroy Obamacare. The Supreme Court has twice affirmed the legality of the Affordable Care Act. But this latest effort by the Trump administration makes it clear these lawsuits are not going away anytime soon. It’s a two-pronged approach from activists, Nilsen writes: “First, get senators to oppose the nomination, and second, flip the Senate in the November midterms.” In other words, while Republicans pressure red-state Democrats, 10 of whom are defending their seats in 2018, to break with their party, Democrats are going to elevate the ideological threat of a right-wing bench. “The question is: Are Republicans going to be able to go on offense on the Supreme Court against Democrats in swing states?” Mackowiak said. Democrats are adding in another factor: their own offense.

### Generic Ballot

#### Dems win the midterms --- generic ballot and enthusiasm prove

Wise, 7/6 (Justin, “Poll: Dems have 10-point lead on generic House ballot”, The Hill, 2018, <http://thehill.com/homenews/395812-poll-dems-lead-gop-by-10-on-generic-house-ballot>)

Democrats enjoy a 10-point lead over Republicans on the generic House ballot, according to a new Washington Post-Schar School poll released Friday. Of the registered voters surveyed, 47 percent said they preferred to vote for a Democrat in the November midterm elections, while 37 percent said they would cast a vote for a Republican. The Washington Post notes that the margin does not grow statistically in battleground districts, with the lead for the Democrats at 12 percentage points in those districts. The survey also indicates that Democrats are more energized to vote in the upcoming midterms than Republicans. Among Democrats and Democratic-leaning independent voters in battleground districts, 59 percent of voters said they think the midterms are extremely important. Meanwhile, 46 percent of Republicans and Republican-leaning independents said the same. The poll comes four months ahead of an immensely important general election for Democrats, as they try to seize on opposition to President Trump to retake the House. The party needs to pick up at least 24 House seats to gain a majority in the lower chamber. In late June, a similar poll from Politico found Democrats held a 7-point lead over Republicans on the generic House ballot.

### Supreme Court

#### Kennedy’s retirement fuels democratic motivation.

Kim, 7/7 (Seung Min – congressional reporter, “Democrats hope Kennedy's retirement will make courts a galvanizing issue for voters”, Chicago Tribune, 2018, <http://www.chicagotribune.com/news/nationworld/politics/ct-kennedy-retirement-supreme-court-democrats-midterm-voters-20180707-story.html>)

Democratic leaders and activists are hoping to use the battle over Kennedy's replacement — and the consequences that come with potentially shifting the court to the right for a generation — as a way to energize the party around the future of the judiciary in the same way conservatives have successfully used the issue for years to galvanize Republican voters. "For folks who have more progressive social views, they have mistakenly felt that those rights were comfortably secure," said Sen. Christopher Coons, D-Del., describing why Democratic voters have not made the courts as central an issue as Republican voters. "A generation of younger voters have grown up in a time where they literally can't imagine Roe being overturned." Conservatives have methodically mobilized for decades on judicial nominations sparked by decisions handed down by the Supreme Court under Chief Justice Earl Warren, which advanced liberal causes in the 1950s and 1960s through landmark decisions on civil rights, privacy and the power of the federal government. The movement built up strength over time and is now playing an even more influential role as groups such as the Federalist Society, founded more than three decades ago, are directly involved in the Trump administration's selection of nominees for the Supreme Court as well as other openings on federal courts. Conservatives spent decades arguing that "activists" on the federal bench were advancing liberal policies, proving to be a powerful force even when Republicans controlled Congress or the White House. "There are so many issues conservatives care about that they feel the courts have taken away from the American people," said Carrie Severino, the chief counsel and policy director of the Judicial Crisis Network, a well-financed heavyweight group on the right. "Liberals have been very effective at skipping right to the courts." But with that dynamic beginning to change, Democrats are looking to replicate the success of groups like Severino's and the Federalist Society, while acknowledging it could be a difficult task. Judicial views on religion likely to figure into a fierce Supreme Court confirmation fight Among Democrats, the lack of interest in the courts is evident even among the most educated and active voters of the party's base — an issue that strategists are trying to better understand and mitigate. Nearly three weeks before Kennedy said he would retire, newly formed group Demand Justice held a pair of focus groups in this Ohio capital composed of engaged Democratic voters to test their views toward the courts. The focus groups — one of white women and the other of black millennials — found that rallying around the courts was not a high priority for these voters and that the role of the courts was not well-known. Participants often didn't distinguish between local courts and the federal judiciary. During a focus group of 10 college-educated white female voters, one woman named Olivera, 37, said that when it came to judges, "I don't see their day-to-day impact on my life." Though Kennedy, who has been the key swing vote on the court for years, had been in the news just that week after ruling in favor of a Colorado baker who declined to make a wedding cake for a same-sex couple, seven out of the 10 women in the focus group didn't know who he was. And when asked about the likelihood that Roe v. Wade, the landmark decision legalizing abortion, would be overturned, a 42-year-old woman named Amanda responded: "I think it's completely unlikely." Brian Fallon, Demand Justice's executive director, said that initially, the focus group participants didn't acknowledge the Kennedy seat as the one that could tip the balance against Roe v. Wade. But once they were given more information about the stakes involved with the Kennedy seat, the voters became concerned much more quickly and subsequently more motivated to mobilize. Potential Trump Supreme Court pick Barrett: Catholic Chicago judge stirs abortion debate "If Trump succeeds in this confirmation fight, progressives will learn the hard way of the importance of the courts," said Fallon, a veteran of the Obama administration and the Hillary Clinton campaign. "It's unfortunate it might take that for the left to realize the courts are an institution worth fighting for." Liberals are still smarting from Senate Republicans decision in 2016 to ignore President Barack Obama's third nominee to the Supreme Court — a move that Democratic senators initially thought would backfire politically on the GOP. But instead, Senate Majority Leader Mitch McConnell's tactic to obstruct Merrick Garland's nomination proved to be a boon for both candidate Trump and the Senate Republicans who were then at risk of losing their majority. Democratic Senate candidates barely campaigned on the issue, and the topic of the Supreme Court went unmentioned at the Democratic National Convention in Philadelphia that year. "I had to calm myself down because no one was talking about it," said Nan Aron, who leads the progressive Alliance for Justice. "No one." Meanwhile, Trump's promise to nominate conservative justices from a list the Federalist Society helped compile helped persuade Republican voters to support a presidential nominee who once backed abortion rights. Of the 21 percent of voters who said the Supreme Court was the most important issue for them in the 2016 election, 56 percent cast their ballots for Trump, while just 41 percent voted for Hillary Clinton, according to exit polls. "Politicians come and politicians go, but these are lifetime appointments," said South Dakota Sen. John Thune, the third-ranking Senate Republican. "And to the base, the Constitution and maintaining our constitutional rights and freedoms is a very, very big priority politically." Part of the left's new strategy is to encourage Democratic senators to be more confrontational when it comes to Trump's reshaping of the federal judiciary. Justice Anthony Kennedy retires, allowing Trump to replace pivotal swing vote on Supreme Court Demand Justice has lavished praise on Sen. Mazie Hirono, D-Hawaii, who has pledged to oppose advancing all Trump judicial nominees as a form of protest vote. And before Kennedy made his retirement official, the group had already planned to try to persuade Democratic senators to vow to oppose any person on Trump's shortlist of potential justices. About a third of the 49-member Democratic caucus has made that pledge already, Fallon said. His organization, which currently employs about a dozen people, launched a $5 million campaign to drive up opposition to Trump's eventual nominee, although Fallon said the group has raised more than that amount. A month before Kennedy's retirement announcement, Demand Justice started ads on the perceived front-runners on Trump's shortlist of justices. "Since Trump, I have never seen so much energy and activity on the progressive side around the courts," said Aron, a veteran of the judicial wars. "And it will only grow with this Supreme Court fight that's brewing." There's some evidence that the confrontational tactic could resonate. In a separate phone poll that Demand Justice conducted in April of Democratic voters, 53 percent said it's "very important" for Senate Democrats to oppose most or all of Trump's picks for the courts, while 60 percent said they would be "much less" likely to back a Democratic candidate who had voted in favor of Trump's judicial nominees. "Honestly, I like right now how the Democrats have not been, at the federal judge level, not been approving some of Trump's nominations," said Hassan Zahir, 36, who participated in the focus group here of black millennial voters. "Some of them are starting to pay more attention, and those are the type of people we need in office."

### A2 Dem Infighting

#### Party infighting is irrelevant to election outcomes.

Grossmann and Hopkins 7/12 (Matt Grossmann, an associate professor of political science at Michigan State University, and David A. Hopkins, an associate professor of political science at Boston College, are the authors of “Asymmetric Politics.” “No, Democrats Aren’t Ruining Their Midterm Chances” The New York Times. July 12, 2018. <https://www.nytimes.com/2018/07/12/opinion/democrats-midterms.html>)

Will Democratic gains in the November midterm elections be squandered by an inopportune bout of party infighting? The upset by the first-time candidate Alexandria Ocasio-Cortez over the 10-term incumbent and House Democratic Caucus chairman Joseph Crowley in New York’s 14th Congressional District primary has reinvigorated this debate.

Ms. Ocasio-Cortez, a member of the Democratic Socialists of America and an alumna of Bernie Sanders’s 2016 presidential campaign, ran on an ambitious left-wing platform while attacking “establishment incumbents” and “the institutional Democratic Party” for their supposed ideological timidity. Nancy Pelosi, the House Democratic leader, appeared to minimize Ms. Ocasio-Cortez’s victory by describing it as “just one district”; some political analysts warned that the popularity of such appeals in the blue precincts of Queens and the Bronx is unlikely to be equaled in the places elsewhere in the country where federal elections are usually decided.

Top Democratic officials — and their sympathizers in the pundit class — are evidently concerned that the surge in liberal activism provoked by the Trump presidency may pose a threat to the party’s fortunes in 2018 by exacerbating what a recent Times article described as “a moment of extraordinary conflict” and “turmoil on the left.”

But they needn’t worry too much: American history demonstrates that party unity is not a necessary condition for electoral success. Democrats repeatedly won presidential and congressional elections by landslide margins in the decades between the 1930s and 1960s even as the national party was deeply split between Northern and Southern wings that disagreed on issues ranging from civil rights to the Vietnam War — much more fundamental rifts than any current divide within the party.

More recently, the growth of the Tea Party movement during the presidency of Barack Obama produced notably sharp fractures among Republicans that ended the careers of several leading politicians, but it did not prevent Republican candidates from netting 70 House seats and 14 Senate seats between 2010 and 2014.

Political commentators often suggest that national parties maximize their electoral effectiveness when they push a single policy program or message. But the Democratic Party is organized as a coalition of social groups and best served when candidates are free to shape individual campaign appeals tailored to the interests of their own constituencies. Rather than acting as a single party “base” with a common set of policy goals or ideological commitments, Democratic supporters are made up of a diverse array of social groups strewn across state and district boundaries, each with its own agenda of political concerns and quest for representation among the party leadership. Mobilizing the collective Democratic faithful from coast to coast therefore requires a variety of distinct campaign messages — and messengers.

The differing complexion of the Democratic electorate from one place to another also helps to explain why pressure from party liberals for greater ideological purity (and a more confrontational approach toward the Trump administration) is not evenly distributed across the nation. While veteran blue-state officeholders like Mr. Crowley, Gov. Andrew Cuomo of New York and Senator Dianne Feinstein of California face intraparty challengers from the left, moderate Senate Democrats facing re-election in red states have all either won their primaries or appear on the way to renomination without fear of serious contestation.

As a result, the widespread surge of anti-Trump activism over the past two years has not endangered Democratic electoral prospects by producing a raft of candidates who are poor fits for the broader voting public in their home seats. Special-election nominees like Doug Jones and Conor Lamb have received enthusiastic support from liberal activists despite keeping their distance from the left wing of the party.

If the Democratic Party is undergoing a transformation in the Trump era, it is less ideological than compositional. The party has already nominated a record number of women for Congress in 2018, many of whom are running for competitive seats now held by Republicans. At least three Hispanic Democrats (including Ms. Ocasio-Cortez) are poised to succeed white incumbents in majority-minority House districts. And the November election is also likely to produce the first Eritrean-American and female Native-American members of the legislative branch.

These demographic changes will have substantive implications as well. Research has shown that female and nonwhite representatives tend to concentrate on different issues than white men of the same party. Although the next opportunity to regain control of the elected branches in Washington is still at least two years away, an internal Democratic debate has already begun over how to prioritize initiatives championed by different elements of the party.

The renewed energy on the American left and the evolution of the party’s chief sources of mass support have added a number of new concerns to an already long wish list of policy changes.

But while the 2018 midterms have produced a diverse cast of Democratic candidates running on a mix of issues all over the country, the presence of Mr. Trump in the White House and the procedural rules in the Senate ensure that the actual policy effects of this year’s election are likely to be minor even if the party succeeds in capturing control of Congress.

The full consequences of the debates that have separated Democrats along racial, gender and generational lines in the current campaign will emerge only once the party returns to power in future years. Is health care affordability the most critical problem that the government should address, or is it gun violence, or child care, or immigration reform?

To achieve legislative success, future Democratic leaders will need to broker agreements among party factions over policy priorities as well as policy details. Party unity may not help win elections, but it becomes quite valuable once the time to govern has arrived.

