## Geoeng

#### No private sector geoengineering.

Sikorsky and Ellison 24 – Director, The Center for Climate and Security and the International Military Council on Climate and Security. Master of International Affairs at Columbia University.

Erin Sikorsky and Tom Ellison, Deputy Director for The Center for Climate and Security with an M.A. in Security Studies from Georgetown, “Geoengineering and Climate Change in an Age of Disinformation and Strategic Competition,” Council on Strategic Risks, 04-23-2024, https://councilonstrategicrisks.org/2024/04/23/geoengineering-and-climate-change-in-an-age-of-disinformation-and-strategic-competition/#longterm-versus-nearterm-security-risks-of-geoengineering

While the NIE’s warning may become possible in the future, it is a less plausible near-term risk. It is especially unlikely that a private company or a middle power such as India or Brazil could launch a successful, scientifically-sound effort without detection. The technical requirements for a robust attempt at stratospheric aerosol injection are daunting–the most commonly envisaged form of geoengineering, which aims to dim the sun similar to a volcanic eruption. Such an effort would also require a fairly lengthy and probably observable ramp up. For example, sustaining the deployment of aerosols into the stratosphere would likely necessitate new fixed-wing aircraft designs that do not currently exist.8 Additionally, an effort significant enough to remake the Earth’s climate would also likely depend on the ability to deploy such aircraft from multiple countries, continuously. This, too, is not something easy to keep secret.
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### AT: WM

#### Broad-based/sectoral bargaining is coalition bargaining; not collective bargaining.

US Legal, no date

“Coalition Bargaining: A Comprehensive Guide to Its Legal Framework,” US Legal, https://legal-resources.uslegalforms.com/c/coalition-bargaining

Coalition bargaining is a negotiation process involving multiple employers and unions. Unlike collective bargaining, where individual unions negotiate separately with employers, coalition bargaining requires unions to collaborate and reach a consensus on various issues. Each union's influence in these negotiations is proportional to its membership size, meaning larger unions have a greater say in the final agreement. This method is often utilized in public sectors, particularly for negotiating health insurance coverage, allowing coalitions to secure better rates and choices for employees.

### AT: Duty to Bargain

### Vision---1NR

## Midterms

### OV---1NR

#### It outweighs and turns the case. Post-2026, there’s no going back. A lack of adversarial democracy structurally guarantees authoritarian reign indefinitely. That both turns solvency AND means intervening actors can check their impacts, but not ours.

Drutman 23 – Lecturer at Johns Hopkins University, PhD in Political Science from UC Berkeley.  
Lee Drutman, “More Parties, Better Parties: The Case for Pro-Parties Democracy Reform”, New America, 7/23/23, https://d1y8sb8igg2f8e.cloudfront.net/documents/More\_Parties\_Better\_Parties\_2023.pdf

Healthy Parties Make Elections Meaningful and Engaging for Voters

Without the adversarial nature of electoral democracy, one party could rule indefinitely, without challenge. New ideas enter politics and innovative policy solutions emerge through partisan competition and conflict, not in spite of it.34 Without partisan challengers, incumbents and one-party systems drift into corruption.35

#### Losing the House locks in authoritarian rule, inequality, and racist policies.

Killion 25 – Correspondent at CBS

Nikole Killion, M.S. in Journalism from Northwestern, “NAACP launches town halls to mobilize Black voters ahead of 2026 midterm elections,” CBS News, August 11th, 2025, https://www.cbsnews.com/news/naacp-town-halls-black-voters-2026-midterm-elections/

"It may still seem far away, but the 2026 midterm elections will determine whether our democracy still holds on or whether the people surrender their power to a king," NAACP President Derrick Johnson said in a statement to CBS News. "So, from our perspective, as the NAACP, it's clear: we've got to start organizing early."

Johnson called this "an urgent moment," referring to President Trump's rollback of diversity, equity and inclusion policies and immigration raids, as well as the swath of budget cuts slashing Medicaid and food assistance programs as "attacks on democracy." The town halls will focus on the administration's policies and their impact on the African-African community.

"We've got to strengthen community, recruit volunteers, inform each other about Donald Trump's oppressive policies, and map out local strategies that will ensure everybody gets out to vote," Johnson said. "Our neighbors are being illegally kidnapped by ICE, Trump's budget is taking away our healthcare and access to food stamps, and our civil rights are being stripped away at every turn—all while costs, from housing to groceries, continue to rise, and the billionaire class get richer."

