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1NC GOP Good DA (1/2)

1. Uniqueness – GOP will take control in November – close races will tip in the same direction favoring Republicans

The Economist 7/29 (Montreal Gazette. http://www.montrealgazette.com/business/Democrats+edge+panic/3335871/story.html) JM

Sometimes in politics stating the obvious can get you into trouble. So it was three weeks ago when Robert Gibbs, Barack Obama's spokesman, admitted on a talk show that the Democrats might lose their majority in the House of Representatives in the midterm elections. This earned him a scolding from House Democrats, many of whom already resent Obama for forcing them to vote for unpopular bills and, as they see it, failing to campaign effectively enough to save their jobs in November. It is therefore safe to bet that Gibbs will not be giving public voice to a new fear now spreading through Democratic hearts, namely that it is not just the lower chamber that is vulnerable in November. The Senate might be in play as well. Only 37 of the Senate's 100 seats will be up in November. The Democrats are defending a majority of 59 to 41 (although their majority includes two independents), which means that the Republicans need a net gain of 10 seats to win control. Until recently this feat was thought to be beyond their reach, and many pollsters continue to think so. And yet Bill Galston, a senior fellow at the Brookings Institution, thinks that this could be another of those election years, such as 1980, 1986 and 2006, when most of the close races tip in the same direction and produce a shift of control. It is certainly the case that many once-safe Democratic seats, such as Wisconsin and Washington, are looking vulnerable. The Cook Political Report now judges it possible for the Republicans' Carly Fiorina, the deep-pocketed former chief executive of Hewlett-Packard, to defeat the sitting Democrat, Barbara Boxer, in California. As well as winning the House and Senate, says Galston, the Republicans could hit the trifecta, capturing Obama's former seat in Illinois, Vice-President Joe Biden's in Delaware and, in Nevada, unseating Harry Reid, the majority leader. With more than three months to polling day, there might still be time for Obama's party to confound the doom-sayers. But the panic in the party is palpable -along with a mounting sense of injustice.

1. Links –

1. Immigration would be a big win for the Democrats – they need to show leadership to get the Latino vote.

Sefsaf 2/8/10 (Wendy, “The 2010 Mid-Term Elections and the Impatient Latino Vote” http://immigrationimpact.com/2010/02/08/the-2010-mid-term-elections-and-the-impatient-latino-vote/)

The report also serves as a stark warning to politicians as the election cycle begins anew:

Polling of Latino voters shows that the Republican Party’s image has been severely damaged by GOP lawmakers’ demagoguery on the issue, and that the vast majority of Latinos simply will not vote for a candidate who advocates mass deportation instead of comprehensive immigration reform. That said, if Democrats fail to show real leadership and keep their campaign promises to advance comprehensive immigration reform, they run the risk of alienating Latinos or facing depressed Latino turnout during the crucial 2010 elections. Politicians of both parties also need to approach the issue responsibly during their election campaigns. Heated rhetoric coupled with unrealistic policy solutions like mass deportation will turn off both the crucial Latino voting bloc and other swing voters, who are tired of Washington policymakers talking tough, but delivering little.

2. The latino vote is key for the mid-terms

Sefsaf 2/8/10 (Wendy, “The 2010 Mid-Term Elections and the Impatient Latino Vote” http://immigrationimpact.com/2010/02/08/the-2010-mid-term-elections-and-the-impatient-latino-vote/)

Today, America’s Voice released a report, [The Power of the Latino Vote in the 2010 Elections: They Tipped Elections in 2008; Where will they be in 2010?](http://www.americasvoiceonline.org/page/-/americasvoice/reports/LatinoVoterReport.pdf) The report analyzes forty battleground “Races to Watch” where the Latino vote will be pivotal to both parties. The report notes that “as the Latino electorate grows in size and power, candidates from all political parties must take their views into account to remain viable in an increasing number of House and Senate races as well as future Presidential contests.” This is because “at least one segment of the Latino electorate—foreign‐born, naturalized U.S. citizens of Latino descent, who represent 40% of the Latino voter population—has proven to be a true swing constituency.” In other words, when both parties are supportive of the Latino community and their needs, this Latinos sub-group can swing towards either party. For this group of voters however, immigration reform is a litmus test, and how each candidate treats the issue will be a key factor in determining which way the Latino voters will swing.

1NC GOP Good DA (2/2)

1. Impacts –
2. GOP victories are key to market stability

Bloomberg 7/22/10 (“The Midterms Could Spark a Stock Rally”) http://www.businessweek.com/magazine/content/10\_31/b4189048926083.htm

President Barack Obama has already presided over the biggest stock-market rally during the start of a Presidency since Franklin D. Roosevelt in the 1930s. Now, if election year history is any guide, stocks are poised for further gains, though for reasons Obama probably wouldn't like. Should Democratics fare poorly in this fall's midterm elections and lose control of the House to Republicans, stock investors could view the resulting split government as a positive. "Markets love gridlock," says Ken Fisher, who oversees $35 billion in Woodside, Calif., as chief executive officer of Fisher Investments. "What the markets want to see is no change: less legislation that engages in changes in taxes, spending, regulation, or property rights." The billionaire Fisher expects the market to stage a rally even before the midterm elections. Bets made on Intrade, a Dublin-based prediction market, show a 54 percent chance Republicans will take the House. How big are the potential stock-market gains? The Standard & Poor's 500-stock index has advanced 15 percent on average in years when there was a Democratic President and Republican majority in Congress, the most of any combination, according to New York-based Strategas Research Partners. The S&P 500 gained 6.7 percent in the 12 months after the 2006 midterm election, when Republicans and President George W. Bush lost control of both houses. In the 1994 congressional elections under President Bill Clinton, Democrats gave up their majority in the House and Senate. That was followed by the S&P's 34 percent surge in 1995, the biggest in 37 years, data compiled by Bloomberg show. The chance that Democrats will lose their Senate majority this year is 18 percent, according to Intrade. The stock-market gains are even more impressive in the second year of a Presidency when viewed from a trough-to-peak perspective. The S&P 500 index has surged 48 percent on average starting in the second year of each U.S. Presidential term, measured from its lowest level that year through the high in the third one, according to data compiled by Bloomberg that goes back to 1928. That compares with trough-to-peak gains of 38 percent in other years. Midterm election cycles aside, many other factors will affect the market. Corporate earnings are key, and the outlook is good. S&P 500 companies are projected to increase profits 34 percent in 2010 and 17 percent in 2011, the fastest two-year gain since 1995, based on analysts' estimates.

2 .Global economy recovery key to prevent nuclear World War III

O'Donnell 9 [Sean, Republican Examiner writer. 2-26-2009, The Baltimore Republican Examiner, "Will this recession lead to World War III?," http://www.examiner.com/x- 3108-Baltimore-Republican- Examiner~y2009m2d26-Will-this- recession-lead-to-World-War- III]

Could the current economic crisis affecting this country and the world lead to another world war? The answer may be found by looking back in history. One of the causes of World War I was the economic rivalry that existed between the nations of Europe. In the 19th century France and Great Britain became wealthy through colonialism and the control of foreign resources. This forced other up-and-coming nations (such as Germany) to be more competitive in world trade which led to rivalries and ultimately, to war. After the Great Depression ruined the economies of Europe in the 1930s, fascist movements arose to seek economic and social control. From there fanatics like Hitler and Mussolini took over Germany and Italy and led them both into World War II. With most of North America and Western Europe currently experiencing a recession, will competition for resources and economic rivalries with the Middle East, Asia, or South American cause another world war? Add in nuclear weapons and Islamic fundamentalism and things look even worse. Hopefully the economy gets better before it gets worse and the terrifying possibility of World War III is averted. However sometimes history repeats itself.

\*\*Uniqueness\*\*

Uniqueness – GOP Wins: General

Lingering resentment from Healthcare gives GOP momentm for midterms

NBC News. 7/19/10. (The midterms: 'Slightly over 40. http://firstread.msnbc.msn.com/\_news/2010/07/19/4705996-the-midterms-slightly-over-40).

[MSNBC.com’s Carrie Dann live-blogged "Meet the Press,"](http://bit.ly/bN4bo6) which featured the first-ever joint appearance of the chairmen of the Democratic and Republican campaign committees. She noted that although NRSC Chairman Sen. John Cornyn said, "if the election were held today, it’d be a pretty good election," he wouldn’t say how many Senate seats he thought Republicans would pick up. The [AP](http://bit.ly/drnKXj) writes up this weekend’s midterm predictions, leading with Vice President Joe Biden’s "cheery prediction" that was "in stark contrast to last weekend's talk show comment by White House press secretary Robert Gibbs that enough House seats are ‘in play’ that Republicans could gain control of the House." He also predicted that as voters begin to understand the details of big administration initiatives like health care reform and "begin considering the alternative policies that GOP candidates are offering, they'll start to come around. Republicans, he said, ‘are about repeal and repeat -- repeal what we're doing and go back’ to policies of the past decade that have been tried and found wanting.

GOP will win now – unemployment, oil spill, Afghanistan, immigration, and the deficit all tank Democrats in the midterm

Elhassani 7/25/10. (Camille. The Americas Blog. http://blogs.aljazeera.net/americas/2010/07/25/democrats-republicans-and-100-days).

It’s possible if not probable that Republicans could pick up enough seats to substantially affect policymaking, even if they don’t become the majority party.  That’s because voters are angry that about job loss, home foreclosures and retirement savings vanishing and don’t see substantial progress on their priorities. Jobs, jobs, jobs.  No incumbent will be able to avoid the political black hole of high unemployment.  Nearly 15 million Americans are unemployed, and if they don’t have a job to go to on November 2, they might be the first ones in line on Election Day. And there are other national and local issues voters will consider:  the growing deficit, illegal immigration, and widespread public anger with Washington could translate into a drubbing for the Democratic Party.  The oil spill in the Gulf of Mexico and the increasing number of US casualties in Afghanistan are added headaches for the party in power.   Republicans, as the minority party, will remind voters of unpopular laws passed by the Democrats – healthcare reform, financial services reform, and a stimulus, which they don’t see as helping the weak economy.  However, so far, they haven’t come out with a substantive platform of ideas they want to implement if elected and are counting on a backlash against the Democrats to propel them into office.

Uniqueness – GOP Wins: General

GOP will gain seats – people are turning away from expansive government

VOA News 7/28 (http://www1.voanews.com/english/news/usa/Obama-Tries-to-Rally-Democrats-for-November-Elections-99486959.html) JM

Michael Barone is a political expert with the American Enterprise Institute here in Washington: "The rejection of this vast expansion of the size and scope of government by the Obama administration and the Democratic congressional leadership, I think that is the central issue of this campaign cycle," said Michael Barone. Democrats won control of both houses of Congress in the 2006 midterm elections and they expanded their majorities when Mr. Obama won the White House in 2008. But the political pendulum appears to be swinging back in favor of the Republicans, says presidential expert Bruce Buchanan of the University of Texas. "On balance, the dynamic looks to be very much anti-incumbent," said Bruce Buchanan. "Most of the predictions that one gets from the specialists in this area suggest that there will be losses for the Democrats in both houses, significant losses possibly."In addition to shoring up his base among Democratic voters, President Obama appears to be facing a growing challenge in keeping the support of independent voters who were a big part of his election victory two years ago. Quinnipiac University pollster Peter Brown says some key voter groups seem to be down on the president this year. "Males, independents and white voters are all groups that backed President Obama by larger numbers in the election of 2008 than traditionally Democrats have done among those groups," said Peter Brown. "Now in all three groups, he is getting anywhere in the high 30 percent level. That is a pretty substantial drop off - almost 30 percent - and that is really politically where it could be problematic for the president."

Uniqueness – GOP Wins: General

Republicans are leading by a large point margin in the status quo

Fox News, 2010

(July 29, “Fox News Poll: Republicans Garner 11-Point Lead in Midterms,” http://www.foxnews.com/politics/2010/07/29/fox-news-poll-republicans-garner-point-lead-midterms/, CW, accessed on 7/29/10)

With less than 100 days until the midterm elections, American voters would give the edge to Republicans by an 11 percentage-point margin if the Congressional election were today. Yet a majority doesn't think a Republican takeover of Congress would lead to positive change.

A Fox News poll released Thursday finds that if Americans were heading to the voting booth today, they would back the Republican candidate in their district over the Democrat by 47-36 percent. Two weeks ago the Republicans had a slimmer 4-point advantage (41-37 percent).

As has been the case all year, Republicans continue to be more interested in the upcoming election. Thirty-six percent of Republicans are "extremely" interested compared to 23 percent of Democrats.

GOP will win – American ideology

Galston 7/29

(William, The New Republic, July 28, “How Americans’ Shifting Political Ideologies Threaten the Democrats,” http://www.tnr.com/blog/william-galston/76631/democrats-republicans-popularity-new-demographics, CW, accessed on 7/29/10)

In a recent post, Jonathan Chait rightly calls our attention to the Pew survey released July 16 that showed how voters rate political parties’ ideologies. While I agree with Chait’s interpretation of the data he cites, I want to underscore the significance of some other information in the survey—namely, where voters identify themselves in relation to the parties. On the whole, 58 percent of voters see Democrats as liberal or very liberal, while 56 percent see Republicans as conservative or very conservative; no surprise there. But voters now place themselves much closer to the Republican Party than to the Democratic Party on this left-right continuum. Indeed, the ideological gap between the Democratic Party and the mean voter is about three times as large as the separation between that voter and the Republican Party. And, startlingly, the electorate places itself a bit closer to the Tea Party movement (which is well to the right of the Republican Party) than to the Democratic Party. All this represents a major shift from five years ago, when mean voters placed themselves exactly halfway between their ideological perceptions of the Democratic and Republican parties. The Pew survey also shows that Democrats are far more ideologically diverse than Republicans. Twenty-four percent of Democrats describe themselves as conservative or very conservative, while only 5 percent of Republicans call themselves liberal or very liberal. Conversely, 65 percent of Republicans think of themselves as conservative or very conservative, while only 42 percent of Democrats self-identify as liberal or very liberal. This helps explain why 83 percent of Republicans see the Democratic Party as more liberal than they themselves are—while only 60 percent of Democrats place the Republican Party to the right of where they place themselves. Shifts among Independents are especially notable. A Pew survey in June 2005 found that Independents considered the Republican Party to be twice as distant from them ideologically as the Democratic Party. Today, Independents see the Democratic Party as three times farther away than the Republican Party. In 2005, 51 percent of Independents thought that the Republican Party was more conservative than they themselves were, versus only 36 percent who thought that the Democratic Party was more liberal. Today, 56 percent of Independents see the Democratic Party as more liberal than they themselves are, compared to only 39 percent who see the Republican Party as more conservative. In May 2009, after Obama had taken office and the broad political debate had shifted away from social issues and national security toward the economy and federal regulation, Pew found that Independents had begun to move toward the Republican Party. This month’s survey suggests a continuation of this trend in Obama’s second year. Three politically relevant conclusions follow from these data. First, Democrats’ greater diversity means that party leaders are bound to have more trouble managing their coalition than the Republicans will theirs. Second, the Independents who helped Democrats score a notable success in the 2006 midterm elections may well do the same for Republicans in 2010.

Uniqueness – GOP Wins: General

Polls today say GOP will win House and Senate

Tantaros 10 (Andrea, FoxNews contributer, FoxNews.com, http://www.foxnews.com/opinion/2010/07/23/andrea-tantaros-midterm-elections-gop-capture-house-representatives-senate/) AVL

It’s impossible to predict what will happen in November when voters head to the polls in the 2010 midterms. But looking at the current landscape and polling, it shows that a stagnant economy, a bleak job market, an unpopular healthcare bill, a suffering gulf and lawless border have put Democrats on very shaky ground. And this isn’t just election. Democrats hold the House, the Senate and the White House giving them total control. If the [GOP](http://www.foxnews.com/opinion/2010/07/23/andrea-tantaros-midterm-elections-gop-capture-house-representatives-senate/) were to take either legislative bodies – or both – a power balance would be achieved. If the election were held today, Republicans would have a good chance at capturing the House of Representatives. Generic congressional ballot polls show the GOP with an edge. Numbers by Rasmussen, Fox [News](http://www.foxnews.com/opinion/2010/07/23/andrea-tantaros-midterm-elections-gop-capture-house-representatives-senate/) and Quinnipiac show the right with a 9, 4, and 5 point lead, respectively, and a margin of error of +/- 3%. Enthusiasm is also on the GOP’s side. Republicans are much more engaged in the coming election and more inclined to say they are certain to vote than are Democrats. According to the Pew Center’s President Andrew Kohut, “the much-talked about GOP enthusiasm edge over Democrats is turning into a sizable voter turnout advantage, one even bigger than in 1994 when conservatives shocked Washington and took control of the House and Senate.” The GOP needs to win 39 seats to [switch](http://www.foxnews.com/opinion/2010/07/23/andrea-tantaros-midterm-elections-gop-capture-house-representatives-senate/) control and remove Speaker Pelosi from her leadership post. Currently, 100 seats are being targeted and pursued aggressively. It should be noted that the House has never flipped without the Senate. This could be the first time in history that happens. The Senate seemed out of reach until recently, but with races in both California (where former [HP](http://www.foxnews.com/opinion/2010/07/23/andrea-tantaros-midterm-elections-gop-capture-house-representatives-senate/) CEO Carly Fiorina is closing in on Senator Barbara Boxer) and Wisconsin (where Senator Russ Feingold could be unseated by Ron Johnson) the other side of Capitol Hill is now in play. Independents will play a key role in the midterm outcomes. The demographic broke in large numbers for Barack Obama in 2008 but have peeled off and are now polling more likely with the right.

Public will vote against Dems, confidence down and GOP the answer for midterms

Tantaros 10 (Andrea, FoxNews contributer, FoxNews.com, http://www.foxnews.com/opinion/2010/07/23/andrea-tantaros-midterm-elections-gop-capture-house-representatives-senate/) AVL

Fueling this wave against the left is a very unpopular President and his policies. According to a Fox News/Opinion Dynamics poll released July 16th, finds that 41 percent of voters will cast their ballots to register opposition to President Obama's policies and according the Gallup Daily poll, President Obama’s job approval is hitting one of his lowest points - a 46% approval and disapproval rating. The real nugget of interest when you look closer is that only 36% of Americans have confidence in the Presidency. That’s down 15 percentage points in the last month. But the right shouldn’t reach for the champagne just yet. Despite the GOP’s favorable electoral prospects, its brand image with the public is still relatively lackluster. According to the same Fox News poll, even among GOP voters, nearly as many disapprove as approve of the way Republican congressional leaders are handling their jobs. Bottom line to all this: Democrats need to change course – and fast. The voters aren’t happy with the way they’ve governed and don’t trust them to handle a majority of the most important issues to the nation. The Republicans need a cogent, clear message. It’s time to stop the message schizophrenia from healthcare to Kagan to immigration. They should [hammer](http://www.foxnews.com/opinion/2010/07/23/andrea-tantaros-midterm-elections-gop-capture-house-representatives-senate/) home a message of growth, jobs, the economy and spending each and every day until Election Day, under the umbrella of a larger message: that government is taking over with the Democrats in power. Though the final tally is still months away, one element will likely carry through to the Fall. The voters are motivated by anger and fear. They aren’t just frustrated with Washington; they are petrified of the future and what the Beltway will do next. Democrats – or anyone who has supported big government -should be petrified, too.

Uniqueness – GOP Wins: General

Dems will lose seats – the agenda is massively unpopular

Newstex 7/23 (“Democrat Agenda Isnt Helping Democrats” Ln) JM

If Democrats do as bad in these midterm elections as it seems as though they’re going to do, it won’t be for lack of advancing their agenda. Indeed, it seems as though it’s their agenda that’s making them so unpopular. Washington (CNN) “A new national poll suggests that major legislative victories for the Democrats this week have not helped the party in its goal to keep control of Congress in the midterm elections. In May, the Democrats had a one-point edge in the so-called generic ballot question. But a CNN/Opinion Research Corporation survey released Friday indicates the Republicans have a 49 to 44 percent advantage when voters are asked which partys candidate they will vote for in their congressional district. Some of the biggest losses for the Democrats have come among senior citizens, says CNN Polling Director Keating Holland. Among seniors, Democrats had a two-point edge in May but the GOP is currently winning 56 percent of that group. ¦ This is despite a productive week for the Democrats, with congressional victories on financial reform legislation and unemployment insurance. The survey indicates nearly six out of ten Americans support the financial reform bill, which President Barack Obama signed into law on Wednesday. Independents questioned also support the law, which increases government oversight of major banks and financial institutions in hopes of preventing another major recession. Again, Democrats haven’t been winning elections because voters wanted them to advance a liberal agenda. They’ve been winning elections because Republicans were in the majority and Democrats were the default alternative.

Republicans will gain seats in the midterm elections – democrats are desperate

Cook 7/29 (Dave. Christian Science Monitor. http://www.csmonitor.com/USA/Politics/monitor\_breakfast/2010/0729/GOP-tea-party-link-a-sign-of-Democrats-desperation) JM

Ed Gillespie, chairman of the Republican State Leadership Committee, says it is a “pretty good sign of their desperation” for the Democratic National Committee to launch an effort this week to try to damage Republican candidates’ electoral chances by linking the GOP to the extreme elements of the Tea Party. Can Obama, Biden give a boost to Democratic candidates? Mr. Gillespie, a former chairman of the Republican National Committee, spoke Thursday at a Monitor-sponsored breakfast for reporters. He was asked about a plan announced Wednesday by the Democratic National Committee seeking to reinforce a link in voters’ minds between Republicans and Tea Party positions. DNC Chairman Tim Kaine released what he called the “Republican Tea Party Contract on America” which, he claimed, showed what Republicans would do if they took control of Congress in November’s elections. Items on the ten-point list included repealing Wall Street reform and health insurance reform, privatizing Social Security, and ending Medicare. "They usually wait until October to start telling voters that Republicans are going to eliminate Social Security and Medicare. It is a sign of their desperation that they have started that in July this year,” Gillespie said. The rise of Tea Party movement is a net positive for the Republican Party, Gillespie said. “I do find it somewhat amusing the notion that a wave and a flood of newly engaged voters who are concerned about debt and rising taxes and government intervention in our economy who are coming into the political process, many of them for the first time, is somehow a problem for Republicans.”

Uniqueness – GOP Wins: Indpendents

Democrats will lose seats – Independent voters are turning away

Fineman 7/26 (Howard, Newsweek THE TAKE; Pg. 24 Vol. 156 No. 04. Ln) JM

Obama's lead pollster, Joel Benenson, and veteran Democratic pollster Geoffrey Garin have zeroed in recently on one particular slice of the 2010 electorate: what Obama senior counselor David Axelrod calls "indie men"--independent male voters. Obama won over these voters in 2008, and they may be all that stands between Democrats and catastrophe this fall. But this time he'll have to use a completely different strategy to lure them back. It's easy enough to understand the arithmetic of the midterms. Republicans are united and motivated, if only by their almost pathological fear of the president. They will turn out. Staunch Democrats, by contrast, are long past the giddy high of Obama's historic victory. Minorities and other liberals are disappointed by what they regard as Obama's lack of zeal--and he isn't on the ballot in any case. These deep-fried Democrats will not show up to vote at anywhere near the record levels of 2008, and neither will young and/or first-time voters, who rarely come out for midterms. So if Democrats are to avoid a wipe-out, they need to protect some of the big gains they made two years ago among self-described independents, who, in some polls, make up 40 percent of likely voters in November. And most independents (51 percent) are males. "They're a significant number," says Mark Mellman, the polltaker for Sen. Harry Reid of Nevada, "and a decisive number." As Butch Cassidy once asked, who are those guys? They don't differ much from the country as a whole in income and education, though they are slightly younger on the average. They are overwhelmingly white (87 percent in the Benenson-Garin poll). There are few evangelical Christians among them, but more Catholics than in the overall electorate. Most important, they're not a parliament of Solomons, respectfully weighing the platforms of the two parties. "They are highly disdainful of both parties," Garin told me. "They kind of hate everybody in positions of power, including government and big corporations." They do not like ideological rhetoric, and they focus on concrete results. In other words, they're Americans, but more so. The Democrats' support among this group has fallen to as low as 35 percent in some polls. The reasons are clear. They do not believe that Obama's actions have produced results--and for these practical voters, nothing else matters. The $787 billion stimulus bill is widely regarded as an expensive, unfocused dud, even when measured against the cautious claims the Obama camp originally made for it. Health-care reform remains, for most voters, a 2,000-page, impenetrable, and largely irrelevant mystery. The BP oil spill has hurt Obama's ability to fend off GOP charges that he's ineffective as a leader.

