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#### The nuclear lobby will flip the election- historically they’ve backlashed against parties in power that abandon nuclear tech.

Pasternak 10 Judy Pasternak, 1-24-2010, "Nuclear energy lobby working hard to win support," No Publication, http://investigativereportingworkshop.org/investigations/nuclear-energy-lobbying-push/story/nuclear-energy-working-hard-win-support/

WASHINGTON – The Obama administration may soon guarantee as much as $18.5 billion in loans to build new nuclear reactors to generate electricity, and Congress is considering whether to add billions more to support an expansion of nuclear power. These actions come after an extensive decade-long campaign in which companies and unions related to the industry have spent more than $600 million on lobbying and nearly $63 million on campaign contributions, according to an analysis by the Investigative Reporting Workshop at American University.Nuclear power generates about 20 percent of America's electricity, but many existing reactors are aging and no new plant has been authorized since the 1979 incident at Three Mile Island, when small amounts of radiation were released and authorities feared for days that a huge surge might escape. That's in part because it can cost as much as $8 billion to build a nuclear plant, and in part because the problems of nuclear waste and safety remain unsolved. The problem of global warming remains unsolved, too, however, and as the nation struggles to rebound from a deep recession, building new nuclear reactors increasingly looks to some like a big jobs program. The industry, capitalizing on both developments, argues that nuclear energy must be part of any effort to curb heat-trapping carbon emissions. Its longtime foes -- environmentalists, labor unions, Democrats -- increasingly agree. "This is nuclear’s year," said House Majority Whip James Clyburn, D-S.C., who in recent years has become one of the industry’s champions on Capitol Hill. Democratic Sen. Barbara Boxer of California, who chairs the Senate Environment and Public Works Committee, has pledged that the climate bill that's making its way through Congress will include new government help for the nuclear industry. Sen. Lindsay Graham of South Carolina says he'd provide a much-sought Republican vote for the bill if its energy provisions include help for the nuclear industry. Some Republicans, who historically have been friendlier to nuclear power, are pushing a plan to build 100 reactors over the next 20 years. The industry considers the forthcoming $18.5 billion in guarantees a down payment on a more ambitious expansion. Getting to this point has taken lots of time and lots of money, and the debate over the safety and economics of nuclear electricity is far from settled. During the Bush administration, the nuclear industry got more in electricity-related research and development funding than coal and other fossil fuels did combined, and Congress approved the loan guarantees. More recently, the industry has been reaching out to newly empowered Democrats, among them Clyburn, whose state is among the nation’s leading nuclear-power producers. (The president’s home state of Illinois is the biggest, and Obama and some of his closest political allies have long relationships with Exelon Corp., the country’s biggest nuclear power company.) The industry also has begun to build strong ties to important labor unions. 'THERE ISN'T A SOLUTION WITHOUT NUCLEAR' In the first half of last year, when Congress was considering whether to add nuclear loan guarantees to the economic stimulus package and was starting to work on the climate change bill, companies and unions interested in nuclear energy spent more than $55.8 million on lobbying, the analysis found. Federal Election Commission records also show that industry trade group the Nuclear Energy Institute donated a total of $99,000 to 63 candidates in the first half of 2009. Sixty percent of the money went to Democrats. As a group, nuclear interests gave $3.5 million to congressional candidates in the first six months of last year. It hasn’t hurt that all these efforts have coincided with a big run-up in energy prices and growing concern over the effects that coal-fired power plants have on the buildup in carbon emissions and global warming. We don’t believe that nuclear energy is the answer, but as you look at needs for clean energy and the need to protect the environment, there isn’t a solution without nuclear,” Areva spokesman Jarret Adams said. Areva’s reactors would power many of the new plants that are on the drawing boards. Still, many environmental groups worry about the safety of nuclear power. “The nuclear power industry is always going to remain several minutes away from serious accident and disaster,” said Tom Clements, the Southeastern Nuclear Campaign coordinator for Friends of the Earth, a global environmental group. The Price-Anderson Act, passed in 1957, limits industry liability for a nuclear accident. Most recently renewed in 2005, it requires a private operator to buy the most private insurance possible – currently $300 million – and assesses fees on the industry for a fund to pay out damages above that amount if necessary. If the fund, which now stands at more than $10 billion, isn't enough, Congress would decide whether to require more industry contributions or appropriate public money. The law is now in force through 2025. Opponents also question why nuclear power needs federal subsidies. “If nuclear power is the right path to go down, why can’t it pay for itself?” Clements said. “Nuclear power is going to be dependent on subsidies and handouts and we still get nuclear waste and the threat of accident in return.” The waste issue remains perhaps the biggest stumbling block. Generating nuclear power produces huge quantities of radioactive waste, including plutonium, a key ingredient for