# Links

## DACA

#### Compromising on DACA is a massive electoral win for the GOP.

Detroit News, 6/9 (“Our Editorial: GOP must seize moment on immigration deal”, 2018, <https://good-politic.com/our-editorial-gop-must-seize-moment-on-immigration-deal/8197/>)

Republicans facing an uphill battle to hold their congressional majorities this fall should not leave Washington for the summer without enacting comprehensive immigration reform that includes relief for the so-called Dreamers. The moment is ripe for a compromise that restores the Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals program, adopts common sense policies for legal immigration and gives President Donald Trump enough additional border security and enforcement resources for him to assuage his base. Republicans should move now, rather than go into the fall campaigns having to explain to voters why they have been unable to reach agreement among themselves on how to resolve this urgent issue. House Speaker Paul Ryan met with the GOP caucus late last week in hopes of coming up with a plan to forestall a threat by centrist Republicans to join with Democrats in pushing ahead a discharge petition that would force a series of floor votes on immigration. Michigan Reps. Fred Upton, R-St. Joseph, and Dave Trott, R-Birmingham, were among the Republicans demanding movement. They are right to do so, and should be commended for their leadership. This should not be so hard. A bipartisan majority in Congress agrees that DACA immigrants must be protected. These are people who have grown up in this country, are Americans in every way except legal status and, for the most part, are contributing to an economy in desperate need of workers. Voters overwhelmingly support giving them legal status and a path to citizenship. Continuing to use them as pawns in the overall immigration debate is a risky strategy heading into the mid-term elections.

## Hardline Disapproval

#### The GOP’s hardline immigration policies are what energize the democratic base. Plan saps this political momentum ensuring a GOP victory.

Bump, 6/19 (Philip – national correspondent, “Doubling down on hard-line immigration politics is riskier for Trump than he seems to realize”, The Washington Post, 2018, <https://www.washingtonpost.com/news/politics/wp/2018/06/19/doubling-down-on-hard-line-immigration-politics-is-riskier-for-trump-than-he-seems-to-realize/?utm_term=.afe552f83662>)

More broadly, voters tell pollsters that Trump’s immigration positions are political detriments, not winners. Miller claims “90-10” support for Trump’s positions. NBC-Wall Street Journal polling shows that support for Trump’s immigration policies inclines about half of voters to oppose a candidate. Six in 10 told CBS News that they opposed the centerpiece of Trump’s immigration policies, building a wall on the U.S.-Mexico border. Trump’s approval ratings on immigration are lower than his overall approval and his approval on the economy among every partisan group. Arguing that Republicans express lower approval on immigration than overall because Trump isn’t taking a hard enough line on the issue, but that Democrats’ and independents’ views of Trump’s handling of immigration are also lower — and, in fact, are lower than on any other issue — suggests that taking a harder line won’t help much with midterm elections in swing districts. Winning elections, though, isn’t about getting a majority of the public to agree with you. It’s about getting a majority of the people who show up to vote to agree with you. As it stands, polling consistently shows that enthusiasm among Democrats is higher than it is among Republicans. If Trump and Miller can spur immigration voters to get to the polls — Lewandowski’s point — they can offset or eliminate that Democratic advantage. This is harder to measure. But it’s worth noting that a heightened focus on immigration could energize Trump’s base — and his opponents. Among those who are most enthusiastic about voting in November, according to CNN’s recent poll, Trump’s disapproval is highest on his handling of immigration. The people most energized to vote, in other words, disapprove of Trump most on his handling of immigration.

## Messaging

#### The plan gives the GOP a platform beyond tax reform---that guarantees GOP victory

Bush, 6/6 (Jeb – former governor and presidential candidate, “Jeb Bush: Delaying Immigration Reform Is a Missed Opportunity for Republicans”, *TIME*, [http://time.com/5302970/jeb-bush-daca-immigration-reform-republicans-midterms/)](http://time.com/5302970/jeb-bush-daca-immigration-reform-republicans-midterms/%29)

Despite the urgency of our nation’s immigration crisis, politicians on both sides of the aisle cynically employ immigration as a wedge issue, election after election, for their own benefit. Meanwhile, our inability to fix a broken system has tremendous real world costs, both human and economic. As Republicans consider whether they will hold off taking up immigration in advance of November, I offer a cautionary hypothetical: What happens if Congress doesn’t address the issue this year, and Republicans lose the majority? Do we really want to risk waiting to see what a Democratic House and an unpredictable White House may do? As opposed to caucus infighting over a vote on the fate of DREAMers — just one of many issues that must be addressed — why not embrace conservative, comprehensive immigration reform now? Piecemeal legislative efforts haven’t proved successful to date, so let’s advance a suite of reforms that will return our immigration system into a functioning and economically advantageous institution. President Donald Trump — who has displayed a striking lack of consistency on immigration policy but deserves credit for remaining focused on border security — has indicated multiple times he is open to a striking a deal, something President Obama failed to do when his party controlled Congress. The politics of the issue may be tough, but the solutions are far from elusive. First, it is past time to truly secure our border, and there are new technologies to supplement physical barriers that can be more effective at a dramatically lower cost than constructing a 2,200-mile wall— an unrealistic idea that has little chance of coming fully to fruition, regardless of who pays for it. Considering the latest idea is to “crowdfund” the estimated $21.6 billion project, it would seem pragmatic to focus on the achievable, including bolstering drone surveillance and improving infrastructure that will allow for better monitoring of our border. Second, we must end the diversity lottery — which results in 50,000 visas annually — and narrow family reunification to what every other country allots for: spouses and minor children. Chain migration accounts for a substantial portion of immigrant entrances into our country with no respect to merit or prospective benefit to our nation. Countries like Canada and Australia have prioritized economic-driven factors in their immigration systems, with substantial benefits for their economies. Based on current research, we already know legal immigrants are almost twice as likely to start a business than individuals born here, comprise a quarter of all entrepreneurs in the country and are three times more likely to file patents for innovations. Dramatically cutting legal immigration isn’t the answer. We need a guest worker program linked to market demand. We need to make it easier for foreign students gaining valuable college educations here to obtain work visas. And we must reform the H-1B visa program to help address the 6.7 million job openings that remain unfilled because employers can’t find enough skilled workers. Third, we must modernize our system, overhaul the bureaucracy and effectively enforce our immigration laws. The biggest immigration problem we face is the large population of immigrants who overstay their visas, accounting for a full two-thirds of those here illegally in recent years. Investments in our court system and law enforcement are critical — currently, there is a backlog of more than 700,000 cases before immigration judges. E-Verify, a Department of Homeland Security resource that enables businesses to check if prospective employees are eligible to work in the U.S., must be enhanced and made mandatory to use; employers who don’t should face sanctions. We also have to improve the William Wilberforce Trafficking Victims Protection Reauthorization Act so it no longer provides an unintended incentive for sending Central American children into the country illegally. Finally — and likely the most difficult element to achieve consensus on — we need to address the full population of illegal immigrants in our country today. For all law-abiding DREAMers, there should be a path to citizenship. But the same should not be extended to their parents or other undocumented immigrants who broke laws to come here. Rather, we should develop a framework that allows for them to come out from the shadows, apply for a provisional green card, pay a fine, pay taxes (as many already do) and, over an extended period of time, earn legal status. Rhetoric aside, our country has no realistic plans to deport millions of people, and it’s time we address what we actually can do. Refusing to address the status of the majority of illegal immigrants in the country will only prolong our challenges. Meaningful tax reform was a huge win for the American people in 2018, but it doesn’t have to be the only one. If congressional Republicans want to be masters of their own fate on election day, they need to keep working. Tackling immigration and other issues of high priority to voters — including finally repealing Obamacare, as promised — would provide conservatives the platform guaranteed to win in 2018.

## Reform=Bipartisan

#### The plan is overwhelmingly popular, and a legacy win for trump

Robbins, 2017 (Jeremy – Executive Director of New American Economy, “Immigration may be the biggest -- and least expected -- legislative victory this year”, [http://www.foxnews.com/opinion/2017/07/17/immigration-may-be-biggest-and-least-expected-legislative-victory-this-year.html)](http://www.foxnews.com/opinion/2017/07/17/immigration-may-be-biggest-and-least-expected-legislative-victory-this-year.html%29)

President Trump caused some head scratching when he told a plane full of journalists en route to France that “what I’d like to do is a comprehensive immigration plan.” But as the Russia investigations drag on, the prospects for health care reform are on hold, and tax reform continues to be a work in progress, this seemingly far-fetched plan may in fact be the most likely opportunity for the president to land a signature legislative victory during his first year in office. It’s not the conventional bet, but this is not a conventional time nor a conventional president – and, this is not the first time we’ve seen him lay some groundwork for such a pursuit. The travel ban and aggressive enforcement have been the face of the administration’s immigration policy thus far, but the facts on the ground have changed of late. The president just announced the number of illegal border crossings has dropped by 75 percent since his inauguration. This may create the opportunity to do more. Even before his comments on Air Force One, President Trump had signaled a desire and willingness to go beyond enforcement to fix the broken visa system and address the fact that 11 million people live here without legal status. A couple weeks ago he told Apple CEO Tim Cook and a gathering of tech leaders that he would put “more heart”into the immigration debate and pledged to work on comprehensive immigration reform, a sentiment he had expressed a couple months earlier to a room full of broadcast journalists. These comments may be far from setting administration policy – indeed, Secretary of Homeland Security Kelly just indicated he may not defend Obama-era protection for DREAMers and Politico is reporting that some in the Trump Administration are advocating for cutting legal immigration in half – but they do make clear that a broad immigration overhaul is on the president’s mind and he is open to taking on the issue that has stymied every president since Reagan. I’ll be the first to acknowledge reasonable skepticism, but working on this issue from a nonpartisan vantage point, I believe there are three compelling reasons to believe immigration reform is and should be at the top of the agenda: First, this is how President Trump can fulfill his promises on immigration enforcement. On its own, a bill to build a wall is dead on arrival in the Senate. However, in 2013, a comprehensive bill passed the Senate with votes from 54 Democrats and 14 Republicans. And it passed because instead of focusing solely on enforcement, it overhauled our outdated legal immigration system. The bill didn’t skimp on the border, either. It included $46 billion for security and enforcement, double what President Trump is requesting for his wall now. It mandated hundreds of miles of walls and fences, doubled the number of border patrol agents, and funded aircraft, watchtowers, ground sensors, and mobile surveillance to further monitor the border, while also cracking down on employers who hired undocumented immigrants. Second, and in contrast to many of the administration’s other legislative priorities, overhauling the immigration system already enjoys major bipartisan support in this Congress. Since the 2013 bill, new Republican supporters like Senator Thom Tillis have joined longtime Republican stalwarts like Senators Flake and Hatch in calling for broad immigration reform. In this Congress, Republicans in both chambers have already introduced four distinct bills that would provide undocumented immigrants with legal status. (One such bill in the House has attracted more than 200 co-sponsors, including 99 Republicans.) Finally, despite all the political rhetoric, immigration is actually one of the least controversial policy issues out there. Americans don’t want open borders and amnesty, but they also don’t want to deport 11 million people, the vast majority of whom are not criminals, are working, and are active members of their communities. Multiple polls show that Americans of all political persuasions, including a clear majority of Trump voters, overwhelmingly support immigration reform that would secure the border, grant legal status to non-criminal undocumented immigrants, and bring the visa system into the 21st century by increasing protections for American workers while also allowing companies to recruit the top talent and necessary workers to fill gaps in the American workforce. Importantly, popular support for these policies is only growing – but to enact them, we’ll need a dealmaker who can succeed where so many others have failed. To get a deal, President Trump needs to sweeten the pot by adding broadly popular reforms that would grow the American economy. According to estimates from the nonpartisan Congressional Budget Office, such comprehensive reform would cut the deficit by $900 billion over 20 years because of tax revenues from the millions of people who would be able to formally enter the workforce, and would actually result in a 0.5 percent wage increase for all American workers. It would go a long way toward supporting the administration’s economic growth and job creation goals – the president’s own chair of the Council of Economic Advisers has written extensively on the large gains immigration reform can bring – while also creating the budget room for other major priorities. Of course, the loudest voices might insist on an enforcement-only approach, and decry anything they suspect to be “amnesty.” But balanced against such a challenge will be the enormous political, historical, and economic upside of passing comprehensive immigration reform. Getting to yes on immigration would be a legacy-making move for President Trump – his Nixon-goes-to-China moment, one that would put his deal-making skills on a level with the last president to sign immigration reform, Ronald Reagan. After decades of gridlock on immigration, political necessity and popular demand seem to have aligned. Now it’s in the power of the Dealmaker in Chief to make immigration reform a reality.