GOP winning now – key independents are mobilized to support Republicans in midterms

Philadelphia Bulletin 7/12/10. (http://thebulletin.us/articles/2010/07/12/top\_stories/doc4c3b33b282148748344038.txt)

The GOP is also benefiting from a change in voting preferences among independents. Currently, Republicans have a slight edge over the Democrats among independent voters (44 percent to 36 percent). At this stage in 2006, independents backed the Democratic candidate in their district by a wide margin (47 percent to 32 percent). **Equally important, independents who say they will support the Republican candidate this November are much more engaged than those who favor the Democrat in their district.** This pattern is evident across several measures – enthusiasm about voting, attentiveness to campaign news and intention to vote. **More than half of independent voters (55 percent) who back the Republican candidate in their district are more enthusiastic than usual about voting this year; that compares with 36 percent of independents who prefer the Democratic candidate.** While 63 percent of independent voters who favor the GOP candidate are closely following news about the election, just 48 percent of independents who support the Democratic candidate say the same. And 77 percent of independent voters who support a Republican say they are absolutely certain to vote, compared with 62 percent of independents who back a Democrat.

Uniqueness – GOP Wins: Voter Turnout

GOP will win now – the base is mobilized and will turn out in bulk to vote in November

Philadelphia Bulletin 7/12/10. (http://thebulletin.us/articles/2010/07/12/top\_stories/doc4c3b33b282148748344038.txt)

With four months to go before Election Day, voting intentions for the House remain closely divided, and neither party has gained or lost much ground over the course of 2010. However**, Republicans are much more engaged in the coming election and more inclined to say they are certain to vote than are Democrats. This could translate into a sizable turnout advantage for the GOP in November that could transform an even race among registered voters into a solid victory for the Republicans**. Fully 56 percent of Republican voters say they are more enthusiastic about voting this year than in previous elections – the highest percentage of GOP voters expressing increased enthusiasm about voting in midterms dating back to 1994. While enthusiasm among Democratic voters overall is on par with levels in 2006, fewer liberal Democrats say they are more enthusiastic about voting than did so four years ago (52 percent then, 37 percent today). The Republican Party now holds about the same advantage in enthusiasm among its party’s voters that the Democratic Party held in June 2006 and the GOP had late in the 1994 campaign. Moreover, more Republicans than Democrats are now paying close attention to election news (64 percent vs. 50 percent). At this stage in previous midterms, news attentiveness was about the same for voters in both parties.

GOP will win now – Republicans garner voter turn out in the most important groups

Philadelphia Bulletin 7/12/10. (http://thebulletin.us/articles/2010/07/12/top\_stories/doc4c3b33b282148748344038.txt)

The latest national survey by the Pew Research Center for the People & the Press, conducted June 16-20 among 1,802 adults and 1,496 registered voters reached on cell phones and landlines, finds that the Republicans also continue to hold a substantial advantage in the proportion of their party’s voters who say they are “absolutely certain” to vote. Currently, 77 percent of Republican voters say they are absolutely certain to vote compared with 65 percent of Democratic voters. The new survey finds that 45 percent of registered voters say they support the Republican in their district while the same percentage favors the Democrat. While Democrats have a substantial advantage among the least engaged group of voters – young people – Republicans have a large advantage among the age groups that are most committed to voting – those ages 50 and older. Voters younger than age 30 favor the Democratic candidate in their district by a wide margin (57 percent to 32 percent). Yet only half of young voters say they are absolutely certain to vote. Voters ages 50 and older favor the Republican candidate in their district by double digits (11 points) and roughly eight-in-ten (79 percent) say they are absolutely certain to vote.

Uniqueness – GOP Wins: Economy

GOP wins now – Despite recent momentum, most voters think Dems are weak on the economy

Hunt 7/18/10. (Albert, Economy Is Setting the Tone for Midterm Elections. http://www.nytimes.com/2010/07/19/us/19iht-letter.html?\_r=1&scp=1&sq=midterms%20taking%20over&st=cse

Over the past several months, a handful of high-profile Senate races — Connecticut, Florida, Kentucky, Illinois and Nevada — have tilted in the Democrats’ direction. This has generated hope in President [Barack Obama](http://topics.nytimes.com/top/reference/timestopics/people/o/barack_obama/index.html?inline=nyt-per)’s party that the November elections may not be so bad after all. It’s a mirage. All of these changes are due to sui generis Republican woes. Today, it’s an even bet that Republicans will pick up the 39 seats in the House of Representatives necessary to take control and gain a net of more than a half-dozen Senate seats. What’s lethal for the Democrats is that the election is being framed by the economy and views are locking in, with voters getting more, not less, pessimistic. A Bloomberg poll of Americans last week underscored the deep and pervasive economic pessimism. Most voters said they thought the country was really off on the wrong track and remained in a [recession](http://topics.nytimes.com/top/reference/timestopics/subjects/r/recession_and_depression/index.html?inline=nyt-classifier), even though the downturn actually ended last September. Trends in a couple of groups are especially unsettling for Mr. Obama and the Democrats. Fewer than one in five independents said the country was on the right track, and a plurality of that group gave the president negative ratings. In 2008, Mr. Obama carried the independent vote 52 percent to 44 percent.

Uniqueness – AT: GOP Doesn’t Win House

Even if Senate doesn’t see GOP, the House will and that’ll bring strong gains for US

Bravender 10 (Robin, News writer for Energy & Environment at NYTimes, http://www.nytimes.com/cwire/2010/07/27/27climatewire-cap-and-trade-advocates-see-tougher-battle-a-78288.html?scp=31&sq=GOP,%20midterms%20OR%20win&st=cse) AVL

And with the expected GOP gains in the House and Senate, next year's strategy is almost certain to involve seeking more Republican support. "We're looking at taking on this issue as one that should appeal to both parties," Mendelson said. "I remain optimistic that the issue of climate change as it evolves will force politicians from both parties to deal with it and hopefully that's next session if it doesn't happen this fall." The Democratic majority in the House is in jeopardy this fall, with many political analysts acknowledging the possibility of a GOP takeover. And while the Democrats' Senate majority seems secure, political analysts expect the GOP to make strong gains in the chamber. There is even a slim chance that the Senate could also switch to Republican control, analyst Charlie Cook wrote last week, although he said the flip is "still fairly unlikely." House Republicans would need to prevail in 46 out of 73 races that seem to have a chance of changing parties in that chamber, Cook wrote. Republicans are "going to mount very strong gains" in the Senate, he added. But they would need to win at least a couple long-shot races to achieve the 10-seat gain needed to win control of the Senate.

Uniqueness – AT: Democrats Fundraising

Even the poor Republicans are raising more money than Dems, GOP gains more, win more

Babington 7/15 (Charles, Press Writer, The Tribune, http://www.sanluisobispo.com/2010/07/15/1216771/gop-outpaces-dems-in-open-senate.html?storylink=mirelated) AVL

Republicans are outraising Democrats in nearly a dozen open Senate races, increasing their hopes of significantly narrowing the Democrats' majority in November. The differences are dramatic in some cases, such as Ohio. Republican nominee Rob Portman raised $2.6 million in the quarter than ended June 30, compared to about $1 million raised by Democrat Lee Fisher. Portman held a big cash-on-hand advantage: $8.8 million to $1 million, according to campaign finance reports filed Thursday. The two are seeking the seat being vacated by Republican George Voinovich. Fundraising is more competitive in Kentucky, where GOP Sen. Jim Bunning is retiring. Rand Paul, who won a tough GOP primary, raised $1.1 million for the quarter. Democrat Jack Conway raised slightly less than that from donors, and he lent his campaign another $400,000. Neither campaign had more than $750,000 in the bank at the quarter's end. Money separates the viable candidates from the also-rans, allowing hopefuls to run day-to-day campaign operations and buy expensive television ads. Cash also attracts more money from donors. Republicans need a net win of 10 seats to seize control of the Senate, and they're counting on well-funded candidates to deliver. Most worrisome to Democrats is their lackluster fundraising in states where their members are retiring. In Illinois, Republican Mark Kirk raised $2.3 million, while Democrat Alexi Giannoulias raised about $900,000. Kirk had nearly four times more money in the bank. In Indiana, where Democratic Sen. Evan Bayh is leaving, Republican Dan Coats raised $1.5 million in the quarter, while Democrat Brad Ellsworth took in about $600,000. Ellsworth's campaign had somewhat more cash at the quarter's end, however.Republicans are counting on rich self-funders in several states, such as Connecticut. Former pro wrestling magnate Linda McMahon has poured $21.5 million into her campaign to succeed retiring Democratic Sen. Chris Dodd. She has spent heavily, and reported having $3.2 million on June 30. Her likely Democratic opponent, state Attorney General Richard Blumenthal, had $2.1 million in cash after raising more than $1 million in the quarter. Less wealthy Republicans are doing well elsewhere. In Pennsylvania, Republican Pat Toomey raised more than $3 million in the quarter, and had $4.6 million on hand. Democratic nominee Joe Sestak, who defeated incumbent Arlen Specter in a tough primary, raised $1.9 million for the quarter. He had about $2 million on hand.

GOP fundraising is going into over drive

Politico, 7/10

(July 29, “The cash-for-speaker program,” http://www.politico.com/news/stories/0710/40380\_Page2.html, CW, accessed on 7/29/10)

The GOP strategy now is especially important because it gives Republicans a way to personalize the coming election — an effort aimed at reassuring donors that there money will be well spent. Many key party contributors are hesitant to give to the Republican National Committee or party committees because of concern over RNC Chairman Michael Steele’s stewardship of the national party, as well as lingering concerns about the last House GOP majority’s transgressions on ethics and spending. So the pamphlets attempt to tell the Boehner story. Under a picture of him in his Archbishop Moeller High School football uniform, the leader is depicted as a child of the Midwest who grew up as the son of a Cincinnati tavern owner, learned life lessons from legendary football coach Gerry Faust and got his start in politics by joining his neighborhood homeowners’ association. It’s an image far different from the perpetually tan, cigarette-smoking, golf-playing Boehner of Washington caricature and is geared toward introducing the leader to donors beyond the Beltway. “Some people are more comfortable helping what they see as a cause rather than just a party committee,” explained John DeStefano, Boehner’s political director and deputy executive director at the NRCC. “And they want to be confident that we’ll do what we say we’re going to do.” To this end, the literature depicts Boehner as different from both the current Democratic majority and the Tom DeLay-era GOP. “A staunch opponent of pork-barrel politics and backroom deals, John made a name for himself by taking on the establishment in the House of Representatives — Democrats and Republicans,” one brochure reads. Boehner’s refusal to take earmarks is recounted along with his efforts to curb spending in President George W. Bush’s second term. The “Boehner for Speaker” apparatus is housed in the NRCC and led by DeStefano, Boehner’s close aide and liaison in the building. Also helping are a group of lobbyists Boehner is close to, many of whom were present last Thursday. The K Street crowd included former Reps. Bill Paxon and Susan Molinari, NFIB President Dan Danner, Altria lobbyist Bruce Gates, former Boehner aide Sam Geduldig, Citigroup’s Nick Calio and Ogilvy’s Drew Maloney. According to a source in attendance last week, the leader implored the group to help the cause. “He said, ‘You’re my friends, and I need your help now more than ever,’” the source said. But Boehner aides emphasized that they hope to use conservative anger toward the current majority to develop a national network of donors and supporters who perhaps haven’t traditionally given to GOP House efforts but see retaking the chamber as the party’s best bet for gains this November. Republicans must be creative about how they raise money this cycle and look beyond the usual sources, said a lobbyist who attended the meeting. “Democrats being in the majority means a lot of the PAC money is going their way,” the lobbyist said. “And the resources we’ve traditionally gotten from the RNC are not going to be as plentiful as in years past.”

Uniqueness – AT: Tea Parties

Dems attempting to link the tea party agenda into the GOP agenda is just party rhetoric attacking everyday Americans and proving they are out of touch with the country.

CNN, 2010

(July 28, “NRCC suggests latest DNC move is 'political quackery,” http://politicalticker.blogs.cnn.com/2010/07/28/nrcc-suggests-latest-dnc-move-is-political-quackery/?fbid=TdMOGXddiBe, CW, accessed on 7/29/10)

Contacted by CNN, the National Republican Congressional Committee, which is headed by Rep. Sessions, fired back at Kaine and Wasserman Schultz.

"With no other cards left to play, Democrats are back to attacking voters," NRCC Communications Director Ken Spain said in a written statement, "Not only has this tired line of attack already been proven to be ineffective, it is offensive to voters who are offended by the fiscal recklessness of Washington politicians, and it suggests that Democratic leaders like Tim Kaine and Debbie Wasserman Schultz have been reduced to political quackery."

And a spokesperson for Rep. Pence said national Democrats are showing how out of touch they are with the concerns of everyday Americans.

"Democrat leaders attacking everyday Americans who are concerned about out-of-control spending in Washington shows how out of touch they are," Pence Deputy Press Secretary Courtney Kolb said in a written statement to CNN. "House Republicans are taking a stand to rein in wasteful spending, to fight tax increases, and to create jobs, and will campaign to earn the support of Americans concerned about the future of our country."

Uniqueness – AT: Fin Regs Momentum

Despite a win on financial reform, Dems can’t garner momentum – leadership is fragmented over what agenda item to push next

Chaddock 7/12/10. (Gail R., Staff writer. Christian Science Monitor. http://www.csmonitor.com/USA/Politics/2010/0712/Can-an-overloaded-Congress-get-to-immigration-reform).

Republican Sen. Scott Brown’s announcement Monday that he will vote for financial reform brings Democrats within a vote of passing financial reform regulation – a key pledge of the Obama administration and the Democratic majority. It’s a rare bright spot in an otherwise tough agenda as Congress returns for what is typically the last chance to move major legislation before a long August break and fall campaigns for midterm elections. In the push for floor time this month, there’s a rift between what must be done, such as completing annual spending bills; what plausibly can be done, such as extending unemployment insurance and popular tax breaks; and what Democrats feel they must make at least a credible effort at doing to ensure that their base turns out in November, such as immigration and energy reform.

Uniqueness – AT: Dems Win (General)

Rangel ethics scandal taints all democratic candidates in the midterms

Kane and Leonnig 7/24/10. (Paul and Carol D., Staff writers – Washington Post. http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/content/article/2010/07/23/AR2010072303655.html

[Rep. Charles B. Rangel](http://www.whorunsgov.com/Profiles/Charles_B._Rangel) (D-N.Y.) hunkered down Friday as he prepared to stage a public battle over allegations that his financial dealings broke [House ethics rules](http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/content/article/2010/07/22/AR2010072204704.html). His determination to fight the charges has left Democrats fearful that an ethics trial, planned for mid-September, could wind up [tarnishing the whole party](http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/content/article/2010/03/05/AR2010030504434.html) just weeks before the [midterm elections](http://projects.washingtonpost.com/politicsglossary/election/midterm-election/). Rangel, 80, dismissed talk of resignation, and Democratic leaders left Capitol Hill for the weekend without a clear path for resolving the case. As of late Friday, [Rep. Betty Sutton](http://www.whorunsgov.com/Profiles/Betty_Sutton) (D-Ohio), an endangered second-term [incumbent](http://projects.washingtonpost.com/politicsglossary/election/incumbent/), was the only Democrat to call for the 40-year veteran to resign, telling the Hill newspaper, "This is about preserving the public trust." No Democrats had come out in his defense. [House Speaker Nancy Pelosi](http://www.whorunsgov.com/Profiles/Nancy_Pelosi) (D-Calif.) and [Majority Leader Steny H. Hoyer](http://www.whorunsgov.com/Profiles/Steny_H._Hoyer) (D-Md.) had not spoken to Rangel about the issue, aides said. They made only tepid statements, noting the "process is moving forward." In private, Democratic aides and political strategists shook their heads at the prospect of a public reading of Rangel's alleged misdeeds -- first at a televised preliminary hearing set to begin Thursday and continuing with the ethics trial in September after Congress returns from a nearly seven-week recess. "The time has come for Charlie Rangel to think more about his party than about himself. Each and every day that a trial goes on would cost Democrats more seats," said a Democratic chief of staff to one of the dozens of incumbents who are facing difficult reelection campaigns. Like most Democratic staff and strategists, the aide requested anonymity because of the political sensitivity of criticizing Rangel, who until his ethics woes had been a beloved figure in the Democratic [caucus](http://projects.washingtonpost.com/politicsglossary/Congressional/caucus/).

\*\*Links\*\*

Link – GOP Loses: Immigration

The plan would be seen as a big win for democrats among immigrant voters – they want piecemeal legislation now and they’re the key vote in most swing states

Pangilinan 7/30 (Erin, BA in ethnic studies from UC Berkeley. http://immigration.change.org/blog/view/immigrant\_voter\_blocks\_could\_cost\_democrats\_2010\_mid-term\_election) JM

Democrats should be worried about midterm elections given a large Latino and Asian American voter block unsatisfied with the lack of comprehensive immigration reform. This voter block has the potential to decide the outcome in many swing states that helped carry Obama in the Presidential election; 66% of Latinos and 61% of Asian Americans voted for Obama in 2008. Yet many electoral officials running for reelection and new candidates do not take this voting block seriously enough, and it could cost them their election. Democrats need to realize that Latino and Asian Americans possess a large amount of electoral power that make all the difference in Senate races in seven swing states: Nevada, Colorado, Montana, Illinois, Ohio, New Hampshire, Connecticut. According to Immigration Policy Center, Barack Obama defeated John McCain among Latino voters in Illinois by 72% to 27%. Senate Majority Leader Harry Reid (who denied the presence of undocumented contract workers in his state of Nevada) should know 38% of immigrants are naturalized U.S. citizens eligible to vote and 15% (including children of immigrants) are registered to vote. One-third of immigrants in Colorado are naturalized U.S. citizens eligible to vote. Democratic governors fear that the Department of Justice lawsuit against Arizona's SB 1070 will hurt the party, but they should be concerned about the consequences of inaction. Had there not been a lawsuit, immigrant communities of color would have grown more frustrated (like Latino faith leaders who called to boycott the census until there was activity on comprehensive immigration reform). Groups like Mobilize the Immigrant Vote, Voto Latino, and Promise Arizona, which work to increase immigrant voter participation, are concerned with immigration reform and the Arizona law. While Arizona is not a swing state the in Senate, House seats are leaning Democrat, but will need an extra push. Congress failed to pass bipartisan legislation in recent years. Communities grow impatient and hope for some piecemeal legislation on the DREAM Act and AgJobs as a down payment on reform during lame-duck session, since reform as a whole now looks to be on the table no sooner than 2011. President Obama recognized that electoral candidates will suffer the consequences if the issue continues to remain unaddressed – who will have the courage to tackle the issue and when will they do it? He said, “the understandable, the natural impulse among those who run for office is to turn away and defer this question for another day, or another year, or another administration.” Latinos and Asian Americans hit the polls in 2008 in the hopes that this president and this Congress would listen to their needs. Two years later, they must vote again to prove their loyalty to leaders who are supposed to serve constituent concerns – comprehensive immigration reform needs to prioritized in the next Congressional session. The acronym of Rep. Luis Gutierrez's immigration reform bill, CIR ASAP, wasn't an accident. We need comprehensive immigration reform as soon as possible. Immigration reform cannot continue to be pushed aside for “another day, year, Administration.” If Democrats don't take steps to prove their interest in fixing the immigration system, Latino and Asian American voters might not bother showing up to give them an undeserved vote.

Obama’s inaction on immigration paralyzes the Latino vote – they won’t mobilize for the 2010 midterms

Brady 7/30/10. (Jeff, NPR Politics. http://www.npr.org/templates/story/story.php?storyId=128873428)

But it's not just supporters of the Arizona law who are angry. Those who oppose it have vented their anger during street protests. It's not clear, though, that outrage over the law will prompt Latino voters to turn out in greater numbers than they did in the 2006 midterm election. Stanford political science professor Gary Segura does consulting and polling for Latino and Democratic-leaning organizations. He says many Latinos are discouraged because Obama hasn't yet made good on his campaign pledge to overhaul immigration laws. "I would predict that Latino voter turnout in 2010 would be lower than Latino voter turnout in 2006," says Segura, "which would be damaging for the Democrats."

Link – GOP Loses: Immigration

Perception of Immigration legislation ensures Hispanic align with Dems which causes a midterm loss for the GOP

Shear 7/20 (Michael, Washington Post, July 20, “Republican immigration position likely to alienate Latinos, Obama officials say,” http://host.madison.com/ct/news/article\_b52da622-93f8-11df-a35d-001cc4c002e0.html, CW, accessed on 7/30/10)

West Wing strategists argue that the president's call for legislation that acknowledges the role of immigrants and goes beyond punishing undocumented workers will help cement a permanent political relationship between Democrats and Hispanics -- much as civil rights and voting rights legislation did for the party and African Americans in the 1960s. As a result, although the president is unlikely to press for comprehensive immigration reform this year, he has urged his allies to keep up the pressure on Republican lawmakers. "Look: The Republicans, if you do the math, cannot be successful as a national party if they continue to alienate Latinos," said one Democratic strategist familiar with White House thinking on the issue. Another top Democrat who has advised the administration on immigration added: "If the Republicans continue on the same course they are on, the politics of immigration are potentially devastating to their party." Both spoke on the condition of anonymity to be candid about White House strategy.

Action on immigration satisfies Latino vote causing them to vote Dem.

Pangilinan, 10

(Erin, July 30, correspondent for Philippine News, “Immigrant Voter Blocks Could Cost Democrats 2010 Mid-Term Election,” http://immigration.change.org/blog/view/immigrant\_voter\_blocks\_could\_cost\_democrats\_2010\_mid-term\_election, CW, accessed on 7/30/10)

Democrats should be worried about midterm elections given a large Latino and Asian American voter block unsatisfied with the lack of comprehensive immigration reform. This voter block has the potential to decide the outcome in many swing states that helped carry Obama in the Presidential election; 66% of Latinos and 61% of Asian Americans voted for Obama in 2008. Yet many electoral officials running for reelection and new candidates do not take this voting block seriously enough, and it could cost them their election. Democrats need to realize that Latino and Asian Americans possess a large amount of electoral power that make all the difference in Senate races in seven swing states: Nevada, Colorado, Montana, Illinois, Ohio, New Hampshire, Connecticut

Action on immigration guarantees a Latino vote for Dems.

America Voice, 08

(November 7, “Latin American Immigrant Voters Swing from Republicans to Democrats,” http://americasvoiceonline.org/press\_releases/entry/latin\_american\_immigrant\_voters\_swing\_from\_republicans\_to\_democrats/, CW, accessed on 7/30/10)

"It's no surprise that the voters most affected by harsh immigration policies and the hostile tone of the immigration debate are fleeing the Republican Party," said Frank Sharry, Executive Director of America's Voice. "The lesson for the Republican Party is clear: it either distances itself from the anti-immigrant forces, and reaches out to Latino immigrants with something other than mass deportation, or it continues to ride into the political wilderness. The implications for Democrats are also clear: Latino immigrants want action on their priorities - with immigration reform clearly being one of them - and if the party that controls Congress and the White House fails to deliver, it could lose support and drain the enthusiasm of these swing voters."

Link – GOP Loses: Immigration

Immigration legislation before the midterms splits the GOP and cost them the election.