nuclear weapons. When many of the current nuclear reactors were put into place, there was an assumption that the federal government eventually would create a national repository. After decades of debate, however, that promise appears no closer to being met, and the plants have become de facto storage facilities. PLAYING THE INFLUENCE GAME In many ways, the nuclear power industry’s efforts to win support are a textbook case of how the influence game is played in Washington. Besides the money spent on lobbying and campaign contributions, the industry, led by the NEI, has created a network of allies who give speeches, quote one another approvingly and showcase one another on their Web sites. The effect is an echo chamber of support for nuclear power. While energy lobbies such as big oil and big coal have taken turns in the spotlight, big nuke flies largely under the radar. Alex Flint, the NEI's chief lobbyist, summed up the strategy last year at a luncheon with utility officials from Southeastern states: "Quiet." He likes to let surrogates make the case. For instance, Patrick Moore, who played a leading role in Greenpeace during the 1970s, now helps lead the Clean and Safe Energy Coalition, known as CASEnergy Coalition. His partner is Christine Todd Whitman, a former New Jersey governor and Environmental Protection Agency administrator. Both have touted nuclear power at gatherings of members of Congress and on national television. Left unmentioned in these settings is that the NEI paid a public relations company to create CASEnergy, an example of “Astroturfing” techniques that many industries have adopted to give the appearance of grass-roots support. Moore, who runs a consulting company based in Vancouver, British Columbia, acknowledged the ties in an interview, referring to NEI as “my biggest client.” He declined to divulge his fees. Whitman’s firm, the Whitman Strategy Group, says on its site that it was hired by CASEnergy, but the coalition’s Web site doesn’t mention the financial relationship. Neither does NEI’s site, where Whitman and Moore are quoted on the merits of a nuclear future. Labor is another new ally. NEI and 20 unions co-sponsored a “Welcome Back, Congress” bash in a House of Representatives office building last January. In March, Mark Ayers of the AFL-CIO arranged a meeting between NEI’s president and House Energy and Commerce Chair Henry Waxman to talk about the climate bill. The liberal California Democrat is leading the effort to pass the measure. It seemed to work like magic. “Now Mr. Waxman has not been somebody who’s been particularly open to our agenda in the past and yet he was very much so this time,” NEI’s Flint told nuclear executives in May. Flint credited union help for the changed atmosphere, quoting his boss’s description of labor allies as “bulletproof gear.” No one expected Waxman to lead the charge for nuclear, Flint said. Rep. John Dingell, a veteran Michigan Democrat who was Waxman’s predecessor as committee chair and the top recipient of nuclear-interest campaign contributions – more than $600,000 since 1999 – was offering an amendment to the climate bill that would create a clean-energy bank, which would help finance an expansion of low-carbon energy technologies. In addition to renewable energy sources such as wind, solar and geothermal power, the capture of emissions from coal and nuclear energy plants would be eligible for help. NEI had merely hoped that Waxman wouldn't squelch Dingell’s proposal without a vote. Waxman not only let the amendment in, but also voted for it. Ayers received a call from NEI’s then-president soon after he took up his AFL-CIO post in 2007. Ayers listened to his plea for help, he recalled in an interview, while thinking that many proposed new units would be in the South and in remote areas, generally not union-friendly territory. So he offered “a quid pro quo here: I help you, but I want to build these plants.” Later, a requirement in the House climate bill's bank amendment for “prevailing wages” at projects that receive government-backed loans helped Ayers' construction unions. More explicitly, NEI took a pro-union position for nuclear construction sites and gave Ayers access to utility officials to pitch labor contracts. Cementing the relationship, NEI hired one of Ayers’ lobbyists and last May, elected Ayers and an officer of the electrical workers’ union to its board. Third Way, which describes itself as a moderate progressive policy organization, also has come out in favor of nuclear power. After NEI sent Third Way Vice President Matt Bennett to France in July 2007, he wrote, “We all came back with the faith of the converted.” Two months later, Bennett and Third Way trustee John Dyson wrote a Boston Globe column headlined, “Just say ‘oui’ to nuclear power.” In the second-to-last paragraph, they noted that Third Way got less than 1 percent of its budget from nuclear industry donations. BRIDGES TO CONGRESS, WHITE HOUSE These constituencies are important to the party that's in power. Disclosure records show that the industry deftly kept its traditional base among Senate Republicans – who want 100 new nuclear units even if the climate bill fails – while building bridges to Democrats in both houses. Clyburn is one example, receiving about $195,600 from nuclear energy companies and affiliated unions since 2000, $187,000 of that in the last two election cycles. NEI contributed at least $10,000 to Clyburn’s scholarship foundation, and nuclear interests spent more than $30,000 for two six-day trips for Clyburn and his wife. One was to inspect nuclear facilities in France, and the other in the United Kingdom. He also owns stock valued at $15,000 to $50,000 in SCANA Corp., a South Carolina company that's applied to build two reactors. Clyburn has become a key ambassador for the industry, making ample use of its surrogate network. He quoted CASEnergy's Moore approvingly in an opinion column