### UQ---Dems Win---2NC

#### Concludes the link outweighs.

William A. Galston 25, Senior Fellow of Governance Studies at Brookings, “What History Tells Us About the 2026 Midterm Elections,” Brookings, 8/28/25, https://www.brookings.edu/articles/what-history-tells-us-about-the-2026-midterm-elections/

As we have seen, the president’s party almost always loses ground in the midterm election following his victory, and the unusual circumstances that fueled the two exceptions since the 1930s do not seem to prevail today. After the 2024 election, moreover, Republicans held only 220 seats, just two more than the minimum needed for a majority. Barring unforeseeable game-changing events during the next 14 months, the probability that Republicans will lose control of the House is very high.

### AT: Other Issues---2AC

#### Pro-labor policies draw working-class support for Republicans.

Press 25 – Writer, New Yorker. Author of *Dirty Work*, recipient of 2022 Hillman Prize for Book Journalism. PhD in Sociology, NYU.

Eyal Press, “Josh Hawley and the Republican Effort to Love Labor,” The New Yorker, 05-30-2025, https://www.newyorker.com/news/the-lede/josh-hawley-and-the-republican-effort-to-love-labor

But even those who question Hawley’s motives don’t doubt his ambition, particularly as jockeying for 2028 begins. One thing he appears to recognize is that siding with unions has become popular even on the right. In March, American Compass, a conservative think tank, and YouGov conducted a survey that illustrated this fact. Among Republican respondents, the poll found that labor unions had a net favorability of eight percentage points. Among young Republicans, defined as those born after 1980, the margin was thirty-eight points. Young Republicans also overwhelmingly backed several provisions of the PRO Act that the survey tested, such as expediting the collective-bargaining process, posting information about labor rights in workplaces, and penalizing companies that violate the law.

Daniel Kishi, a policy adviser at American Compass and a former aide to Hawley, told me that the generational divide captured by the survey is mirrored among Republican elected officials, with those who entered office after the 2008 financial crisis—such as Hawley and Vance—more likely to view unfettered markets skeptically and to see rank-and-file union members as potential supporters. These officials understand that, while voters in union households still tend to back Democrats, the gap has narrowed, a dynamic that has enabled Trump to win states like Michigan and Pennsylvania. Some Republicans are even beginning to see the labor movement’s leaders as allies, rather than as Democratic operatives who will turn out the vote for their opponents—in particular Sean O’Brien, the general president of the International Brotherhood of Teamsters, who spoke at the Republican National Convention this past summer. Kishi believes that enacting some of the pro-union reforms that drew support from young Republicans in the American Compass survey could solidify the political realignment that has occurred in recent years, leading more and more blue-collar workers to view the Republican Party as their home.

Thus far, of course, what the Trump Administration has prioritized is not passing such reforms but selling influence to wealthy patrons and granting unchecked power to billionaires including Elon Musk, whose Department of Government Efficiency fired thousands of federal employees who are union members. On March 27th, Trump issued an executive order that cancelled the union contracts of nearly a million federal workers. The order is “by far the largest single action of union-busting in American history,” the labor historian Joseph McCartin recently told the Center for American Progress, which has estimated that it ended collective-bargaining rights for one of every fifteen workers currently protected by a union contract. Trump’s tax-and-spending bill contains a few measures designed to appeal to low-income workers, such as eliminating taxes on tips and overtime pay. But assessments by the Congressional Budget Office and other nonpartisan sources show that the benefits will go mainly to the wealthiest households, while the poorest ten per cent of Americans will see their income decline.

### AT: OBBB

#### Their evidence is terrible. It is citing GOP officials and strategist KARL ROVE saying the bill will have huge implications which NO DUH. Not a non-partisan source OR academic. Inserted for Reference

James Bickerton 25, U.S. News Reporter for Newsweek, “Republicans Issued Warning on 2026 Midterms,” Newsweek, 7/5/25, https://www.newsweek.com/republicans-issued-warning-2026-midterms-2094936

Republicans have been warned that the party's recent passage of the One Big Beautiful Bill Act could have dramatic repercussions in the 2026 midterm elections.

Karl Rove, a longtime GOP strategist, said on Fox News's America's Newsroom: "I think it'll have a huge impact on 2026, because, remember, as these changes, particularly the Medicaid changes come into effect, they're going to have, people are going to be losing their coverage."