Grandin, 2010

(Greg, Professor of history at NYU, July 29, “The Game Change,” http://www.thenation.com/article/38037/game-change?page=0,0, CW, accessed on 7/29/10)

4. It is lose-lose for Republicans. Put immigration reform on the docket before the midterm elections and watch Republicans squirm. If they support it, they enrage their Tea Party base. If they oppose it, they keep the Tea Party and might win, even big, in November, but will so anger the more electorally important Latinos that not even Spanish-speaking Jeb Bush, with help from his Mexican-born wife, will be able to win them back. As Ruy Teixeira notes, the "GOP dilemma" is that the Tea Party might help Republicans win in November but that short-term gain will be a long-term loss, a death embrace with a rump political movement that "concentrates in one place the most extreme and reactionary views." By pushing immigration reform before the midterm elections, the Democrats would magnify this dilemma. Let South Carolina's GOP gubernatorial candidate Nikki Haley explain to Latino voters why she calls for stepped-up deportation, opposes amnesty and applauds SB 1070 in the name of "states' rights." Immigration reform could also short-circuit any attempt to restore the Bush dynasty through Jeb, who has spoken out against the Arizona law and in favor of reform. 5. It splits the conservative coalition in other ways. A fight over immigrants' rights drives a wedge between business Republicans and the GOP's "no-amnesty," know-nothing wing. Last year, the powerful National Association of Evangelicals issued a statement calling for comprehensive, dignified reform, which was strongly criticized by the conservative Institute on Religion and Democracy. And the "purity" of Ron and Rand Paul's libertarianism—as the mainstream media never cease to describe what is largely a rebranding of paleoconservatism—seems a lot less pure when they get started talking about "electronic fences," "helicopter stations" and "making English the official language of all documents and contracts." So much for the right to engage in economic transactions as one wishes.

Immigration is a win for the democrats – makes the republicans look unreasonable

Hernandez 7/1/10 (Daisy, “Obama Passes the Buck on Immigration, Then Lectures Everybody”) <http://colorlines.com/archives/2010/07/obama_on_immigration.html>

As expected, Obama called today for a renewed push on immigration reform that everyone, including key leaders in his own party, has already said won't happen this year. But in a midterm election year, it sure was a great opportunity to remind voters, Latino or otherwise, that Republicans are being unreasonable---yet again. Citing failures to pass immigration reform in the past, Obama noted that it can't be done this time without Republican votes. But Obama left out one thing from his speech: himself.  "He failed to recognize that he himself is in a unique position to roll back a lot of the policies that create a human rights crisis and that create divisiveness," said Sarahi Uribe an organizer with the National Day Laborer Organizing Network, adding, "It seemed like he was passing the buck on something he could immediately resolve."

Immigration policy rallies the democratic base - causes huge GOP losses

Johnson 7/17/10 (Geoff, “MidTerm and Long Term Electoral Prospects”) <http://www.gcadvocate.com/2010/07/midterm-and-long-term-electoral-prospects/>

Cer tainly the Demo c ra tic lead er ship is aware of these issues, and I think you’ve arguably seen that aware ness in the deci sion to chal lenge Arizona’s exe crable new immi gra tion law, S.B. 1070, in court. While this legal chal lenge might do favors for Harry Reid and other West ern Democ rats up for re-election by increas ing voter turnout in places like Cal i for nia, Nevada, and Col orado, it could on bal ance be harm ful to Demo c ra tic prospects for the midterm given that a [major ity of Amer i cans](http://www.cbsnews.com/8301-503544_162-20005957-503544.html?tag=contentMain;contentBody) seem to sup port the AZ law. In the long-run though, by challenging the constitutionality of S.B. 1070 the White House strengthens their argument that Democrats are on the side of Latinos. At the same time Republicans like Gover nor Jan Brewer and leaders of the Arizona leg is lature (which Ken Sil ver stein of Harper’s[referred to](http://www.blogforarizona.com/blog/2010/06/sb1070-update-dimwits-racists-and-cranks.html) as being “com posed almost entirely of dimwits, racists and cranks”) are put front-and-center as the embodiment of the GOP and portrayed (not entirely wrongly) as being racist, nativist reactionaries who hate peo ple with Span ish names and/or darker skin. Karl Rove (who is no dummy) was try ing to avoid pre cisely this sit u a tion when he des per ately sought to pass immi gra tion reform in 2006, but the cur rent GOP leadership seems not to care a whit about offending Hispanics.

Link – GOP Loses: Latinos

Immigration key to win Latino vote in elections

America’s Voice 10 (“The Power of the Latino Vote in the 2010 Elections: They Tipped Elections in 2008; Where Will They Be in 2010?” February 2010 <http://amvoice.3cdn.net/8a3a480ea2c63e225c_nzm6iyihr.pdf>)

But rather than looking to the future, politicians are notoriously reliable for looking only as far as their next re‐election campaigns. Interestingly, it is in both parties’ interests to advance comprehensive immigration reform this year. If the Democratic Party wants to energize, mobilize, and consolidate the Latino vote, it should keep its promise on immigration reform, and put forward a solution that works for Latino families and all Americans. This will galvanize the Latino electorate and show them that the Democratic Party is advancing practical solutions to a threshold issue.

Immigration reform key to winning key latino votes

Costa 7/21/10. (Aleksa, Hearst Washington Bureau. http://articles.sfgate.com/2010-07-21/news/21991418\_1\_latino-citizenship-for-undocumented-immigrants-immigration-reform).

Latino voters could have a big impact in the November midterm elections, according to a survey released Tuesday. The survey by the National Association of Latino Elected and Appointed Officials Education Fund, a nonprofit that aims to get Latinos involved in the political process, showed that for the first time immigration is the top policy issue for Latino registered voters, both U.S.-born and naturalized, in California, Texas, Florida and Colorado. Three out of 5 Hispanics in the United States reside in those four states. The survey concluded that 30 percent of Latinos in all four states consider the path to citizenship for undocumented immigrants the most important element of any immigration reform, while 8.9 percent think border security is the most important element of immigration reform. The poll estimated that more than 61 percent of Latino registered voters, or 6.6 million, will "definitely" vote in the November midterm elections, up by 1.5 million from 2006.

A win on immigration mobilizes key support from Latino voters

Pangilinan 7/30/10. (Erin, staff writer Philippine News. http://immigration.change.org/blog/view/immigrant\_voter\_blocks\_could\_cost\_democrats\_2010\_mid-term\_election) JL

Democrats should be worried about midterm elections given a large Latino and Asian American voter block unsatisfied with the lack of comprehensive immigration reform. This voter block has the potential to decide the outcome in many swing states that helped carry Obama in the [Presidential election](http://www.cnn.com/ELECTION/2008/results/polls/#val=USP00p1); 66% of Latinos and 61% of Asian Americans voted for Obama in 2008. Yet many electoral officials running for reelection and new candidates do not take this voting block seriously enough, and it [could cost them their election](http://www.pbs.org/newshour/rundown/2010/07/political-strategists-react-to-new-polling-on-immigration-look-ahead-to-midterms.html). Democrats need to realize that Latino and Asian Americans possess a large amount of electoral power that make all the difference in [Senate races in seven swing states](http://elections.nytimes.com/2010/senate): Nevada, Colorado, Montana, Illinois, Ohio, New Hampshire, Connecticut. According to [Immigration Policy Center](http://www.immigrationpolicy.org/just-facts/economic-and-political-power-immigrants-latinos-and-asians-all-50-states), Barack Obama defeated John McCain among Latino voters in Illinois by 72% to 27%. Senate Majority Leader Harry Reid (who [denied](http://www.politico.com/news/stories/0710/39716.html#ixzz0tewTCJce) the presence of undocumented contract workers in his state of Nevada) should know 38% of immigrants are naturalized U.S. citizens eligible to vote and 15% (including children of immigrants) are registered to vote. One-third of immigrants in Colorado are naturalized U.S. citizens eligible to vote.

Link – GOP Loses: Amnesty

Amnesty is publicly controversial – it could be a win for Democrats

McCune 10 (Marianne, Immigrant Advocates Aim to Influence Mid-Term Elections”)

Heather MacDonald of the Manhattan Institute says such an amnesty would backfire: "The effects of an amnesty are to draw more people from across the world into the country illegally."   She argues it is not fair to let people who came here illegally stay while others wait patiently for their turn to come legally. "People came here knowing they were breaking the law, and that is a risk that they assumed," MacDonald says. On both sides of this debate, people are clamoring to influence midterm elections. In areas where races are close, particularly in Southwestern states such as Arizona and New Mexico as well as Colorado, strong feelings about immigration policy could decide the winners.

Link – GOP Loses: H-5B Popular

Bipartisan support for past legislation proves – H5B programs are popular across party lines

Sisken 5 (Greg, Visa Law Blog <http://www.visalaw.com/2005_05_01_blogarchive.html>

This week we present another special issue covering major developments in immigration law. A few days ago, one of the most significant immigration bills in many years was introduced with strong bipartisan support. The Secure America and Orderly Immigration Act (SAOIA) is co-sponsored by power hitter SenatorsMcCain (R-AZ), Graham (R-SC), Brownback (R-KS), Kennedy (D-MA) and Lieberman (D-CT). An identical bill has been introduced in the House also with bipartisan sponsorship. We are likely to see at least one or two competitor bills and the President has yet to signal whether he supports SAOIA, so this legislation has a long way to go. But the chances of serious immigration legislation happening this year are much better than in years past and the competitor bills are likely to overlap in many respects with SAOIA. So what are some of the things SAOIA does? First, it provides substantial new tools to beef up and secure the borders of the US. The idea is that the country will finally secure the borders and create legal ways to ensure that those coming to the US can do so in a manner where we can verify that they do not pose a security threat. That means creating a genuine guest worker program - an H-5A visa - that is generous and meets the President's goal of matching up willing employers with willing workers and ensuring that Americans seeking employment are not overlooked. It also creates an H-5B visa that allows those out of legal status to get back into legal status. These workers will pay substantial fines for this privilege. The bill contains provisions that will allow H-5B workers to seek permanent residency and it is this issue that is likely to be an area of disagreement in the competing bills.

Link – Public Loves Immigration

Public supports immigration reform

West 4/26/10 (Darrell, Vice President and Director, Governance Studies, The Huffington Post, “Immigration Reform is Good Politics”) <http://www.brookings.edu/opinions/2010/0426_immigration_west.aspx>

Polling data suggest the public is open to immigration reform. There is support for the United States creating a "path to citizenship" for illegal immigrants currently in the country, subject to certain conditions. Results from a Pew Research Center survey demonstrate that nearly two-thirds (63 percent) of Americans favor a "path to citizenship" if illegal immigrants pass a background check, pay fines and have a job.

Link – GOP Loses: H-1B (Bill Gates)

Bill Gates supports plan due to shortage of engineers

Lee 8, [Timothy B., PhD in computer science at Princeton's Center for IT Policy. He is an adjunct scholar at the Cato Institute, March 13 2008, http://arstechnica.com/tech-policy/news/2008/03/gates-to-congress-microsoft-needs-more-h1-b-visas.ars]

In probably the most controversial portion of his testimony, Gates said that the shortage of trained scientists and engineers had grown so severe that it required a dramatic increase in the number of highly-skilled immigrants permitted to enter the country. He charged that the current limit of 65,000 H-1B visas per year "bears no relation to the U.S. economy's demand for skilled professionals," and noted that all of the visas for fiscal year 2008 were snapped up on the first day they were available. As he has [done](http://arstechnica.com/news.ars/post/20050427-4861.html) [before](http://arstechnica.com/news.ars/post/20070226-8924.html), Gates asked for a dramatic expansion of the H-1B cap.

Bill Gates is an influential player in the business world

Lima 6 [Staff writer for Associated Content,Yahoo. December 8 2006. http://www.associatedcontent.com/article/96180/why\_bill\_gates\_should\_be\_deemed\_the.html?cat=15]

Bill Gates should be deemed the most influential person in 2006 because his unique combination of skills and compassion allow him to leverage power around the world. Bill Gates is known by citizens in the First World and in the Third World and everywhere in between. He moves easily from technical discussions to matters of individual survival. It's easier to understand why Bill Gates should be deemed the most influential person in 2006 if you consider these three distinct faces of Bill Gates.

Microsoft key to democratic campaign contributions

Protalinksi 9 [Emil. Staff Writer for Ars Technica. January 5 2009 http://arstechnica.com/microsoft/news/2009/01/microsoft-backed-obama-during-the-2008-elections.ars]

The 2008 elections may be over, but it's still interesting to look back and see who supported whom. As a company, Microsoft didn't stick to just the Democrats or just the Republicans, but according to data from OpenSecrets.org, the software giant did have a clear winner in mind. Out of the $2,973,322 in contributions Microsoft made, $2,124,186 went to the Democrats, while only $844,586 was given to the Republicans. This comes out to about 71.4 percent and 28.4 percent, respectively. The rest of the contributions went to individuals and political action committees. OpenSecrets notes that Microsoft hasn't always been such a big player in political donations:

Link – GOP Loses: H-1B (Tech Lobbies)

Plan is a win for the dems – tech industry loves it

Larson 5 (Jane, The Arizona Republic. http://www.azcentral.com/arizonarepublic/business/articles/1213H-1Bvisas13.html)

High-tech employers are lobbying Congress to raise a cap on visas for specialty workers and allow an additional 30,000 such workers into the United States each year. Companies say that would give them more flexibility to put the world's best and brightest to work in America instead of in competing countries. They say it would increase the chances of employees developing groundbreaking innovations in the United States. But an increase in the number of these visas could create tougher job competition for American workers. "It's a major, major issue for Arizona companies," said Shoshana Tancer, a Phoenix lawyer and member of the American Immigration Lawyers Association. "It's not just the giant high-tech companies. It is the small businesses that want people. They've graduated with master's degrees and they want to work in the United States for a time, and they have the skills (small businesses) need." Business organizations such as the National Association of Manufacturers, high-tech trade association AeA and Compete America are lobbying for the increase. High-tech companies including Intel Corp., Motorola Inc. and Microsoft Corp. are supporters.The cap would cover H-1B visas, a category that allows workers in specialty occupations to work in the United States for up to six years. They are admitted on the basis of their professional education, skills or experience. Companies with 15 percent or more of their workforce on H-1B visas are required to seek U.S. workers or attest that they have not laid off a U.S. worker before hiring foreign employees under the program. For immigrants, an H-1B is often a prelude to applying for status as a legal permanent resident.

Tech industry is highly influential in election campaigns – key to democrats

Tendersinfo News 7/2 (“United States : High Tech Industry Gives More Money to Democrats” Ln) JM

The computers and Internet industry has given 66 percent of its money in the 2010 election cycle to Democrats, according to data from the Center for Responsive Politics. Of the $12.9 million the industry has given to federal candidates and party committees in the 2010 election, over $8.4 million has gone to Democrats. Since corporations and labor unions by law may not contribute to federal candidates, these figures reflect contributions from industry employees, their families, and political action committees associated with computer and Internet companies. Of the top 10 recipients of money from the computer and Internet industry this election, nine are Democrats. New York Democratic Sen. Chuck Schumer leads with $194,384, followed by Washington Democratic Sen.Patty Murray ($176,973) and New York Democratic Sen. Kirsten Gillibrand ($161,395). The lone Republican in the top 10 is Massachusetts Sen. Scott Brown at number eight with $88,750. Microsoft is the top contributor with 60 percent of its nearly $1.3 million in contributions going to Democrats. This number reflects contributions made to incumbents, challengers, and national party committees. Contributions from those associated with Cisco make it the second highest contributor in the industry with $557,919 in donations, 67 percent of which went to Democratic candidates and committees. Google is next, with $456,119 in contributions, 75 percent of which went to Democrats, followed by Intel, with 57 percent of its $373,205 in contributions going to Democrats. The fifth-most-prominent computer/internet company, Hewlett-Packard, also favored Democrats, despite the fact that its former CEO, Carly Fiorina, is running as a Republican in California's high-profile Senate race. Those associated with Hewlett-Packard gave $367,460, with only 40 percent going to Republican candidates and parties.

Link – GOP Loses: Human Trafficking

Obama’s been involved in human trafficking – the plan would be an important legislative victory

Skinner 6/14 (E. Benjamin. Time. http://www.time.com/time/nation/article/0,8599,1996402,00.html) JM

Clinton's special adviser on human trafficking defended her record in pressing for greater protections for domestic servants of diplomats. "The Obama Administration has done more than any previous Administration to address the unique vulnerabilities of domestic workers to trafficking in persons," argued ambassador Luis CdeBaca, whose Office to Monitor and Combat Trafficking in Persons drafts the report and who had previously, as a congressional staffer, worked to add protections for domestic workers to the reauthorized TVPA. He cited new State Department regulations and policies governing how foreign and U.S. diplomats treat domestic workers. The annual report itself reflects the Administration's continuing shift toward a more balanced focus on both forced labor and sex trafficking. Though it named no single country guilty of such abuses on U.S. soil, the report featured a generic passage explaining that "worldwide, domestic workers employed by diplomats suffer abuses ranging from wage exploitation to trafficking offenses." Also, the U.S. country narrative reported that "there are cases of domestic workers, foreigners on [diplomatic servant] visas, being subjected to trafficking-related abuse by diplomats posted to the United States." Finally, though it made no mention of the Mzengi case, the department downgraded Tanzania as a whole in the report, finding that "understanding of what constitutes trafficking remained low among government officials."

Democrats would paint the plan as an important legislative victory to leverage against republicans – it could win them the election

Payne 7/28 (Scott H. True Slant. http://trueslant.com/scotthpayne/2010/07/28/campaign-finance-reform-and-democrats-midterm-playbook/) JM

Despite two consecutive weekly polls by Gallup showing Democrats edging out Republicans on the generic ballot, Democrats are still a party without a compelling story for November. In an email about the Callup numbers, well respected pollster J. Ann Selzer of Public opinon research firm Selzer and Company reflected that, “until other polls show something similar this will be treated as an outlier, I would think.” Selzer’s analysis puts a substantial damper on the idea that Democrats had finally found a rhetorical foothold with the anti-Wall Street that had accompanied the passage of financial regulation reform concurrent with the jump noted by Gallup. A separate poll by Gallup just two weeks ago bears out the obvious conclusion that voters are primarily concerned with economic issues and jobs heading into November. The July 14 poll shows that 31% of respondents felt that, “the economy in general,” was the “most important problem facing [the] country today.” A close second was, “unemployment/jobs,” clocking in at 22%. That’s an overwhelming 53% citing economic concerns as the biggest problem facing the country in their estimation. However, the third most important issue may help to shed some light on the Democratic strategy heading into November. At an admittedly somewhat distant third (11%) was, “dissatisfaction with government/Congress/politicians; poor leadership; corruption; abuse of power.” In bringing the DISCLOSE Act to a vote, Democrats seem to be attempting to enact a win-win strategy with regards to legislative efforts by tying economic concerns and government gridlock together. Poll after poll has shown that, despite what most Democrats would describe as their best — and the White House is describing as successful — efforts at dealing with the economic challenges facing the country, a majority of Americans do not feel that the President’s and Democrats’ economic programs have either helped or hurt them. And Democrats are smart enough to know that a.) nothing they do between now and November is likely to change that sentiment and b.) economic conditions in the country are not likely to turn around such that they affect that mood by November. So rather than attempting the impossible task of changing the opinions people have formed based on their current life experiences, Democrats have, perhaps, decided their best strategy is to pin the failures on Republican obstructionism. This is a war cry that has been sounded for some time now. But in an electoral situation that seems as perilous as Novembers, Democrats might just see it as their only plausible hail mary. The strategy would run: bring as many bills up for vote between now and November as possible, particularly those that have broad pubic support. If a handful of Senate Republicans decide to break ranks and pass the bill, great, add it to the list of legislative accomplishments Democrats offer to the voters in November. If, as with the DISCLOSE Act, Senate Republicans rebuff Democrats, great, add it to the list of bills on which Republicans refused to work with Democrats. Of course, bills like the DISCLOSE Act have nothing to do with jobs, but that isn’t really the point of the strategy. The thrust of the strategy would be to lead with talk about jobs and talk about how Democrats would have liked to have done more, but then note that Republicans simply made that impossible. Likely Democrats will first point to instances like Jim Bunning’s one-man wrecking crew on the extension of unemployment benefits and then start looking to present as many other instances of obstructionism as possible, whether they have to do with jobs or not. Needless to say, the longer the list, the more compelling the argument that Republicans are to blame for the current woes facing voters. All things considered, this may actually represent Democrats best chances at staying in power.

Link – GOP Loses: Human Trafficking

GOP doesn’t support changing human trafficking visas translates to win for Democrats.

Bennion, 09

(David, Citizen Orange, September 22, “BECK, O'KEEFE EXPLOIT TRAFFICKING VICTIMS FOR POLITICAL PURPOSES,” http://www.citizenorange.com/orange/2009/09/beck-okeefe-exploit-traffickin.html, CW, accessed on 7/31/10)

If I am wrong, where is the evidence? Where is O'Keefe's story on unaccompanied minors in the U.S. who are smuggled by coyotes to rejoin their parents or trafficked into prostitution, then arrested and targeted by DHS? Where is Beck's expose on the failure of the U.S. government to prevent human trafficking or protect trafficking victims? Has O'Keefe ever met any undocumented Salvadoran children? Does he know what their concerns are? Does he know anything about their struggles in El Salvador or in the U.S.? I've seen no indication that he does. Instead, I've seen him and his accomplice use underage Central American prostitutes--who do exist in this country--to execute a dirty takedown of a political opponent. The work of O'Keefe, Giles, and Beck serves not the interests of low-income communities in the U.S., but rather the political interests of the GOP and GOP-approved media. Those political interests include further marginalizing black and latin@ communities because they vote heavily against Republicans.

Democrats support changing human trafficking visas.

Migration News, 2010

(June, “Arizona, Polls, REPAIR,” <http://migration.ucdavis.edu/mn/more.php?id=3612_0_2_0>, CW, accessed on 7/31/10)

Senator Robert Menendez (D-NJ) introduced the Protect Our Workers from Exploitation and Retaliation (POWER) Act in April 2010 to provide temporary protected status to immigrant workers who report employer violations of labor laws. The POWER Act would expand the U-visa program created by the Victims of Trafficking and Violence Protection Act, which gives immigrant visas to victims of human trafficking and other criminal activity who assist law enforcement in prosecution of the crime, to victims of civil labor law violations if the worker suffered severe abuse or would suffer harm if deported.

Link Helper – Immigration = Controversial

Immigration has the ability to rally constituencies during election years

Cannon 5/25/10 (Lou, Political Writer, “Lou Cannon: In Aftermath of Arizona Law, Immigration Debate Stirs Historic Passions”) <http://www.noozhawk.com/local_news/article/052510_lou_cannon_arizona_law_immigration/>

On occasion, most notably in the case of the once-powerful [Ku Klux Klan](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Ku_Klux_Klan), fear of foreigners and Catholics combined with virulent hatred of blacks. But every outburst of anti-immigrant fervor also produced a political backlash. During the 1884 presidential campaign Republican nominee [James Blaine](http://www.biography.com/articles/James-G.-Blaine-39772)was on track to win the presidency over his Democratic opponent, [Grover Cleveland](http://www.whitehouse.gov/about/presidents/grovercleveland/). Six days before the election Blaine gave a speech in New York City in which a Protestant minister warmed up the crowd by denouncing the Democrats as the party of “Rum, Romanism and Rebellion.” These were not Blaine’s sentiments. His mother was Irish and Roman Catholic and he espoused Irish independence from Britain and was accordingly popular with the New York’s large Irish-American community. Most historians agree that in the tumult of the rally Blaine simply failed to hear the minister’s bigoted phrase, which he almost certainly would have repudiated. Democrats pounced, distributing handbills with the offending remark in Irish-American neighborhoods. The Irish deserted Blaine, costing him New York’s 36 electoral votes by the slim margin of 1,149 votes and the presidency. Modern anti-immigrant campaigns have also produced unintended consequences. In California in 1994, moderate Republican [Gov. Pete Wilson](http://www.californiagovernors.ca.gov/h/biography/governor_36.html)hitched his re-election campaign to [Proposition 187](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/California_Proposition_187_%281994%29), an initiative that would have denied medical and educational benefits to illegal immigrants. A Wilson television commercial showed Mexicans pouring across the border to the sound of scary music as an announcer declared, “They keep coming!”