he wrote and in a keynote speech to a convention of Ayers’ building trades group. He arranged a session on nuclear power for the Congressional Black Caucus. Nuclear energy is so high on Clyburn’s agenda that he made a point of attending Senate confirmation hearings for Steven Chu, Obama’s energy secretary. When Chu spoke favorably about nuclear fission as a source of electricity, Clyburn concluded “Obama is not anti-nuclear or he would not have nominated Chu.” In an interview, Clyburn said he could report progress. Four congressional Democrats from New York, he said, are moving in his direction on nuclear power. Carol Browner, the Obama administration's energy czar and a former head of the EPA, told him that it would be inconsistent to worry about global warming and dismiss nuclear power. He raised the issue at a congressional lunch with Obama and said he left feeling reassured. The industry is plugged in on its own at the White House through labor groups and Exelon. Exelon CEO John W. Rowe is NEI’s past chairman and a current director. The company, based in the president’s home state of Illinois, has funded Obama campaigns since his Senate run, when employees contributed more than $48,000, according to CQ Moneyline, and Exelon’s political action committee gave the maximum of $10,000. Exelon employees gave Obama nearly $210,000 for his presidential campaign, according to CQ Moneyline. Exelon's management includes two Obama bundlers who are friends of the president. One, director John W. Rogers, helped direct Obama’s Illinois fundraising during his presidential race and helped plan the inauguration. The other, Frank M. Clark, has lobbied on nuclear issues for the company. White House Chief of Staff Rahm Emanuel is close to Exelon, too. The merger that created the utility was the biggest deal of Emanuel’s brief but lucrative investment-banking career. Another White House connection is strategist David Axelrod, whom Exelon subsidiary ComEd once hired to create a fake grass-roots organization supporting higher electricity rates. Exelon lobbyist David Brown said that the company had applied for the federal loan guarantees, but it didn't make the cut for the first round. Exelon hasn't contacted its high-level White House friends, he added. HELP WANTED FROM WASHINGTON The nuclear wish list is controversial. Electric utilities want more than $100 billion in guarantees for construction that's expected to cost $200 billion. The NEI contends that the guarantees wouldn't cost taxpayers a dime because the recipients would pay fees that should cover the cost of defaults, much the way that auto insurers cover the cost of accidents with premiums paid by safe drivers. However, the Congressional Budget Office concluded in 2003 that the risk of default on a nuclear loan would be “very high – well above 50 percent.” Critics of nuclear power say these sums would divert resources from other low-carbon sources of electricity that don't have nuclear’s safety or waste issues. These include wind, solar, biomass and geothermal generators. The clean energy bank as proposed would “be a big nuclear-coal slush fund,” charged Michele Boyd, who lobbies for Physicians for Social Responsibility. Carbon capture for coal and nuclear construction are so expensive that there would be little left over for renewables, she thinks. Even some advocates of new reactors say that utilities should find private financing without involving taxpayers. “It’s a proven technology. Kick back the government and let industry get about the business of building reactors,” said Jack Spencer, an analyst for the conservative Heritage Foundation, a research center in Washington. There are other options, too, for generating more nuclear electricity. By upgrading its existing reactors, Exelon expects to gain an additional 1,300 to 1,500 megawatts of capacity. That's about what a new reactor could produce for significantly less money – a total of $3.5 billion. No loan guarantees are needed for these projects, said Marshall Murphy, a spokesman for Exelon’s nuclear division. Clyburn, however, said the nuclear industry deserved help. A former employment counselor, he finds the jobs argument convincing, and he's unimpressed by local opponents who argue that the seven plants in his home state are unsafe: “Every time I talk to somebody about the dangers, they go back to Three Mile Island," he said. "In fact, Three Mile Island did not fail…That process worked. So what’s the deal?” Most of all, Clyburn said, he wonders how the U.S. will generate electricity in the future. “I just woke up one day and said, ‘Where are you gonna get it?’” he recalled. There’s no telling whether the industry’s expensive effort will succeed. Witness the fate of the full-court press a week after Obama’s inauguration. Sen. Robert Bennett, R-Utah, who received $56,000 in nuclear-interest donations from 1999 to 2008, pitched the addition of $50 billion in loan guarantees for the nuclear power industry to the economic stimulus bill. Sen. Byron Dorgan, D-N.D., allowed it; he chairs the energy appropriations subcommittee and has received $190,000 in industry contributions since 1999, nearly half of that in 2007-2008. Although nuclear power plants starting a multi-year licensing process are hardly “shovel-ready,” “You take the vehicles you can get,” Bennett said in an interview. The full Senate included the money, but critics protested and the House insisted on removing guarantees from the final version of the bill. Obama stayed out of the fight. “The President is a very smart guy,” Clyburn said. “The Energy Department hadn’t given out the (Bush-era loan guarantees of) $18.5 billion. Why tie up $50 billion?” Since then, Chu has announced talks with four finalists for those guarantees. “That 18.5 billion can only cover three or four, but no more,” he told the House energy appropriations subcommittee in June. He’d be back to ask for more, he added.