#### The mega bill won’t help republicans maintain the edge — other shortcomings outweigh.

Kilgore 25 – Political Analyst for New York Magazine and Intelligencer

Ed Kilgore, “Democrats Don’t Need Big Beautiful Calamity to Win the Midterms,” New York Magazine, July 14th, 2025, https://nymag.com/intelligencer/article/dems-dont-need-big-beautiful-calamity-to-win-the-midterms.html

There are three major data points that should be kept in mind in assessing the impact of the megabill. The first is that the parallel legislative package of the first Trump term, the Obamacare Repeal and Replace legislation, was never enacted, which means that Republicans entered the 2018 midterms with just the sweet dessert of tax cuts on their résumé rather than the foul-tasting budget cuts originally designed to pay for them. They still lost 41 House seats in the midterms. Signature bills aren’t always as significant as you might expect. The second data point is that prior to the enactment of the Big Beautiful Bill, Trump’s job approval rating was already chronically underwater, as was the GOP’s standing in the congressional generic ballot measuring party preferences for control of the House. Polls further showed very limited public consciousness of the details of the megabill as of the time Trump signed it.

### AT: Too Early---1NR

#### 3. Now’s key.

Bronner and Mourtoupalas 25 – Principal Data Scientist at The Washington Post, M.S. in Statistics from Stanford University; Politics Journalist at The Washington Post.

Lenny Bronner and Nick Mourtoupalas, “What Democratic swings in special elections mean for 2026,” The Washington Post, 06-27-2025, https://www.washingtonpost.com/politics/2025/06/27/democratic-special-election-gains/

It’s not too early to talk about 2026, when the first national elections will be held since Donald Trump was voted into the White House for a second time. It’s the first opportunity for Americans to register their approval or disapproval of Trump’s agenda by deciding whether to maintain a Republican congressional majority.

As such, politicos are scouring the landscape for any signs hinting at which way voters may be leaning in the 2026 midterms. If history is any guide, Democrats should gain seats in the House and Senate, because that has been the pattern of the party out of power in off-year contests, with a few notable exceptions.

#### They’re right around the corner, extremely tight, and policies now will have an impact.

Rothenberg 25 – Political Analyst at The Rothberg Report, former Professor of Political Science at Bucknell University, PhD in Political Science from the University of Connecticut.

Stuart Rothenberg, “The 2026 midterm elections are just around the corner,” Roll Call, 01-07-2025, https://rollcall.com/2025/01/07/the-2026-midterm-elections-are-just-around-the-corner/

The 2026 midterm elections are just around the corner

Democrats shouldn’t start counting their chickens before they’ve hatched in the 2026 fight for control of the House of Representatives.

#### Gerrymandering has reached its limits. More attempts create unpredictable outcomes and backfire.

Hunt 25 – Assistant Professor of Political Science at Boise State University.

Charlie Hunt, “3 reasons Republicans’ redistricting power grab might backfire,” The Conversation, 8/8/25, https://theconversation.com/3-reasons-republicans-redistricting-power-grab-might-backfire-262553

Dummymandering

Another possible problem for either party looking to gain some seats in this process stems from greediness.

In responding to Democrats’ continued absence from Texas, Gov. Greg Abbott threatened even more drastic gerrymanders. “If they don’t start showing up, I may start expanding,” Abbott said. “We may make it six or seven or eight new seats we’re going to be adding on the Republican side.”

But Abbott might think twice about this strategy.

Parties that gerrymander their states’ districts are drawing lines to maximize their own advantage, either in state legislatures or, in this case, congressional delegations.

When parties gerrymander districts, they don’t usually try to make them all as lopsided as possible for their own side. Instead, they try to make as many districts as possible that they are likely to win. They do this by spreading groups of supportive voters across several districts so they can help the party win more of these districts.

But sometimes the effort backfires: In trying to maximize their seats, a party spreads its voters too thin and fails to make some districts safe enough. These vulnerable districts can then flip to the other party in future elections, and the opposing party ends up winning more seats than expected.

This phenomenon, commonly referred to as “dummymandering,” has happened before. It even happened in Texas, where Republicans lost a large handful of poorly drawn state legislative districts in the Dallas suburbs in 2018, a strong year for Democrats nationwide.

With Democrats poised for a strong 2026 midterm election against an unpopular president, this is a lesson Republicans might need to pay attention to.

There’s not much left to gerrymander

One of the main reasons dummymandering happens is that there has been so much gerrymandering that there are few remaining districts competitive enough for a controlling party to pick off for themselves. This important development has unfolded for two big reasons.