It’s often forgotten that Wilson, an able governor, led in the polls before he endorsed Proposition 187 and could have won without it. But his name has become indelibly linked with this measure, approved by voters but in large part subsequently invalidated by the courts. The principal political legacy of Proposition 187 was alienation of Latinos, whom the Democrats mobilized as they swept to victory in the state elections four years later. Latinos have retained their Democratic affiliations and now constitute more than a fifth of registered voters in California. Their influence may be tested in this year’s U.S. Senate election. Embattled Democratic [Sen. Barbara Boxer](http://boxer.senate.gov/) opposes the law, while all three Republicans who are vying to oppose her support it

I/L – Interest Groups Key

Funding is the key determination of the election – interest groups matter

Rucker 7/8/10 (Philip, “Republican Leaning Groups Set to Outspend Democrats in Midterms” <http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/content/article/2010/07/08/AR2010070804764.html?hpid=topnews>)

"There's a real danger that we'll see an avalanche of special-interest money flowing into these campaigns,"[Rep. Chris Van Hollen](http://www.whorunsgov.com/Profiles/Chris_Van_Hollen) (D-Md.), chairman of the Democratic Congressional Campaign Committee, said in an interview Thursday. "This kind of money can clearly affect the outcome of elections. That's why they're doing it. And that's why it's important [for Democrats] to try and confront the challenge." Van Hollen said a concerted effort is underway to "raise the alarm" about the "secret special interest money" that could start pouring into hotly-contested races. A second memo circulating among Democrats,[first reported Thursday](http://www.huffingtonpost.com/2010/07/08/democrats-fear-they-cant_n_639202.html) by The Huffington Post, estimates total spending by conservative groups at $200 million.

I/L – Latino Voters Key

Immigration reform key to winning key latino votes

Costa 7/21/10. (Aleksa, Hearst Washington Bureau. http://articles.sfgate.com/2010-07-21/news/21991418\_1\_latino-citizenship-for-undocumented-immigrants-immigration-reform).

Latino voters could have a big impact in the November midterm elections, according to a survey released Tuesday. The survey by the National Association of Latino Elected and Appointed Officials Education Fund, a nonprofit that aims to get Latinos involved in the political process, showed that for the first time immigration is the top policy issue for Latino registered voters, both U.S.-born and naturalized, in California, Texas, Florida and Colorado. Three out of 5 Hispanics in the United States reside in those four states. The survey concluded that 30 percent of Latinos in all four states consider the path to citizenship for undocumented immigrants the most important element of any immigration reform, while 8.9 percent think border security is the most important element of immigration reform. The poll estimated that more than 61 percent of Latino registered voters, or 6.6 million, will "definitely" vote in the November midterm elections, up by 1.5 million from 2006.

A win on immigration mobilizes key support from Latino voters

Pangilinan 7/30/10. (Erin, staff writer Philippine News. http://immigration.change.org/blog/view/immigrant\_voter\_blocks\_could\_cost\_democrats\_2010\_mid-term\_election) JL

Democrats should be worried about midterm elections given a large Latino and Asian American voter block unsatisfied with the lack of comprehensive immigration reform. This voter block has the potential to decide the outcome in many swing states that helped carry Obama in the [Presidential election](http://www.cnn.com/ELECTION/2008/results/polls/#val=USP00p1); 66% of Latinos and 61% of Asian Americans voted for Obama in 2008. Yet many electoral officials running for reelection and new candidates do not take this voting block seriously enough, and it [could cost them their election](http://www.pbs.org/newshour/rundown/2010/07/political-strategists-react-to-new-polling-on-immigration-look-ahead-to-midterms.html). Democrats need to realize that Latino and Asian Americans possess a large amount of electoral power that make all the difference in [Senate races in seven swing states](http://elections.nytimes.com/2010/senate): Nevada, Colorado, Montana, Illinois, Ohio, New Hampshire, Connecticut. According to [Immigration Policy Center](http://www.immigrationpolicy.org/just-facts/economic-and-political-power-immigrants-latinos-and-asians-all-50-states), Barack Obama defeated John McCain among Latino voters in Illinois by 72% to 27%. Senate Majority Leader Harry Reid (who [denied](http://www.politico.com/news/stories/0710/39716.html#ixzz0tewTCJce) the presence of undocumented contract workers in his state of Nevada) should know 38% of immigrants are naturalized U.S. citizens eligible to vote and 15% (including children of immigrants) are registered to vote. One-third of immigrants in Colorado are naturalized U.S. citizens eligible to vote.

Dissatisfied Latino voters are key to midterm turnout

Pangilinan 7/30/10. (Erin, staff writer Philippine News. http://immigration.change.org/blog/view/immigrant\_voter\_blocks\_could\_cost\_democrats\_2010\_mid-term\_election) JL

Groups like [Mobilize the Immigrant Vote](http://mivcalifornia.org/docs/Main_Page), [Voto Latino](http://www.votolatino.org/), and [Promise Arizona](http://org2.democracyinaction.org/o/6834/p/salsa/web/common/public/content?content_item_KEY=2896), which work to increase immigrant voter participation, are concerned with immigration reform and the Arizona law. While Arizona is not a swing state the in Senate, House seats are leaning Democrat, but will need an extra push. Congress failed to pass bipartisan legislation in recent years. Communities grow impatient and hope for some piecemeal legislation on the [DREAM Act](http://www.dreamactivist.org/) and [AgJobs](http://www.fwjustice.org/Immigration_Labor/AgJOBS_Info.htm) as a down payment on reform during lame-duck session, since reform as a whole now looks to be on the table no sooner than 2011. President Obama [recognized](http://www.apaforprogress.org/president-obama-remarks-need-comprehensive-immigration-reform) that electoral candidates will suffer the consequences if the issue continues to remain unaddressed – who will have the courage to tackle the issue and when will they do it? He said, “the understandable, the natural impulse among those who run for office is to turn away and defer this question for another day, or another year, or another administration.” Latinos and Asian Americans hit the polls in 2008 in the hopes that this president and this Congress would listen to their needs. Two years later, they must vote again to prove their loyalty to leaders who are supposed to serve constituent concerns – comprehensive immigration reform needs to [prioritized](http://thehill.com/blogs/congress-blog/politics/108419-congress-needs-to-step-in-on-immigration-reform-?page=2#comments) in the next Congressional session. The acronym of Rep. Luis Gutierrez's immigration reform bill, [CIR ASAP](http://www.gutierrez.house.gov/index.php?option=com_content&view=article&id=456&Itemid=30), wasn't an accident. We need comprehensive immigration reform as soon as possible. Immigration reform cannot continue to be pushed aside for “another day, year, Administration.” If Democrats don't take steps to prove their interest in fixing the immigration system, Latino and Asian American voters might not bother showing up to give them an undeserved vote.

I/L – Latino Voters Key

Latinos are key to the mid-term election

Conda 7/24/10 (Cesar, Former Domestic Policy Advisor to Cheney, “GOP Must Fix Its Latino Problem”) <http://www.politico.com/arena/archive/open-mike-july-24-25.html>

While the GOP will undoubtedly have a strong midterm election with significant pickups in the House, Senate and governorships, there are larger demographic shifts at play that will complicate the party’s efforts to win back the White House in 2012. The recent controversy surrounding the Arizona law on illegal immigration is compounding the GOP’s already significant problems with Latino voters, making it more difficult for the party to regain its footing in the West and Florida.  In 2008, Barack Obama won the combined minority vote 80-20. Minorities were 26 percent of the electorate then. In 2012, the minority vote will likely be 30 percent of the pie. If President Obama wins similar support in the minority communities, it will be nearly impossible for the Republican candidate to win.

Anti-immigrant sentiment kills the GOP

Conda 7/24/10 (Cesar, Former Domestic Policy Advisor to Cheney, “GOP Must Fix Its Latino Problem”) <http://www.politico.com/arena/archive/open-mike-july-24-25.html>

The Republican Party must find a way to connect with Latino voters. A [poll of Texas Hispanics](http://www.dallasnews.com/sharedcontent/dws/news/politics/state/stories/DN-hisppolitics_24tex.ART.State.Edition1.4bd6241.html) conducted earlier this year found that over half called themselves “conservative.” The GOP’s message of rugged individualism, hard work, thrift, family values, entrepreneurship, and a strong national defense ought to resonate with Latinos, but the anti-immigrant rhetoric of many Republican politicians drives them away. Being politically competitive among Hispanic voters is the only way the GOP can spread the electoral playing field. Otherwise, the party will have to thread a needle to win that’s getting smaller and smaller each four year cycle.

Dissatisfied Latino voters are key to midterm turnout

Pangilinan 7/30/10. (Erin, staff writer Philippine News. http://immigration.change.org/blog/view/immigrant\_voter\_blocks\_could\_cost\_democrats\_2010\_mid-term\_election) JL

Groups like [Mobilize the Immigrant Vote](http://mivcalifornia.org/docs/Main_Page), [Voto Latino](http://www.votolatino.org/), and [Promise Arizona](http://org2.democracyinaction.org/o/6834/p/salsa/web/common/public/content?content_item_KEY=2896), which work to increase immigrant voter participation, are concerned with immigration reform and the Arizona law. While Arizona is not a swing state the in Senate, House seats are leaning Democrat, but will need an extra push. Congress failed to pass bipartisan legislation in recent years. Communities grow impatient and hope for some piecemeal legislation on the [DREAM Act](http://www.dreamactivist.org/) and [AgJobs](http://www.fwjustice.org/Immigration_Labor/AgJOBS_Info.htm) as a down payment on reform during lame-duck session, since reform as a whole now looks to be on the table no sooner than 2011. President Obama [recognized](http://www.apaforprogress.org/president-obama-remarks-need-comprehensive-immigration-reform) that electoral candidates will suffer the consequences if the issue continues to remain unaddressed – who will have the courage to tackle the issue and when will they do it? He said, “the understandable, the natural impulse among those who run for office is to turn away and defer this question for another day, or another year, or another administration.” Latinos and Asian Americans hit the polls in 2008 in the hopes that this president and this Congress would listen to their needs. Two years later, they must vote again to prove their loyalty to leaders who are supposed to serve constituent concerns – comprehensive immigration reform needs to [prioritized](http://thehill.com/blogs/congress-blog/politics/108419-congress-needs-to-step-in-on-immigration-reform-?page=2#comments) in the next Congressional session. The acronym of Rep. Luis Gutierrez's immigration reform bill, [CIR ASAP](http://www.gutierrez.house.gov/index.php?option=com_content&view=article&id=456&Itemid=30), wasn't an accident. We need comprehensive immigration reform as soon as possible. Immigration reform cannot continue to be pushed aside for “another day, year, Administration.” If Democrats don't take steps to prove their interest in fixing the immigration system, Latino and Asian American voters might not bother showing up to give them an undeserved vote.

**I/L – AT: Anti Immigration Lobby**

Latino vote outweighs –

Sefsaf 2/8/10 (Wendy, “The 2010 Mid-Term Elections and the Impatient Latino Vote” <http://immigrationimpact.com/2010/02/08/the-2010-mid-term-elections-and-the-impatient-latino-vote/>)

Yet, despite hard data, there will still likely be those politicians who are spooked by the vocal anti-immigrant movement. However, Frank Sharry of America’s Voice warns them not to overestimate the power of these groups—“anti-immigrant groups and their supporters don’t turn elections but turn on their fax machines during a congressional debate.” Smart politicians will listen to a proven voting contingent and not be swayed by a vocal minority.

I/L – AT: Immigration Irrelevant

Wrong – Arizona changed everything

Cannon 5/25/10 (Lou, Political Writer, “Lou Cannon: In Aftermath of Arizona Law, Immigration Debate Stirs Historic Passions”) http://www.noozhawk.com/local\_news/article/052510\_lou\_cannon\_arizona\_law\_immigration/

Immigration is the canary in the coal mine of American politics. Like unseen deadly gases in a mine, fear of foreigners has a capacity to strike without warning or detection. Only a few months ago immigration was a back-burner issue in the 2010 election campaign; a poll in immigration-conscious California ranked it a distant fourth among issues of concern to Republican voters. Then came the overwrought restrictive Arizona law giving police broad power to detain illegal immigrants. This measure — [Senate Bill 1070](http://www.azleg.gov/legtext/49leg/2r/bills/sb1070s.pdf) — has put illegal immigration on the agenda in the California and Texas elections and prompted showdowns in statehouses on immigration bills from Massachusetts to Idaho.

\*\*Impacts\*\*

Impact Module – Warming

GOP victories will lead to a dramatic increase in the push for climate legislation – most important pieces of environment legislation has happened in lame-duck sessions

Cohen 7/26/10. (Steven, Executive Director, The Earth Institute. Huffington Post. http://www.huffingtonpost.com/steven-cohen/here-comes-some-old-fashi\_b\_659003.html)

Congress will not pass a comprehensive climate and energy bill before the mid-term election, but after November, I would look for the political dynamic to shift suddenly and dramatically. If the Democrats lose ground in the House and Senate as expected, there may very well be an active and productive lame duck session of Congress. If the Democrats lose one or both houses of Congress, this session will take on an even greater sense of urgency. Many of our most important pieces of environmental legislation, such as Superfund and Alaska Lands, have been enacted during lame duck sessions. I wouldn't be surprised to see that happen once again.

Inaction on climate change leads to extinction

Tickell 8 (Oliver, Climate Researcher. The Gaurdian, 11 Aug. http://www.guardian.co.uk/commentisfree/2008/aug/11/climatechange)

We need to get prepared for four degrees of global warming, Bob Watson told the Guardian last week. At first sight this looks like wise counsel from the climate science adviser to Defra. But the idea that we could adapt to a 4C rise is absurd and dangerous. Global warming on this scale would be a catastrophe that would mean, in the immortal words that Chief Seattle probably never spoke, "the end of living and the beginning of survival" for humankind. Or perhaps the beginning of our extinction. The collapse of the polar ice caps would become inevitable, bringing long-term sea level rises of 70-80 metres. All the world's coastal plains would be lost, complete with ports, cities, transport and industrial infrastructure, and much of the world's most productive farmland. The world's geography would be transformed much as it was at the end of the last ice age, when sea levels rose by about 120 metres to create the Channel, the North Sea and Cardigan Bay out of dry land. Weather would become extreme and unpredictable, with more frequent and severe droughts, floods and hurricanes. The Earth's carrying capacity would be hugely reduced. Billions would undoubtedly die. Watson's call was supported by the government's former chief scientific adviser, Sir David King, who warned that "if we get to a four-degree rise it is quite possible that we would begin to see a runaway increase". This is a remarkable understatement. The climate system is already experiencing significant feedbacks, notably the summer melting of the Arctic sea ice. The more the ice melts, the more sunshine is absorbed by the sea, and the more the Arctic warms. Andas the Arctic warms, the release of billions of tonnes of methane– a greenhouse gas 70 times stronger than carbon dioxide over 20 years – captured under melting permafrost is already under way. To see how far this process could go, look back 55.5m years to the Palaeocene-Eocene Thermal Maximum, when a global temperature increase of 6C coincided with the release of about 5,000 gigatonnes of carbon into the atmosphere, both as CO2 and as methane from bogs and seabed sediments. Lush subtropical forests grew in polar regions, and sea levels rose to 100m higher than today. It appears that an initial warming pulse triggered other warming processes. Many scientists warn that this historical event may be analogous to the present: the warming caused by human emissions could propel us towards a similar hothouse Earth.

Impact Module – Economy

**Economic instability causes global war**

Walter Russell Mead - Senior Fellow, Council of Foreign Relations - August 30, 1998 Houston Chronicle

Forget suicide car bombers and Afghan fanatics. It’s the financial markets, not the terrorist training camps, that pose the biggest immediate threat to world peace. How can this be? This about the mother of all global meltdowns: the Great Depression that started in 1929. U.S. stocks began to collapse in October, staged a rally, then the market headed south big time. At the bottom, the Dow Jones Industrial Average had lost 90 percent of its value. Wages plummeted, thousands of banks and brokerages went bankrupt, millions of people lost their jobs. There were similar horror stories worldwide. But the biggest impact of the Depression on the United States – and on world history – wasn’t money. It was blood: World War II, to be exact. The Depression brought Adolf Hitler to power in Germany, undermined the ability of moderates to oppose Josef Stalin’s power in Russia, and convinced the Japanese military that the country had no choice but to build an Asian empire, even if that meant war with the United States and Britain. That’s the thing about depressions. They aren’t just bad for your 401(k). Let the world economy crash far enough, and the rules change. We stop playing The Price is Right and start up a new round of Saving Private Ryan.

Impact ext – Econ Internal

GOP control of Congress is key to economic reform bills –

Tumulty and Kane 7/17/10 (Karen and Paul, Washington Post Staff Writers, “Republicans Dividied on the Importance of an Agenda for Midterm Elections”) http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/content/article/2010/07/16/AR2010071606245.html

It is no accident that Boehner has put two up-and-coming second-term congressmen, Kevin McCarthy (Calif.) and [Peter Roskam](http://www.whorunsgov.com/Profiles/Peter_Roskam) (lll.), in charge of drafting the new agenda for governing. Neither has the taint of having been in Washington for the previous 12-year reign of House Republicans. Although their plan is not likely to be as ambitious as the Contract with America, Republicans say it will be more detailed than anything the Democrats offered in 2006. "There will be legislation. There will be bills. You'll see what's in them," said McCarthy. He is gathering public suggestions on a Web site the party calls "America Speaking Out," though traditional polling is likely to be the real GPS for drafting any legislation. It will probably be relatively cautious, and limited to a few of the top concerns of both conservatives and independent voters. "What's our plan to create jobs and grow the economy?" said GOP pollster David Winston, who is advising the House Republican leadership on the effort. "That's really what we have to address. We need command focus." Minority Whip [Eric Cantor](http://www.whorunsgov.com/Profiles/Eric_Cantor) (R-Va.) said it will also include sections on national security and proposals for making internal reforms of the House, to create more transparency as to how the legislative process works.

GOP key to the economy

McManus 7/14/10 (Doyle, LA Times Writer “Commentary: A Post-Novermber Congressional Outlook? Partisan Gridlock”) <http://www.mcclatchydc.com/2010/07/13/v-print/97395/a-post-november-congressional.html>

The agenda will probably focus mostly on one issue, the economy, and it will try to reinforce the basic message the GOP has already been trying to convey: that the Democrats' policies have failed, and that cutting taxes and spending will work better. The question will be whether the GOP can agree on specific proposals that can convince voters they'll do better than the Democrats.

"There really is only one issue: the economy," said David Winston, a Republican pollster who is advising Boehner. "It's not that healthcare and other issues aren't important, but the economy is the emergency that people want someone to address now."

Winston argues that the GOP should articulate a specific plan, but he also cautions against putting too much into it.

GOP victory in the midterms is key to fiscal responsibility and building confidence on Wall Street

Blankley 7/19/10. (Tony, vice president of the Edelman public relations firm in Washington .Washington Times. <http://www.washingtontimes.com/news/2010/jul/19/is-it-enough-for-the-gop-to-just-say-no/>).

Also, the GOP must make a firm commitment to economic growth and prosperity, which will require a balanced budget without tax increases. Serious spending cuts must appear in the first year of the first budget the Republican Congress crafts. Finally, as community leaders as well as legislators, Republicans must provide leadership in a voluntary, private-sector explosion of "republican virtues" - that is to say, the qualities of citizenship that make free self-governance possible. We need not only to limit entitlements but limit the need for them by encouraging self-sufficiency in the public.

Impact Module – Health Care (1/3)

GOP win will lead to healthcare repeal

Kristol 10 (William, “ Special Editorial: Repeal” <http://www.weeklystandard.com/blogs/special-editorial-repeal>)

Why not? Because we can repeal it. As National Review’s editors explain (and see also the strong Wall Street Journal[editorial this morning](http://online.wsj.com/article/SB10001424052748703775504575135881813148208.html)), this legislation “will increase taxes, increase premiums, and increase debt, while decreasing economic growth, job growth, and the quality of health care.” So it will--if it is allowed to go into effect. Luckily, key parts of Obamacare--especially the subsidies--don’t go into effect until 2014. So what Republicans have to do is to make the 2010 and the 2012 elections referenda on Obamacare, win those elections, and then repeal Obamacare.     But the details of the replacing and reforming are secondary. Repeal is the heart of the matter. It should be the heart of the message. Think of it this way: This year Obama has handed Republicans a one-item Contract with America, an item a majority of the public supports--opposition to, and therefore repeal of, Obamacare. Barack Obama was able to muscle his health care plan through, and therefore avoided a legislative defeat that Sen. Jim DeMint had said would be his Waterloo. But Waterloo was always an imperfect analogy. Leaving aside the injustice to Napoleon of comparing Obama to him, the better analogy is Borodino. Napoleon invaded Russia in June of 1812. On September 7 of that year, the Grande Armée under Napoleon’s command attacked the Russian army near the village of Borodino. Napoleon won the battle, the greatest of the Russian campaign, but at a terrible cost--about a third of his soldiers were killed or wounded. The Russian army was not destroyed, and while Napoleon occupied an abandoned Moscow a week later, the French army was never the same. It soon had to begin its disastrous winter retreat from Russia, and Napoleon finally did meet his Waterloo almost three years later. Last night’s victory was the culmination of Obama’s health care effort, which has been his version of  Napoleon’s Russia campaign. He won a short-term victory, but one that will turn out to mark an inflection point on the road to defeat, and the beginning of the end of the Democratic party’s dominance over American politics. Last night was Obama’s Borodino. Obama’s Waterloo will be November 6, 2012. And then comes repeal, and the opportunity for renewed and revitalized conservative governance.

Impact Module – Health Care (2/3)

Health care kills army recruitment

Norris 8 (Floyd, “Health’s Gain May Be Army’s Loss”) <http://www.nytimes.com/2008/05/30/business/30norris.html?ei=5124&en=48a84acfacec6f7c&ex=1369886400&partner=permalink&exprod=permalink&pagewanted=print>

If the Democrats win the election this year, and are able to enact a health care plan that extends adequate coverage to all Americans, the loser could be the Army. Getting enough people to enlist could become a major problem for the next president. Senator [John McCain](http://topics.nytimes.com/top/reference/timestopics/people/m/john_mccain/index.html?inline=nyt-per), the presumptive Republican candidate, has already pointed out that Senator [Barack Obama](http://topics.nytimes.com/top/reference/timestopics/people/o/barack_obama/index.html?inline=nyt-per), the likely Democratic candidate, never served in the military. It remains to be seen how potent that will be as an issue, given the fact that the last four presidential elections have been won by the candidate with the less impressive military resume. But there is something else that distinguishes Mr. Obama from all recent candidates for the presidency. He would be the first presidential nominee to come of age after the draft was abolished in the administration of [Richard M. Nixon](http://topics.nytimes.com/top/reference/timestopics/people/n/richard_milhous_nixon/index.html?inline=nyt-per). He never had to decide how to deal with the draft, and legally was under no more pressure to enlist than he was to go to medical school or become a bus driver. Joining the military was a career option like any other. And that has made it harder to put the Army together. Government polls [show](http://www.marinecorpstimes.com/news/2008/04/marine_recruiting_041208w/) that the proportion of young people who think they might enlist is roughly half what it was in the late 1980s. The military has responded with more recruiters and higher cash enlistment bonuses, and has met its goals. A significant factor for many recruits, it turns out, is the military’s generous health benefits for dependants. Michael Massing, writing in the April 3 issue of The New York Review of Books, [tells](http://www.nybooks.com/articles/21201) the story of one part-time college student from Brooklyn, who was holding down two jobs but still going into debt. “Meanwhile, he got married, his wife got pregnant, and he had no health care. From a brother in the military, he had learned of the Army’s many benefits, and, visiting a recruiter, he heard about Tricare, the military’s generous health plan.” He enlisted. It seems a bit perverse that the incentives for a young person with children to join are greater than the incentives for his childless friend. But that is the way it is. All that could change if the push for some kind of national health insurance program were to be successful. It is true, of course, that Democrats have been talking about such things for generations. The failure of health care legislation during [Bill Clinton](http://topics.nytimes.com/top/reference/timestopics/people/c/bill_clinton/index.html?inline=nyt-per)’s first two years in office left some viewing the issue as political dynamite — good for a campaign but fatal to anyone who tries to pass a specific program. It is quite unclear how the government would pay for a comprehensive program, and no candidates seem eager to discuss ways to hold down health care spending. But if such a program were adopted, it seems likely that the military, and particularly the Army, would feel the immediate effect. To expand the Army, as all the candidates say they want to do, would require some other incentive for enlistment, particularly when the economy recovers. In the near term, it is possible that a recession will improve the military’s recruiting success. The official unemployment rate is still low, but the proportion of Americans who expect the job picture to improve is at its lowest level in a quarter century, according to [the Conference Board](http://topics.nytimes.com/top/reference/timestopics/organizations/c/conference_board/index.html?inline=nyt-org)’s consumer confidence survey. That survey shows that younger people are still more confident than older ones, but the confidence of both groups has fallen sharply this year. One partial solution to the negative effect on enlistment of a health care plan for all could be a new G.I. education benefit. Both the House and Senate have approved such a plan, but as part of the Iraq funding bill on which there are major differences. President Bush is opposed to the legislation, which its sponsors say would cost $50 billion over 10 years, and it is far from clear it will be enacted.