#### **Nuclear power’s very popular.**

NEI 15 Nuclear Energy Institute “New Survey Shows Strong Support for Nuclear Energy” March 19th 2015 <https://globenewswire.com/news-release/2015/03/19/716919/10125637/en/New-Survey-Shows-Strong-Support-for-Nuclear-Energy.html> JW

Large majorities of Americans support nuclear energy and believe it will be important for the future, a new national public opinion survey shows. Public support for nuclear energy is particularly strong in the Midwest and in the South, where five reactors are being built. Americans rank reliability and clean air—two of nuclear energy's chief attributes—as their top two considerations for the way electricity is produced. "On a wide range of measures, the new survey shows an upturn in support for nuclear energy over the past year. What really stands out to me, having surveyed public opinion in this area for more than 30 years, is the sustained positive turnaround in public attitudes on nuclear energy over the past quarter century," said Ann Bisconti, president of Bisconti Research Inc. "In 1983, when the Nuclear Energy Institute's public tracking program began, only half the public favored nuclear energy. Now, more than two-thirds of Americans are favorable." Bisconti's firm, along with Quest Global Research, conducted the survey for the Nuclear Energy Institute from Feb. 18 to March 1. It has a margin of error of plus or minus three percentage points. Sixty-eight percent of those surveyed said they "favor the use of nuclear energy as one of the ways to provide electricity in the United States," with 30 percent opposed. In the Midwest, 76 percent of respondents favor the use of nuclear energy, as do 71 percent of respondents in the South.   Seventy-eight percent of respondents believe nuclear energy will be important in meeting the nation's electricity needs in the years ahead; 19 percent feel it will not be important. In a national survey by Bisconti Research one year ago, 63 percent of Americans favored the use of nuclear energy, and 74 percent felt nuclear energy will be important in meeting future electricity needs. The new survey also shows a notable increase over the past year in public perceptions of nuclear energy safety. Seventy-nine percent of respondents agree that "nuclear power plants operating in the United States are safe and secure." In two surveys in 2014, that sentiment was expressed by 70 percent of respondents.

#### Hillary is tied to Obama’s approval ratings – data proves.

Lazaroff 16 Leon (Leon Lazaroff has been with TheStreet since March 2013 as an editor, media industry reporter and political writer. Prior to joining TheStreet, Leon was a reporter at Bloomberg News on its media and emerging markets teams, a national correspondent for the Chicago Tribune and through much of the 1990s a foreign correspondent reporting from Mexico and Spain with the Associated Press and other outlets. Leon completed the Knight-Bagehot Fellowship in Economics and Business Journalism at Columbia University in 2002, earning a masters degree in journalism, and a bachelor of arts in history from the University of Wisconsin) “Why Hillary Clinton Is Embracing Barack Obama and His 47% Approval Rating” The Street Jan 24 2016 <https://www.thestreet.com/story/13426987/1/why-hillary-clinton-is-embracing-barack-obama-and-his-47-approval-rating.html> JW

In comments on the economy, Wall Street regulation, healthcare and negotiating with Iran, Clinton heaped plaudits on the man that she and her husband Bill once derided as inexperienced and naive. This time around, with the Iowa Caucuses just three weeks away, Hillary's appreciation or even affection for the president was effusive, or as Politico's Glenn Thrush put it "Clinton hugged Obama so hard he needs new ribs." There's a strategy at work here, and it's quite simple. Obama's most recent job approval rating stands at 47%, according to a Gallup Poll conducted Jan. 4-10. That figure is well within the margin of error of the 50% threshold needed to all but assure election of the party's nominee, explained Doug Sosnik, a Democratic strategist in a piece for Politico in July. Put aside for the moment that Sosnik used to work with Bill Clinton and certainly has a horse in the current race. Focus instead on that 47% number -- it doesn't sound like much but it could put Clinton into the White House come November. In eight of the last nine presidential elections, the candidate of the incumbent party was victorious whenever the standing president's job approval rating was near or above 50% prior to the start of the general election. The only exception to Sosnik's theory was George W. Bush's 2000 victory in which he lost the popular vote and was declared the winner by the Supreme Court following a tumultuous legal process. In all the other cases, if the incumbent president's rating was near or above that 50% line, that party's nominee strode to victory. If it was less than 40%, that party's candidate was defeated. "The job approval ratings of the incumbent president, regardless of whether they are running for re-election, serve as a proxy for the electorate's mood and have historically been the most accurate predictor of election outcomes," he wrote.

#### Trump reverses warming progress; pushes us past the point of no return.

Graves 16 Lucia (Guardian US columnist. She was previously a staff correspondent for National Journal magazine and a staff reporter at Huffington Post) “The Whole World Has a Stake in the Outcome of Our Presidential Election” Pacific Standard January 5th 2016 https://psmag.com/the-whole-world-has-a-stake-in-the-outcome-of-our-presidential-election-8987fb0242f2#.3062y5idu JW