First, in terms of gerrymandering, the low-hanging fruit is already picked over. States controlled by either Democrats or Republicans have already undertaken pretty egregious gerrymanders during previous regular redistricting processes, particularly following the 2010 and 2020 censuses.

Republicans have generally been more adept at the process, particularly in maximizing their seat shares in relatively competitive states such as Wisconsin and North Carolina that they happen to control.

But Democrats have also been successful in states such as Maryland, where only one Republican serves out of nine seats, despite the party winning 35% of the presidential vote in 2024. In Massachusetts, where Democrats hold all eight seats, Republicans won 37% of the presidential vote in 2024.

There’s also the fact that over the past half-century, “gerrymanderable” territory has become more difficult to find regardless of how you draw the boundaries. That’s because the voting electorate is more geographically sorted between the parties.

This means that Democratic and Republican voters are segregated from each other geographically, with Democrats tending toward big cities and suburbs, and Republicans occupying rural areas.

As a result, it’s become less geographically possible than ever to draw reasonable-looking districts that split up the other party’s voters in order to diminish the opponents’ ability to elect one of their own.

#### Specifically in Texas and Ohio.

Wu 25 – Congressional reporter at POLITICO with a focus on the House of Representatives.

Nicholas Wu, “Republicans run a risky strategy for holding the House that rests on redrawn maps,” POLITICO, 7/11/25, https://www.politico.com/news/2025/07/11/texas-redistricting-00448145

A Donald Trump-backed effort to gerrymander Texas would boost the GOP’s attempts to cling to its razor-thin House majority in next year’s midterms — but it also runs a serious risk of backfiring.

Texas Gov. Greg Abbott asked the state legislature to redraw the map during its special session this summer, following a push from the White House and the Justice Department. Ohio is also required by state law to redraw its lines before next year’s midterms. Taken together, Republicans see an opportunity to potentially create more GOP seats, guarding against the possibility of a blue wave in 2026.

But in Texas, Republicans are in danger of creating a so-called dummymander, whereby an attempt to draw more seats for one party accidentally benefits the other. Texas’ congressional map already heavily favors the GOP, so any changes to further benefit the party would have to walk a careful line. Adding Republican voters to blue districts to reduce Democrats’ margins means taking those same voters out of the red districts where they reside. The result is more competitive districts across the board — ones Democrats hope to take advantage of as they harness anti-Trump energy in the midterms.

“They are playing a little bit of roulette with these maps,” said Rep. Julie Johnson (D-Texas). “In a wave election like what we have a potential opportunity for in ‘26 I think it makes these Republicans very vulnerable.”

Texas has 38 House seats, with 25 held by Republicans. Members of the state’s Democratic delegation huddled with House Minority Leader Hakeem Jeffries as the redistricting talk ramped up, with follow-up meetings planned.

Jeffries warned in a statement Wednesday that an aggressive map could “result in making several incumbent House Republicans vulnerable to fierce general election challenges.”

“Republicans are cutting off their nose to spite their face,” he added.

#### That deters gerrymandering especially because it’ll trigger democratic gerrymander.

Hunt 25 – Assistant Professor of Political Science at Boise State University.

Charlie Hunt, “How GOP’s Gerrymandering Power Grab May Backfire,” Flagler Live, 8/10/25, https://flaglerlive.com/how-gops-gerrymandering-power-grab-may-backfire/

The gerrymandering drama in Texas – and beyond – has continued to unfold after Democratic state legislators fled the state. The Democrats want to prevent the Republican-controlled government from enacting a mid-decade gerrymander aimed at giving Republicans several more seats in Congress.

The Texas GOP move was pushed by President Donald Trump, who’s aiming to ensure he has a GOP-controlled Congress to work with after the 2026 midterm elections.

Other Republican states such as Missouri and Ohio may also follow the Texas playbook; and Democratic states such as California and Illinois seem open to responding in kind.

But there are a few factors that make this process more complicated than just grabbing a few House seats. They may even make Republicans regret their hardball gerrymandering tactics, if the party ends up with districts that political scientists like me call “dummymandered.”

#### Specifically, a race-to-the-bottom.

Hunt 25 – Assistant Professor of Political Science at Boise State University.

Charlie Hunt, “Republicans’ redistricting power grab might backfire,” Salon, 8/11/25, https://www.salon.com/2025/08/11/republicans-redistricting-power-grab-might-backfire\_partner/

And this time, the Texas attempt could spark chaos and a race to the bottom, where every state picks up the challenge and tries to rewrite their electoral maps – not in the usual once-a-decade manner, but whenever they’re unsatisfied with the odds in the next election.