Impact Module – Health Care (3/3)

That’s key to hegemony

Perry 6 (William Perry, Madeleine Albright, Sandy Berger, and John Shalikashvili, January 2006, The National Security Advisory Group, <http://www.cfr.org/content/publications/attachments/us-military_nsag-report_01252006.pdf>

If recruiting trends do not improve over the next year, the Army, both active and reserve, will experience great difficulty fully manning its planned force structure and providing the needed rotation base for operations in Iraq and Afghanistan. Fewer than needed recruits and first-term reenlistees could result in a significant “hollowing” and imbalance in the Army. There is already a deficit of some 18,000 personnel in the Army’s junior enlisted grades. Even if it meets its recruiting and retention goals, the Army is expected to be short some 30K soldiers (not including stop loss) by the end of FY06. This will undermine unit readiness, exacerbate PERSTEMPO strains, and jeopardize the Army’s ability to populate its planned force structure. These factors will create tremendous internal pressures to begin drawing 2 down the level of Army forces in Iraq by next spring, whatever the conditions on the ground may be.

US hegemony is key to preventing proliferation and global nuclear war.

Khalilzad, 95 (Zalmay, director of the Strategy and Doctrine Program at RAND & former US Ambassador to Afghanistan) "Losing the Moment? The United States and the World After the Cold War," Washington Quarterly, Spring, p. proquest)

Under the third option, the United States would seek to retain global leadership and to preclude the rise of a global rival or a return to multipolarity for the indefinite future. On balance, this is the best long-term guiding principle and vision. Such a vision is desirable not as an end in itself, but because a world in which the United States exercises leadership would have tremendous advantages. First, the global environment would be more open and more receptive to American values — understood as democracy, free markets, and the rule of law. Second, such a world would have a better chance of dealing cooperatively with the world's major problems, such asnuclear proliferation, threats of regional hegemony by renegade states, and low-level conflicts. Finally, U.S. leadership would help preclude the rise of another hostile global rival, enabling the United States and the world to avoid another global cold or hot war and all the attendant dangers, including a global nuclear exchange. U.S. leadership would therefore be more conducive to global stability than a bipolar or a multipolar balance of power system.

Impact ext – Healthcare Internal

GOP win would repeal health care

Graves 7/23/10 (Lucia, “Republicans Threaten Repeals Subpoenas If they Take Back the House”) <http://www.huffingtonpost.com/2010/07/23/republicans-threaten-repe_n_657132.html>

House Tea Party Caucus leader Rep. Michelle Bachmann (R-Minn.) and House Minority Leader John Boehner (R-Ohio) agree: If Republicans win back control the House in November, they'll embark on an agenda of issuing subpoenas, repealing legislation, and holding hearings to investigate the Obama administration. "I think all we should do is issue subpoenas and have one hearing after another and expose all the nonsense that has gone on," Bachmann [said](http://www.threefingersofpolitics.com/?p=1129)Thursday at the GOP Youth Convention in Washington. Boehner said Wednesday that if he became Speaker of the House he would immediately repeal health care reform as it "not only ruined the best health care system in the world, it'll bankrupt the country." And last week, minutes after the Wall Street reform bill passed, Boehner said, "it ought to be repealed." Republicans must win 39 seats in November to take back the House, which White House Press Secretary Robert Gibbs [has acknowleged is possible](http://tpmdc.talkingpointsmemo.com/2010/07/gibbs-no-doubt-the-republicans-could-take-back-the-house-video.php), but Democratic leaders have since[insisted](http://www.rollcall.com/news/48322-1.html?CMP=OTC-RSS) [it's not going to happen](http://www.huffingtonpost.com/2010/07/22/steny-hoyer-mocks-speaker_n_656369.html)

GOP control can kill health care reform – they don’t need to repeal, just to stop funding

Chait 10 (Jonathan Chait, The New Republic, 3-19-10, http://www.tnr.com/blog/jonathan-chait/could-republicans-repeal-health-care-reform)

Mitt Romney lays out his plan to repeal Romneycare... I mean, Obamacare: The key, he said, is having Republicans reclaim the White House and take majorities in the Senate and the House. Then, "we can clamp down on this bill ... by not funding it," Romney said during a speech Thursday I think Romney is just trying to cover his tracks and protect himself from the inevitable, true Republican primary attacks that he enacted a health care plan similar to Obama's, except more left-wing in the sense that it lacked the long-term cost controls. But he's still laying out the closest thing to a plausible Republican legislative plan to repeal health care reform should it be enacted into law. The problem with repealing health care reform is the filibuster -- Republicans would need 60 votes to undo the exchanges, regulations on things like preexisting conditions, and the individual mandate. But they could use budget reconciliation, which just needs a majority, to undo the tax credits and Medicaid expansion that make coverage affordable. (Even though using reconciliation to undo a major reform would be unprecedented!)

Impact Module – Israel

GOP win is necessary to provide the impetus for an Israeli strike on Iran

Glick 4/30/10 (“Republicans, Democrats and Israel”) <http://www.carolineglick.com/e/2010/04/republicans-democrats-and-isra.php>

If House Republicans and Republican House candidates were to collectively pledge to cut off US funding for the PA in the aftermath of such a declaration, they could neutralize the threat. And if they pledged not to fund a US embassy in such a Palestinian state, they would make it impossible for Obama to continue holding his decision over Israel's head.  As for Iran, if Republicans win the House, they will be in a position to use omnibus budgetary bills to force the administration to provide Israel with the military equipment necessary to win a war against Iran and its allies. This would limit Obama's capacity to threaten Israel with an arms embargo in the increasingly likely event that the Iranian axis attacks the Jewish state.

An Israeli strike on Iran would curb Middle East proliferation

Phillips 10 (James, Senior Research Fellow for Middle Eastern Affairs in the Douglas and Sarah Allison Center for Foreign Policy Studies, The Heritage Foundation, “An Israeli Preventative Attack on Iran’s Nuclear Sites: Implications for the US”)

From Israel's perspective, buying even a small amount of time to postpone an existential threat is a worthwhile endeavor. The 1981 strike on Iraq's Osiraq nuclear reactor did not end Iraq's nuclear weapons efforts, but it paid large dividends because Saddam Hussein's regime never was able to replace the reactor. Iraq's nuclear program suffered further setbacks due to U.S. air strikes during the 1991 Gulf war and the U.N. sanctions that followed after Iraq refused to abide by the subsequent ceasefire agreement. An Israeli military operation that delayed the emergence of a nuclear-armed Iran also would have the benefit of delaying the prospective cascade of nuclear proliferation that would acceler ate a nuclear arms race among other states threat ened by Iran, such asSaudi Arabia, Egypt, and Turkey, which would further destabilize the tense region and immensely complicate Israel's security environment.

Proliferation results in extinction

Cohn 9 (William, 09 Lecturer law, ethics and logic at the University of New York in Prague, May 19, <http://www.informationclearinghouse.info/article22655.htm>)

 More nations have acquired these weapons. Testing has continued. Black market trade in nuclear secrets and nuclear materials abound. The technology to build the bomb has spread.” Harvard political scientist Graham Allison’s Newsweek cover story (“Stopping the Ultimate Attack,” March 23, 2009) highlights the danger of nuclear terror and calls for a revitalization of the concept of deterrence. Allison, author of Nuclear Terrorism: the Ultimate Preventable Catastrophe and Nuclear Proliferation: Risk and Responsibility, surely recognizes that the best deterrence is the abolition of nuclear weapons. Nuclear theorists and strategists should heed the call of former Pentagon chief Robert McNamara, who in 2003 acknowledged “it was luck that prevented nuclear war” and catastrophe in the 1962 Cuban Missile Crisis. Luck may not save us next time. Nuclear threats now include: Al-Qaeda, the Taliban or other religious extremists getting nukes; India and Pakistan having the Bomb, with their bloody history and Kashmir dispute; a nuclear arms race in the Middle East, with numerous doomsday scenarios; more states pursuing civilian nuclear technology as a source of ‘clean energy’ (but what do we do with the radioactive waste?) leading to bomb-building; accidents like the recent collision of French and British nuclear submarines; misuse of the bloated nuclear arsenal of the former Soviet Union where poor safeguards, political instability and corruption have given rise to a booming black market trade in nuclear materials; nukes in the hands of one of many militant separatist groups; Iran’s firebrand leader running a reelection campaign on nuclear nationalism; and, North Korea led by a lunatic who, impotent to meet the needs of his people, snubs cooperation at every opportunity, and whose only political capital is playing the international pariah. The scenarios for atomic annihilation are many, and growing. The prospect of atomic annihilation increases daily as black market trade in nuclear weapons material and technology expands. Today, nuclear smuggler A.Q. Khan runs his own website from Pakistan. International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) Director and 2005 Nobel Peace Prize winner Mohamed ElBaradei calls Khan’s nuclear distribution network the “Wal-Mart of private-sector proliferation.”

Impact Calc – Israel

Threat of proliferation outweighs any impact turn –

Phillips 10 (James, Senior Research Fellow for Middle Eastern Affairs in the Douglas and Sarah Allison Center for Foreign Policy Studies, The Heritage Foundation, “An Israeli Preventative Attack on Iran’s Nuclear Sites: Implications for the US”)

Recognize Israel's right to self-defense against a hostile Islamist dictatorship that also threat ens U.S. interests and regional stability. Wash ington should not seek to block Israel from taking what it considers to be necessary action against an existential threat. The United States does not have the power to guarantee that Israel would not be attacked by a nuclear Iran in the future, so it should not betray the trust of a democratic ally by tying its hands now. Although an Israeli attack on Iran's nuclear program will entail increased risks for U.S. interests in the Middle East, these risks would be dwarfed by the threats posed by a nuclear-armed Iran. Not only would a nuclear Iran pose a much more dire direct threat to the U.S., Israel, and other allies, but Tehran might pass a nuclear weapon to one of its Islamist ter rorist surrogates. Its support for terrorism against Israel, insurgent attacks against U.S. troops in Iraq, and subversive efforts against moderate Arab governments are likely to grow steadily if it believes its nuclear capability gives it a carte blanche to act with impunity. Moreover a nuclear Iran would induce many other Middle Eastern states to seek their own nuclear weapons. This cas cade of nuclear proliferation would enormously increase the risks of a future nuclear exchange involving some combination of Middle Eastern nuclear powers, threaten Israel and other U.S. allies, and increase the risks of oil disruptions, even if Iran was not involved in a future crisis.

Arming Israel is key to avoiding nuclear war

Phillips 10 (James, Senior Research Fellow for Middle Eastern Affairs in the Douglas and Sarah Allison Center for Foreign Policy Studies, The Heritage Foundation, “An Israeli Preventative Attack on Iran’s Nuclear Sites: Implications for the US”)

The Obama Administration must develop a Plan B to contain the fallout if its engagement strategy fails to dissuade Iran from continuing on its current nuclear path. Tehran must recognize that America's allies and friends will protect their own interests, particularly Israel, which faces the greatest threat from a nuclear Iran. As bad as the consequences could be if Israel launched a preventive strike against Iran--it would be far worse if the two countries fought a nuclear war, or if the United States were forced to fight a war against a nuclear Iran.

Impact Module – START (1/2)

GOP victories in midterms ensures that START won’t be ratified

GSN 7/26 (Global Security Newswire, Nuclear Threat Initiative. http://www.globalsecuritynewswire.org/gsn/nw\_20100726\_3747.php) JM

Demands by Senate Republicans for additional details on the treaty and time to consider ratification have raised the possibility that senators pact might not vote on the pact until after November's midterm election, according to the Times. Ratification of the treaty in Washington would require 67 Senate votes, a number that must include no less than eight Republicans endorsements in this Congress. If debate continued into next year, the possible election of additional Republican senators into office could further increase political resistance to the pact. If the treaty dies in the Senate, the Obama administration would find it more difficult to press ahead with other arms control goals, according to the Times. Republican senators including Jon Kyl (Ariz.) and John McCain (Ariz.) have placed various conditions on their support for the treaty, including a long-term, well-funded commitment to updating the U.S. nuclear weapons complex; assurance the document would not limit future missile defense deployments; and confidence that the document's verification provisions are adequate for accurately monitoring the state of Russia's nuclear deterrent. "The cynical interpretation is that the Republicans are just trying to delay this thing until after the election so they have more leverage," said Tom Collina, an expert with the Arms Control Association. The current Congress would only re-convene after the election this year with approval from both parties, Collina said. If Republicans won a substantial number of additional offices, they might opt to wait to gain more bargaining power when the new Congress convenes in 2011, he said.

Turn – START will result in a net increase in nuclear proliferation

National Review 5/3 (“This Week”, p. Ln) JM

The U.S. and the Russians agreed to cut their arsenals of deployed strategic warheads to 1,550. This is advertised as a 30 percent cut, although the limit is only 150 warheads beneath 1,700, the lowest bound of the 2002 Bush-Putin Treaty of Moscow. As a practical matter, **the Russians won't have to cut at all. The decrepitude of their force, coupled with economic constraints, means that they cannot stay at current levels, new START treaty or no**. By the standards of traditional arms-control doctrine, the treaty is sorely lacking. For decades, the experts have warned of the destabilizing effects of so-called **MIRV-ing, putting multiple warheads on a launcher. The treaty will encourage this practice through its "counting rules": Each launcher counts as only one warhead, no matter how many warheads are actually on it. This rule happens to suit Moscow's needs precisely as it seeks to economize**. And it's a strange arms-control **treaty** that **makes it** theoretically **possible for both sides to go up in deployed warheads**, but that's what the rule accomplishes. (There is of course no danger that the Obama administration will take advantage of this loophole.) More important, **the** new **treaty weakens the verification procedures that existed in the prior START treaty**. Under the new agreement, as John R. Bolton writes elsewhere in this issue, **we will "lose important START requirements for on-site inspections, telemetry exchanges, and production monitoring**." Worst of all, the treaty will constitute a limit on our missile defenses. The provision specifically about missile defense is in Article V; **it forbids the conversion of** intercontinental-ballistic-missile (**ICBM**) **launchers for use in missile defense**. As Keith Payne of Missouri State University points out, **this would be** a **harmful** stricture **if, in a crisis, we needed quickly to use Minuteman missile silos to launch interceptors**. In addition, the treaty's preamble notes "the interrelationship between strategic offensive arms and strategic defensive arms" that will "become more important as strategic nuclear arms are reduced." The Russians interpret this language as a check on missile defense. Prior to the signing of the treaty, **Russia's** foreign minister, Sergei Lavrov, **said that "linkage to missile defense** is clearly spelled out in the accord and **is legally binding**." Russian president Dmitry Medvedev says Russia might withdraw from the treaty if our defenses create "an imbalance." Psychologically, the Russians want to leverage the agreement into a new de facto Anti-Ballistic Missile Treaty. Given how invested the Obama administration is in the new treaty, this extortion will surely work. Obama's overarching theory is that U.S. nukes are what cause countries like Iran to pursue their own nuclear weapons. So we engage in exemplary **acts of limiting ourselves and our arsenal, in the forlorn hope of winning the good will of rogue states that have every reason to go nuclear, whatever our posture**. **The new START treaty is a crystallization of this mistaken premise**. It has no upside for the United States, is shot through with flaws, and worsens our position on missile defense. The U.S. Senate should reject it.

Impact Module – START (2/2)

Proliferation results in extinction

Cohn 9 (William, 09 Lecturer law, ethics and logic at the University of New York in Prague, May 19, <http://www.informationclearinghouse.info/article22655.htm>)

 More nations have acquired these weapons. Testing has continued. Black market trade in nuclear secrets and nuclear materials abound. The technology to build the bomb has spread.” Harvard political scientist Graham Allison’s Newsweek cover story (“Stopping the Ultimate Attack,” March 23, 2009) highlights the danger of nuclear terror and calls for a revitalization of the concept of deterrence. Allison, author of Nuclear Terrorism: the Ultimate Preventable Catastrophe and Nuclear Proliferation: Risk and Responsibility, surely recognizes that the best deterrence is the abolition of nuclear weapons. Nuclear theorists and strategists should heed the call of former Pentagon chief Robert McNamara, who in 2003 acknowledged “it was luck that prevented nuclear war” and catastrophe in the 1962 Cuban Missile Crisis. Luck may not save us next time. Nuclear threats now include: Al-Qaeda, the Taliban or other religious extremists getting nukes; India and Pakistan having the Bomb, with their bloody history and Kashmir dispute; a nuclear arms race in the Middle East, with numerous doomsday scenarios; more states pursuing civilian nuclear technology as a source of ‘clean energy’ (but what do we do with the radioactive waste?) leading to bomb-building; accidents like the recent collision of French and British nuclear submarines; misuse of the bloated nuclear arsenal of the former Soviet Union where poor safeguards, political instability and corruption have given rise to a booming black market trade in nuclear materials; nukes in the hands of one of many militant separatist groups; Iran’s firebrand leader running a reelection campaign on nuclear nationalism; and, North Korea led by a lunatic who, impotent to meet the needs of his people, snubs cooperation at every opportunity, and whose only political capital is playing the international pariah. The scenarios for atomic annihilation are many, and growing. The prospect of atomic annihilation increases daily as black market trade in nuclear weapons material and technology expands. Today, nuclear smuggler A.Q. Khan runs his own website from Pakistan. International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) Director and 2005 Nobel Peace Prize winner Mohamed ElBaradei calls Khan’s nuclear distribution network the “Wal-Mart of private-sector proliferation.”

Impact – START Bad: Proliferation

START weakens the NPT and increases the risk of nuclear proliferation by destroying the US nuclear umbrella guarantee

**Bolton 10** (Joshua, former U.S. representative to the United Nations, National Review. May 5. p. Ln) JM

As to the consequences of rejecting the treaty, they are not even vaguely apocalyptic. Senators should understand that saying no to this agreement implies neither opposing all future arms-control agreements nor even opposing a subsequent, modified version of this treaty. Rejecting the text signed in Prague simply requires that negotiators return to the bargaining table, with instructions to Team Obama to do a better job. That is, after all, what the "advice" portion of the Senate's "advice and consent" power actually means. Substantively, the most appalling aspect of the Obama -Medvedev treaty is not its specific provisions, but what it reveals about President Obama's national-security psychology. He has repeatedly said he believes lowering U.S. nuclear-warhead levels will encourage support for the Non-Proliferation Treaty's weapons prohibitions on non-nuclear-weapons states. This is the purest form of theology, since the empirical evidence is entirely to the contrary. As the Cold War ended, Moscow and Washington made dramatic reductions in warhead levels, huge in percentage and absolute terms. Nonetheless, nuclear proliferation continued, and the pace is quickening. After START I and II, India, Pakistan, and North Korea tested nuclear weapons, and Iran rapidly approaches that point. Syria had a clandestine nuclear reactor until Israel destroyed it in September 2007. And if current and aspiring nuclear proliferators keep or develop weapons, this will encourage still more proliferation activity. Approval of American disarmament in European capitals and American academic salons is not proof that disarmament strengthens international nonproliferation norms. In fact, Tehran and Pyongyang will conclude the opposite, namely that America is getting weaker, and react accordingly. Faced with the Obama mindset, Iran and North Korea are now more likely to fall all over themselves getting to the bargaining table. There seems to be no limit to what they would be able to extract from Obama negotiators, to our serious and perhaps permanent detriment. As for the treaty itself, among the myriad lines of potential inquiry, take only its headline obligation, its seemingly easiest-to-grasp provision: the new limits on operationally deployed strategic warheads, with both sides capped at 1,550. The idea that the surface equality of the warhead limit is a positive result for the United States is based on belief in an entirely false symmetry. It is precisely the asymmetric capabilities and nuclear doctrines of the two sides -- such as the circumstances under which they are prepared to use nuclear weapons, their unequal nuclear infrastructures, and their differing global commitments and capabilities -- that require elaboration and understanding. What is not in the draft treaty may well be more important than what is. Merely for starters, here are eight issues about the warhead limits that senators should consider: 1. At a minimum, the bilateral equivalence at 1,550 represents a retreat from the 2002 Treaty of Moscow, which prescribed a range of 1,700 to 2,200 operationally deployed strategic nuclear warheads, thus reflecting that one size does not fit all. The range provision was important to the United States, providing as it did both security and flexibility within the treaty's terms. Moreover, both sides well understood that Washington would rest near the top end of the range, while Moscow, squeezed by a depressed economy and other problems, would be unable to do more than cling to the bottom end, perhaps even dropping below that. Therefore the Obama -Medvedev treaty, leaving all other questions aside, almost certainly will require the United States to bear the brunt of operational-warhead cuts, reducing us to Russian levels. 2. Equal warhead ceilings, particularly at the treaty's very low levels, also ignore the different global obligations and responsibilities of Russia and America, and gravely threaten the strength and integrity of our nuclear umbrella. Russia has a legitimate interest in self-defense, but it is no longer a truly global power. Unlike the United States, it does not have a worldwide system of alliances, with dozens of countries explicitly or implicitly relying on its nuclear strength as a core element of their national-security policies. The risk of rips and tears in our nuclear umbrella is not simply that our allies will be less safe, although they will. Beyond that, several friends, concerned for their security, could feel impelled to develop their own nuclear-weapons capabilities. The treaty thus increases the risk of proliferation, exactly the opposite of what Obama believes as a matter of faith. 3. Low and equal warhead limits also ignore the two sides' disparate, evolving technological and operational capabilities. Since the 2002 Treaty of Moscow, Russia has skillfully used global oil-price increases to upgrade and modernize its warhead stockpiles and delivery systems. In light of its limited financial resources, then, Russia has out-negotiated the Obama administration, by contriving to set treaty ceilings that it can reach, barely, and that actually allow it to increase its total number of delivery systems, substituting newer, more sophisticated platforms for many relics now in service. In stark contrast, the United States has done precious little for decades to modernize its warheads and delivery systems. America's design and production infrastructure is declining in key respects, and the safety and reliability of our stockpile remains uncertain, as the heads of the three major national nuclear laboratories recently reaffirmed.

\*\*Aff Stuff\*\*

Uniqueness – Dems Win

Democrats are gaining momentum heading into the election

Todd 7/30 (Chuck, MSNBC analyst. NBC News. http://firstread.msnbc.msn.com/\_news/2010/07/30/4784189-first-thoughts-are-democrats-closing-the-gap) JM

Are Democrats closing the gap? Largely lost in all the recent focus on the BP spill, Shirley Sherrod, the Arizona immigration law, Charlie Rangel, and the Wikileaks leak is this bit of news: Democrats -- perhaps ever so slightly -- are beginning to close the midterm gap. For two-straight weeks now, they've had a lead in Gallup’s weekly generic ballot test. In some key Senate races (Nevada, Kentucky, and Illinois), they like their poll position, at least compared with what it was a few weeks ago. Charlie Crist is running better in Florida than many expected after his indie switch. Colorado has turned into an absolute nightmare for Republicans. And House Democrats are feeling a bit better about their prospects.

Democrats will maintain a majority in the house

Hunter 7/29 (Kathleen, staff writer. CQ Politics, http://www.cqpolitics.com/wmspage.cfm?docID=news-000003713765) JM

House Majority Leader Steny H. Hoyer confidently painted a rosy picture Thursday of House Democrats’ prospects in the midterm elections. “Historically, the probability is that we’re going to lose some seats,” the Maryland Democrat told reporters at a roundtable session. “We’re going to hang on, and we’re going to hang on significantly to our majority.” Hoyer was hesitant to predict precisely how many seats Democrats would control after the election, but when pressed he said he thought Democrats would lose fewer than the 28 to 33 seats that political expert and CQ-Roll Call contributor Stuart Rothenberg has predicted would flip to Republicans. “We’re going to do better, in my opinion, than people are giving us credit for,” Hoyer said. “We’re going to lose fewer seats than some people surmise.” For Republicans to seize control of the House, Hoyer said, an unlikely combination of factors would have to break their way. “The math’s pretty daunting for the Republicans,” he said. The Majority Leader, who has been active on the campaign trail, identified a handful of districts he thought Democrats could flip. He predicted Democrats would pick off Rep. Anh “Joseph” Cao (La.) and retake the at-large Hawaii seat that Rep. Charles Djou won in a special election that divided Democrats earlier this year.