## Travel Ban

#### Reversing the travel ban undermines democratic recruitment of moderates in GOP districts – swings a close election.

King, 6/28 (Ledyard, “Trump celebrates, Democrats fume over Supreme Court decision upholding immigrant travel ban”, 2018, https://www.usatoday.com/story/news/politics/2018/06/26/congress-divided-supreme-court-ruling-immigrant-travel-ban/734842002/)

Tom Perez, chairman of the Democratic National Committee, said the ruling will be one more in a litany of issues Democrats have already been spotlighting on the campaign trail. "It simply underscores the importance of what we've been doing the last 18 months which is organizing in every single state," he said in an interview Tuesday. "Because the question presented in every federal race is do you want leadership that continues to divide and conquer? Do we need a check and balance on the most dangerous and divisive president in the history of this country?" The narrowness of Tuesday's ruling presented both sides with another example of the importance of winning elections: it determines who controls the Supreme Court. It was Republicans under Senate Majority Leader Mitch McConnell who successfully blocked President Obama's pick of Merrick Garland to the high court in 2016. Just moments after the Supreme Court issued its ruling, the Team Mitch Twitter account posted a picture of him about to shake hands with Justice Neil Gorsuch, who was nominated by Trump and joined the court in April 2017. "I am proud of my decision ... to let the American people decide who they wanted to appoint the next Supreme Court justice," said a different tweet Tuesday from McConnell's account. "As a result, the Senate confirmed President Trump’s outstanding nominee, Justice Neil Gorsuch.” Gorsuch was among the five justices supporting Trump's ban. Perez said Tuesday's ruling by itself won't change Democrats' message or tactics this fall other than it simply "reinforces what our strategy has been which is organizing everywhere and leading with our values." But the travel ban, coupled with the president's other positions to reduce the flow of legal and illegal immigration, could help Democrats mobilize first-generation Americans or minorities in GOP-held swing districts and closely contested Senate races.

## Visas

#### Visa reform is a win for the GOP as democrats lose their ammunition against republican immigration policy.

Mackowiak 7/4 (Matt – president of Potomac Strategy Group, “Trump, Republicans can win the immigration debate this fall”, The Washington Times, 2018 [https://www.washingtontimes.com/news/2018/jul/4/trump-republicans-can-win-the-immigration-debate-t/)](https://www.washingtontimes.com/news/2018/jul/4/trump-republicans-can-win-the-immigration-debate-t/%29%20)

Increasingly it appears that the midterm election will be a referendum on the issue of immigration. Both parties seem fine with this. The controversy surrounding family separations at the Mexican border has subsided somewhat, with President Trump signing an executive order as a temporary fix. Predictably, Congress has done nothing to address the issue. The family separation issue required the Trump administration to make a difficult choice: enforce the law as it is written or continue the much-criticized policy of “catch and release.” There is no question that the Trump White House underestimated the backlash to its shift in enforcement policy, resulting in a rare backtrack from the president. It would be to everyone’s advantage if officials can now reunify these children with their families as quickly as possible. The government must confirm that the parent and the child are in fact related, which is not as easy as it may sound. If all the parent has are documents from their home country, it may take time to verify the documents. The logistical issues involved with unifying around 1,800 children with their parents are significant as well. Add to that the very real concern of where to house these families as the parent goes through the legal system. More broadly, the Trump administration in the longer term is confident that it has a majority of the country behind them on several key immigration questions, with new polls suggesting the issue is rising to the top of voter concerns this fall. Mr. Trump and his advisers believe a majority of voters want more effective border security, with reinforced fencing for now and a border wall in urban areas as soon as funding can be secured. They also think a majority wants an end to catch-and-release, which makes a mockery of our justice system and the rule of law. They further believe a majority want E-Verify, so employers can know — and will be forced to determine — whether they are hiring illegal labor. They believe a majority of Americans want to move away from relative-based chain migration to a merit-based system, as the U.K., Canada and Australia now have. Nuclear family members would still be eligible to legally immigrate here, but not the far reaches of an extended family. Mr. Trump and his aides believe there’s a majority in the country strongly opposed to sanctuary cities, which defy federal authority and needlessly endanger the public. They believe a majority opposes any effort to abolish the Immigration and Customs Enforcement agency, which provides interior enforcement throughout the country, despite the calls from prominent Democrats in recent days to abolish the agency. That’s all clear and straightforward. The big question is, What do Democrats believe? The #AbolishICE movement is catching fire on the left, and Democratic elected officials are scrambling to align themselves with it or find some flexible formulation to avoid taking a stand. The Democrats clearly oppose a Mexican border wall. Do they believe security along the border is adequate now? If not, what are they prepared to support? Democrats want to continue the current chain migration system. My guess is that they’re betting a massive amnesty program will eventually come to pass, creating at a stroke potentially 10 million to 12 million likely new Democratic voters. And how do Democrats explain why a merit-based immigration system would not be better for our economy and our country? There is consensus in Washington that our current legal immigration system is broken. It takes far too long to come here legally, which makes illegal entry attractive. We desperately need visa reform, as we are currently educating some of the brightest minds in the world, who are then virtually forced to leave America rather than stay here and become the leading doctors, engineers, scientists and entrepreneurs of the next generation. President Trump made a good-faith offer to help the children who were receiving benefits from the Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals program, but Democrats refused to move in his direction at all. At some political risk, he put a “path to citizenship” on the table for those children, a position that made many conservatives recoil. In return, congressional Democrats made a bad-faith offer of an “authorization” for the border wall, knowing that appropriating actual money is what really matters. Immigration can be a winning issue for Mr. Trump and the Republicans this fall, provided they play the coming months right. First, they must reunify the children to put that issue completely behind them. For a permanent fix, Congress must act. The Cruz-Feinstein legislative compromise has a good chance of becoming that legislative vehicle. Second, Republicans need to define the choice that voters have before them. Republicans are in favor of legal immigration, public safety, the rule of law and sensible reform. Democrats want to abolish ICE, block measures to strengthen border security and support sanctuary cities. For voters, it shouldn’t be a hard choice.

# Link Framing

## Immigration Key

#### Immigration is the key issue driving midterm outcomes.

Edwards-Levy, 6/26 (Ariel – reporter and polling editor for HuffPost, “Immigration Gains Steam As A Midterm Issue”, Huffington Post, 2018, <https://www.huffingtonpost.com/entry/immigration-midterm-election-issue_us_5b328a40e4b0cb56051cc87f>, shae)

Immigration policy has ratcheted up in importance as a key issue in campaigns across the nation in the past week, a new poll showed, dominating voters’ minds and the messaging from office seekers in their states. Thirty-five percent of surveyed registered voters cited immigration as one of the two issues most important to them for this year’s midterm elections, a new HuffPost/YouGov survey found, edging ahead of health care and the economy, at least for the time being. A majority of polled Republican and Republican-leaning voters (55 percent) cited immigration among the issues most important to them, up from 43 percent in March. Among Democratic and Democratic-leaning voters, 19 percent called immigration a priority, up from 10 percent in the spring ― a more modest uptick that left it third in their attention, behind health care and gun policies. Immigration ranked second only to health care as an issue that voters said they would like to hear more about from midterm candidates; 36 percent of Democratic and Democratic-leaning voters and more than half of Republican and Republican-leaning voters said they’d like to hear more discussion of the issue.

#### Most recent polling shows immigration as the number one issue for voters.

Crowe, 7/6 (Jack – news writer for National Review Online, “POLL: Immigration Top Issue for Midterm Voters”, National Review, 2018, <https://www.nationalreview.com/news/poll-immigration-top-issue-for-midterm-voters/>, shae)

Immigration has emerged as the number one issue for voters in the midterm elections, surpassing both the economy and health care as the policy area that will most determine how votes are cast, according to a Reuters/Ipsos poll released Thursday. The poll, conducted between June 28 and July 2, found that fifteen percent of registered voters named immigration as the issue that will most significantly impact how they cast their vote, while fourteen percent said the economy was their top priority.

#### Moderate dems are waiting to see what happens on immigration before they decide how to vote.

Bowden, 7/6 (John, “Poll: Immigration top issue for voters ahead of midterms”, The Hill, 2018, <http://thehill.com/blogs/blog-briefing-room/news/395777-poll-immigration-top-issue-for-voters-ahead-of-midterms>, shae)

Americans are most likely to select concerns about immigration policy as the top important issue to them ahead of November's midterm elections, according to a survey released Thursday. A Reuters/Ipsos poll found that 15 percent of registered voters said on Monday that immigration is their biggest concern, topping economic performance and healthcare. That number is much higher among Republicans, with 26 percent of GOP voters citing immigration as their major concern while just 7 percent of Democrats said the same. Among Democrats, health care (16 percent) and economic worries (14 percent) top concerns over immigration, as voters stay firmly divided over President Trump's handling of the southern border. Overall, 52 percent of registered voters polled said they disapproved of Trump's job performance on immigration issues so far, with 81 percent of Republicans supporting and 84 percent of Democrats opposing his immigration policies. Americans' concerns over immigration issues has been rising since the beginning of the year, according to a Gallup poll last month, that found that the issue grew as the top concern past other issues such as gun control and race relations.

# Impacts

## Democracy

#### 2018 Dem win would be a clear rebuke of Trumpism – that stops broader erosion of American democracy.

Lanktree and Brambilla, 2017. (Graham Lanktree and Chiara Brambilla, Newsweek, **citing Brian Klaas**, a fellow in comparative politics at the London School of Economics. IS DONALD TRUMP ENDING AMERICAN DEMOCRACY? December 9, 2017. www.newsweek.com/donald-trump-ending-american-democracy-742561)

Disagreement between Republicans and Democrats on the Trump administration’s tax policy is a given. But President Donald Trump’s attacks on the pillars of U.S. democracy is something every American should fight, says Brian Klaas, an academic who studies authoritarian regimes. “I don't mind that people agree or disagree on tax policy, health care, foreign affairs," Klaas, a fellow in comparative politics at the London School of Economics, tells Newsweek. "But there are certain aspects of Donald Trump that go outside of what’s acceptable in all Western politics—our basic values.” Klaas recently published The Despot's Apprentice, a book looking at how Trump is directly attacking the core essence of American democracy and mirroring the tactics of despots throughout history. Critics call Klaas partisan, but he says that throughout the book he uses something he calls the "McCain, Romney test”—referring to the past two Republicans nominees Senator John McCain and businessman Mitt Romney—to gauge Trump’s behavior. “Anything that they would do, I don't criticize,” Klaas says. “I’m genuinely advocating for the things that two years ago, before Donald Trump’s arrival in the political scene, would have been viewed as universally accepted opinions, both in the Republican and Democratic Party. “I focus on violations of democratic procedure, democratic norms. I focus on things that we should all value: a free press, a rule of law society, the idea that people should be hired not because they are family members but because of their merit.” The politicization of rule of law is a key aspect of authoritarian rule, Klaas says, and Trump has done this repeatedly. As both candidate and president, Trump pushed for his 2016 election opponent, Democrat Hillary Clinton, to be locked up. After becoming commander in chief, he pardoned former Arizona Sheriff Joe Arpaio, who violated a court order against his discriminatory policies against immigrants. Trump supports Arpaio’s policies, which a court ruled were unconstitutional. The president also attacked the FBI last weekend, saying America’s top law enforcement agency’s reputation is in “tatters” because a single agent involved in an investigation probing his campaign reportedly sent anti-Trump text messages. The agent was quickly removed from the investigation. Republicans have followed the president's lead this week by attacking the integrity of the investigation as well as law enforcement institutions. Department of Justice Deputy Attorney General Rod Rosenstein and former Acting FBI Director Andrew McCabe have also come in for strong criticism of partisanship from Trump for things he didn’t like. Trump has also attacked federal judges for blocking his executive orders when they ruled these violated the Constitution. Earlier this year he called the checks and balances of the U.S. Constitution—the bedrock of American democracy—“archaic” and “really a bad thing for the country.” He blamed them for his rocky first 100 days in office. “This is the kind of stuff we see in banana republics, not in functioning democracies,” Klaas says. Klaas outlines four different scenarios for the future of America. “The hopeful scenario, the optimistic one, is called 'the Trump vaccine' where he shows the weaknesses in American democracy the same way that a weakened strain of a disease shows the weaknesses in your immune system and allows you to respond to it, like a vaccine,” Klaas says. This could shore up American institutions if citizens become more civically engaged and speak out against Trump’s more despotic tendencies and abuses of democratic institutions, Klaas says. But, he adds, that is an unlikely scenario. “The more likely options are things like democratic decay, where the system slowly erodes over time, day after day, and weakens itself,” Klaas says. Klaas calls the third possible scenario "the forerunner, where a Trump 2.0 figure comes along with more charisma, more discipline, but the same authoritarian impulses and is more effective at eroding American democracy.” The final scenario, which Klaas says is unlikely but still possible, is an American version of authoritarianism. This scenario might come to pass if there was a mass-casualty terrorist attack under Trump and his authoritarian impulses—including a clear desire to scapegoat and blame Muslims—took over. “All of this hinges on how people respond to Trump and one of the key benchmarks we should be looking at is next year's midterm elections,” Klaas says, noting that if there is a clear rebuke of Trump, America’s core institutions could be shored up. “These are not partisan values,” Klaas says, but the “fundamental issues of what makes a Democratic society function.”