#### At worst, it won’t swing the election.

DeSmith 23 – Harvard Staff Writer at The Harvard Gazette.

Christy DeSmith, “Biggest problem with gerrymandering,” The Harvard Gazette, 7/5/23, https://news.harvard.edu/gazette/story/2023/07/biggest-problem-with-gerrymandering/

They found the tactic used by parties to gain a numerical advantage in Congress was widespread during the 2020 redistricting cycle, yet its effect on the partisan makeup of the U.S. House of Representatives was small. Their in-depth analysis, published last month in the Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences, found the country’s patchwork of congressional districts netted Republicans all of two House seats.

#### Trump irrelevant. Independents are decisive and flippable---they’ll determine the midterms.

Zorn and Weisbrot 25 – Senior Policy and Strategy Advisor for the Center for Economic and Policy Research, M.P.P. in Political Communications and Economic Policy from Harvard

Justin Talbot Zorn, Former Legislative Director in the House of Representatives, B.A. in Political Economy from Oxford; Mark Weisbrot, Co-Director at the Center for Economic and Policy Research, Ph.D. in Economics from the University of Michigan, “How Foreign Policy Could Crash Republican Midterm Prospects,” The Hill, October 3rd, 2025, https://thehill.com/opinion/white-house/5433078-trump-iran-policy-risks/

When respondents consider the economic consequences of a broader conflict, as well as their trust in the justifications offered for involvement in such a war, Trump faces overwhelming dissent among Independents. These voters are about one-third of the electorate and currently about evenly split between Democrat-leaning and Republican-leaning. If an issue becomes important in an election and the Independent voters move strongly in one direction, that can swing the election.

A clear majority of voters — 65 percent — reported they would hold Trump responsible if gasoline prices rose to $6 a gallon as a result of expanded U.S. military involvement. Among Independent voters, this sentiment rises to 69 percent. Further, when informed that economists would expect a significant rise in mortgage interest rates to result from an expanded conflict — potentially adding over $100,000 in lifetime payments for a typical home — 72 percent oppose U.S. military involvement, with two thirds of those expressing “strong” opposition.

Most polls treat foreign policy decisions as isolated events, simply asking whether voters support or oppose military action. But major interventions do not occur in isolation — they can impact gas prices, mortgage rates and overall confidence in politicians and their political parties. A true measure of public sentiment on expanded military involvement must account for these potential and even likely consequences, which often drive voter attitudes more than abstract strategic considerations.

Donald Trump rose politically by highlighting Americans’ declining trust in institutions, from government regulators and health experts to traditional media. But the polling shows that Trump himself faces serious accusations from his base of breaching public trust and caving to wealthy donors advocating unconditional support for Israeli policies that millions of voters view as wrong and dangerous.

Sixty-three percent of respondents expressed concern that Trump’s decision to attack Iran could be influenced by major campaign donors, a concern particularly strong among Independents. And two-thirds of voters — including nearly one-third of Republicans — feel that intervening in an Israel-Iran conflict contradicts Trump’s core “America First” promise.

In June, Tucker Carlson accused Trump of being “complicit in the act of war” following Israel’s attacks on Iran, and influential MAGA voices like Steve Bannon echoed similar skepticism. Yet commentary alone is unlikely to shift conservative public opinion. People respond to tangible impacts in their lives. If Trump once again follows Israeli Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu into major military action in the Middle East, the consequences may extend beyond geopolitics and significantly impact the president’s party in next year’s midterm elections.

Consider some midterm math. On all five questions related to U.S. intervention in Iran, voters who identify as Republican or Democrat overwhelmingly aligned with their respective parties. For example, by a ratio of 88 percent to 12 percent, Democrats said they did not believe that “Trump is getting involved in this war for the sake of U.S. national security.” Republicans held the opposite view, with 77 percent believing national security was the reason and 23 percent not believing it. This leaves Independent voters as potentially decisive.

According to current polling data, Independents are evenly divided between “Republican-leaning” and “Democrat-leaning,” generally indicating close national elections. However, on questions regarding U.S. participation in a war against Iran, Independents are solidly opposed, by a margin of two to one. This leads to an overall result of 63-37 saying that they do not believe that U.S. involvement in such a war is “for the sake of national security.