Uniqueness – Dems Win

Democrats will keep their seats – new anti-republican strategies will keep voters away from the GOP

Montopoli 7/28 (Brian, Washington analyst. CBS. http://www.cbsnews.com/8301-503544\_162-20011956-503544.html) JM

The Democratic National Committee today unveiled a new initiative to brand the Republican Party as synonymous with the Tea Party movement. A DNC document laid out what it says are the plans of the "Republican Tea Party," among them repealing the health care bill, privatizing Social Security, ending Medicare in its current form, extending the Bush tax cuts for the wealthy and abolishing the Departments of Education and Energy. They call the ten-point platform the "Republican Tea Party Contract on America." (Most Republicans do support repealing health care and extending the Bush tax cuts, though the other positions here have far more limited support within the party.) DNC Chair Tim Kaine pushed the initiative at a press conference today, saying "the Republican Party agenda has become the tea party agenda, and vice versa." Democrats hope that by linking the Tea Party to the GOP they will convince moderate voters who might have considered voting Republican that the party is too extreme. Republican National Committee spokesperson Katie Wright responded to the DNC effort with a statement saying Democrats have an "arrogant agenda" and arguing that their "strategy for this summer appears be attacking voters as opposed to listening to them." The Democratic initiative is designed to help blunt expected GOP gains in the November midterm elections. The name of their document, the "Republican Tea Party Contract on America," is meant to evoke memories of Republicans' 1994 "Contract With America" that helped the GOP win control of Congress. Republicans are planning a new version of that document before the November elections. Minnesota Republican Rep. Michele Bachmann recently started a Tea Party Caucus in the House, which attracted 28 Republicans. Some members of the GOP appear to be wary of being linked too closely to the movement, though they hope to harness Tea Party enthusiasm in the midterms. A DNC official told Politico that "We are going to use this from now until the election as a pre-emptive strike against GOP's August rebranding effort, and as a response to the new contract we expect them to come out with this fall."

Democrats won’t lose seats – they’re altering the agenda to appeal to a larger majority

Zwick 7/26 (Jesse. Washington Independent. Ln) JM

After a legislative year chock full of big accomplishments, The New York Times reports that Democrats are looking to go small in the lead-up to midterm elections this November: Democrats will try to stave off electoral disaster in November with tools like these: electric-car batteries, free mammograms and loans for dry cleaners. [...] You can see it in the administrations piece-by-piece rollout of the new health care law, and Mr. Obama’s travels to highlight individual benefits of economic stimulus legislation. And you can see it in the small-business lending fund that the administration is advocating on Capitol Hill alongside Senator Mary Landrieu, Democrat of Louisiana, who beseeches colleagues to act in the name of the Taco Sisters restaurant in Lafayette, La. By scuttling a comprehensive climate bill and choosing to focus instead on measures like extending unemployment benefits and backing a small-business lending bill, congressional Democrats are trying to pass less ideological measures that they hope will both attract Republican support and give a boost to the economy.

Uniqueness – Dems Win: Fundraising

Dems are outstripping the GOP in fundraising, successfully connecting GOP candidates with Bush

Witt, 7/24/10. (Ryan. Political Buzz Examiner. http://www.examiner.com/x-5738-Political-Buzz-Examiner~y2010m7d24-The-2010-midterms--Campaign-strategies-increasingly-focus-on-a-tale-of-presidents ).

To counter this somewhat convincing argument, Democrats are arguing that Republicans will simply try to bring us back to the Bush era.  Many Americans are frustrated with President Obama, but he remains much more popular that President Bush [according to a recent poll (53% to 33%)](http://thinkprogress.org/2010/07/15/bush-miss-poll/).  In addition, a large majority of Americans (71%) still blame President Bush for the current economic situation as compared to a small minority (27%) that blame President Obama.  In an attempt to take advantage of these numbers, Democrats are spending $28 million on ad campaign which argues Republicans will return the country to the Bush agenda.  The ad (seen below) uses comments made by Rep. Pete Sessions (R-TX) in which he said the country needs to go back to "the exact same agenda" which empowered free enterprise.  Rep. Sessions has since argued that he was not speaking of the Bush agenda, but Democrats point to Republicans efforts to renew the Bush tax cuts as evidence of their true intent.

Democrats spending $49 million on new ad campaign for the midterms

ABC News. 7/28/10. (The midterms: It's Fallin vs. Askins. http://firstread.msnbc.msn.com/\_news/2010/07/28/4768495-the-midterms-its-fallin-vs-askins

"Democrats say they are prepared to spend $49 million on TV ads during the final weeks of the midterm elections in their effort to maintain a House majority," the AP reports, adding: "The ad reservations bring the total number of House districts that party strategists are willing to discuss publicly to 60.” "House Majority Leader Steny Hoyer plans a busy August on the campaign trail, with appearances planned for more than two dozen House Members and candidates, particularly moderates for whom the Maryland Democrat is the go-to leader, according to his office," [Roll Call](http://bit.ly/9V8o4e) reports.

Dems will maintain their numbers – they’re stepping up fundraising efforts

Zwick 7/28 (Jesse. Washington Independent. Ln) JM

President Obama and the Democrats are both kicking their midterm election efforts into a higher gear today. The President held a fundraiser for the Democratic National Committee last night in DC, is hosting two more DNC events today in New York City, and will host four more events around the country next week. Meanwhile, the Democratic Congressional Campaign Committee announced that its upping the number of seats it plans to lavish money on this fall ” it’s now committed to spending more than $49 million on advertising for 60 races. Guests at Obamas DNC events in New York City today will be asked to give the legal maximum of $30,400 to attend. Both events are sold out, but The Wall Street Journal nonetheless argues that antipathy towards Democrats on Wall Street will limit the amount of events Obama will be able to throw in the Big Apple: Measured in a variety of ways, Wall Street giving to Democrats is down. Overall, five of the top 10 sources of donations to the DNC in 2008 were Wall Street firms, according to an analysis of campaign donations by the nonpartisan Center for Responsive Politics. This election season, just one financial company”the investment-management firm Capital Group Cos.”ranks in the top 10. Employees of Goldman Sachs Group Inc. (NYSE:GS) donated a total of $1.1 million to the DNC in 2008, making Goldman the biggest source of campaign cash to the Democratic Party. Goldman employees have donated about $100,000 to the DNC so far in the 2010 congressional elections, according to the centers data. Wall Street is angry with Obama and the Democrats meme is popular and not without a kernel of truth. Fundraising numbers, however, dont actually seem to bear this out, at least when compared against the amount of money Wall Street is giving to Republicans. In the same article, the Journal admits as much: While Wall Street giving is down, Democrats are still outpacing Republicans. Overall, Wall Street has given $4.26 million to the DNC in the current cycle. Financial executives have donated just $870,000 to the Republican National Committee so far, less than 1% of the total raised.

Uniqueness – Dems Win: Indpendents

Dems will win now – recent polling proves Dems are winning key Independents

Hunt 7/18/10. (Albert, Economy Is Setting the Tone for Midterm Elections. http://www.nytimes.com/2010/07/19/us/19iht-letter.html?\_r=1&scp=1&sq=midterms%20taking%20over&st=cse

A week removed from an internecine fight about whether or not control of the House is up for grabs this fall (it is), Democrats got some welcome news this morning as the party re-took the lead in [Gallup's generic congressional ballot question](http://www.gallup.com/poll/141440/Democrats-Jump-Six-Point-Lead-Generic-Ballot.aspx). Forty-nine percent of those tested said they preferred a generic Democratic candidate for Congress while 43 percent said they would opt for a generic Republican. Democrats' six point margin represents a bump from the Gallup data earlier this month -- Democrat 47 percent, Republican 46 percent -- and **marks the first time that Democrats have had a statistically significant edge on the question so far this election cycle. The reason for Democrats' upward movement in the poll appears to be independent voters** where Republicans now hold a four point generic edge (43 percent to 39 percent), a major drop from Gallup polling earlier this month that showed the GOP with a 14-point margin.

Uniqueness – GOP Loses – Party Infighting

GOP won’t gain seats – party in-fighting and general ridiculosity

Schlesinger 7/28 (Robert, analyst. US News. http://politics.usnews.com/opinion/articles/2010/07/28/the-republicans-agenda-dilemma-in-the-2010-elections.html?PageNr=1) JM

To be or not to be, that is the question facing Republicans. With less than 100 days remaining until the midterm congressional elections, the GOP must decide whether it's smarter in politics to merely loose slings and arrows upon embattled Democrats or to take stands on a sea of issues and risk their presumed return to majority status. [See a slide show of 5 bad Republican policy ideas.] There is a struggle going on within the Republican Party's strategic class. On one side are the party's political consultants, who see an embattled Democratic president and congressional majority and advocate an unceasing offensive through November. The Washington Post reported earlier this month that some of the party's most influential consultants are urging their clients to, as the paper put it, "avoid issues at all costs." Why give the Democrats a target when they are busy being hoisted upon their own policy petards? On the other side are many current and former elected GOP leaders, like would-be Speaker John Boehner and former Speaker Newt Gingrich. Boehner plans to unveil in the fall a Contract With America-like agenda. Gingrich told the Post that the avoid-issues scheme was "mindless," adding that "consultants, in my opinion, are stupid." The editors of National Review Online were somewhat more diplomatic this week when they weighed in, favoring a clear agenda. "The consultants think Republicans risk putting targets on their backs by associating themselves with particular policy ideas," the editors wrote. "But Republicans will be targeted regardless. The White House wants to define them as mindless apostles of 'No,' and as 'Bush Republicans.'" [See who suports Boehner.] Indeed, there is nothing the Democrats would like more than to run against George W. Bush one last time. But even if the GOP can successfully avoid carrying a scarlet W through the fall, they have other definitional problems. If not the Party of W, they are at risk of becoming the Party of Tea. National Republican leaders fought a series of primary fight skirmishes over the last few months trying to avoid nominating a slate of Tea Party favored candidates whose kooky views could jeopardize (and have) GOP opportunities in November. Senate Majority Leader Harry Reid has toxic poll numbers, for example, but has still opened a lead against GOP nominee Sharron Angle. She is perhaps best known for her musings about "Second Amendment remedies" for a wayward Congress. [See who donated the most to Reid's campaign.] [Check out our editorial cartoons on the Tea Party.] Angle and Rand Paul (and, perhaps, Ken Buck, a Tea Partyer favored to win the right to face Colorado Democratic Sen. Michael Bennet) are all challengers, but they have allies in Congress. Loopy Minnesota Rep. Michele Bachmann (who once called on the media to investigate "anti-American" members of Congress) recently formed a House Tea Party Caucus. The new group's ranks include Louie Gohmert of Texas (who last year said hate crimes legislation would lead to Nazism and encourage bestiality and necrophilia) and Steve King of Iowa, who last year described gay marriage as a "purely socialist concept" and recently said that President Obama "favors the black person" over the white.

RNC scandals will make it hard for a GOP win

The Atlantic 7/22 (“RNC Chaos Threatens GOP Chances for House Takeover”) http://www.theatlantic.com/politics/archive/2010/07/rnc-chaos-threatens-gop-chances-for-house-takeover/60263/

The chaos at the Republican National Committee threatens to cost Republicans the chance to take control of the House of Representatives, Republican strategists fear. During midterm elections, the national committee plays two essential roles. First, it serves as a bank account that can be drawn upon to shore up House races or put others into play. Second, it coordinates the party's field operations and funds joint "Victory" committees with state parties. The RNC, at the moment, is barely fulfilling the second function and has less than $10 million on hand, so it cannot help much with House races.

Uniqueness – GOP Loses – Tea Parties

Dems win – the Tea Party is becoming synonymous with GOP and splitting the base Montopoli 7/28/10. (Democrats: Republican Party = Tea Party Movement. http://www.cbsnews.com/8301-503544\_162-20011956-503544.html).

The Democratic National Committee today unveiled a new initiative to brand the Republican Party as synonymous with the Tea Party movement. A DNC [document](http://my.democrats.org/page/content/tpgop) laid out what it says are the plans of the "Republican Tea Party," among them repealing the health care bill, privatizing Social Security, ending Medicare in its current form, extending the Bush tax cuts for the wealthy and abolishing the Departments of Education and Energy. They call the ten-point platform the "Republican Tea Party Contract on America." (Most Republicans do support repealing health care and extending the Bush tax cuts, though the other positions here have far more limited support within the party.) DNC Chair Tim Kaine pushed the initiative at a press conference today, saying "**the Republican Party agenda has become the tea party agenda, and vice versa." Democrats hope that by linking the Tea Party to the GOP they will convince moderate voters who might have considered voting Republican that the party is too extreme.**

Dems win – the Tea Party is becoming synonymous with GOP and splitting the base Montopoli 7/28/10. (Democrats: Republican Party = Tea Party Movement. http://www.cbsnews.com/8301-503544\_162-20011956-503544.html).

The Democratic initiative is designed to help blunt expected GOP gains in the November midterm elections. The name of their document, the "Republican Tea Party Contract on America," is meant to evoke memories of Republicans' 1994 "Contract With America" that helped the GOP win control of Congress. Republicans are planning a new version of that document before the November elections.  Minnesota Republican Rep. Michele Bachmann recently [started a Tea Party Caucus in the House](http://www.cbsnews.com/8301-503544_162-20011213-503544.html), which attracted 28 Republicans. Some members of the GOP appear to be wary of being linked too closely to the movement, though they hope to harness Tea Party enthusiasm in the midterms. A DNC official [told Politico](http://www.politico.com/playbook/0710/playbook1124.html) that "We are going to use this from now until the election as a pre-emptive strike against GOP's August rebranding effort, and as a response to the new contract we expect them to come out with this fall."

No Link – H-1B

No link – most Latino and immigration advocates don’t care about H-1B

Lawrence 10 (Stewart J. iView, Political Social - Article Ref: CP1001-4055. 21 Jan. http://www.iviews.com/articles/articles.asp?ref=CP1001-4055&p=1) JM

Obama needs support from high-tech businesses to promote his broader economic revitalization program, and in contrast to past years, these businesses have developed their own pro-immigration advocacy arm and are increasingly vocal. But except for labor, most other immigration advocates have not placed much emphasis on H-1B. That's in part because unlike unskilled agricultural workers, skilled engineers don't fit the public's image of the exploited "under-class." Moreover, since very few of these skilled workers are Latino, the main Latino advocacy groups don't see these workers as part of their ethnic constituency. But an increasing number of studies have shown that exploitation of the skilled foreign-born and the use of the H-1B program to displace American workers and depress native-born wages is a serious and growing problem. Sen. Bernie Sanders (I-VT), among others, has made H-1B a pet cause, and his vote will be needed to pass immigration reform, just as it was needed on health care reform, giving him and his labor allies significant leverage.

Link Turn – Immigration

Perception of the GOP changing their view on immigration is key to the election.

America’s Voice 10 (“The Power of the Latino Vote in the 2010 Elections: They Tipped Elections in 2008; Where Will They Be in 2010?” February 2010 http://amvoice.3cdn.net/8a3a480ea2c63e225c\_nzm6iyihr.pdf)

Similarly, the Republican Party has much to gain by engaging responsibly on comprehensive immigration reform. After multiple election cycles in which the GOP tried to use the immigration issue as a wedge to put Republican candidates over the top, it is time the Party learns that the anti‐immigrant forces driving this strategy are all bark and no bite. They might have sway in a few Republican primaries, but they do not win general elections, and they actually put moderate districts in play when the most extreme candidate wins the GOP primary. If the Republican Party were to change course on immigration, and allow for a diversity of opinion among its ranks, it would go a long way toward rehabilitating its image—not only with Latino voters, but with business‐oriented Republicans and Independent voters who want policymakers to offer practical solutions, not just heated rhetoric. As this report and NCLR’s analysis lay out, an important segment of the Latino vote is in play, and Republicans have a chance to reverse their steep decline if they get the issues right. In California, Latino support for Governor Arnold Schwarzenegger’s reelection campaign jumped from 31% in 2003 to 39% in 2006, after Schwarzenegger expressed support for comprehensive immigration reform and made a dedicated outreach effort to Latinos in the state.xv Failure to change their brand on immigration, however, will mean an increasing number of Congressional seats, statewide races, and entire segments of the Electoral College become out of reach for the GOP almost overnight.

Link Turn – Anti-Immigration Lobby

Anti-immigration lobby outweighs latino voters – short term gains.

Hohmann 5/14/10 (James, “Immigration Foes in High Demand”) <http://www.politico.com/news/stories/0510/37270.html>

A Wall Street Journal/NBC poll released Thursday suggested the short-term politics of the immigration debate strongly favor opponents of illegal immigration, with 64 percent of respondents saying they supported Arizona’s new law and just 34 percent saying they opposed it. And while Tancredo said he hasn’t noticed an uptick in the number of campaign requests he gets, Arpaio’s campaign manager said it’s a different story for the sheriff.

Link Turn – Unemployment

Plan would be a loss for Democrats – unemployment causes huge aversion to immigration.

Hornick 7/21/10 (Ed, “Democrats Agenda Running Out of Gas AS Midterms Approach”)

The reason? As the political phrase goes, "It's the economy stupid." With high unemployment and worries over the federal debt, other issues seem to pale in comparison. "Some may see immigration and energy as being very important but second to the issue of creating jobs," said Epstein, former chief minority counsel to the House Judiciary Committee. "It's always difficult to push through immigration reform. It's especially difficult to push through the reform when you're facing 10 percent unemployment." A CNN/Opinion Research Corp. poll released in May found that 42 percent of those surveyed said the economy was the most important issue facing the country today. Only 5 percent said that energy was a top issue; immigration didn't even make the list. In a June CNN/Opinion Research Corp. poll, 73 percent said things were going badly in the country; 27 percent said things were well. Those statistics are undoubtedly front and center for members of Congress as they head back home to campaign for November elections. The time for legislative work will likely be pushed to the side. For Democrats in close races, any work on controversial issues could hurt them in November.

In times of economic downturn and unemployment liberal immigration policies receive the most backlash

Moore 2 (Kathleen, “United We Stand”: American Attitudes Toward (Muslim) Immigration Post September-11th, The Muslim World, Volume 92, p. 39 Questia)

A long tradition of research on public attitudes toward immigration to the United States suggests that in periods when liberal immigration policy (permitting high levels of immigration) coincide with heightened concerns over unemployment and declining standards of living, an increasing proportion of the public becomes willing to pin the blame for economic woes on the nation's most recent immigrants.11 Some scholars explain this scapegoating phenomenon as "partly a response to the tendency of politicians and labor leaders to blame foreign workers for unemployment and downward pressure on wages."12 Yet other researchers have questioned the use of economic criteria as the primary explanation of mass attitudes toward immigrants and immigration. Social factors other than economic outlook, such as prejudice, political ideology, age, sex, and level of education, have all been shown to influence American attitudes toward immigration.13 Here I present preliminary results from the survey that will help us explore the influence of such social factors as familiarity (otherwise known as `direct experience') on attitudes toward immigration and certain immigrants. In other words, a hypothesis tested here is that there is an important connection between whether one is personally acquainted or familiar with immigrants and one's attitudes onimmigration policy and civil liberties. The public opinion data gathered in this survey can show the extent to which such variables as direct exposure to immigrants serve to explain attitudes in a highly controversial policy domain.

Link Turn – H5B

McCain Kennedy is massively unpopular

Koch 10 (Edward, “Opinion: Amnesty for Illegal Immigrants Should Fail”)  <http://www.aolnews.com/opinion/article/opinion-amnesty-for-illegal-immigrants-should-fail/19500219>.

Meanwhile, public office holders in Washington, D.C., who support immigration reform legislation also do so for political reasons (they think votes will come). And clergy, such as [Cardinal Roger Mahony](http://articles.latimes.com/2010/apr/20/local/la-me-0420-mahony-immigration-20100420) of California, support the cause of illegal immigrants as a matter of conscience. Both elements propose an amnesty and a pathway to citizenship. Depending on the source, that could affect [12 million](http://pewhispanic.org/reports/report.php?ReportID=94) to [20 million](http://www.freerepublic.com/focus/f-news/1424067/posts) illegal immigrants throughout the United States. But those, like myself, who oppose amnesty and citizenship believe the U.S. should not reward illegal immigration. To provide amnesty only encourages people to come here illegally, hoping we will continue what is becoming a tradition of amnesty being offered every 20 years or so. The last such amnesty was provided under the [Simpson-Mazzoli](http://www.oig.lsc.gov/legis/irca86.htm) legislation of 1986. Obama and Schumer know the American public is overwhelmingly against amnesty legislation, and when George W. Bush was leading the cause for it, an enraged public defeated two attempts by Congress to pass such legislation.

Plan would be a loss for democrats - Amnesty bill is massively unpopular

Welch 7 (Matt, “The Myth of the Maverick” October 9th 2007)

McCain had been largely AWOL from the immigration negotiations all year, after previously serving as the deal’s lead Republican champion. For the Arizona senator it was the worst of all possible worlds: his effort to get something done about a pressing national problem was being held up on a what he considered to be a niggling detail; and although he was no longer the Republican face on the deal--he’d sloughed that thankless duty off on his state-mate John Kyl. [Meanwhile, McCain] was still being hammered in the conservative media and the polls over the deeply unpopular “amnesty” bill.

McCain-Kennedy Bill was extremely controversial – empirically proven.

Perrotti (Dino, American Engineering Careers, March 20th 2007 “Round 5: H1-B Battle: McCain, Kennedy RETREAT! IEEE-USA offers Solution”)

Fearing political fallout, senior Senators McCain (R-AZ) and Kennedy (D-MA) retreated from the H-1B and Immigration Reform bill battlefield last week.  The McCain/Kennedy [coalition split](http://www.nytimes.com/2007/03/20/us/politics/20immig.html?ref=us)and opted not to release the immigration reform bill they've been working on.  McCain seemed frustrated with the endeavor and is also concerned about losing support from his conservative base in his bid for the Republican presidential candidacy.  Conservative voters are strongly against guest worker programs which, many feel, leads to amnesty for illegal aliens.  The H-1B program is not related to illegal immigration but it is growing into an equally controversal guest worker program with heavyweight opponents such as IEEE-USA, the AFL-CIO, the CWA and many others who are joining in as the immigration battle progresses. Kennedy gave up completely on developing any new ideas and has reverted to supporting the immigration reform bill version that the Senate proposed last year, an already anachronistic bill which is popular with large corporations butunpopular with the majority of voters. This is an exciting time in American history where politicians are stuck in the middle of a well-publicized tug of war between their campaign contributors and their voters.   At stake is no less than control of the soul of the country. When it comes to immigration, it seems that members of congress simply cannot appease their corporate supporters without risking losing their next election.  Sooner or later, both Houses will have to face the donnybrook and somehow come up with viable solutions for all parties.

Link Turn – H-1B (Labor)

H-1B visa expansion is massively unpopular with labor lobbies

Perotti 7 (Dino. Computer World, 20 March. http://blogs.computerworld.com/node/5208) JM

Fearing political fallout, senior Senators McCain (R-AZ) and Kennedy (D-MA) retreated from the H-1B and Immigration Reform bill battlefield last week. The McCain/Kennedy coalition split and opted not to release the immigration reform bill they've been working on. McCain seemed frustrated with the endeavor and is also concerned about losing support from his conservative base in his bid for the Republican presidential candidacy. Conservative voters are strongly against guest worker programs which, many feel, leads to amnesty for illegal aliens. The H-1B program is not related to illegal immigration but it is growing into an equally controversal guest worker program with heavyweight opponents such as IEEE-USA, the AFL-CIO, the CWA and many others who are joining in as the immigration battle progresses.