#### America is the global model of democracy – it is a necessary check on all conflict.

Kasparov 17, Chairman of the Human Rights Foundation, 2/16/2017 Garry, “Democracy and Human Rights: The Case for U.S. Leadership” <http://www.foreign.senate.gov/imo/media/doc/021617_Kasparov_%20Testimony.pdf>

The Soviet Union was an existential threat, and this focused the attention of the world, and the American people. There existential threat today is not found on a map, but it is very real. The forces of the past are making steady progress against the modern world order. Terrorist movements in the Middle East, extremist parties across Europe, a paranoid tyrant in North Korea threatening nuclear blackmail, and, at the center of the web, an aggressive KGB dictator in Russia. They all want to turn the world back to a dark past because their survival is threatened by the values of the free world, epitomized by the United States. And they are thriving as the U.S. has retreated. The global freedom index has declined for ten consecutive years. No one like to talk about the United States as a global policeman, but this is what happens when there is no cop on the beat. American leadership begins at home, right here. America cannot lead the world on democracy and human rights if there is no unity on the meaning and importance of these things. Leadership is required to make that case clearly and powerfully. Right now, Americans are engaged in politics at a level not seen in decades. It is an opportunity for them to rediscover that making America great begins with believing America can be great. The Cold War was won on American values that were shared by both parties and nearly every American. Institutions that were created by a Democrat, Truman, were triumphant forty years later thanks to the courage of a Republican, Reagan. This bipartisan consistency created the decades of strategic stability that is the great strength of democracies. Strong institutions that outlast politicians allow for long-range planning. In contrast, dictators can operate only tactically, not strategically, because they are not constrained by the balance of powers, but cannot afford to think beyond their own survival. This is why a dictator like Putin has an advantage in chaos, the ability to move quickly. This can only be met by strategy, by long-term goals that are based on shared values, not on polls and cable news. The fear of making things worse has paralyzed the United States from trying to make things better. There will always be setbacks, but the United States cannot quit. The spread of democracy is the only proven remedy for nearly every crisis that plagues the world today. War, famine, poverty, terrorism–all are generated and exacerbated by authoritarian regimes. A policy of America First inevitably puts American security last. American leadership is required because there is no one else, and because it is good for America. There is no weapon or wall that is more powerful for security than America being envied, imitated, and admired around the world. Admired not for being perfect, but for having the exceptional courage to always try to be better. Thank you

## Immigration

### Crackdown

#### GOP control after the midterm results in immigration crackdown.

Estepa and Collins, 6/22 (Jessica, and Eliza, “President Trump says Republicans should 'stop wasting their time on immigration' until after midterms”, USA Today, 2018, <https://www.usatoday.com/story/news/politics/2018/06/22/donald-trump-gop-should-stop-wasting-their-time-immigration/725068002/>, shae)

Congress has been facing growing pressure to act on immigration, including from Trump himself. House Speaker Paul Ryan, R-Wis., has offered a bill that would toughen enforcement laws and provide funding for Trump's proposed wall on the southern border. It would also aim to help young immigrants who were brought to the U.S. as children and halt separations of families detained at the border together. The migrant family crisis has created further urgency to act. But while the bill was aimed at bridging the differences between moderate and conservative lawmakers, the prospects of passing anything look grim — and a tweet from the president could further dampen any chances the bill has of winning over reluctant conservatives. Trump on Friday morning he tweeted: "Republicans should stop wasting their time on Immigration until after we elect more Senators and Congressmen/women in November." "Dems are just playing games, have no intention of doing anything to solves this decades old problem. We can pass great legislation after the Red Wave!" Trump wrote. The tweet was “a bit of a surprise after the conference meeting. I must confess, I still think it’s something that Americans want us to do," Rep. Greg Walden, R-Ore., told reporters. Still, Rep. Patrick McHenry, R-N.C.., noted that the compromise bill was brought to the floor as a way to fulfill a promise to moderate Republicans who abandoned a bipartisan effort to force a vote on legislation that would protect undocumented immigrants who were brought to the country as children." When asked why Republicans didn't follow the president's advice, McHenry replied, "That’s a very good question. Votes were pledged in order to turn off the discharge petition." A vote on the bill that was scheduled for this week had to be postponed until next week because Republican lawmakers could not agree on the details. A more hardline piece of legislation failed to pass Thursday. Before Republicans postponed a vote on the bill on Thursday, the president blamed Senate Democrats for its weak prospects of becoming law. "What is the purpose of the House doing good immigration bills when you need 9 votes by Democrats in the Senate, and the Dems are only looking to Obstruct (which they feel is good for them in the Mid-Terms)," he tweeted. "Republicans must get rid of the stupid Filibuster Rule-it is killing you!" Trump, who campaigned for the presidency by promising to build a border wall, has emphasized his call for stricter immigration laws as a theme for the midterms. "Elect more Republicans in November and we will pass the finest, fairest and most comprehensive Immigration Bills anywhere in the world," he tweeted Thursday. "Right now we have the dumbest and the worst. Dems are doing nothing but Obstructing. Remember their motto, RESIST! Ours is PRODUCE!"

#### This crackdown massively increases family separation and indefinite detention.

Long and Taxin, 7/14 (Colleen, and Amy, “Border measures part of Trump's bigger immigration crackdown”, ABC News, 2018, <https://abcnews.go.com/Politics/wireStory/border-measures-part-trumps-bigger-immigration-crackdown-56587278>, shae)

The separation of families at the U.S.-Mexico border caught the attention of the world and prompted mass outrage, but it only tells a small part of the story surrounding the Trump administration's immigration policy. In reality, the government is working to harden the system on multiple fronts to curb immigration, carving a path around various court rulings to do so. The administration is seeking to lock up families indefinitely, expand detention space and tighten asylum rules and apply more scrutiny to green card applications. Many of the initiatives received little attention during the chaos over separated families, but they show how determined President Donald Trump is to stop immigrants from coming — both legally and illegally — even in cases where the administration has been stymied by the courts. Other administrations may have faced similar problems with illegal immigration and tried similar solutions, but all have been unable to stem the flow of migrants streaming through southern border. No other president, however, has campaigned so vociferously on the topic. "The United States will not be a migrant camp and it will not be a refugee holding facility," President Donald Trump declared days before putting an end to the separation of parents from their children. "Not on my watch." This week's headlines were dominated by stories of reunions of immigrant parents and their young children that the Trump administration had to carry out under a court order. The White House said it "worked tirelessly" to complete the reunifications and make sure the children were put back into safe homes. In the same week, however, the administration made other moves to clamp down on immigrant families, asylum seekers and those seeking green cards. The administration's attempts to deter Central American families and children from making the trip north are designed to send the message to immigrants — and Trump's supporters in an election year — that reaching the United States is going to get harder, and so will getting papers to stay in the country legally. "All of these things, I think, are part of a bigger ultimate aim, which is to significantly reduce immigration of all kinds to the United States over the longer term, and in the process, the real desire is to change the character of the country," said Doris Meissner, a former commissioner of the Immigration and Naturalization Service in the Clinton administration.

### Turns Asylum

#### Expedited removal will prevent asylum seekers from even getting into a court room.

Long and Taxin, 7/14 (Colleen, and Amy, “Border measures part of Trump's bigger immigration crackdown”, ABC News, 2018, <https://abcnews.go.com/Politics/wireStory/border-measures-part-trumps-bigger-immigration-crackdown-56587278>, shae)

Officials are also seeking to send immigrants back to their countries sooner and make it harder for them to seek asylum in a backlogged courts system where it can take years to get a ruling. Trump officials say too many people are claiming they are persecuted when they are not, adding that only 20 percent of asylum claims are granted. Asylum officers tasked with screening immigrants stopped at the border were told this week to heed a recent opinion by Attorney General Jeff Sessions that gang and domestic violence should not generally be a reason for asylum — reasons cited by many immigrants fleeing bloodshed in Central America. The result: fewer immigrants will pass these initial screenings that enable them to seek asylum before an immigration judge, said Megan Brewer, an immigration attorney in Los Angeles and former asylum officer.

## Impeachment

### Dems Key

#### GOP majority in the house is too scared to do it – dem control is key

Marcin, 2017 (Tim, Newsweek, “DONALD TRUMP WILL BE IMPEACHED IF DEMOCRATS WIN THE HOUSE IN 2018, CONSERVATIVE PUNDIT PREDICTS”, August 13, http://www.newsweek.com/donald-trump-will-be-impeached-if-democrats-win-house-2018-conservative-645974)

President Donald Trump should keep his eyes on the 2018 midterm elections, according to one conservative writer, because he'll be impeached if Republicans don't hold on to majority control of the House of Representatives. That's not to say he'd necessarily be removed from office, but John Podhoretz of Commentary magazine and the New York Post predicted that Trump would likely face at least impeachment proceedings should Democrats take the House. Podhoretz made this comment during a segment on MSNBC's Morning Joe, during which a panel was discussing the president's historically low approval ratings. Trump hit a new low Wednesday in both the right-leaning Rasmussen Reports daily survey and a Quinnipiac University poll. In the latter, just 33 percent of voters said they approved of the job he's doing. Morning Joe co-host Joe Scarborough brought up the possibility that Republican voters would abandon Trump in the 2020 presidential campaign should a conservative try to challenge him, but Podhoretz responded by pointing to 2018. "You're jumping pretty far ahead in time, and we're going to have an election next year. And the simple fact of the matter is if [Trump's] got 80 percent [approval] in Alabama, it's not like a Democrat is going to win the Senate in Alabama," Podhoretz said. "There is actually a senatorial race in Alabama, and no Democrat is going to win that now or in 2018. That's not the issue." The conservative columnist and pundit—who is not a fan of the former reality-TV star—then shifted to what he felt was the most important thing to note about 2018: the potential for Trump to be impeached. He even brought up the last commander in chief to be impeached, Bill Clinton. "The plain political issue is Democrats need 24 House seats to take the House back in 2018," Podhoretz said. "The table is being set pretty nicely for them to get that number. And if they get that number or 10 more than that number, he's going to get impeached. I'm not saying he's going to be convicted and thrown out of office—I'm saying that the House will impeach him if Democrats have a 10-seat majority. And if he doesn't right the ship, he's writing his own—he's Clinton in 1998 and 1999, with no recovery possible, Clinton was doing that at a time of explosive economic growth." Suggestions of impeachment have been frequent during Trump's brief but tumultuous tenure in the White House. House Democrats even filed articles of impeachment last month, but they stand little chance of going anywhere, since Republicans have a majority. The president's involvement in the ongoing investigation into his administration's connections to Russia has reportedly worried some advisers. Notably, there was the recent revelation that he fed his son Donald Jr. a misleading statement about a meeting he took with a Kremlin-connected lawyer to hear about supposedly damaging information on Democratic presidential nominee Hillary Clinton. Obstruction of justice has long been considered an impeachable offense, and The Washington Post reports that aides close to Trump worry he has opened himself up to allegations of a cover-up. As long as Republicans control Congress, impeachment remains very unlikely. But for what it's worth, some oddsmakers are putting the chances Trump is impeached or resigns before 2020 as high as 48 percent.

### Senate GOP

#### Senate Republicans will turn against Trump after a blue wave.

Antle, 2018 (W. James – politics editor of The Washington Examiner, “Why Senate Republicans might just impeach Trump”, The Week, February 1, <http://theweek.com/articles/752058/why-senate-republigcans-might-just-impeach-trump>)

It seems more likely than not that Democrats will retake the House in November, with the building wave of GOP retirements perhaps the best indicator that Republicans themselves are expecting a rout. If Democrats win control of Congress, they will then have the simple House majority required to impeach Trump. What they almost certainly will not have, however, no matter how well the midterms go, is the two-thirds Senate majority needed to convict and remove him. Given the difficult map this year, Democrats may not even be able to take control of the Senate. But for the sake of argument, let's say they win a 52-48 majority. They would still need 15 Republicans to vote to remove Trump from office. Would Senate Republicans ever turn on Trump? That's a tall order. But contrary to the expectations of liberals who believe all elected Republicans indiscriminately enable Trump, it may not be an impossible one, at least compared to the last two presidents threatened with impeachment. Remember the '90s? Even with 55 votes in the Senate, Republicans were never going to be able to complete their impeachment drive against President Bill Clinton because there were no Democratic senators willing to vote to remove him. Only five House Democrats voted for any of the Clinton articles of impeachment. The GOP was never going to get 12 senators. Similarly, if party leaders had allowed antiwar Democrats to move forward with their efforts to impeach President George W. Bush, they might have won over Republicans like Ron Paul or Walter Jones in the House, but zero Senate Republicans could have been persuaded to convict Bush. In Clinton's case, Democrats simply did not believe that the underlying offense that led to the president's perjury and alleged obstruction of justice — consensual sexual relations with White House intern Monica Lewinsky — was serious enough to justify removing him from office. And in Bush's case, Republicans would have regarded the president's impeachment as the criminalization of policy disagreements (particularly over the so-called war on terror), and they overwhelmingly still agreed with the Bush policy in question. Things might be different with Trump. If Mueller is able to present clear and compelling evidence of collusion between Russia and the Trump campaign, with the president's knowledge, Republican votes for impeachment really are gettable in a way that they were not in past cases. This situation would be fundamentally different than the impeachment talk around Clinton and Bush. And some Senate Republicans really might turn on the president. Obviously, the threshold for GOP senators to turn on Trump would be much higher than for Democrats, for whom the Trump Tower meeting alone suffices. For Republicans, "collusion" would likely have to mean some direct involvement in stolen Democratic emails, cooperating with the creation and distribution of Russian fake news, or at bare minimum a well established awareness of and coordination with what the Russians were doing. They would have to see a clear quid pro quo. For many GOP lawmakers, even that wouldn't be enough. Many have indeed shown that they'll back Trump no matter what. But it is not that hard to imagine a set of facts that would cause principled Russia hawks like Ben Sasse, Marco Rubio, and Lindsey Graham to turn against the president. And once a few dominos fall, it makes it easier for the others to topple in turn. Remember, too, that the two biggest reasons that Republican lawmakers continue to back Trump is that they see him as a vehicle to accomplish their legislative goals, and they fear a backlash from the Trump-loving base were they to turn on him. But in a post-midterm world in which Republicans have been roundly shellacked, Trump's legislative agenda would be dead on arrival, and his base would be disillusioned. Republican senators might well see fewer reasons to stand by their man. Of course, a lot would have to happen to get us to this point. What little we know of the Mueller probe suggests we are presently far from this outcome. None of the indictments handed down so far even attempt to establish the existence of a broader conspiracy between the Russians and the campaign, not even in the case of George Papadopoulos, who appears to have at least attempted collusion. Cooperators could be rewarded with sentencing leniency while pleading to things more significant than process crimes — maybe the fact that they weren't charged with worse offenses doesn't mean anything, maybe it does. All the intrigue surrounding the Trump White House points to an obstruction investigation, centering around the firing of former FBI Director James Comey. That's where the memo, the anti-Trump FBI texts, and the complaints about former Deputy Director Andrew McCabe, whatever their merits, come into play: The more doubts Republicans have about the impartiality of the investigation, the more evidence they will demand of Mueller.