Whether it’s by rolling back Obama’s Clean Power Plan — a lynchpin of the U.S. commitment to reducing greenhouse gas emissions — or by pulling out of the deal directly, a Republican president could single-handedly undo the past decade of progress on climate and propel the world far beyond the warming cap of two degrees Celsius needed to stave off the worst consequences of climate change. The U.S., as the world’s second-largest emitter currently and the biggest emitter cumulatively, has an outsized duty in preserving the planet’s future. Obama seems to be betting that a GOP president wouldn’t go through with breaking the global contract; as he told reporters in Paris: “Your credibility and America’s ability to influence events depends on taking seriously what other countries care about.” Now that there’s global consensus behind taking action, Obama added, the next president “is going to need to think this is really important.” So far, however, that looks like wishful thinking, particularly where Republican frontrunners are concerned. Ted Cruz has already said he would withdraw the U.S. from the Paris accord, telling reporters in a high school classroom in Knoxville, Tennessee: “Barack Obama seems to think the SUV parked in your driveway is a bigger threat to national security than radical Islamic terrorists who want to kill us. That’s just nutty. These are ideologues, they don’t focus on the facts, they won’t address the facts, and what they’re interested [in] instead is more and more government power.” Trump, while he hasn’t directly addressed the accord, has argued in the past that climate change is a hoax created by the Chinese to make U.S. manufacturing non-competitive. Meanwhile Rand Paul thinks granting power to the United Nations would threaten U.S. sovereignty, resulting in “a bunch of two-bit dictators telling America what to do,” as he put it recently. Marco Rubio insists the Paris climate deal is an “unfunny joke” that’s “hurting the American dream.” “Here’s the most outrageous part,” Rubio told Fox News recently. “This is a deal that’s going to require the American taxpayer to send billions of dollars to developing countries. Well, China considers itself a developing country. Does that mean the American taxpayer is going to send billions to China to help them comply with the arrangement here?” Short answer: no. Contrary to Rubio’s impressions, China played a leadership role in the Paris talks and was on the giving side of the equation, offering up to $3.1 billion to help actual developing countries. In fact, the only Republican candidate supporting clear actions on climate change, Lindsey Graham, dropped out in late December after failing for months to break the one percent mark in the polls. He never even made it onstage for anything but an undercard debate. The only other Republican contender to express (tepid) support for the deal, George Pataki, dropped out a week later. This, apparently, is what happens when you take a realistic, even semi-honest approach to climate change in the Republican primary: You’re drummed out. There remains no candidate on the Republican side who will commit to upholding the [Paris] deal, and the majority of candidates have said nothing about the agreement at all. By contrast, all three candidates on the Democratic side have said they’d not just honor the Paris Agreement, but advance it; before the gavel even went down in Paris, Bernie Sanders was lamenting that the deal doesn’t go far enough. But denial won’t play well in the general election. A recent Pew Research Center survey found 69 percent of Americans favor a multilateral commitment to limit the burning of greenhouse gas emissions; and that such statistics are sharply divided by political affiliation won’t work in Republicans’ favor come November. The leading Democratic contender, Hillary Clinton — well aware of her party’s edge here — has been increasingly vocal on climate, as when she came out against the Keystone XL pipeline even before president Obama nixed the project ahead of Paris. She’s also voiced her support for all the president’s executive actions on climate. Still, many environmental advocates still favor Sanders, who, as movement leader Bill McKibben noted in an aside at Paris climate talks, was against Keystone as early as 2011, when the pipeline first came on the national stage. Given how things looked (say) 18 months ago, environmentalists can perhaps take comfort in watching Democratic candidates argue in prime-time over who hated Keystone first, and most. The world will be presented with two stark choices come the general election. But the White House, for its part, expresses hope that the accord can be upheld regardless. “I think it’s going to be incredibly difficult to move back from this position,” a senior administration official told reporters post-Paris. “Momentum begets momentum.” “We don’t want to be naive to the domestic policies here,” he added, “but I think with every passing month and with every passing milestone, [the ideals of the Paris Agreement] will get more and more baked in.” Of course it’s possible that Republicans are just pandering and that, if elected to office, a Republican president might not seek to destroy the deal. Obama has gestured to this possibility, arguing: “Even if somebody from a different party succeeded me, one of the things you find is when you’re in this job, you think about it differently than if you’re just running for the job.” Maybe he’s right. But is it worth betting the world? For years the U.S. has had the dubious distinction of being the only country anywhere with a major party that denies the overwhelming scientific consensus that climate change is real, man-made, and accelerating. It was always a denial with far-reaching effects, given the U.S.’s hefty emissions, currently the second largest after China’s, but now that pernicious reach is extended farther still. If America elects a Republican in 2016, he (it would almost certainly be a “he”) could undermine the diplomatic efforts of almost 200 countries, offering our global partners a tempting excuse to abandon their climate commitments — and to distrust the U.S. for years to come. Given America’s long history of hypocrisy in climate negotiations and repeated broken promises to world partners, such a reversal could be devastating. In Paris, for the first time ever, the U.S. played the role of a climate leader, hero even, in these talks, a hard-won victory that’s been years in the making. That Obama has invested so much in this deal for so long, that he’s made it a centerpiece of his administration — and, many expect, the overarching mission of his final year in office — underscores just how difficult it is to achieve the kind of victory we saw in Paris, and just how much these global climate talks depend on the power of the U.S. president. If Obama could make this, the next guy could break it. It might not be easy to destroy the Paris Agreement, but it would be a whole lot easier than what the world pulled off at le Bourget.

#### Warming is real, anthropogenic, and causes extinction.

Jamail 15 Dahr “Mass Extinction: It's the End of the World as We Know It” July 6 2015 Truthout <http://www.truth-out.org/news/item/31661-mass-extinction-it-s-the-end-of-the-world-as-we-know-it> JW