Labor is massively influential during elections – they’d shift support to the GOP

Lengell 8 (Sean. Washington Times, PLUGGED IN - POLITICS; B01. Ln) JM

The AFL-CIO and its affiliates collectively are expected to spend about $200 million this year on get-out-the-vote campaigns, issue ads and other election-related purposes favorable to Democratic-candidates. "This election for the American workers is terribly, terribly important," said former House Democratic Whip David Bonior, chairman of the labor advocacy group American Rights at Work. "Failure to elect a pro-worker majority [in Congress] for our nation will be a continued diminution of workers rights. Our laws already are stacked against workers rights in this country today." After decades of dwindling membership and stagnant political relevance, labor's influence on Capitol Hill rebounded when Democrats took control of Congress after the 2006 elections. With Democrats expected to make gains in both houses of Congress and possibly winning the White House in November, unions are gearing up for what could be their most productive era on Capitol Hill in decades. "A bigger Democratic majority and a Democratic president is an opportunity to address [our] issues and re-balance our economy," said Bill Samuel, director of government affairs with the AFL-CIO labor federation. Mr. Samuel said "there's a lot of pent-up energy" in the labor movement after it was forced to shelve much of its legislative agenda during the Republicans' 12 years in control of Congress, which ended last year. Labor's biggest potential legislative prize in decades is the Employee Free Choice Act, or "card check," a measure that would allow unions to form after getting a majority of employees to sign a card or petition. Unions and business advocates agree that the card-check measure, if passed, would dramatically enhance labor's ability to increase its membership. U.S. union membership has fallen from 35 percent of the work force in the mid-1950s to about 12 percent. Less than 8 percent of private-sector workers are in unions. Card-check legislation failed in Congress last year, but unions are pushing to get the proposal reintroduced next year. "This would be one of the most substantial updates to labor laws since the 1930s," said Josh Goldstein, a spokesman with American Rights at Work. "The deck has constantly been stacked toward corporations and business for decades, and the Employee Free Choice Act would go a long way toward evening the playing field." Other principal components of labor's legislative agenda include a nationalized health insurance program, an increase in family medical leave benefits, improved laws to make it easier for workers to bargain collectively and a moratorium on trade agreements with foreign governments. Pro-business groups acknowledge that labor's influence is a potential force not to be ignored. "We see a labor movement that is bolder, more aggressive and frankly more effective than we've seen in decades," said Steven J. Law, chief legal officer and general counsel with the U.S. Chamber of Commerce, a frequent union critic.

Link Turn – Terrorist Restrictions

Perceptions of weakness on terrorism will give the GOP the fire they need to win seats in the elections

Mcaulif 10 (Michael. NY Daily News, 4 January. http://www.nydailynews.com/blogs/dc/2010/01/gop-sees-a-changed-game.html) JM

Democrats may be accusing Republicans of politicizing the fight against terrorism, but in the eyes of the GOP, the Christmas underwear bomber is a political game-changer. Here’s how House GOP Whip Eric Cantor’s office put it this morning: “The first Monday of an “election” New Year finds the Administration and Democrats on Capitol Hill in a precarious situation. With Americans focused on terrorism and national security, will the Majority in Washington choose to unite across partisan lines to face our enemies and the serious threat head on? Will they emphasize security over a partisan, ideological agenda, by reconsidering the closing of GITMO, scrapping a job killing energy tax, and stopping a government takeover of health care that more than half of the country strongly objects to? Will they finally work together with Republicans on common-sense solutions to get our nation’s fiscal house in order and focus on creating an environment conducive to job creation? With the State of the Union address less than a month away, we will have the answers to these questions sooner rather than later.” We’re not sure that health care or financial regulation has much to do with a guy who stuffed an IED in his BVDs, but one premise here seems pretty sound to us — the Democrats are indeed in a precarious position. And the GOP would like the rest of the above conclusions to flow from that, or at least have the debate framed in those terms.

Empirically, Republicans will spin the plan as “pro-terrorist” mobilizing fears over national security to crush the Dems

Winship and Moyers 10. (Michael, senior writer of PBS’s public affairs program, Bill, PBS host. 3/9/10

http://www.middle-east-online.com/english/?id=37731)

Wilson and Zeleny make a compelling case for a 2006 remake with a role reversal. But in the end, I fear that another important - and sadly, fitting - comparison may be the 2002 midterms, the first big elections after 9/11. I use the word "fear" deliberately, for 2002 was the election year the Republicans first used the public's fear of terrorism and attendant homeland insecurities as a campaign issue. It was on Aug. 26, 2002, that Vice President Dick Cheney announced, "Simply stated, there is no doubt that Saddam Hussein now has weapons of mass destruction," and during the weeks leading up to the elections that President Bush insisted on the congressional vote authorizing the use of force against Iraq. You'll remember, too, that Condoleezza Rice stirred fantasies of smoking guns turning into mushroom clouds. It was also the year Georgia Republican Saxby Chambliss upended Democratic Senator Max Cleland's bid for re-election, impugning his patriotism and running a television ad with pictures of Osama bin Laden and Saddam Hussein that mischaracterized Cleland's votes against amendments to the bill creating the Department of Homeland Security. This year, Democrats may have been sufficiently snakebitten on the economy and health care - and now, corruption - without conservatives having to do much of anything else. But fear is their ace in the hole and they already are playing it with gusto. As in 2002, the current election cycle has featured a steady stream of attack and insinuation from Republicans that Democrats in Congress and this time, the Obama administration, have been soft on terrorism, despite a pretty solid record so far snagging terrorist suspects both here and abroad. Dick Cheney was on the offensive during a Feb. 14 interview on ABC's “This Week” and the following day his daughter Liz told Fox News, "There's simply no way that you can say that the president is using every tool at his disposal to fight and win this war."

Link Turn – Terror Restrictions

GOP would spin the plan as dems being weak on terrorism

Hunt 10 (Kasie. Politico, 19 Jan. http://www.politico.com/news/stories/0110/31659.html) JM

Senate Republicans have already laid out their line of attack in advance of the underwear bomber hearings Wednesday: They’re blaming President Barack Obama and saying he’s weak on terrorism. “Rewinding the clock to Sept. 10 will not deter Islamist militants. It will only embolden them,” Alabama Sen. Jeff Sessions, the top Republican on the Senate Judiciary Committee, said Tuesday. Sessions’s statement, released in advance of Wednesday’s Judiciary panel hearing, is a sign that Republicans are planning a broadside partisan attack as the formal congressional investigations get under way. FBI director Robert Mueller is scheduled to appear, as are officials from the State Department and the Department of Homeland Security. “In order to have dots to connect in the first place, we must fully equip our military and security agents with the tools they need. Unfortunately, the Obama administration has been stripping these tools away,” Sessions said. “They have given terrorists Miranda rights instead of tough interrogations and have shipped foreign war criminals to American communities for civilian trial.”

GOP will attack dems as being weak on terrorism

Neuman 10 (Johnathon. LA Times, 3 February. http://latimesblogs.latimes.com/washington/2010/02/xmas-day-bomber-now-talking-gop-criticism-withers.html) JM

Republicans were blistering in their criticism of the White House for reading the failed Christmas Day bomber his Miranda rights. Only Saturday, Maine's Susan Collins said Umar Farouq Abdulmuttalab, who tried to blow up a bomb during a flight to Detroit, was questioned by the FBI for only 50 minutes before he was informed he had the right to remain silent. It was a terrible mistake, she said in the Republican response to President Obama's weekly address, to "treat a foreign a terrorist who had tried to murder hundreds of people as if he were a common criminal." Now it turns out that the so-called underwear bomber was talking to FBI agents even as Collins, ranking member of the Senate Homeland Security Committee, was attacking the administration's handling of the case. The pivotal turning point in the case came when the administration flew the would-be bomber's family -- keep in mind his father tried to warn officials about his son's disturbing behavior even before the terrorist attack -- to the United States to persuade him to start talking again. As Ticket reported Tuesday, opinion on the Arab streets may be changing, in part because a new study shows that most of the victims of Al Qaeda's violence are not Westerners but Muslims. The administration also hit back at critics by reminding folks that the Bush administration used the criminal-justice system to convict more than 300 terrorists and that shoe-bomber Richard Reid was Mirandized within five minutes. None of this, of course, has stopped Republicans from blasting the administration for failures of intelligence that have plagued both the Bush and Obama administrations. Fox News offered this verdict: Team Obama got "really, really lucky."

Arizona changed everything. Lifting terrorist restrictions would be spun as anti-national security, crushing Democratic chances in the miderms

Sidoti 10. (Liz, staff writer. Huffington Post. http://www.huffingtonpost.com/2010/06/25/arizona-immigration-law-s\_n\_625338.html)

"What the Arizona law did tap into was the idea that we've got to control our borders," said Andrew Kohut, director of the nonpartisan Pew Research Center. "This law really galvanized public opinion on that one aspect of this issue." Politicians from President Barack Obama down find themselves again wrestling with a topic that's politically perilous for Republicans and Democrats alike, particularly in an election year and as both parties seek to court Hispanics, the nation's fastest-growing minority group. They have little choice. An Associated Press-GfK poll this month found that **85 percent of people now rank immigration as an important issue**. Every spoke in the wheel of American life is touched by it. **Porous borders and undocumented people have national security implications**. Foreign workers become an important part of the economy, filling low-paying jobs and possibly depressing wage scales in higher-paying ones. Schools, businesses and most other entities are forced to adapt to immigrant-swelled populations. Family, race and social norms also are at play.

Link Turn – Ext: Labor Matters

New York proves – Labor lobbies will be willing to black ball

Hernandez 10 (Raymond, Columnist, The New York Times, 3-26-2010, Sec. A, p. 23) AVL

The lawmakers were already confronting the difficult task of holding onto their seats in conservative swingdistricts and in midtermelections this year that may not bode well for Democrats. Now they are facing intense criticism from labor organizations and other Democratic constituency groups that are, in some cases, vowing to mount primary challenges against them. ''Bad votes have consequences,'' said Dan Cantor, executive director of the Working Families Party, which has emerged as perhaps the most influential third party in New York. The threat is significant enough that national party leaders, who are working to defend the party's House majority in the fall, are urging the groups to ratchet down the rhetoric. Representative Steve Israel of Long Island, the chief national recruiter of candidates for the Democratic Congressional Campaign Committee, warned that divisions in the party over health care could give Republicans an edge in the election.

Same labor group that swung conservatives to Obama are using their power for GOP to win in elections

Rucker 10 (Philip, National Political Reporter w/Yale bachelors, The Washington Post, 4-19-2010, Sec. A, p. A01) AVL

A political rebellion is brewing inside an old funeral home near the state Capitol here. Frustrated liberals and labor organizers are taking aim at the Democratic Party, rushing to gather enough signatures to start a third party that they believe could help oust three Democratic congressmen. Less than two years ago, this same funeral home was a command post for the grass-roots army that propelled [Barack Obama](http://www.lexisnexis.com.ezproxy1.lib.asu.edu/us/lnacademic/search/XMLCrossLinkSearch.do?bct=A&risb=21_T9849904483&returnToId=20_T9849923013&csi=8075&A=0.7347418010024093&sourceCSI=9369&indexTerm=%23PE000A0BO%23&searchTerm=Barack%20Obama%20&indexType=P)Barack to victory in this conservative swing state. Here is where supporters distributed signs and stickers, sorted lists of registered voters and rallied with a Johnny Cash cover band. Now, some of [Obama's supporters](http://www.lexisnexis.com.ezproxy1.lib.asu.edu/us/lnacademic/search/XMLCrossLinkSearch.do?bct=A&risb=21_T9849904483&returnToId=20_T9849923013&csi=8075&A=0.7347418010024093&sourceCSI=9369&indexTerm=%23PE000A0BO%23&searchTerm=Obama's%20supporters%20&indexType=P)Obama's supporters  -Search using:[Biographies Plus News](http://www.lexisnexis.com.ezproxy1.lib.asu.edu/us/lnacademic/search/XMLCrossLinkSearch.do?bct=A&risb=21_T9849904483&returnToId=20_T9849923013&csi=8075&A=0.7347418010024093&sourceCSI=9369&indexTerm=%23PE000A0BO%23&searchTerm=Obama's%20supporters%20&indexType=P) are mounting a defiant strike against the president's party. The nascent third party, North Carolina First, could endanger the Democratic congressional majority by siphoning votes from incumbent Democrats in November's midterm election, potentially enabling Republican challengers to pick up the seats.

AT: Immigration Key

Immigration not key – fragmented Latino voters and other issues like unemployment, the economy, and healthcare outweigh

Kim 7/30/10. Mallie Jane, US News Politics & Policy. http://politics.usnews.com/news/articles/2010/07/30/arizona-immigration-ruling-has-little-impact-on-elections.html)

But analysts doubt the Arizona controversy will make much of a political splash in elections farther from Mexico's border. **National campaigns are focused on unemployment, the economy, taxes, and healthcare, and it's unlikely immigration will overcome these as a key campaign issue**. But Pineda says candidates should be aware of how their stance on immigration will affect the Latino vote. A recent CNN-Opinion Research Corporation national poll **suggests Hispanic voters are not unanimous in their view of immigration polic**y. Twenty-four percent of Hispanics polled favor Arizona's law. The poll also shows 65 percent of Hispanic voters favor increased law enforcement at the U.S. border with Mexico, 31 percent favor a 700-mile long border fence, and 94 percent want a program to allow illegal immigrants already in the U.S. to apply to stay legally.

Impact – **AT: Israel**

No attacks onIran in the status quo

Williams 10 (Dan, 1/31/10, Reuters, “Israel "responsible" on Iran, Obama adviser says,” http://www.reuters.com/article/idUSTRE60U1AL20100131) GAT

Israel and the United States are closely conferring about the Iranian nuclear program, U.S. National Security Adviser Jim Jones said in an interview published Sunday, calling Israel's conduct "responsible." Western governments fear that Iran wants to produce nuclear weapons but Tehran says the program is for peaceful purposes. Iran has vowed to respond to any unilateral Israeli strike over the nuclear program. The five permanent Security Council members -- the United States, Britain, France, Russia and China -- along with Germany have been negotiating with Iran, but U.S. officials say drafts of possible sanctions should circulate among the group soon. Jones said the United States and Israel are in close coordination over how to handle Iran. "We have very good dialogue with Israel, continual dialogue," he told The Jerusalem Post. "We're working very closely with them." Asked whether Washington was concerned about Israel trying to take on its arch-foe alone, Jones said: "Our Israeli partners are very responsible." Michael Oren, Israel's envoy to the United States, said last month the military option "was not a subject of discussion."

Prolif slow – no incentive to develop

Waltz 0 (Kenneth, Prof of Poli Sci @ UC Berkeley, Georgetown Journal of International Affairs, V1 N1, Winter/Spring 2000, http://www.ciaonet.org/olj/gjia/gjia\_winspr00f.html)

It is now estimated that about twenty–five countries are in a position to make nuclear weapons rather quickly. Most countries that could have acquired nuclear military capability have refrained from doing so. Most countries do not need them. Consider Argentina, Brazil, and South Africa. Argentina and Brazil were in the process of moving toward nuclear military capability, and both decided against it–wisely I believe–because neither country needs nuclear weapons. South Africa had about half a dozen warheads and decided to destroy them. You have to have an adversary against whom you think you might have to threaten retaliation, but most countries are not in this position. Germany does not face any security threats–certainly not any in which a nuclear force would be relevant. I would expect the pattern of the past to be the same as the pattern in the future, in which one or two states per decade gradually develop nuclear weapons.

Prolif will be slow – predictions of fast prolif are overblown.

Gavin 9 (“Same As It Ever Was” Francis J. International Affairs @ University of Texas at Austin, *International Security*, Vol. 34, No. 3 Winter http://www.mitpressjournals.org/doi/pdf/10.1162/isec.2010.34.3.7)

In his analysis of more than sixty years of failed efforts to accurately predict nuclear proliferation, analyst Moeed Yusuf concludes that “the pace of prolif- eration has been much slower than anticipated by most.” The majority of countries suspected of trying to obtain a nuclear weapons capability “never even came close to crossing the threshold. In fact, most did not even initiate a weapons program.” If all the countries that were considered prime suspects over the past sixty years had developed nuclear weapons, “the world would have at least 19 nuclear powers today.”44 As Potter and Mukhatzhanova argue, government and academic experts frequently “exaggerated the scope and pace of nuclear weapons proliferation.”45

Impact Turn – Israel

If Israel attacks Iran, a rapidly escalating war would break out in the Middle East and would engulf all the great powers

Trabanco 9 (Jose M. A., writer for Global Research, <http://www.globalresearch.ca/index.php?context=va&aid=11762>)

In case of an Israeli and/or American attack against Iran, Ahmadinejad's government will certainly respond. A possible countermeasure would be to fire Persian ballistic missiles against Israel and maybe even against American military bases in the regions. Teheran will unquestionably resort to its proxies like Hamas or Hezbollah (or even some of its Shiite allies it has in Lebanon or Saudi Arabia) to carry out attacks against Israel, America and their allies, effectively setting in flames a large portion of the Middle East. The ultimate weapon at Iranian disposal is to block the Strait of Hormuz. If such chokepoint is indeed asphyxiated, that would dramatically increase the price of oil, a very threatening retaliation because it will bring intense financial and economic havoc upon the West, which is already facing significant trouble in those respects. In short, the necessary conditions for a major war in the Middle East are given. Such conflict could rapidly spiral out of control and thus a relatively minor clash could quickly and dangerously escalate by engulfing the whole region and perhaps even beyond. There are many key players: the Israelis, the Palestinians, the Arabs, the Persians and their respective allies and some great powers could become involved in one way or another (America, Russia, Europe, China). Therefore, any miscalculation by any of the main protagonists can trigger something no one can stop. Taking into consideration that the stakes are too high, perhaps it is not wise to be playing with fire right in the middle of a powder keg.

Mideast war escalates and goes nuclear

Steinbach 2 (John, Hiroshima/Nagasaki Peace Committee, March 2002, http://www.wagingpeace.org/articles/02.03/0331steinbachisraeli.htm)

Meanwhile, the existence of an arsenal of mass destruction in such an unstable region in turn has serious implications for future arms control and disarmament negotiations, and even the threat of nuclear war. Seymour Hersh warns, "Should war break out in the Middle East again,... or should any Arab nation fire missiles against Israel, as the Iraqis did, a nuclear escalation, once unthinkable except as a last resort, would now be a strong probability."(41) and Ezar Weissman, Israel's current President said "The nuclear issue is gaining momentum (and the) next war will not be conventional."(42) Russia and before it the Soviet Union has long been a major (if not the major) target of Israeli nukes. It is widely reported that the principal purpose of Jonathan Pollard's spying for Israel was to furnish satellite images of Soviet targets and other super sensitive data relating to U.S. nuclear targeting strategy. (43) (Since launching its own satellite in 1988, Israel no longer needs U.S. spy secrets.) Israeli nukes aimed at the Russian heartland seriously complicate disarmament and arms control negotiations and, at the very least, the unilateral possession of nuclear weapons by Israel is enormously destabilizing, and dramatically lowers the threshold for their actual use, if not for all out nuclear war. In the words of Mark Gaffney, "... if the familar pattern(Israel refining its weapons of mass destruction with U.S. complicity) is not reversed soon - for whatever reason - the deepening Middle East conflict could trigger a world conflagration." (44).

Impact – AT: Health Care

GOP takeover doesn’t kill health care reform – they won’t take the risk of stopping funding

Chait 10 (Jonathan Chait, The New Republic, 3-19-10, http://www.tnr.com/blog/jonathan-chait/could-republicans-repeal-health-care-reform)

Mitt Romney lays out his plan to repeal Romneycare... I mean, Obamacare: The key, he said, is having Republicans reclaim the White House and take majorities in the Senate and the House. Then, "we can clamp down on this bill ... by not funding it," Romney said during a speech Thursday I think Romney is just trying to cover his tracks and protect himself from the inevitable, true Republican primary attacks that he enacted a health care plan similar to Obama's, except more left-wing in the sense that it lacked the long-term cost controls. But he's still laying out the closest thing to a plausible Republican legislative plan to repeal health care reform should it be enacted into law. The problem with repealing health care reform is the filibuster -- Republicans would need 60 votes to undo the exchanges, regulations on things like preexisting conditions, and the individual mandate. But they could use budget reconciliation, which just needs a majority, to undo the tax credits and Medicaid expansion that make coverage affordable. (Even though using reconciliation to undo a major reform would be unprecedented!) The question is, could they really pull that off? First, you're doing a lot of pretty unpopular things -- yanking coverage away from people, raising taxes on the middle class. You'll have news stories about people whose lives are about to be ruined by the GOP. Second, if you do pass that, then you've started to unravel the system. You'll have a Republican administration and Congress presiding over a policy meltdown that, among other things, will raise enormous ire among insurers, doctors, hospitals, and others who will take a huge hit because they'll be flooded with patients who they have to treat or but can't pay the cost. So you're just setting things up for the Democrats to reinstate the subsidies when they take back power, which would become more likely if the GOP has deliberately caused a health care disaster.

Impact Turn – Healthcare

Repealing healthcare will kill US economic recovery by hampering small businesses

Cutler 7/23 (David M., professor of economics @ Harvard. Center for American Progress. http://www.americanprogress.org/issues/2010/07/small\_biz\_reform.html) JM

The conservative effort to repeal the new health care law will hit small businesses hard and severely affect their ability to be the “engines of the economy.” Firms with fewer than 500 employees accounted for 64 percent, or 14.5 million, of the 22.5 million net new jobs created between 1993 and the third quarter of 2008. The Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act, combined with the jobs bill, will help reduce the current cost burdens on small firms and their workers. These proposed reforms will encourage entrepreneurial activity by increasing the incentives for talented Americans to launch or expand their own companies, and they will increase the pool of workers willing to work at small firms. And small businesses will benefit in particular from reductions in absenteeism and improvements in worker productivity resulting from better health outcomes due to expanded access to health insurance coverage. It’s critical to drive these reforms forward at a time when unemployment is high and the economy is still faltering. We can’t afford to step back. This push for repeal highlights opponents’ willingness to put politics ahead of supporting small business and ensuring the health of Americans who are small business employees.

Healthcare is key to reducing the deficit – economic recovery would be impossible if healthcare were repealed

Cutler 6/30 (David M., professor of economics @ Harvard. Center for American Progress. http://www.americanprogress.org/issues/2010/06/cbo\_health.html) JM

The Congressional Budget Office came out with its long-term fiscal projections today. The headline was grim: The federal budget is substantially out of balance over the long term. This is not news. There is no way to absorb the Bush administration’s reckless tax cuts and two wars paid for on credit, prevent a depression, prepare for an aging population, and finance higher medical spending without something having to give. Yet the health care story beyond the aggregate headline is more interesting. The much maligned, supposedly budget-busting Affordable Care Act will actually reduce the deficit substantially. The CBO estimates budget savings of $143 billion in the next decade and more than $1 trillion in the subsequent decade. Score one for fiscal responsibility. That by itself is not enough. Health care costs will continue to increase even under the CBO’s assumptions about the Affordable Care Act, putting pressure on the budget. There are two reasons for this. Population aging is the first factor, which is inevitable absent dramatic increases in fertility or immigration. It results in part from advances in medical care. When you save people from death, those survivors need more resources. We have to decide as a society how to pay for this. The second factor in rising spending is the inexorable expansion of medical treatments. Medical spending growth has historically been attributable in great part to the development and diffusion of new ways of treating people. Cancer used to be a (cheap) death sentence. Now it is thankfully less fatal, and also much more expensive. The CBO assumes this will continue—as well it should. Medical care is by and large valuable, even if we need to figure out how to direct it in the right way. What CBO misses is a third factor: changes in the organization of medical care to increase its value and reduce its cost. Health industry leaders and experts are in agreement that improving quality and lowering costs in our health care system will require bringing health care into the information age, reforming health insurance markets, learning what works, and rewarding health care providers accordingly. The goal of the Affordable Care Act is to extend efficiency measures throughout the medical system. It does this in several ways: by measuring the quality of different providers and disseminating that widely, and by moving toward payment systems that reward more efficient care and away from systems that reward greater volume of care.

Impact – AT: Warming

A democratic climate bill will fall short of the sweeping changes needed to solve warming

Espo 7/17/10. (David. AP’s chief congressional correspondent. http://www.google.com/hostednews/ap/article/ALeqM5jjo1f4e2HDTVBvFWmUZa4NnDtmxAD9H0LU0G0).