### AT: Trump Cheats---2NC

#### No cheating.

#### 1. The president has zero authority over elections.

Riccardi and Swenson 25 – Western Political Writer at Associated Press; National political reporter at AP

Nicholas Riccardi and Ali Swenson, “Trump vows to change how elections are run. The US Constitution doesn’t give him that power,” Associated Press, 08-18-2025, https://apnews.com/article/trump-elections-mail-voting-midterms-2026-8be6dba80091fd7e6d8570814b34a7fe

Thousands of elections, none under presidential control

Unlike in most countries, elections in the U.S. are run by the states. But it gets more complicated — each state then allows smaller jurisdictions, such as counties, cities or townships, to run their own elections. Election officials estimate there are as many as 10,000 different election jurisdictions across the country.

A frequent complaint of Trump and other election conspiracy theorists is that the U.S. doesn’t run its election like France, which hand counts presidential ballots and usually has a national result on election night. But that’s because France is only running that single election, and every jurisdiction has the same ballot with no other races.

A ballot in the U.S. might contain dozens of races, from president on down to city council and including state and local ballot measures.

The Constitution makes the states the entities that determine the “time, place and manner” of elections, but does allow Congress to “make” or “alter” rules for federal elections.

Congress can change the way states run congressional and presidential elections but has no say in the way a state runs its own elections. The president is not mentioned at all in the Constitution’s list of entities with powers over elections.

“The president has very limited to zero authority over things related to the conduct of elections,” said Rick Hasen, an election law professor at the University of California, Los Angeles.

Courts have agreed — no presidential involvement

Parts of Trump’s earlier executive order on elections were swiftly blocked by the courts, on the grounds that Congress, and not the president, sets federal election rules.

It’s unclear what Trump plans to do now, but the only path to change federal election rules is through Congress.

Although Republicans control Congress, it’s unclear that even his party would want to eliminate voting machines nationwide, possibly delaying vote tallies in their own races by weeks or months. Even if they did, legislation would likely be unable to pass because Democrats could filibuster it in the U.S. Senate.

#### 2. Other checks and balances solve. Empirics.

Singh 25 – Senior Counsel at the Brennan Center, Former California Deputy Attorney General, J.D. from UC Berkeley

Jasleen Singh, “The Trump Administration’s Campaign to Undermine the Next Election,” Brennan Center for Justice, 08-03-2025, https://www.brennancenter.org/our-work/research-reports/trump-administrations-campaign-undermine-next-election

In March 2025, President Trump issued an executive order that aims to overhaul and exert partial control over significant parts of the nation’s election systems. The order includes several provisions; here we highlight three.

First, the order purports to direct the Election Assistance Commission (EAC) — an independent, bipartisan agency that assists states with election administration — to mandate that voters show a passport or other, similar document proving citizenship when they register to vote using the federal voter registration form.

Second, it attempts to force the EAC to amend its guidelines to rescind all previous certifications of voting equipment based on prior standards and, if appropriate, to re-certify voting systems under amended guidelines, which are to include provisions from the executive order. Eleven states and Washington, D.C., require their systems to be federally certified. And even states that do not require federal certification typically incorporate federal guidelines and testing and use voting systems that have been federally certified. Yet currently, just one voting system on the market complies with the standards issued prior to the executive order, and it was only certified on July 7, 2025. Replacing machines could cost states billions of dollars.

The president’s attempt to interfere with voting systems is not novel. In his first term, he tried to direct the attorney general, the Department of Defense, and the Department of Homeland Security (DHS) to seize voting machines. He was unsuccessful. Yet now there are signs that the federal government may already be attempting to interfere with voting systems, beyond anything expressed in the executive order. A DHS official and an individual claiming to work for the administration have asked election officials in Colorado for access to their voting equipment.

Third, the order calls on the administration’s new Department of Government Efficiency (DOGE) and DHS to obtain state voter files and other records kept by election officials, including voter list maintenance records. The DOJ has already requested voter lists from at least nine states, and at least two have provided them. Unredacted voter files and voter list maintenance records can contain sensitive private information about U.S. citizens. Other records may contain information that is subject to access controls for security reasons. Relatedly, the order mandates that states have access to federal citizenship data for voter list maintenance purposes; DHS recently overhauled and expanded the scope of its program for states to identify supposed noncitizens on the voter rolls.

Each of these provisions is analyzed in turn.