Guy McPherson is a professor emeritus of evolutionary biology, natural resources and ecology at the University of Arizona, and has been a climate change expert for 30 years. He has also become a controversial figure, due to the fact that he does not shy away from talking about the possibility of near-term human extinction. While McPherson's perspective might sound like the stuff of science fiction, there is historical precedent for his predictions. Fifty-five million years ago, a 5-degree Celsius rise in average global temperatures seems to have occurred in just 13 years, according to a study published in the October 2013 issue of the Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences. A report in the August 2013 issue of Science revealed that in the near term, earth's climate will change 10 times faster than during any other moment in the last 65 million years. McPherson fears that we are well along in the process of causing our own extinction. Prior to that, the Permian mass extinction that occurred 250 million years ago, also known as the "Great Dying," was triggered by a massive lava flow in an area of Siberia that led to an increase in global temperatures of 6 degrees Celsius. That, in turn, caused the melting of frozen methane deposits under the seas. Released into the atmosphere, those gases caused temperatures to skyrocket further. All of this occurred over a period of approximately 80,000 years. The change in climate is thought to be the key to what caused the extinction of most species on the planet. In that extinction episode, it is estimated that 95 percent of all species were wiped out. Today's current scientific and observable evidence strongly suggests we are in the midst of the same process - only this time it is anthropogenic, and happening exponentially faster than even the Permian mass extinction did. In fact, a recently published study in Science Advances states, unequivocally, that the planet has officially entered its sixth mass extinction event. The study shows that species are already being killed off at rates much faster than they were during the other five extinction events, and warns ominously that humans could very likely be among the first wave of species to go extinct. So if some feel that McPherson's thinking is extreme, when the myriad scientific reports he cites to back his claims are looked at squarely and the dots are connected, the perceived extremism begins to dissolve into a possible, or even likely, reality. The idea of possible human extinction, coming not just from McPherson but a growing number of scientists (as well as the aforementioned recently published report in Science), is now beginning to occasionally find its way into mainstream consciousness. "A Child Born Today May Live to See Humanity's End, Unless ..." reads a recent blog post title from Reuters. It reads: Humans will be extinct in 100 years because the planet will be uninhabitable, according to Australian microbiologist Frank Fenner, one of the leaders of the effort to eradicate smallpox in the 1970s. He blames overcrowding, denuded resources and climate change. Fenner's prediction is not a sure bet, but he is correct that there is no way emissions reductions will be enough to save us from our trend toward doom. And there doesn't seem to be any big global rush to reduce emissions, anyway. McPherson, who maintains the blog "Nature Bats Last," told Truthout, "We've never been here as a species and the implications are truly dire and profound for our species and the rest of the living planet." Truthout first interviewed McPherson in early 2014, at which time he had identified 24 self-reinforcing positive feedback loops triggered by human-caused climate disruption. Today that number has grown to more than 50, and continues to increase. A self-reinforcing positive feedback loop is akin to a "vicious circle": It accelerates the impacts of anthropogenic climate disruption (ACD). An example would be methane releases in the Arctic. Massive amounts of methane [is] are currently locked in the permafrost, which is now melting rapidly. As the permafrost melts, methane - a greenhouse gas 100 times more potent than carbon dioxide on a short timescale - is released into the atmosphere, warming it further, which in turn causes more permafrost to melt, and so on. As soon as this summer, we are likely to begin seeing periods of an ice-free Arctic. (Those periods will arrive by the summer of 2016 at the latest, according to a Naval Postgraduate School report.) Once the summer ice begins melting away completely, even for short periods, methane releases will worsen dramatically. Is it possible that, on top of the vast quantities of carbon dioxide from fossil fuels that continue to enter the atmosphere in record amounts yearly, an increased release of methane could signal the beginning of the sort of process that led to the Great Dying? McPherson, like the scientists involved in the recent study that confirms the arrival of the sixth great extinction, fears that the situation is already so serious and so many self-reinforcing feedback loops are already in play that we are well along in the process of causing our own extinction. Furthermore, McPherson remains convinced that it could happen far more quickly than generally believed possible - in the course of just the next few decades, or even sooner.

#### Turns case – Trump sustains coal energy while Clinton pushes us towards renewables.

Rocco 7/25 Matthew “How Trump vs. Clinton Will Impact American Energy” Fox Business July 25th 2016 <http://www.foxbusiness.com/politics/2016/07/25/how-trump-vs-clinton-will-impact-american-energy.html> JW

The November presidential election is shaping up to have far-reaching implications for the energy industry. Donald Trump, who officially became the Republican nominee for president last week, pledged in his primetime address Thursday to support the coal industry and American energy production, echoing past remarks in which the businessman has been critical of the Environmental Protection Agency and President Barack Obama’s regulatory moves. Trump’s challenger, presumptive Democratic nominee Hillary Clinton, is expected to stand by the Obama administration’s environmental regulations targeting coal. The former Senator also wants to cut U.S. oil consumption by a third through the development of alternative energy projects. S&P Global Market Intelligence recently issued a wide-ranging report examining the election’s likely impact on various industries, including energy. With sharply contrasting views, the 2016 candidates would lead America’s energy policy on two different paths. A Clinton victory would be a boon for solar companies and other alternative-energy firms, S&P said. Clinton is targeting a one-third cut to U.S. oil consumption, paired with a national goal of 500 million solar panels by the end of a hypothetical eight-year presidency. S&P estimates that another 100 million to 120 million solar panels would need to be installed to meet that goal. That implies a 20% increase in annual demand. In a four-year term, demand would need to surge 45% each year. “Generating that kind of growth is possible but highly contingent, in our view, on the continued extension of the Investment Tax Credit (ITC), which is now slated to expire in 2021,” S&P analyst Stewart Glickman wrote in the research note. Solar firms including First Solar (FSLR) and SolarCity (SCTY) stand to benefit from Clinton’s policy proposals. More from FOXBusiness.com 'America First': Donald Trump Touts Jobs Plan in RNC Speech Ivanka Trump: My Father Will Change Labor Laws to Benefit Women Billionaire Harold Hamm: Trump Will Achieve American Energy Independence Given stronger federal incentives for solar and other renewables like wind energy—not to mention the prospect of additional regulations—a Clinton administration may spell trouble for oil and natural gas. In particular, oil refiners would feel the effects of Clinton’s plan to tackle crude consumption. The International Energy Agency pegged U.S. oil demand at 19.5 million barrels per day in the first quarter, easily the highest in the world, as cheap gasoline prices encouraged Americans to drive more. Cutting that figure by one-third, or 6.5 million barrels per day, would lead refineries to become underutilized, thus hurting their earnings power. Valero Energy (VLO), Phillips 66 (PSX) and Marathon Petroleum (MPC) are a few companies that might be negatively affected. No matter who wins in November, S&P doesn’t foresee alternative energy reaching a point of cost competitiveness with fossil fuels at least until after the next four-year term. A Trump presidency would be good news for the oil and gas industry, as well as coal. In an energy-policy speech delivered in May, Trump criticized President Obama for stopping TransCanada’s (TRP) Keystone XL pipeline, working to scale back drilling on federal land and targeting coal-fired power plants with new emissions rules. Peabody Energy (BTUUQ), the nation’s largest coal company, joined many of its rivals when it filed for bankruptcy in April. Trump has said he will remove obstacles for energy exploration and support all forms of energy without picking “winners and losers,” according to his remarks in May Opens a New Window. . S&P believes Trump could seek to cut the ITC, and a significant reduction to those tax credits has the potential to drag solar installation demand as much as 60% lower. In turn, near-term demand for fossil fuels would grow. Trump’s energy plans should offer a “mild tailwind” for oil and gas companies such as Valero, Glickman wrote. Larger energy firms, namely Exxon Mobil (XOM) and Chevron (CVX), are also poised to see positive or negative trends depending on the vote. However, their international exposure should soften the blow either way.