## North Korea

#### Only congressional checks prevent Trump nuke war---specifically solves North Korean first strike.

Florence, 2017 (Justin Florence is the Legal Director of Protect Democracy, a non-profit, non-partisan organization dedicated to strengthening and defending our democratic laws, norms, and institutions. He previously served in the Office of the White House Counsel as Special Assistant to the President and Associate Counsel to the President. Justin also worked for Senator Sheldon Whitehouse as Senior Counsel on the staff of the Senate Judiciary Committee. Outside of his service in government, Justin has worked in private practice at Ropes & Gray LLP and O'Melveny & Myers LLP. Justin also served as a Fellow at the Georgetown Center on National Security and the Law. President Trump’s War Powers, Congress, And North Korea. August 10, 2017. https://www.huffingtonpost.com/entry/president-trumps-war-powers-congress-and-north-korea\_us\_598cc264e4b063e2ae057e3f)

The escalating tension with North Korea reminds us once again that in matters of war and peace, there are often no good options. But that does not mean that there aren’t particularly bad, even catastrophic options. That is why the founders divided constitutional war-making authority, granting Congress alone the power to declare and fund wars, while making the president the commander-in-chief of the armed forces. Decisions about going to war may be so difficult that Congress at times would rather sit them out, but **weighing in on potential new wars is a constitutional responsibility**, not an elective activity. That’s why, in the wake of President Trump’s strikes against the Syrian government earlier this year, we at Protect Democracy demanded to know the president’s legal justification. The debate about war powers has gone on for decades, but prior presidents have felt obligated to at least explain their legal justification for military action. We filed FOIA requests, and when the administration refused to comply, we went to court ― and have already won a preliminary decision. We took no position on the wisdom of the strikes themselves, and many in Congress and in the public may have supported the strikes, but as U.S. District Court Judge Christopher Cooper put it in his ruling, “Being closed off from such a debate is itself a harm in an open democracy... Military strikes cannot be undone.” Now, even as we work through the schedule to obtain those Syria documents, the court’s words ring like alarm bells. As the **prospect of** a **nuclear conflict** looms, even if in the distance, the president continues to act as if decisions of war and peace are his alone to make. And though some in Congress express comfort in the generals the president has surrounded himself with, there are now reports that Trump’s own national security team was caught unaware when he dramatically escalated tensions with his “fire and fury” comments. (We’re filing a new round of FOIA requests on Trump’s legal authority to strike North Korea today.) There has already been movement to reassert Congress’s war powers. Even before the escalation with North Korea, the House embraced an amendment to demand a new war authorization for the fight against ISIL (it was later stripped from the legislation behind closed doors by Speaker Paul Ryan). And now, in addition to senators of both parties raising concerns about the president’s escalating rhetoric, Republican Senator Dan Sullivan of Alaska stated flatly, “if one of the military options that the administration is looking at is a preemptive war on the Korean peninsula launched by the United States, that would require the authorization of Congress,” adding that “Article I of the U.S. Constitution is very clear about that.” It is probably no coincidence that the most definitive demand for a vote came from one of the states that is geographically closest to North Korea. With a volunteer army increasingly bearing the burden of wars with their families outside the direct experience of most Americans, including most Members of Congress, decisions to enter military conflicts can increasingly seem like an abstract policy debate. But it should not take the vivid image of a nuclear missile aimed at one’s state for Congress to fulfill the responsibilities that the founders placed in them. The president could actually bolster his own authority if he went to Congress and got support for any actions he pursues against North Korea. Under the famous framework laid out by Justice Jackson in the 1952 Youngstown Steel Seizure case, the president’s powers are at their zenith when he has Congress behind him. As Justice Jackson’s concurring opinion explained: “When the President acts pursuant to an express or implied authorization of Congress, his authority is at its maximum, for it includes all that he possesses in his own right plus all that Congress can delegate. In these circumstances, and in these only, may he be said (for what it may be worth) to personify the federal sovereignty.” On the flip side, if other members of Congress share Sen. Sullivan’s fears, they can constrain the president. As Justice Jackson put it, “When the President takes measures incompatible with the expressed or implied will of Congress, his power is at its lowest ebb, for then he can rely only upon his own constitutional powers minus any constitutional powers of Congress over the matter.” While the Court’s language looks to legal constraints that Congress may impose, **strong statements from members of Congress** can create a powerful political check as well. As it stands now, with Congress neither authorizing nor forbidding action against North Korea, **we stand in** what Justice Jackson **called the “zone of twilight.”** As he explained: “congressional inertia, indifference or quiescence may sometimes, at least, as a practical matter, enable, if not invite, measures on independent presidential responsibility.” **With nuclear war being threatened, and dangerously unpredictable men holding power in the U.S. and North Korea,** the stakes are simply too high for Congress to leave things to the president. President **Trump**’s apparent view that he alone can start new wars stands as an open breach in our democracy, and he **is making decisions** based on this misunderstanding by the day, **with** potentially unimaginable consequences. President Trump must acknowledge the role of Congress, not continue to act as if he alone holds all war-making powers. I**f the president continues on this misunderstanding,** Congress can, and must, correct him before it is too late. There are many ways for Congress to do this, both **formally** and **informally**. Congress can hold hearings on legislation like the bill introduced earlier this year **requiring congressional approval for nuclear first strikes**. It can consider legislation to prohibit (or authorize under specific conditions) the preemptive use of force against North Korea. It can conduct oversight through document requests and hearings with witnesses from the administration to better understand the president’s strategy or views of his legal authority. Or members of Congress can serve as a strong political restraint by joining Sen. Sullivan in **speaking out forcefully against the president**’s view that he alone can choose to start a war. Whatever path Congress takes, it is time for members to engage ― this is not an elective activity, it’s their job.

## Populism

#### Democratic wave’s key to symbolically delegitimize Trumpian populism globally

Francis Fukuyama 17, the Olivier Nomellini Senior Fellow at the Freeman Spogli Institute for International Studies (FSI), and the Mosbacher Director of FSI's Center on Democracy, Development, and the Rule of Law, Stanford University, 12/4/17, “The Future of Populism at Home and Abroad,” https://www.the-american-interest.com/2017/12/04/future-populism-home-abroad/

Few populist nationalist parties have appeared across the developed world, and threaten to undermine the liberal international order. What is the likelihood that they will succeed? For better or worse, a lot depends on what will happen in the United States. American power was critical in establishing both the economic and political pillars of the liberal order, and if the United States retreats from that leadership role, the pendulum will swing quickly in favor of the nationalists. So we need to understand how populism is likely to unfold in the worlds leading liberal democracy. The American Constitution’s system of checks and balances was designed to deal with the problem of “Caesarism,” that is, a populist demagogue who would accumulate power and misuse it. It is for this reason that vetocracy exists, and so far into the Trump Administration, it appears to be working. Trump’s attacks on various independent institutions—the intelligence community, the mainstream media, the courts, and his own Republican party—have only had modest success. In particular, he has not been able to get a significant part of his legislative agenda, like Obamacare repeal or the border wall, passed. So at the moment he looks like a weak and ineffective president. However, things could change. The factor most in his favor is the economy: wages have been growing after stagnating for many years, and growth has reached 3 percent for two quarters now. It may move even higher if the Republicans succeed in passing a stimulative tax cut as they seem poised to do. All of this is bad policy in the long run: the United States is not overtaxed; the stimulus is coming at the exactly wrong point in the business cycle (after eight years of expansion); it is likely to tremendously widen fiscal deficits; and it will lay the ground for an eventual painful crash. Nonetheless, these consequences are not likely to play themselves out for several years, long enough to get the Republicans through the 2018 midterm elections and even the 2020 presidential contest. What matters to voters the most is the state of the economy, and that looks to be good despite the President’s undignified tweeting. Foreign policy is another area where Trump’s critics could be surprised. It is entirely possible that he will take action on some of his threats—indeed, it is hard to see how he can avoid action with regard to North Korea’s nuclear ballistic missile program. Any U.S. move would be highly risky to its South Korean and Japanese allies, but it is also possible that the U.S. will call North Korea’s bluff and force a significant climbdown. If this happens, Trump will have lanced a boil in a manner that has eluded the last three presidents. Finally, it is not possible to beat something with nothing. The Democrats, under a constant barrage of outrageous behavior from the Administration, have been moving steadily to the left. Opposition to Trump allows them to focus on the enemy and not to define long-term policies that will appeal to voters. As in Britain, the party itself in increasingly dominated by activists who are to the left of the general voter base. Finally, the Democrats have lost so much ground in statehouses and state legislatures that they do not have a strong cadre of appealing, experienced candidates available to replace the Clinton generation. Since American elections are not won in the popular vote but in the Electoral College (as Bruce Cain has recently pointed out in these pages), it does not matter how many outraged people vote in states like California, New York, or Illinois; unless the party can attract centrist voters in midwestern industrial states it will not win the Presidency. All of this suggests that Trump could not just serve out the remainder of his term, but be re-elected in 2020 and last until 2024. Were the Republicans to experience a setback in the midterm elections in 2018 and then lose the presidency in 2020, Trump might go down in history has a fluke and aberration, and the party could return to the control of its elites. If this doesn’t happen, however, the country’s polarization will deepen even beyond the point it has reached at present. More importantly, the institutional checks may well experience much more significant damage, since their independence is, after all, simply a matter of politics in the end. Beyond this, there is the structural factor of technological change. Job losses among low skill workers is fundamentally not driven by trade or immigration, but by technology. While the country can try to raise skill levels through better education, the U.S. has shown little ability or proclivity to do this. The Trump agenda is to seek to employ 20th century workers in their old jobs with no recognition of how the technological environment has changed. But it is not as if the Democrats or the progressive Left has much of an agenda in this regard either, beyond extending existing job training and social programs. How the U.S. will cope with this is not clear. But then, technological change is the ultimate political challenge that all advanced societies, and not just the democratic ones, will have to face. Outside the United States, the populist surge has yet to play itself out. Eastern Europe never experienced the kind of cultural liberalization experienced by Germany and other Western European countries after World War II, and are now eagerly embracing populist politicians. Hungary and Poland have recently been joined by Serbia and the Czech Republic, which have elected leaders with many Trump-like characteristics. Germany’s consensus politics, which made the country a rock of EU stability over the past decade, appears to be fraying after its recent election, and the continuing threat in France should not be underestimated—Le Pen and the far-left candidate Melenchon between them received half the French vote in the last election. Outside Europe, Brazil’s continuing crisis of elite legitimacy has given a boost to Jair Bolsonaro, a former military officer who talks tough and promises to clean up the country’s politics. All of this suggests that the world will be in for interesting times for some time to come.

#### Discrediting Trumpian populism’s key to avoid extinction

Alex de Waal 16, Executive Director of the World Peace Foundation at the Fletcher School at Tufts University, 12/5/16, “Garrison America and the Threat of Global War,” http://bostonreview.net/war-security-politics-global-justice/alex-de-waal-garrison-america-and-threat-global-war