Attempting to Impose a “Show Your Papers” Requirement on Voters

Impact: If implemented, the requirement to show a citizenship document to register to vote when using the federal form would undermine voting and disrupt election administration in multiple respects. The “show your papers” provision, which overlaps significantly with the policy laid out in the deeply unpopular SAVE Act (which has stalled in the U.S. Senate), could block millions of American citizens from voting. According to research by the Brennan Center, more than 21 million citizens do not have a birth certificate, a passport, or naturalization papers readily available.

Why It’s Wrong: A president has no right to rewrite the country’s election rules or regulate federal elections on his own. As a federal court recently put it, “The Constitution vests none of these powers in the President.” In issuing the order, the president claimed extraordinary unilateral authority to regulate federal elections and usurp the powers of Congress, the states, and the EAC, an independent, bipartisan federal agency.

Status: The order was challenged in five lawsuits across the country. Two courts have blocked some provisions while litigation proceeds, including those directing the EAC to add a requirement to show a passport or naturalization document to register to vote in federal elections. The same reasoning — that the president lacks authority to compel the EAC to act — would apply to other parts of the order that have not yet been carried out. Litigation is ongoing.

### AT: Link Turn

#### Union voters can swing elections because of high concentration and voting rate. They’ll flip based on the plan.

Ax and Reid 18 – National Affairs Reporter Reuters, M.A. in Politics and Journalism from Columbia

Joseph Ax; Tim Reid, Journalist at Reuters, “Democrats target union workers who regret Trump vote,” Reuters, May 8th, 2018, https://www.reuters.com/article/world/democrats-target-union-workers-who-regret-trump-vote-idUSKBN1I5180/

Like many union workers, Oberbroeckling voted twice for former Democratic President Barack Obama before backing Donald Trump and other Republicans in 2016.

Now he has buyer's remorse - and plans to support the Democratic challenger to Rod Blum, the Republican congressman in this blue-collar, eastern Iowa district.

"Trump is for the rich," said Oberbroeckling, 37, sipping a rum-and-coke. "Blum's for big business. They said they were for the workers, but they're not."

That sentiment should encourage Democrats, who saw their once-reliable labor vote help send Trump to the White House after he vowed to revive Rust Belt factories with trade tariffs and ailing coal mines with environmental deregulation. Now - with coal still struggling and Trump stoking a trade war - many union workers have soured on the president ahead of November’s midterm congressional elections, the Reuters/Ipsos opinion poll shows.

Between March 2017 and March 2018, union members' approval of Trump fell 15 points, to 47 percent. In more than two dozen interviews with union members, many blasted Trump’s tax cut, arguing most of the benefits will flow to corporations and wealthy people.

A loose coalition of union leaders, Democratic strategists and political action committees (PACs) aims to seize on that shift by directing money and campaign workers to about 30 competitive races union-heavy districts. The party needs to gain 23 seats to retake the U.S. House of Representatives.

But falling support for Trump is no guarantee Democrats can restore the party’s historic dominance of the union vote. Nearly half of members polled still approve of the president, and their support for congressional Democrats has declined slightly from two years ago.

Forty-seven percent of union members polled would support a Democratic candidate in November; 34 percent favored a Republican. That compares to 51 percent favoring Democrats and 29 percent supporting Republicans in March 2016.

The 2018 poll was conducted online, in English, and included more than 1,400 union workers nationwide. It has a credibility interval of 3 percentage points, meaning results could vary in either direction by that amount.

Union membership has fallen by half since the early 1980s, to 10.7 percent of U.S. workers last year. But members can still sway close elections because they are concentrated in specific regions and vote at high rates. In the 2014 midterms, 52 percent of union workers voted, compared to 39 percent of others, according to a study by Demos, a liberal think tank.

"If we don't win them back, we will never win here," said Abby Finkenauer, the leading Democrat challenging Blum in Iowa's 1st District.

#### The labor movement is the key obstacle to a GOP landslide.

Eilperin 14 – Deputy Editor at The Washington Post, A.B. in Politics from Princeton
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"This is the skeleton and the muscle of the modern Democratic Party," said conservative activist Grover Norquist, who hosted a panel at this year's Conservative Political Action Conference meeting that focused on targeting public-sector unions as a way of "Turning Blue States Red."

Norquist said if Republicans can end the practice of compulsory dues among public-sector unions — which he called “stolen money” — it could debilitate Democrats “because they’ve structured themselves around this funding source.”

Steve Rosenthal, a longtime Democratic activist and former political director of the AFL-CIO, said Republicans are keenly aware of what “unions bring to the table.”