### Link – Lobbies

#### Nuclear lobby has dedicated significant funds over the last decade, creating partnerships that have morphed into key constituencies to the party in power.

Pasternak 10 Judy Pasternak, 1-24-2010, "Nuclear energy lobby working hard to win support," No Publication, http://investigativereportingworkshop.org/investigations/nuclear-energy-lobbying-push/story/nuclear-energy-working-hard-win-support/

WASHINGTON – The Obama administration may soon guarantee as much as $18.5 billion in loans to build new nuclear reactors to generate electricity, and Congress is considering whether to add billions more to support an expansion of nuclear power. These actions come after an extensive decade-long campaign in which companies and unions related to the industry have spent more than $600 million on lobbying and nearly $63 million on campaign contributions, according to an analysis by the Investigative Reporting Workshop at American University.Nuclear power generates about 20 percent of America's electricity, but many existing reactors are aging and no new plant has been authorized since the 1979 incident at Three Mile Island, when small amounts of radiation were released and authorities feared for days that a huge surge might escape. That's in part because it can cost as much as $8 billion to build a nuclear plant, and in part because the problems of nuclear waste and safety remain unsolved. The problem of global warming remains unsolved, too, however, and as the nation struggles to rebound from a deep recession, building new nuclear reactors increasingly looks to some like a big jobs program. The industry, capitalizing on both developments, argues that nuclear energy must be part of any effort to curb heat-trapping carbon emissions. Its longtime foes -- environmentalists, labor unions, Democrats -- increasingly agree. "This is nuclear’s year," said House Majority Whip James Clyburn, D-S.C., who in recent years has become one of the industry’s champions on Capitol Hill. Democratic Sen. Barbara Boxer of California, who chairs the Senate Environment and Public Works Committee, has pledged that the climate bill that's making its way through Congress will include new government help for the nuclear industry. Sen. Lindsay Graham of South Carolina says he'd provide a much-sought Republican vote for the bill if its energy provisions include help for the nuclear industry. Some Republicans, who historically have been friendlier to nuclear power, are pushing a plan to build 100 reactors over the next 20 years. The industry considers the forthcoming $18.5 billion in guarantees a down payment on a more ambitious expansion. Getting to this point has taken lots of time and lots of money, and the debate over the safety and economics of nuclear electricity is far from settled. During the Bush administration, the nuclear industry got more in electricity-related research and development funding than coal and other fossil fuels did combined, and Congress approved the loan guarantees. More recently, the industry has been reaching out to newly empowered Democrats, among them Clyburn, whose state is among the nation’s leading nuclear-power producers. (The president’s home state of Illinois is the biggest, and Obama and some of his closest political allies have long relationships with Exelon Corp., the country’s biggest nuclear power company.) The industry also has begun to build strong ties to important labor unions. 'THERE ISN'T A SOLUTION WITHOUT NUCLEAR' In the first half of last year, when Congress was considering whether to add nuclear loan guarantees to the economic stimulus package and was starting to work on the climate change bill, companies and unions interested in nuclear energy spent more than $55.8 million on lobbying, the analysis found. Federal Election Commission records also show that industry trade group the Nuclear Energy Institute donated a total of $99,000 to 63 candidates in the first half of 2009. Sixty percent of the money went to Democrats. As a group, nuclear interests gave $3.5 million to congressional candidates in the first six months of last year. It hasn’t hurt that all these efforts have coincided with a big run-up in energy prices and growing concern over the effects that coal-fired power plants have on the buildup in carbon emissions and global warming. We don’t believe that nuclear energy is the answer, but as you look at needs for clean energy and the need to protect the environment, there isn’t a solution without nuclear,” Areva spokesman Jarret Adams said. Areva’s reactors would power many of the new plants that are on the drawing boards. Still, many environmental groups worry about the safety of nuclear power. “The nuclear power industry is always going to remain several minutes away from serious accident and disaster,” said Tom Clements, the Southeastern Nuclear Campaign coordinator for Friends of the Earth, a global environmental group. The Price-Anderson Act, passed in 1957, limits industry liability for a nuclear accident. Most recently renewed in 2005, it requires a private operator to buy the most private insurance possible – currently $300 million – and assesses fees on the industry for a fund to pay out damages above that amount if necessary. If the fund, which now stands at more than $10 billion, isn't enough, Congress would decide whether to require more industry contributions or