Trump’s promises have been so vague that it will be hard for him to disappoint. Nonetheless, many of his supporters will wake up to the fact that they have been duped, or realize the futility of voting for a wrecker out of a sense of alienated desperation. The progressives’ silver lining to the 2016 election is that, had Clinton won, the Trump constituency would have been back in four years’ time, probably with a more ruthless and ideological candidate. Better for plutocratic populism to fail early. But the damage inflicted in the interim could be terrible—even irredeemable if it were to include swinging a wrecking ball at the Paris Climate Agreement out of simple ignorant malice. Polanyi recounts how economic and financial crisis led to global calamity. Something similar could happen today. In fact we are already in a steady unpicking of the liberal peace that glowed at the turn of the millennium. Since approximately 2008, the historic decline in the number and lethality of wars appears to have been reversed. Today’s wars are not like World War I, with formal declarations of war, clear war zones, rules of engagement, and definite endings. But they are wars nonetheless. What does a world in global, generalized war look like? We have an unwinnable “war on terror” that is metastasizing with every escalation, and which has blurred the boundaries between war and everything else. We have deep states—built on a new oligarchy of generals, spies, and private-sector suppliers—that are strangling liberalism. We have emboldened middle powers (such as Saudi Arabia) and revanchist powers (such as Russia) rearming and taking unilateral military action across borders (Ukraine and Syria). We have massive profiteering from conflicts by the arms industry, as well as through the corruption and organized crime that follow in their wake (Afghanistan). We have impoverishment and starvation through economic warfare, the worst case being Yemen. We have “peacekeeping” forces fighting wars (Somalia). We have regional rivals threatening one another, some with nuclear weapons (India and Pakistan) and others with possibilities of acquiring them (Saudi Arabia and Iran). Above all, today’s generalized war is a conflict of destabilization, with big powers intervening in the domestic politics of others, buying influence in their security establishments, bribing their way to big commercial contracts and thereby corroding respect for government, and manipulating public opinion through the media. Washington, D.C., and Moscow each does this in its own way. Put the pieces together and a global political market of rival plutocracies comes into view. Add virulent reactionary populism to the mix and it resembles a war on democracy. What more might we see? Economic liberalism is a creed of optimism and abundance; reactionary protectionism feeds on pessimistic scarcity. If we see punitive trade wars and national leaders taking preemptive action to secure strategic resources within the walls of their garrison states, then old-fashioned territorial disputes along with accelerated state-commercial grabbing of land and minerals are in prospect. We could see mobilization against immigrants and minorities as a way of enflaming and rewarding a constituency that can police borders, enforce the new political rightness, and even become electoral vigilantes. Liberal multilateralism is a system of seeking common wins through peaceful negotiation; case-by-case power dealing is a zero-sum calculus. We may see regional arms races, nuclear proliferation, and opportunistic power coalitions to exploit the weak. In such a global political marketplace, we would see middle-ranking and junior states rewarded for the toughness of their bargaining, and foreign policy and security strategy delegated to the CEOs of oil companies, defense contractors, bankers, and real estate magnates. The United Nations system appeals to leaders to live up to the highest standards. The fact that they so often conceal their transgressions is the tribute that vice pays to virtue. A cabal of plutocratic populists would revel in the opposite: applauding one another’s readiness to tear up cosmopolitan liberalism and pursue a latter-day mercantilist naked self-interest. Garrison America could opportunistically collude with similarly constituted political-military business regimes in Russia, China, Turkey, and elsewhere for a new realpolitik global concert, redolent of the early nineteenth-century era of the Congress of Vienna, bringing a façade of stability for as long as they collude—and war when they fall out. And there is a danger that, in response to a terrorist outrage or an international political crisis, President Trump will do something stupid, just as Europe’s leaders so unthinkingly strolled into World War I. The multilateral security system is in poor health and may not be able to cope. Underpinning this is a simple truth: the plutocratic populist order is a future that does not work. If illustration were needed of the logic of hiding under the blanket rather than facing difficult realities, look no further than Trump’s readiness to deny climate change. We have been here before, more or less, and from history we can gather important lessons about what we must do now. The importance of defending civility with democratic deliberation, respecting human rights and values, and maintaining a commitment to public goods and the global commons—including the future of the planet—remain evergreen. We need to find our way to a new 1945—and the global political settlement for a tamed and humane capitalism—without having to suffer the catastrophic traumas of trying everything else first.

# \*\*\*\*AFF\*\*\*\*

# Non Unique

## GOP Winning

### Hardline Immigration

#### The GOP is winning now because of their hardline immigration policies which rally the base. Plan’s political shift drains GOP enthusiasm.

Glasser, 6/22 (Susan B. – staff writer for The New Yorker, “Trump’s Cynical Immigration Strategy Might Work for Him—Again”, The New Yorker, 2018, <https://www.newyorker.com/news/letter-from-trumps-washington/trumps-cynical-immigration-strategy-might-work-for-himagain>, shae)

There are, nonetheless, some uncomfortable facts that Democrats who see the issue as an unmitigated win need to face. For starters, hours before he pulled the plug on his Administration’s policy, and after weeks of other controversies, Trump hit his highest approval ratings since his Inauguration. According to Gallup, forty-five per cent of Americans approved of the job he was doing, which is still a low figure by historical standards, but is arguably strikingly high for such a divisive figure. The President’s endless bashing of undocumented immigrants and his vow to toughen “Boarder security,” as he spelled it in a recent tweet, is a key reason. Trump’s ability to gin up fears about illegal immigration, more than perhaps any other issue, won him the White House. Headed into a midterm election that will be won by the political party that can better rally its base, Trump has remained determined to talk about immigration, even when others in his party have resisted. Indeed, Republican leaders on Capitol Hill were furious with Trump as the immigration controversy spiralled out of control this week—a time they had planned to spend celebrating the G.O.P. tax cut, along with the general strength of the economy, which they hope to make the centerpiece of their fall campaign. On Monday, as the political pressure on Trump was escalating, I met with Kristen Soltis Anderson, a Republican pollster who has advised G.O.P. leaders about this fall’s elections at a couple of recent retreats. Trump, she told me, had a “freakishly stable” approval rating; in such a polarized moment, people know where they stand on the President. She said that, unlike in previous midterm elections in which the incumbent President’s party has done poorly, voter enthusiasm for Trump has remained strong among Republican voters, even as a blue wave of Trump-hating Democrats has been building. “The question is,” Anderson told me, “if the blue wave is coming, have Republicans built a large enough wall to stop it?” New Pew Research Center data this week underscored her point, finding that voters in both parties are more motivated to vote than they were at any time in the previous twenty years. The Democrats’ advantage on enthusiasm, Pew found, is significantly weaker than it was in the previous election cycles when their party scored big.

### Strong Economy

#### GOP will stave off the blue wave now – strong economy.

Wilson, 7/7 (Reid – national correspondent, “Voter optimism holds key to GOP’s midterm hopes”, The Hill, [http://thehill.com/homenews/campaign/395874-voter-optimism-holds-key-to-gops-midterm-hopes)](http://thehill.com/homenews/campaign/395874-voter-optimism-holds-key-to-gops-midterm-hopes%29)

GOP strategists are hopeful that a booming economy and voters’ growing confidence on the country’s direction will dampen what might otherwise be a wave for Democrats in November’s midterms. Republican pollsters are nervous about President Trump’s approval rating and a generic ballot match-up that reliably favors Democrats, but a review of polling conducted before the last seven midterm elections shows the fate of the incumbent president’s party can rise or fall based on voters’ views of the direction of the country. In 1994, 2006, 2010 and 2014 — all wave midterm years in which the president’s party lost a large number of House seats — voters overwhelmingly said the country was headed in the wrong direction. In 2006, when Democrats reclaimed control of Congress, more than twice as many voters said America was on the wrong track as those who said the opposite. In 2010, when Republicans stormed back to the majority, just 32 percent said the country was headed in the right direction, while 59 percent said it was on the wrong track. Years in which voter attitudes are more positive have been better for the incumbent’s party. In 1990 and 1998, the president’s party lost eight and five seats, respectively. Former President George W. Bush’s Republican Party picked up eight seats in 2002, when voters said the country was headed in the right direction by a 13-point margin. “Right track/wrong direction is a great data point to use when considering the impact the environment will have on elections for the party in power,” said Brent Buchanan, a Republican pollster based in Alabama. Democrats, however, may not need a deeply pessimistic electorate to win back control of the House. The party needs a net gain of 24 seats — including several vacancies they are likely to win easily — to wrest the Speaker’s gavel. That hurdle may not require a wave, given the number of Republican-held districts Hillary Clinton carried in 2016. But if voters feel worse about the direction of the country in November than they do now, Republicans will face a more difficult challenge in blunting the Democratic advantage. In the decade after the worst recession in modern history, voters have remained almost entirely pessimistic about the future of the country. Only once in the last 10 years have more voters said the country is on the right track than the wrong one — when former President Obama was inaugurated. But a strong economy has put voters in a better mood of late. Recent surveys have shown that between 34 percent and 45 percent of voters say the country is headed in the right direction. That number is still low by historical standards, and a majority, somewhere in the mid-50s, say the country is still on the wrong track. But that level of dissatisfaction is far below what was seen in polls taken before the 2014, 2010 and 2006 midterm elections. Some pollsters see the right track-wrong direction question as an imperfect gauge of voter sentiment, one that is so rooted in the early days of polling — it was first asked by George Gallup’s pollsters in the 1930s — that it is effectively meaningless. “We’re using railroad metaphors, for goodness sake,” said Andrew Smith, a nonpartisan pollster at the University of New Hampshire. “You can interpret it any way you want. When you say the direction of the country, does that mean economically? Does it mean technologically? Does it mean how we’re relating to China?” But given 80 years of trend lines, the question can offer some lessons. Views on the direction of the country generally tend to correlate with the strength of the American economy, several pollsters said. Optimism surges in a bubble, then tanks when a recession hits. But though optimism has increased since 2016, it has not tracked with an economy that has sent unemployment levels to or near all-time lows. On Friday, the Bureau of Labor Statistics reported the economy added 213,000 new jobs in June. The unemployment rate rose to 4 percent, likely because more people began looking for work, and the overall rate is down over the last year.

## Dems Lose

### Messaging

#### Democratic in-fighting between moderates and progressives destroys voter enthusiasm.

Butler, 7/15 (Anthea – Associate Professor of Religious Studies and Africana Studies @ the University of Pennsylvania, “Democrats will lose in 2018 if they don't shut up about civility and shout about our democracy dying”, NBC News, 2018, <https://www.nbcnews.com/think/opinion/democrats-will-lose-2018-if-they-don-t-shut-about-ncna891196>, shae)

While much was made about the anger of Republican voters in 2016, Democratic voters are even angrier — and mobilized to vote in 2018. According to a Washington Post-Schar School poll, 46 percent of Democrats say it is extremely important to vote in the 2018 midterm elections. But they are watching their party disintegrate over squabbling about the 2016 election and the inability of Democrats to do anything to stop Trump’s numerous attacks on women, immigrants and people of color. And the leadership feels the need to tamp down on any kind of pushback against Republicans that is deemed uncivil, even if it excites their base as much as Trump's incivility excites his. Since the 2016 election, the Democratic party has failed to coalesce around a coherent message that galvanizes democratic voters who are increasingly incensed at the failure of Democrats to fight back, rhetorically or otherwise, at the Republican Party. Four months until the 2018 election cycle, there are few advertisements by Democrats or their organizations about voting in the midterms, or prosecuting immigration policies in the court of public opinion. Meanwhile, Republicans, always on message, are rolling out digital advertisements about Brett Kavanaugh, encouraging red-state Democratic leaders to confirm him. The inability of Democratic leadership to come up with a coherent message to engage and battle Trumpism and the Republican Party is unconscionable: Trump’s daily chaos and his policy upheaval should frame every utterance from the Democratic Party. There is, after all, so much from which to choose, from immigrant children kept in cages to the judiciary being stacked for the next 50 years. While Sen. Schumer has said that he will fight Kavanaugh’s appointment, no clear unified message has come from Senate Democrats on how, exactly, they plan to either push back against the nomination or lay his decisions directly at the White House's door. And when activists take matters into their own hands, the timidity that characterized so much of the Democratic response to Trump in 2016 is on full display: Don't irk the vast center, they seem to say, no matter how much it fires up the left. Democrats should be able to run on one clear message with which we all agree: Democracy is being destroyed under the Trump administration. The Republican Party is the Party of Trump, and Trumpism is not democracy. It might not be "civil" to accuse the other side of ruining the country, but they've never been shy about doing it to us and, this time, it's true. Come out fighting, instead of trying to be polite and civil; Trumpism has proven that bullying is a winning strategy. If Democrats cannot get a clear coherent message of why, exactly, voters should flock to the polls in a rebuke to the absolute chaos of this Trump Presidency — one which is mired in scandal and is stripping away every policy gain for which Democrats worked since the Roosevelt Administration — the party deserves to lose so that we can find something better with which to replace it. This time of national upheaval should be a clarion call for a clear message of common sense and fighting for democracy. If Democrats can’t find that message, then perhaps it will be time to change the symbol of the party from a donkey to a jackass.

# Link

## Defense

### Family Separation

#### Family separation was the last straw – that’s all voters care about.

Boag, 6/23 – (Keith – political reporter, “Trump could reform immigration and make history — but he'd rather fire up his base”, CBC News, 2018, <https://www.cbc.ca/news/world/trump-immigration-border-reform-midterms-1.4718995>)

Getting tough on immigration and the chaos at the border is one thing, but the president-versus-the-children issue is not a winning one for Republicans and many were rattled by what the Trump administration is doing in their name. Those who thought a common sense immigration policy also required common decency have been shaken by the tone deafness of the administration's various explanations for why government agents would separate children from their parents at the country's southwest border. For some, it was the last straw. U.S. crackdown on migrants could exacerbate security situation in Central America and drive more people north Veteran Republican strategist Steve Schmidt likened it to the evil of separating families during slavery as he exited the party with a tweet saying the GOP is now "fully the party of Trump." The scorn heaped on Schmidt by Trump supporters such as Fox News host Laura Ingraham seemed not only to underline Schmidt's point but also herald yet another battle of attrition in the civil war that has consumed the party for close to a decade. Veteran campaign strategist Steve Schmidt announced on Twitter that he's no longer a Republican because he was so appalled by the Trump administration's policy of separating migrant children from their parents at the border. (Jonathan Ernst/Reuters) Polls show Republican women in particular recoiled at the Trump policy. With little more than 130 days until the midterm elections, they are not a constituency the party can afford to squander.