**With less than four months remaining until the elections and a lame-duck session of Congress likely this fall,** Obama is on track to win confirmation for Elena Kagan to the Supreme Court, his second pick in two years. An extension of unemployment benefits is all but certain. Democrats hope to overturn the Pentagon policy against gays serving openly in the military. **Reid intends to seek passage of a slimmed-down energy bill that includes greater liability for BP in the oil spill in the Gulf of Mexico. But even if it passes, it will fall far short of the sweeping plan Obama outlined to control carbon emissions.** That's one of the 345 stalled measures on the House list, and one that some rank-and-file moderates would like to have back. Democrats may also yet attempt to roll back tax cuts from the Bush era that benefit those at the highest income level.

Impacts to warming will be minimal – disaster claims are all rhetoric

**Walter 7** (Christopher, Former policy advisor of Margaret Thatcher while she was Prime Minister, “Consensus? What Consensus?” Science and Public Policy Institute, June, http://scienceandpublicpolicy.org/images/stories/papers/monckton/consensus.pdf, AD: 6/29/09)

It is often said that there is a scientific “consensus” to the effect that climate change will be “catastrophic” and that, on this question, “the debate is over”. The present paper will demonstrate that the claim of unanimous scientific “consensus” was false, and known to be false, when it was first made; that the trend of opinion in the peer-reviewed journals and even in the UN’s reports on climate is moving rapidly away from alarmism; that, among climate scientists, the debate on the causes and extent of climate change is by no means over; and that the evidence in the peer-reviewed literature conclusively demonstrates that, to the extent that there is a “consensus”, that “consensus” does not endorse the notion of “catastrophic” climate change. The origin of the claim of “consensus” avid Miliband, the Environment Minister of the United Kingdom, was greeted by cries of “Rubbish!” when he told a conference on climate change at the Holy See in the spring of 2007 that the science of climate and carbon dioxide was simple and settled. Yet Miliband was merely reciting a mantra that has been widely peddled by politicians such as Al Gore and political news media such as the BBC, which has long since abandoned its constitutional obligation of objectivity on this as on most political subjects, and has adopted a policy of not allowing equal air-time to opponents of the imagined “consensus”. The claim of “consensus” rests almost entirely on an inaccurate and now-outdated singlepage comment in the journal Science entitled The Scientific Consensus on Climate Change (Oreskes, 2004). In this less than impressive “head-count” essay, Naomi Oreskes, a historian of science with no qualifications in climatology, defined the “consensus” in a very limited sense, quoting as follows from IPCC (2001) – “Human activities … are modifying the concentration of atmospheric constituents … that absorb or scatter radiant energy. … most of the observed warming over the last 50 years is likely to have been due to the increase in greenhouse gas concentrations.”

Warming is dead—solar hibernations

**SSRC 9** (Space and Science Research Center, 2009, John Casey [former consultant to NASA, space shuttle engineer, military missile and computer systems officer; BS in physics and mathematics], http://www.spaceandscience.net/id16.html)

According to Center Director John Casey, “The climate change predictions which I started to pass out to our government and media in early 2007 based upon the ‘RC Theory’ have now come to pass, exactly as forecast. Global warming has ended, conclusively, as predicted. The Earth’s average temperature has begun its steep decline within the time frame I said it would. And last but not least, the Sun has entered a state of ‘hibernation’ when I said it would. This new solar period is one of the most amazing events in the history of science. During solar hibernations, the Sun makes significant reductions in output which always, always, brings long cold climates to the Earth. Unbelievably, this historic phenomena is still largely and intentionally unreported by the media and our leaders and therefore unknown by the American people. The new cold climate will usher in global travail that will be amplified specifically because of the catastrophic climate change policies of the administration of President Barack Obama that will leave most citizens unprepared.”

Impact – AT: Warming

Nuclear war outweighs – faster time frame and makes warming worse

**Byner 6** [Jeanna, Live Science Staff Writer, Dec 11, “Small Nuclear War Would Cause Global Environmental Catastrophe,” http://www.livescience.com/forcesofnature/061211\_nuclear\_climate.html]

A small-scale, regional nuclear war could disrupt the global climate for a decade or more, with environmental effects that could be devastating for everyone on Earth, researchers have concluded. The scientists said about 40 countries possess enough plutonium or uranium to construct substantial nuclear arsenals. Setting off a Hiroshima-size weapon could cause as many direct fatalities as all of World War II. "Considering the relatively small number and size of the weapons, the effects are surprisingly large," said one of the researchers, Richard Turco of the University of California, Los Angeles. "The potential devastation would be catastrophic and long term." The lingering effects could re-shape the environment in ways never conceived. In terms of climate, a nuclear blast could plunge temperatures across large swaths of the globe. **"**It would be the largest climate change in recorded human history**,"** Alan Robock, associate director of the Center for Environmental Prediction at Rutgers' Cook College and another member of the research team. The results will be presented here today during the annual meeting of American Geophysical Union. Blast fatalities In one study, scientists led by Owen "Brian" Toon of the University of Colorado, Boulder, analyzed potential fatalities based on current nuclear weapons inventories and population densities in large cities around the world. His team focused on the black smoke generated by a [nuclear blast](http://www.livescience.com/technology/060613_nuclear_bomb.html) and firestorms—intense and long-lasting fires that create and sustain their own wind systems.  For a regional conflict, fatalities would range from 2.6 million to 16.7 million per country. "A small country is likely to direct its weapons against population centers to maximize damage and achieve the greatest advantage," Toon said. Chilled climate With the information, Robock and colleagues generated a series of computer simulations of potential climate anomalies caused by a small-scale nuclear war. "We looked at a scenario of a regional nuclear conflict say between India and Pakistan where each of them used 50 weapons on cities in the other country that would generate a lot of smoke," Robock told LiveScience. They discovered the smoke emissions would plunge temperatures by about 2 degrees Fahrenheit (1.25 degrees Celsius) over large areas of North America and Eurasia—areas far removed from the countries involved in the conflict. Typically when [sunlight](http://www.livescience.com/environment/050505_earth_bright.html) travels through the atmosphere, some rays get absorbed by particles in the air, before reaching Earth's surface. After a nuclear blast, however, loads of black smoke would settle into the upper atmosphere and absorb [sunlight](http://www.livescience.com/forcesofnature/060124_earth_albedo.html) before it reaches our planet's surface. Like a dark curtain pulled over large parts of the globe, the smoke would cause cool temperatures, darkness, less precipitation and even [ozone depletion](http://www.livescience.com/environment/060928_ozone_upate.html). At the end of the 10 years, the simulated [climate](http://www.livescience.com/weather/) still hadn't recovered.  Global upshot The study showed it doesn't take much [nuclear power](http://www.livescience.com/technology/ap_050523_sun_laser.html) to drive meteoric results. Whereas the scenarios presumed the countries involved would launch their entire nuclear arsenals, that total is just three-hundredths of a percent of the global arsenal. Will the conclusions result in worldly changes? "We certainly hope there will be a political response because nuclear weapons are the most dangerous potential environmental danger to the planet. They're much more dangerous than global warming," Robock said.

Impact Turn – Warming

Democratic agenda is key to fighting climate change – GOP victory will kill US action for years and will send a signal of inaction to other high-polluting countries

The Economist 7/29 (“Capped” http://www.economist.com/node/16693293?story\_id=16693293&fsrc=rss) JM

NO ONE expected a bang; but the idea of a cap on America’s carbon emissions died with barely the bathos of a whimper. Despite months of legislative fiddle piled on procedural faddle, no one ever drafted a bill with a carbon cap, and the sort of trading system necessary for industry to meet its demands, that stood a chance on the Senate floor. So the majority leader, Harry Reid, finally decided the whole issue should be quietly flushed away (see article). With the mid-term elections sure to swing heavily away from Mr Reid’s Democrats, there is now no possibility of comprehensive climate-change legislation in America for years. Given the murkiness of some of the bathwater involved (maybe we’ll let you have a little cap and trade if you’ll let us go on emitting neurotoxic mercury, said the electric utilities), it is easy to lose track of the attractions of the baby. America is the largest per-person emitter of carbon dioxide among the world’s big economies, and the second-largest emitter overall. If the risks of global damage through climate change are to be reduced, America’s emissions need to come under some sort of control, both because of what they do to the climate and because of the message such control would send to the world’s other large emitters—and in particular to China, the largest. In his election campaign, Barack Obama spoke enthusiastically of a cap-and-trade scheme; so did his opponent, John McCain. But Mr Obama never made it a high priority, and Mr McCain, back in the Senate, maintained a sulky silence on the subject. Opposition by the Republican minority marked a triumph of politics over policy: some Republicans recognise the risks of climate change and the appeal of cap and trade. But it was Democrats who killed the bill. Over to the EPA A significant number of Democrats from states dependent on coal would not vote for cap and trade when the economy was weak and tight elections loomed. Pressure from their voters could have swayed them; but public support for climate action, though fairly broad, is rarely deep. In its absence the blandishments of a well-funded environmental lobby, the sporadic half-throated encouragement of the White House and the not entirely convincing rhetoric on green jobs from their colleagues on the left could not shift them. To hope that a tranche of Republicans might make good the numbers when a block of Democrats wouldn’t was to ask far too much of principle in a polarised political atmosphere. America’s emissions will not go unabated. The Environmental Protection Agency is now legally required to act on carbon dioxide. Utilities will be obliged to buy renewable energy and encouraged to build nuclear plants. But such progress will be modest, ill co-ordinated and inefficiently won, while also drawing on the public purse. One of the attractions of cap and trade was that it raised money which might be spent on measures such as grid improvements and the development and deployment of new research: some technology push to make market pull go farther. Much of this would have been pork-barrel spending, but at least the cap-and-trade system brought in its own pork; energy-only bills do not. Damage will also be done to the momentum of international negotiations and America’s leadership role within them—weak sisters to begin with. When America helped to broker the Copenhagen accord last year, its aim was to level the playing field between rich countries that made commitments and poor ones that didn’t. Offering no legislative commitment at all rather makes a mockery of that goal.

GOP victory in November will destroy the effort to battle warming

AFP 7/27 (Agence France Presse. http://www.google.com/hostednews/afp/article/ALeqM5h5Y27wkmrNTgKgY7Fkj2tHMSWsLw) JM

"That legislation is an important step in the right direction," said Obama, of a bill which focuses on the aftermath of the BP oil spill in the Gulf of Mexico and developing alternative energy projects. "But I want to emphasize it's only the first step and I intend to keep pushing for broader reform, including climate legislation." Obama said the Gulf oil spill had shown that current US energy policy was "unsustainable," adding the United States could not stand by and let China create the clean energy jobs of the future. "We should be developing those renewable energy resources and creating those high-wage, high-skill jobs right here in the United States of America. "That's what comprehensive energy and climate reform would do, and that's why I intend to keep pushing this issue forward." Obama's Democratic allies last week acknowledged they lacked votes to approve the first-ever US plan restricting carbon emissions blamed for global warming and shelved the legislation. With Republicans hoping for big gains in November's congressional polls, the move may mean the end of carbon capping legislation for the foreseeable future, dealing a blow to the global effort to battle warming. The president also called on Republicans to drop their policy of blanket opposition to his agenda by backing a bill that would offer incentives for small businesses to create jobs. "We shouldn't let America's small businesses be held hostage to partisan politics, and certainly not at this critical time." Obama, who will this week step up his political campaigning ahead of mid-term elections in November, warned lawmakers should ignore "chatter" about politics and polls and honor their commitments to voters. "The folks we serve... they sent us here for a reason. They sent us here to listen to their voices, they sent us here to represent their interests, not our own." Later, Senate Democratic Majority Leader Harry Reid unveiled legislation, dubbed the Clean Energy Jobs and Oil Accountability Act, aimed at boosting the use of "green" energy and encourage energy efficiency.

Impact – AT: GOP Solves Econ

**GOP strategy is fundamentally anti-Dems – they have no tangible plans or legislation to solve the economy**

Green 7/19/10. (Joshua, senior editor of The Atlantic. http://www.theatlantic.com/politics/archive/2010/07/has-the-gop-hit-a-wall/59987/).

That said, one reason for my reluctance to fully embrace the Armageddon-for-Democrats scenario has to do with the rhythms of how the media cover the two parties, and how I expected them, at some point, to change. When a single party holds power, that party appropriately tends to be the focus of attention. But when the possibility that the other party might take over becomes real--and we're certainly at that point--the attention starts to shift. This always struck me as a potential problem. I don't really imagine that Republicans plan to repeal health care or the new financial regulations (although, who knows?). But they haven't offered up much in the way of a compelling alternative agenda. This shortcoming was on glaring display yesterday when two top Republicans, Pete Sessions and John Cornyn, appeared on "Meet the Press." As MSNBC's "First Read" team [pointed out](http://firstread.msnbc.msn.com/_news/2010/07/19/4706078-first-thoughts-bush-vs-obama-by-proxy) this morning: Over the course of several minutes, both Sessions and Cornyn were unable or unwilling to discuss what Republicans would specifically do on the deficit, etc., if they take back control of Congress. Sessions said that the GOP would: 1) ensure that the government live within its means, and 2) read the actual legislation. But when NBC's David Gregory demanded specifics and details of painful choices Republicans were willing to make, Sessions didn't offer a single one. I'd go even further and characterize the Republicans' inability to answer the question as being similar in nature to Ted Kennedy's devastating inability in 1980 to explain to Roger Mudd why he wanted to be president. Obviously, the scale of the two examples is not quite the same. Anger at Democrats and the White House may well be strong enough that they're in for major losses regardless. But if Republicans can't find a way to answer Gregory's question, and soon--and I can't think what that answer would be--then I'd expect their gains to be on the lower end of the prognosticators' estimates. And that might not be enough to capture the House or the Senate.

Impact Turn – Economy

Democratic majority is key to sustained economic recovery – republican policies of deregulation would destroy the economy

Olsen 10 (Ole, journalist. News Junkie Post, 14 May. http://newsjunkiepost.com/2010/05/14/the-2010-midterms-what-if-the-democrats-win/) JM

Health care reform was passed. This is not the only legislative accomplishment either. The US House under the leadership of Nancy Pelosi has also passed the stimulus bill, cap and trade, and wall street reform, as well as a host of other important reforms. Despite the unprecedented obstruction, this demonstrates the willingness to change the course of the country. There are positive indicators on the road to economic recovery as well. If the current job growth trends continue, more jobs will be created in 2010 than during the entire Bush presidency. Finally, the emotional scars of what the Republicans did during their time in power under Bush are still too fresh. Conservative economic philosophy under their leadership, in particular the culture of unbridled corporate greed and governmental deregulation that took place led us to the brink of collapse, causing the Great Recession and millions of jobs losses. Conservative foreign policy showed the country the Republicans will flat out lie to their faces to illegally invade a foreign country, which cost an enormous fortune, destroyed our national reputation, and made the country less safe. Conservative domestic policy brought us domestic espionage, ‘love it or leave it’, and a continual erosion of civil liberties.

The economy does better under democrats – history proves

Perr 7/21/10 (Jon, “GOP Leaders Remind Voters The Economy Does Better Under Democrats”)

That refrain is music to Democratic ears. After all, a recent [Time poll](http://thinkprogress.org/2010/07/15/bush-miss-poll/) showed Americans not only prefer President Obama over Bush by a twenty-point margin, but blame Dubya for the economic disaster 61% to 27%. Last week's [Washington Post-ABC survey](http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-srv/politics/polls/postpoll_07132010.html) revealed a staggering 73% have some or no confidence in Republicans' ability to make the right decisions for the country's future. And by a 42% to 34% margin, the public still trusts Democrats to do a better job handling the economy. But the larger truth about the free enterprise system trumpeted by Pete Sessions is this:

When it comes to GDP, employment, the stock market or just about any other measure of the health of American capitalism, the historical record is clear: the economy almost always [does better under Democrats](http://www.perrspectives.com/blog/archives/001448.htm).

More evidence – GOP hurts the economy

Perr 7/21/10 (Jon, “GOP Leaders Remind Voters The Economy Does Better Under Democrats”)

For the investor class so fond of perpetuating the myth of Republicans' superior economic stewardship, the collapse of the stock marketing during [the Bush recession](http://www.perrspectives.com/blog/archives/001313.htm) must be particularly galling. The Standard & Poor's 500 spiraled down at annual rate of 5.6% during Bush's time in the Oval Office, a disaster even worse than Richard Nixon's abysmal 4.0% yearly decline. (Only Herbert Hoover's cataclysmic 31% plunge makes Bush look good in comparison.)

As it turns out, as the New York Times also [showed in October 2008](http://www.nytimes.com/interactive/2008/10/14/opinion/20081014_OPCHART.html), the Democratic Party "has been better for American pocketbooks and capitalism as a whole." To make its case, the New York Times asked readers to imagine having put their money where its mouth is. Contrary to [Republican mythology](http://www.perrspectives.com/blog/archives/001207.htm), Americans fare better - much, much better - under Democratic administrations:

As of Friday, a $10,000 investment in the S.& P. stock market index would have grown to $11,733 if invested under Republican presidents only, although that would be $51,211 if we exclude Herbert Hoover's presidency during the Great Depression. Invested under Democratic presidents only, $10,000 would have grown to $300,671 at a compound rate of 8.9 percent over nearly 40 years.

Impact – AT: Prolif

Prolif slow – no incentive to develop

Waltz 0 (Kenneth, Prof of Poli Sci @ UC Berkeley, Georgetown Journal of International Affairs, V1 N1, Winter/Spring 2000, http://www.ciaonet.org/olj/gjia/gjia\_winspr00f.html)

It is now estimated that about twenty–five countries are in a position to make nuclear weapons rather quickly. Most countries that could have acquired nuclear military capability have refrained from doing so. Most countries do not need them. Consider Argentina, Brazil, and South Africa. Argentina and Brazil were in the process of moving toward nuclear military capability, and both decided against it–wisely I believe–because neither country needs nuclear weapons. South Africa had about half a dozen warheads and decided to destroy them. You have to have an adversary against whom you think you might have to threaten retaliation, but most countries are not in this position. Germany does not face any security threats–certainly not any in which a nuclear force would be relevant. I would expect the pattern of the past to be the same as the pattern in the future, in which one or two states per decade gradually develop nuclear weapons.

Prolif will be slow – predictions of fast prolif are overblown

Gavin 9 (“Same As It Ever Was” Francis J. International Affairs @ University of Texas at Austin, *International Security*, Vol. 34, No. 3 Winter http://www.mitpressjournals.org/doi/pdf/10.1162/isec.2010.34.3.7)

In his analysis of more than sixty years of failed efforts to accurately predict nuclear proliferation, analyst Moeed Yusuf concludes that “the pace of prolif- eration has been much slower than anticipated by most.” The majority of countries suspected of trying to obtain a nuclear weapons capability “never even came close to crossing the threshold. In fact, most did not even initiate a weapons program.” If all the countries that were considered prime suspects over the past sixty years had developed nuclear weapons, “the world would have at least 19 nuclear powers today.”44 As Potter and Mukhatzhanova argue, government and academic experts frequently “exaggerated the scope and pace of nuclear weapons proliferation.”45

Impact Turn – START (Prolif)

Ratification gives credibility necessary to stop proliferation

**Blank 9** (Stephen, Strategic Studies Institute expert on the Soviet bloc and post-Soviet world. March. http://www.strategicstudiesinstitute.army.mil/pdffiles/PUB908.pdf) JM

Accordingly, from Moscow's standpoint, trends in this bilateral relationship exercise a profound and fundamental influence upon the entire world order. Neither is this exclusively a Russian view. For example, Stephen Cimbala, a long-time analyst of the bilateral strategic relationship of U.S. and Russian military policies, writes that this relationship is one of complex interaction that relates to the strategic agenda of NATO and to the question not just of nuclear force structures among the superpowers, but also of global proliferation issues. This connection between the major nuclear powers' self-restraint and even downsizing of their arsenals and the viability and durability of the Nonproliferation Treaty (NPT) regime is clear and enshrined in both the NPT itself and in formal documents between Russia and America. For example, the Strategic Framework Declaration on U.S.-Russian relations signed by both Presidents Bush and Vladimir Putin on April 6, 2008, explicitly states that both governments will work toward a post-Strategic Arms Reduction Treaty (START) agreement on limiting strategic arms that would enable "strategic offensive arms reductions to the lowest possible level consistent with our national security requirements and alliance commitments." It also further stated that such an agreement would "be a further step in implementing our commitments under Article VI of the [Nonproliferation] Treaty." Under present conditions of hostility due to the crisis generated by the war in Georgia, the converse is true. If strategic arms control accords cannot be reached, the likelihood of increased proliferation increases accordingly, and the 2010 Review conference of the NPT will be as big a fiasco, if not worse, than was the 2005 session.

Impact Turn – START (Nuc Terror)

Decay of START results in terrorist acquisition of nuclear weapons

**Arbatov 9** (Alexei, PhD, Head of the Center for International Security Center of the Institute for International Economy and International Relationships of the Russian Academy of Sciences. International Commission on Nuclear Non-proliferation and Disarmament, March) JM

For the first time in 40 years Russia and America will face a legal vacuum and be increasingly less well informed about each other’s strategic capabilities and intentions in this area of military and political security of such paramount importance for both countries and the world as a whole. This situation did not arise overnight. In the fifteen years since START-1 was signed, Russia and the United States have not implemented fully a single agreement in this vital area for their military and political relations and global security. This is the case with nuclear disarmament in general. The military security system based on treaties and agreements reached through long decades of exhausting and unbelievably complex negotiations has been all but completely dismantled today. In 2002, the United States denounced the fundamental 1972 ABM Treaty. The 1993 START-2 Treaty did not come into force, nor did the START-3 Framework Treaty, the 1997 Agreement on Confidence-Building Measures related to ABM systems, or the 1996 Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty (CTBT), and work on the Fissile Materials Cutoff Treaty (FMCT) has very much ground to a halt. Once the START-1 Treaty expires in December 2009, the Moscow Strategic Offensive Reductions Treaty will also cease to exist. If Russia fulfills its threat to withdraw from the Intermediate Nuclear Forces Treaty of 1987 (INF) in response to the deployment of US ballistic missile defense (BMD) sites in Europe, this would leave only the decades-old partial nuclear test ban treaties of 1963 and 1976 and a few symbolic documents on this subject. It is hardly surprising in this situation that the Nuclear Nonproliferation Treaty (NPT) should be cracking at the seams and that the eighth NPT review conference in 2010 risks being the last. If this happens, the proliferation of nuclear weapons would become inevitable and there would be a very high probability of their use or acquisition by terrorists. To complete the picture, we should also note that the 1972 Convention on the Prohibition of Biological Weapons still does not have a verification system, and the Convention on the Prohibition of Chemical Weapons (which entered into force in 1997) has not been implemented according to schedule by Russia and the United States for financial reasons (see Table 1). This situation is largely the result of the destructive policy pursued by the USA under the Republican Administration during 2001–2008. As for Russia, despite the Russian authorities’ periodic calls to continue the nuclear disarmament process, they have provided nothing substantial in a diplomatic or military-technical sense to act as a counter to Washington’s policies. Recently, Moscow has been following the U.S. example in bringing down the remnants of the world arms control system, contemplating a withdrawal from the 1987 INF Treaty and suspending the implementation of the Treaty on Conventional Forces in Europe (the CFE Treaty). Over this decade, American leaders and numerous politicians and theoreticians have talked constantly about how, after the Cold War, Russia and the U.S. were no longer enemies, and therefore arms control talks between them were no longer necessary. However, life has gone on to dispel this naiveté (or outright hypocrisy). Virtually nothing remains now of the arms control treaties, and not only have the two powers not become friends, but winds reminiscent of the Cold War have begun to stir once more, and signs of a renewed arms race are ever clearer. The failure to reach agreement on a treaty to succeed START-1 has both political and strategic causes.

Extinction

**Sid-Ahmed 4** (Al-Ahram Mohamed Weekly political analyst. August 26 "Extinction!" http://weekly.ahram.org.eg/2004/705/op5.htm)

What would be the consequences of a nuclear attack by terrorists? Even if it fails, it would further exacerbate the negative features of the new and frightening world in which we are now living. Societies would close in on themselves, police measures would be stepped up at the expense of human rights, tensions between civilisations and religions would rise and ethnic conflicts would proliferate. It would also speed up the arms race and develop the awareness that a different type of world order is imperative if humankind is to survive. But the still more critical scenario is if the attack succeeds. This could lead to a third world war, from which no one will emerge victorious. Unlike a conventional war which ends when one side triumphs over another, this war will be without winners and losers. When nuclear pollution infects the whole planet, we will all be losers.