“For the right wing in many states, the labor movement is the main obstacle they face in terms of getting to the end zone,” he said.

#### Labor reform specifically determines how union blocs vote. They’re decisive.
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Robert Forrant, “Trump and Harris, with starkly different records on labor issues, are both courting union voters,” Yahoo News, September 2nd, 2024, https://www.yahoo.com/news/trump-harris-starkly-different-records-192549088.html?guccounter=1

Democratic presidential nominee Kamala Harris and Republican nominee Donald Trump are in a tight race for the White House. Every voting bloc will count — including members of labor unions and other people in their households.

The majority of union leaders have over generations endorsed Democratic candidates, and this race is no exception. Although rank-and-file union members have also historically sided with the Democratic Party by large margins, that support has wavered for at least the past 45 years. In 2016, exit polls indicated that voters in union households supported Democratic nominee Hillary Clinton over Trump by only 8 percentage points, down from 18 percentage points in 2012 when Barack Obama was on the ballot.

No Democratic presidential nominee had fared worse with union voters since Ronald Reagan’s wins over Jimmy Carter and Walter Mondale in 1980 and 1984.

Union voters are particularly prominent in Michigan, Pennsylvania and Nevada, three swing states where the share of voters who belong to unions is above the national average of 10%.

A late 2023 New York Times/Siena College poll of six swing states that Joe Biden won in 2020 — those three plus Arizona, Georgia and Wisconsin — shows that Biden and Trump were tied at 47% among union voters when they were asked who they’d vote for in 2024. Biden had an 8 percentage point advantage with these same voters in 2020, according to a different survey.

3 key issues

Union voters, like all U.S. citizens, are concerned about many issues. But they are more likely than most people to seriously consider a candidate’s record in terms of support for workers and organized labor. Labor historians generally concur that the Biden administration has the second-strongest labor-friendly record, after Franklin D. Roosevelt.

#### There’s tons of popular support for labor reform. Best polling proves it would redeem the GOP.
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Labor is popular among the electorate.

Nationwide polls show that over 60 percent of the public supports labor unions, which is about as high as public support has been in many decades.15 Support is likely to continue growing since young adults are the most supportive of unions.16 Indeed, Millennials—most of today’s young adults—are very progressive in their economic views and frequently take action to advance their views.17

In addition, the very limited publicly available polling on bold labor policy reform indicates strong public support. A survey designed to test whether workers would join and financially support various types of unions and workers organizations found that roughly 70 percent of workers would join a union that provides benefits and broad-based bargaining. This support was higher than for any other type of worker organization tested.18 These results should be taken with some skepticism because the proposals were not explained in detail, nor were proposals critiqued, but the fact that the types of proposals described in this book were the most popular is noteworthy. Two separate polls with questions on wage boards found that nearly three-quarters of likely voters support the policy, including the majority of Republicans.19 The wage board questions may overstate support because of the favorable way they frame the policy and do not discuss opposing arguments. Still, the results are worth noting because they also suggest the potential for strong public support, especially because they likely reflect a type of gut-level response to bold labor reforms, as there had been little public discussion of wage boards or other significant bargaining reforms at the times of the surveys, and the polls gave limited information about the reform.

More importantly, recent labor actions and policy debates indicate widespread support for reform, even in conservative areas. The 2018 teacher strikes in Republican-leaning states like West Virginia, Oklahoma, and Arizona drew broad public support.20 Further, when citizens have had a chance to directly vote on union policy, the public has backed labor, even though most votes took place in relatively conservative states. To be sure, not every labor-related issue before the general public has resulted in victory for unions, but the losses usually involved a complicating factor that made the public’s choice not solely about the labor policy. In 2012, the attempt to recall Wisconsin governor Scott Walker for his antiunion policies failed, but a recall is quite different from a direct vote on his labor program. Similarly, the 2012 Michigan ballot initiative to end right to work failed in part because it required changing a state constitution, something voters are reluctant to do for a general policy matter.21 But when voters have been able to make a clear and direct choice about labor union policy, they have favored labor. For example, Ohio voters passed a 2011 initiative with over 60 percent in support of overturning Republican legislation to restrict collective bargaining for public-sector workers.22 In 2018, voters in Missouri overturned the state’s right-to-work law by a margin of almost two to one, with more people voting on that ballot initiative than on the state’s US senate race, indicating that many people cared strongly about labor issues.23 Because public-sector bargaining and right to work are two of the least popular labor union issues to debate, these victories may even understate the degree of support for unions in these more conservative states.