## Offense

### Plan Kills GOP Enthusiasm

#### The plan’s liberal immigration measure sans border security costs the GOP the house.

Shesgreen, 5/22 (Deidre, “Immigration: GOP divide over issue could have far-reaching implications for Ryan, 2018 midterms,” USA Today, 2018, [https://www.usatoday.com/story/news/politics/2018/05/22/gop-divided-immigration-midterm-election/632467002/)](https://www.usatoday.com/story/news/politics/2018/05/22/gop-divided-immigration-midterm-election/632467002/%29)

“Republican primary voters are the most opinionated and the most passionate about border security of any voter segment in the country," said Frank Luntz, a Republican political consultant. "And to them, the immigration solution has to involve significant efforts at the border, not just addressing those who are here illegally now." A soft approach to immigration, Jordan said on Tuesday, "is contrary to the mandate of the 2016 election." He and other hard-liners have argued that Republicans have to make good on that campaign promise or they risk the ire of conservative voters. For moderate Republicans, the calculation is completely different, but just as politically charged. "There needs to be a permanent fix for DREAMers," Denham told reporters Tuesday morning. The DREAMers are undocumented immigrants brought to the country as children. Many of them were thrown into legal limbo last year when Trump ended the Obama-era Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals (DACA) program, which granted roughly 700,000 of them temporary legal status. Federal courts have forced the administration to keep the program running, but Republicans such as Denham want a permanent solution for the DACA recipients so they do not have to fear deportation. Denham is part of a rump faction of moderates who have joined with nearly all Democrats to push a rare maneuver known as a "discharge petition" to try to force a series of immigration votes. The conservative legislation hard-liners are pushing for would be one of the bills brought up, though it is expected to fail. The legislation that is most likely to pass, is a bipartisan immigration bill with far broader support, including from many Democrats. That bill would grant U.S. citizenship to some DREAMers, strengthen border security, and leave the legal immigration system as is. "My dairy farmers, they need a legal workforce," said Rep. Chris Collins, a moderate from New York who has signed the discharge petition. "We can’t go into Nov. 6 (Election Day) and go home and tell in my case, my dairy farmers, that we did nothing," Collins said. "They're upset." If a majority of House members sign on to the discharge petition, it would go straight to the floor, bypassing GOP leaders. Ryan has blasted the petition maneuver, saying it would hand power over to House Democrats and help pass a bill that Trump opposes. Last week, House Majority Leader Kevin McCarthy, who is vying to succeed Ryan, told Republicans during a closed-door meeting that if Republicans pass a moderate immigration bill, it would depress voter turnout among the GOP base and hand the House over to Democrats.

### GOP Want Cuts

#### GOP voters want immigration cuts – any policy which increases immigration will hand the midterms to the Dems.

Binder, 6/15 (John, “Likely Midterm Voters Repeatedly Say Immigration Is Biggest Priority, Tax Reform One of the Least,” 2018, [http://www.breitbart.com/big-government/2018/05/15/likely-midterm-voters-repeatedly-say-immigration-is-biggest-priority-tax-reform-one-of-the-least/)](http://www.breitbart.com/big-government/2018/05/15/likely-midterm-voters-repeatedly-say-immigration-is-biggest-priority-tax-reform-one-of-the-least/%29)

Likely voters have repeatedly told pollsters that immigration is their biggest priority heading into the 2018 midterm elections, while tax cuts are one of the least important issues. While the Republican establishment is attempting to run their re-election campaigns on tax cuts, Republican voters and swing voters have said tax cuts are not their top priority but rather wage-boosting cuts to immigration. In a March poll, swing voters were asked, “What is the most important issue to you in deciding how to vote in this year’s midterm election,” Independents say immigration is their third most important issue. Meanwhile, taxes are dead last as an issue for swing voters. Likewise, half of swing voters at the time, 50 percent, said the GOP tax cuts that were passed last year have “no impact” on their midterm election vote. The March poll found that Republicans say immigration is more important than taxes, healthcare, and gun policy when it comes to their vote in the midterm elections. The economy is the only issue that is as much of a priority for Republican voters as immigration. A month before, Republican voters told pollsters that reducing immigration to the U.S. was a bigger priority than repealing and replacing Obamacare, destroying ISIS, and passing an infrastructure bill. The only issue that outpaced reducing immigration levels as the biggest priority for Republican voters was stimulating American jobs, which can be directly tied to immigration. For Trump voters, reducing immigration to the country is more important than repealing and replacing Obamacare, passing tax reform, and even building a wall along the U.S.-Mexico border to help stem illegal immigration. Republican voters said again in March that reducing immigration was a bigger priority for them than tax cuts, repealing Obamacare, getting the U.S. out of the Iran Deal, destroying ISIS, and expanding family leave. John Binder @JxhnBinder Second biggest issue for GOP voters (including those who didn't even vote for Trump): Reducing illegal and legal immigration. http://www.breitbart.com/big-government/2018/02/21/poll-of-republican-voters-reducing-immigration-more-important-than-replacing-obamacare-destroying-isis/ … 7:33 PM - Feb 21, 2018 Poll of Republican Voters: Reducing Immigration More Important than Replacing Obamacare, Destroying... Reducing the number of illegal and legal immigrants flooding into the US every year is the second biggest priority for Republican voters. breitbart.com 16 See John Binder's other Tweets Twitter Ads info and privacy Immigration is so important to Republicans in March polling that it even surpassed the economy and jobs as being the biggest issue. The latest polling from April revealed a similar trend among GOP likely midterm voters. When asked to rank the biggest priorities for the U.S., 47 to 40 percent of GOP voters say immigration and national security are the leading issues in their opinion. Meanwhile, only 11 percent of GOP voters said taxes were the most important issue in the country, ranking lower than more obscure issues like school safety and defense spending. About 45 percent of President Trump’s supporters say immigration is the most important issue in the country, while only 11 percent of Trump supporters say the same of taxes. Not only are GOP voters and swing voters wanting immigration to be the leading issue of the midterm elections, rather than tax cuts, but both voting blocs are also vastly supportive of Trump’s plan to cut legal immigration levels in half. Currently, the U.S. admits more than 1.5 million illegal and legal immigrants every year. Trump’s plan would cut legal immigration to the U.S. to raise the wages of America’s working and middle class. In the latest poll by the Polling Company, a majority, 52 percent, of swing-voters said they wanted the 250,000 visas allotted to “chain migrants” — the foreign relatives of newly naturalized citizens — eliminated altogether rather than handed over to businesses to allow them to import an additional flood of foreign workers. John Binder @JxhnBinder "52% of swing-voters said they wanted the 250,000 visas allotted to 'chain migrants' — the foreign relatives of newly naturalized citizens — eliminated rather than handed over to businesses to allow them to import an additional flood of foreign workers." http://www.breitbart.com/big-government/2018/05/06/poll-majority-swing-voters-oppose-importing-foreign-workers/ … 5:33 PM - May 6, 2018 Poll: Majority of Swing-Voters Oppose Importing More Foreign Workers | Breitbart The majority of voters say they oppose allowing big businesses to import more foreign workers to compete against their fellow citizens for coveted blue-collar and white-collar jobs. In the latest... breitbart.com 17 See John Binder's other Tweets Twitter Ads info and privacy Harvard-Harris polling found that 66 percent of voters — or nearly two out of three — said they support a plan by the Trump administration to almost cut legal immigration in half by ending the process known as “chain migration,” as well as the Diversity Visa Lottery, and building a border wall along the U.S.-Mexico border. The Polling Company survey also revealed that nearly 70 percent of GOP likely midterm voters want legal immigration reduced to anywhere between zero to 250,000 admissions a year, a major reduction to current mass immigration levels that have led to poor job growth, stagnant wages, and increased public costs to offset the importation of millions of low-skilled foreign nationals.

# Thumpers

## Russia – Dems

#### Foreign election interference guarantees a blue wave.

Graff, 2018 (Garrett M. – journalist and former editor of POLITICO Magazine, “Why Russia Will Help the Democrats Next”, POLITICO Magazine, July 19, <https://www.politico.com/magazine/story/2018/07/19/russia-democrats-election-meddling-219020>, shae)

The Director of National Intelligence, Dan Coats, warned last week that the nation was under sustained cyberattack from foreign adversaries like Russia. “I’m here to say, the warning lights are blinking red again,” Coats said, echoing the comments of former CIA Director George Tenet about the summer of 2001. “The warning signs are there. The system is blinking. It is why I believe we are at a critical point.” Coats’ remarks reinforced consistent warnings, from current and former national security officials over the last year, that Russia was moving forward with more attacks on the midterm elections. And why shouldn’t the Russians do more? Their multi-pronged 2016 attack, outlined in repeated indictments this year by special counsel Robert Mueller, was a resounding success, and in the nearly two years since, the United States has taken no meaningful action to change Russia’s calculation that the risk-reward of attacking American democracy is worth it. “There should be no doubt that Russia perceives its past efforts as successful and views the 2018 U.S. midterm elections as a potential target for Russian influence operations,” Coats said in February. “We expect Russia to continue using propaganda, social media, false-flag personas, sympathetic spokespeople and other means of influence to try to exacerbate social and political fissures in the United States.” What makes the American government’s ongoing inaction—and the general myopia on Capitol Hill and at the White House around the cyber threat—so stunning is the simple fact that the Republicans in charge of the executive and legislatives branches should be terrified that they’re next. The 2016 attacks by Russia boosted Trump and undermined Hillary Clinton’s campaign, but there's no guarantee that the next nation-state considering the electoral landscape will back the Republicans. In fact, almost the opposite. There’s solid geopolitical evidence that boosting the Democrats would be a smart strategy for a foreign actor this fall. \*\*\* Vladimir Putin’s goal isn’t—and never was—to help the Republican Party, at least in the long run. Boosting Donald Trump’s presidential campaign was a means to Putin’s end: Weakening the West, and exploiting the seams and divisions of the West’s open democracies to undermine our legitimacy and moral standing. Russia accomplished that with great success in 2016—and it’s a strategy that is continuing to pay dividends today. “Their purpose was to sow discontent and mistrust in our elections; they wanted us to be at each others’ throat when it was over,” former chair of the House Intelligence Committee Mike Rogers said last year. “It’s influencing, I would say, legislative process today. That’s wildly successful.” Just look at the last week of foreign policy, where Trump slammed NATO, insulted Angela Merkel, undermined Theresa May and the government of our closest ally, called Europe a “foe,” and mused out loud about whether he would honor the foundational mutual-defense premise of NATO. Not to mention the bizarre press conference with Putin that the BBC summed up as: “Trump sides with Russia against FBI at Helsinki summit.” It would have been hard for Putin to plan a more effective week to undermine and divide the West if he had orchestrated and stage-managed the entire process from a Kremlin whiteboard. As James Comey explained Putin’s strategy: “It’s not about Republicans or Democrats. They’re coming after America, which I hope we all love equally. They want to undermine our credibility in the face the world. They think that this great experiment of ours is a threat to them. And so they’re going to try to run it down and dirty it up as much as possible. That’s what this is about, and they will be back. Because we remain—as difficult as we can be with each other—we remain that shining city on the hill. And they don’t like it.” The Russian attack in 2016 was a nearly perfect asymmetric assault. Although it was expansive and expensive—the Internet Research Agency effort alone employed hundreds of people and cost upwards of $1.25 million a month, according to Mueller’s indictment—it was highly cost-effective, perhaps the most effective intelligence operation in modern world history, all achieved at very little political cost to Russia and at little risk to its personnel. As Comey said, “We’re talking about a foreign government that, using technical intrusion, lots of other methods, tried to shape the way we think, we vote, we act. That is a big deal. And people need to recognize it.” The next round of election attacks may not even stem from Russia. Other nation-state adversaries—particularly America’s three other leading cyber adversaries, China, North Korea, and Iran—have surely taken note. It would be all-but espionage malpractice for them not to be out there plotting right now about how to achieve the same results by following Russia’s now tried-and-tested model. That’s especially true as they watch the wishy-washy response to Russia’s attack from the White House: The U.S. government has taken no meaningful action that would discourage Russia was interfering again, in 2018 and 2020—and we’re spending another week consumed by the very question of whether Russia even did attack us. The White House, meanwhile, has even done away with the National Security Council’s cybersecurity coordinator position, downgrading the role that has served as the government’s main point person on cyber—meaning that if an attack did occur this fall, our response might even be slower and less coordinated than the response was in 2016. These are hardly the actions of a government inclined to rain down meaningful, damaging punishment on someone coming to attack voting machines in Arizona. There’s a good argument to be made that China, for one, might look at our congressional elections and think that helping the Democrats in 2018 would be best for them. While much of our focus on Trump’s bull-in-a-multilateral-china-shop approach to foreign policy has focused on his attacks on Canada, Europe, and Africa, or his inexplicable coddling of Putin and Russia, there’s no country that has benefited more from his presidency than the rising and increasingly aggressive and authoritarian China. As we retreat from international alliances, China has stepped into that vacuum. Trump’s temper tantrums have given China the time and space to build new relationships around the Pacific Rim, to pursue their mega-One Belt One Road project, and to chip away at the international security alliances that have made the Pacific an American lake for 50 years. One way for China to extend the period of a vacuum of American leadership: Throw the Senate to the Dems, ensuring not just two years of oversight hearings but also fraught nomination fights that would leave the government understaffed and under-resourced and unable to engage thoughtfully with the rest of the world. Democratic control of one or both houses of Congress might, from a brass tacks Chinese or Russian perspective, guarantee two years of a paralyzed America, a country continuing to look inward, not outward. And Democratic control of Congress could help arrest Trump’s trade war, which actually could be harming China’s growth and rise—and the one thing China can’t afford to lose right now is it’s economic growth. A Democratic House might lead to a polarizing impeachment fight that would further exacerbate America’s political divides and weaken the country globally, at least in the short term. China doesn’t need to sideline the U.S. forever—just long enough to have built itself into the global military and economic superpower befitting its status as the world’s most populous nation. Another two or four years of America refusing to engage on the world stage, undermining rules-based systems like the World Trade Organization, and of President Trump storming out of G-7 summits would go a long way toward giving China the space it needs to solidify new alliances and build new systems that aren’t focused on the post-World War II Bretton Woods-style comity that aided the U.S. over the last 70 years. Similarly, Russia might decide that its aid to Trump was so successful, that he's been so effective at advancing Putin's goals, that they want to keep him in power past 2020. A good way to help Trump get re-elected is to give him a Democratic Congress to rail against for the next two years. There’s a pretty straightforward trend in American electoral politics: Recent incumbent presidents lose ground in the midterms, then win second terms. Iran, of course, is another capable cyber adversary that has a big bone to pick with Trump: the death of the nuclear deal that was letting the Islamic Republic reenter the global economy. What if Iran decides that they want to go after Tom Cotton, its fiercest critic and a Trump backer?

