Twitter Thread by Ezra Levin

Ezra Levin
@ezralevin

Short version of this argument: "But won't the GOP do a lot of damage after they win in 2022 or beyond??"

This is the anti-reform argument I hear most often, including sometimes from progressives. So I take it seriously, but don't find it persuasive for 2 reasons:

> The case against Democrats nuking the filibuster https://t.co/yQpcE2jBE1
>
> — The Fix (@thefix) January 22, 2021

1st counter argument) McConnell + GOP have packed the courts, gutted the voting rights act, & blocked all democracy reforms. Of COURSE they're on a path to winning power again.

To fix this, we need to pass HR 1, the John Lewis Voting Rights Act, DC Statehood, and court reform.

McConnell calls those bills "socialism" and a "power grab." He will filibuster them all because they threaten his power.

By eliminating the filibuster, Democrats can pass these reforms. That's good for democracy and reduces the pro-McConnell bias in the system.

2nd counter-argument) But still, what if GOP wins a trifecta again in the future? Won't they enact their bad agenda?

Two responses to this, one philosophical and one based in McConnell's cold hard power politics.

First, yes, in a post-democracy reform world, the GOP very well may win a majority again. But they will have won that majority is world with protected and expanded voting rights, DC statehood, secure election, and campaign finance reform.

ANY political party that builds a governing majority in that environment SHOULD be able to enact its agenda. That's democracy, folks.

If you're a progressive, you shouldn't dream of gridlock. You should dream of functioning government held accountable by free and fair elections.

But let's put aside that high-minded democracy argument. We're talking about MCCONNELL here. Make no mistake he will gut the legislative filibuster as soon as it stands in his way. He gutted the filibuster twice under Trump to pack the courts.

McConnell didn't need to end the legislative filibuster to accomplish his top legislative goals under Trump - tax cuts for his donors. He did that through reconciliation with 50 votes. When his goals change, his stance on the filibuster will too.

If you think McConnell will stand with precedent even when that gets in his way, I just don't know what to say. Oh, I guess I'll say "Merrick Garland." And I'll say "Amy Coney Barrett."

Ok, that's it. In short I think @AaronBlake makes a reasonable but unconvincing argument. Dems should use their power while they have it to pass structural reforms that strengthen our democracy - regardless of what McConnell says now or what they fear he might do in the future.