## Russia – GOP

#### Russia and Voter Disenfranchisement thumps the link

Sumner, 2018 — Mark Sumner, M.A. from Washington University, Author of Numerous Novels, Contributing Editor at the Daily Kos, 01-12-2018, Date Accessed: 1-15-2018, "Next Target For Russian Hackers—2018 Senate races" Daily Kos, <https://www.dailykos.com/stories/2018/1/12/1732197/-Next-target-for-Russian-hackers-2018-Senate-races>

Next Target for Russian Hackers—2018 Senate Races With Republicans seemingly retiring by the day, and Trump helping out by dragging his party into the excrement, the idea that Democrats might flip the House has gone from the longest of long shots to a not-so-risky bet. But on the Senate side of the hill, even Trump can’t get around the fact that Democrats are defending 25 seats and Republicans are facing only eight contests. In an ordinary year—even an ordinary midterm under a new president—that’s a formula that suggests Republican gains. Still, with Trump weighing on the party, and Doug Jones cutting the margin with his win in Alabama, the chances that Democrats could end up in control of both ends of Congress seem much better than they did a year ago. But it appears that Republicans may have a not so secret weapon. The same Russian government-aligned hackers who penetrated the Democratic Party have spent the past few months laying the groundwork for an espionage campaign against the U.S. Senate, a cybersecurity firm said Friday. In 2016, Russian efforts actually extended into 39 states. Since then Russia has tested its ability to sway world events by planting false stories justifying the quarantine of Qatar, making intrusions into the global power grid, and hacking into the infrastructure of the French election. At the very least, 2018 is likely to see a return of the same sorts of actions that Russian operatives used in the last cycle—from stealing emails and get out the vote plans, to using armies of ‘bots along with carefully placed ads in social media. That’s because Republicans, intent on protecting Trump, have refused to take seriously any measure to address the continuing threat. Cybersecurity experts have long warned that America’s election system is a sitting duck for hackers looking to cause chaos. Voter rolls have regularly been been stored on inadequately protected systems, and the country has for years relied on outdated electronic voting machines. At the state and local level, governments can lack the funds to hire elite cyber professionals or properly train staff. Instead Republicans have concentrated on “voter ID laws” and efforts to “cleanse voter rolls” both of which are intended to make it harder for core Democratic voters to participate in the election. This leaves security at the feet of individual campaigns, most of which are organizations thrown together in a matter of weeks, or even days, often by first-time staffers and with the assistance of multiple volunteers. It’s not the kind of environment that leads to strong cybersecurity procedures. Campaigns have enough difficulty getting out yard signs and keeping pizza around the office. They certainly don’t have the time to police, not just the security of their own electronic communications, but those of their state. Compared to a presidential campaign, House and Senate staffs are skeleton crews, often working at the edge of their abilities. And the greatly reduced scale of these campaigns makes them exquisitely sensitive to the effects of targeted ads and other social media-engineered attacks. Considering the demonstrated effectiveness of ads placed on social media in 2016, expect a repeat on a grand scale. It’s likely too late at [t]his point to do anything to safeguard the 2018 elections other than being vigilant for intrusions into voting rolls and election infrastructure. That’s something that could be helped considerably if more federal resources were made available … which seems unlikely. Meanwhile, candidates across the nation should expect to find themselves at the focus of the sort of hacker-generated false stories and pop-up ad storms that voters in specific regions saw in 2016.

# Impacts

## A2 Impeachment

### No Impeachment

#### Zero risk impeachment happens- Pelosi VOWED not to push for it- and she’s the house democratic leader.

Ducharme, 2017 (Jamie, TIME, 11-17-17, Nancy Pelosi: Impeaching President Trump Would Be a Waste of Time and Energy, <http://time.com/5029752/nancy-pelosi-impeach-trump/>, JKS)

Two days after a group of Democrats made moves to impeach President Donald Trump, House Democratic Leader Nancy Pelosi said during a speech that impeaching Trump would be a waste of time and energy, because “he’s just not that important.” Pelosi, who spoke at Hearst’s offices on Friday, said Democrats’ priority should not be removing Trump from office, according to tweets from Cosmopolitan features editor Emma Barker. “Republicans would love for us to make our campaigns about the impeachment of Trump,” she said. “That’s not what it’s about. It’s about the well-being of American families.” The longtime congresswoman has publicly denounced impeachment efforts in the past. Earlier this month, she told Politico that impeachment proceedings are “not someplace that I think we should go.” During her appearance at Hearst, according to Barker’s tweets, Pelosi also said that impeaching former President Bill Clinton was “a frivolous activity.”

### No Removal

#### Impeachment doesn’t mean removal from offense.

Beinhart, 2017 (“The Odds of Impeachment Are Dropping Despite Robert Mueller’s damaging disclosures, Republican voters offer Trump unwavering support.” The Atlantic PETER BEINART DEC 3)

That may be true. But bringing impeachment charges against Trump, and actually forcing him from office, are two vastly different things. And while the former may be more likely today than it was half a year ago, the latter is actually less likely. Since Robert Mueller became special counsel in May, the chances of the House of Representatives passing articles of impeachment—and the Senate ratifying them—have probably gone down. That’s because impeachment is less a legal process than a political one. Passing articles of impeachment requires a majority of the House. Were such a vote held today—even if every Democrat voted yes—it would still require 22 Republicans. If Democrats take the House next fall, they could then pass articles of impeachment on their own. But ratifying those articles would require two-thirds of the Senate, which would probably require at least 15 Republican votes. That kind of mass Republican defection has grown harder, not easier, to imagine. It’s grown harder because the last six months have demonstrated that GOP voters will stick with Trump despite his lunacy, and punish those Republican politicians who do not. Among Republicans, Trump’s approval rating has held remarkably steady. The week Mueller was named, according to Gallup, Trump’s GOP support stood at 84 percent. In the days after Donald Trump Jr. was revealed to have written, “I love it” in response to a Russian offer of dirt on Hillary Clinton, it reached 87 percent. In Gallup’s last poll, taken in late November, it was 81 percent. Trump’s approval rating among Republicans has not dipped below 79 percent since he took office. None of the revelations from Mueller’s investigation—nor any of the other outrageous things Trump has done—has significantly undermined his support among the GOP rank and file. The GOP senators who have challenged Trump, by contrast, have seen their support among Republican voters crash. In July, Arizona Senator Jeff Flake’s brave and honorable book was excerpted in Politico as “My Party Is in Denial About Donald Trump.” Trump retaliated, of course. And by October, a Morning Consult poll found that Arizona Republicans disapproved of Flake by 13 points. That month, he declined to run for reelection. The other GOP senator to most frontally challenge Trump has been Tennessee’s Bob Corker, who in a series of interviews in October, accused him of “debasing” the presidency and warned that he could lead America into World War III. The result: A similar collapse of support. As The Washington Post’s Aaron Blake has noted, Tennessee Republicans approved of Corker in February by 40 points. By the end of October, they disapproved of him by 12 points. Not surprisingly, Corker isn’t running for reelection either.

### Removal Slow

#### Removal takes years.

Silver, 2017 (Nate, you already know, “Trump And Congress Are Probably On A Collision Course Over Russia” 7-26-2017 https://fivethirtyeight.com/features/trump-and-congress-are-probably-on-a-collision-course-over-russia/)

It took two years and almost two months from the discovery of the Watergate break-in on June 17, 1972, to Richard Nixon’s resignation under threat of removal from office on August 9, 1974. Even after what was probably the most infamous event of the Watergate ordeal — the Saturday Night Massacre on Oct. 20, 1973, in which Nixon fired special prosecutor Archibald Cox — it still took almost 10 months until Nixon resigned. In most respects, Trump is ahead of Nixon’s schedule. He’s only been president for six months — and it’s been less than three months since Comey was fired and less than three weeks since Trump Jr.’s meeting with Russians at Trump Tower was revealed. Trump also has only a 38 or 39 percent approval rating — whereas Nixon, five months after the Watergate break-in in November 1972, overwhelmingly won re-election with 61 percent of the vote against George McGovern. Recent polls4 show that about 43 percent of the public want Trump to be impeached, which is short of a majority — but also well ahead of where Nixon was in July 1973, when just 24 percent of the public supported impeachment. How much further Trump’s approval rating might fall and how quickly that might happen is hard to say. His numbers did decline a few percentage points after the Comey firing, but they’ve been fairly steady since then. There’s undoubtedly some truth in the notion that partisanship will give Trump a cushion with Republican voters. At the same time, his numbers are historically poor for a president at this point in his term despite a fairly good economy, which usually boosts approval ratings. And there’s been considerable erosion in the number of voters who say they strongly support Trump. Voters who go from strongly supporting a candidate to reluctantly supporting him may turn out to oppose him a few months later. Trump, like Nixon, also has a tendency to make enemies out of former allies when feeling embattled. Some media outlets that usually strongly support Trump, such as Breitbart, have come out strongly in defense of Sessions, for example. It’s not that hard to imagine a scenario — a year or two from now — where Trump is increasingly isolated, as George W. Bush was late in his second term. But the impeachment process is slow, both by custom and design. And that’s for good reason: Removing a popularly-elected president is a drastic step, especially early in his term. If I had to imagine a world in which Trump winds up being impeached and removed from office, it would play out fairly gradually. Some event will probably spark a confrontation between Trump and Congress later this year or early next year. But it might take until 2019, after further White House missteps throughout 2018 and a big Democratic win at the midterms, for Republicans to be ready to impeach Trump. The confrontation is increasingly unlikely to be avoided — but the key tests of how Republicans in Congress will respond to Trump’s conduct over Russia have still yet to come.

### A2 Blue Wave

#### No impeachment – even assuming Dem wave

Dorf, 2018 (Michael C. – Robert S. Stevens Professor of Law @ Cornell Law School, January 9, https://takecareblog.com/blog/the-overlap-between-impeachment-and-the-25th-amendment)

To make clear that I am about to engage in a purely "academic" exercise, I begin with the obvious political reality: (1) There is virtually no chance that Donald Trump will be removed from the presidency via the 25th Amendment based on his past conduct or his inevitable future conduct of a similar sort; and (2) absent irrefutable evidence of crimes on the order of cannibalistic murder personally committed by Trump, there is also virtually no chance that Trump will be removed from the presidency via impeachment, even assuming a strong midterm wave election in which Democrats take the House and the Senate, because Republicans will still have enough votes in the Senate to block removal. That is the reality, because it is now clear that there are very few Republicans willing to stand up to Trump when it really matters. I suppose that it is possible that a sufficient drubbing in the midterm elections could change that--which is why I hedged a bit by saying "virtually" twice in the prior paragraph. For practical purposes at least for now, both impeachment and invocation of the 25th Amendment--no matter how justified--are a mirage.

## A2 North Korea

#### Trump is all bluster on North Korea – deterrence prevents any conflict.

Fifield and Kang, 2017 (Anna Fifield is The Post’s bureau chief in Tokyo, focusing on Japan and the Koreas., 8-11-17, “Are we on the brink of nuclear war with North Korea? Probably not.”, <https://www.washingtonpost.com/news/worldviews/wp/2017/08/11/are-we-on-the-brink-of-nuclear-war-with-north-korea-the-consensus-is-probably-not/?utm_term=.9b731a36da40>, JKS)\*\*Interviewing Kang

David Kang, director of the Korean Studies Institute at the University of Southern California:

“This time isn’t any different from the North Korean side — they haven’t done that much different than in the past. Kim Jong Un may be testing more missiles, but essentially their behavior is not any different. The big thing we keep missing about North Korea is that their threats are always the second half of a sentence, and we ignore the first half. North Korea consistently says, 'If the United States attacks us first, we will fight back.' The only thing that gets reported in the U.S. media is the second clause, not the first. So their comments are clearly deterrent in nature, and the Guam 'threat' was exactly along those lines. So we always overhype the North Korean threat, because it is absolutely not a threat of preemptive or first strike. For the U.S., the current administration might be speaking perhaps a little more flamboyantly than previous administrations, for sure. But essentially what they are saying is no different than any previous administration has said: 'If the United States is attacked first, we will fight back, as well.' The message is one of deterrence, not first strike. Both sides are reiterating that they will fight back if attacked. Deterrence works, because both sides believe the other. It is widely accepted that North Korea will strike at American targets somewhere in the Pacific if we attack them first, almost nobody doubts that. For their part, the North Koreans fully expect a massive American attack at some point, they believe us. So deterrence holds, because of the costs involved. It’s not pretty, but it works.”