appropriate public money. The law is now in force through 2025. Opponents also question why nuclear power needs federal subsidies. “If nuclear power is the right path to go down, why can’t it pay for itself?” Clements said. “Nuclear power is going to be dependent on subsidies and handouts and we still get nuclear waste and the threat of accident in return.” The waste issue remains perhaps the biggest stumbling block. Generating nuclear power produces huge quantities of radioactive waste, including plutonium, a key ingredient for nuclear weapons. When many of the current nuclear reactors were put into place, there was an assumption that the federal government eventually would create a national repository. After decades of debate, however, that promise appears no closer to being met, and the plants have become de facto storage facilities. PLAYING THE INFLUENCE GAME In many ways, the nuclear power industry’s efforts to win support are a textbook case of how the influence game is played in Washington. Besides the money spent on lobbying and campaign contributions, the industry, led by the NEI, has created a network of allies who give speeches, quote one another approvingly and showcase one another on their Web sites. The effect is an echo chamber of support for nuclear power. While energy lobbies such as big oil and big coal have taken turns in the spotlight, big nuke flies largely under the radar. Alex Flint, the NEI's chief lobbyist, summed up the strategy last year at a luncheon with utility officials from Southeastern states: "Quiet." He likes to let surrogates make the case. For instance, Patrick Moore, who played a leading role in Greenpeace during the 1970s, now helps lead the Clean and Safe Energy Coalition, known as CASEnergy Coalition. His partner is Christine Todd Whitman, a former New Jersey governor and Environmental Protection Agency administrator. Both have touted nuclear power at gatherings of members of Congress and on national television. Left unmentioned in these settings is that the NEI paid a public relations company to create CASEnergy, an example of “Astroturfing” techniques that many industries have adopted to give the appearance of grass-roots support. Moore, who runs a consulting company based in Vancouver, British Columbia, acknowledged the ties in an interview, referring to NEI as “my biggest client.” He declined to divulge his fees. Whitman’s firm, the Whitman Strategy Group, says on its site that it was hired by CASEnergy, but the coalition’s Web site doesn’t mention the financial relationship. Neither does NEI’s site, where Whitman and Moore are quoted on the merits of a nuclear future. Labor is another new ally. NEI and 20 unions co-sponsored a “Welcome Back, Congress” bash in a House of Representatives office building last January. In March, Mark Ayers of the AFL-CIO arranged a meeting between NEI’s president and House Energy and Commerce Chair Henry Waxman to talk about the climate bill. The liberal California Democrat is leading the effort to pass the measure. It seemed to work like magic. “Now Mr. Waxman has not been somebody who’s been particularly open to our agenda in the past and yet he was very much so this time,” NEI’s Flint told nuclear executives in May. Flint credited union help for the changed atmosphere, quoting his boss’s description of labor allies as “bulletproof gear.” No one expected Waxman to lead the charge for nuclear, Flint said. Rep. John Dingell, a veteran Michigan Democrat who was Waxman’s predecessor as committee chair and the top recipient of nuclear-interest campaign contributions – more than $600,000 since 1999 – was offering an amendment to the climate bill that would create a clean-energy bank, which would help finance an expansion of low-carbon energy technologies. In addition to renewable energy sources such as wind, solar and geothermal power, the capture of emissions from coal and nuclear energy plants would be eligible for help. NEI had merely hoped that Waxman wouldn't squelch Dingell’s proposal without a vote. Waxman not only let the amendment in, but also voted for it. Ayers received a call from NEI’s then-president soon after he took up his AFL-CIO post in 2007. Ayers listened to his plea for help, he recalled in an interview, while thinking that many proposed new units would be in the South and in remote areas, generally not union-friendly territory. So he offered “a quid pro quo here: I help you, but I want to build these plants.” Later, a requirement in the House climate bill's bank amendment for “prevailing wages” at projects that receive government-backed loans helped Ayers' construction unions. More explicitly, NEI took a pro-union position for nuclear construction sites and gave Ayers access to utility officials to pitch labor contracts. Cementing the relationship, NEI hired one of Ayers’ lobbyists and last May, elected Ayers and an officer of the electrical workers’ union to its board. Third Way, which describes itself as a moderate progressive policy organization, also has come out in favor of nuclear power. After NEI sent Third Way Vice President Matt Bennett to France in July 2007, he wrote, “We all came back with the faith of the converted.” Two months later, Bennett and Third Way trustee John Dyson wrote a Boston Globe column headlined, “Just say ‘oui’ to nuclear power.” In the second-to-last paragraph, they noted that Third Way got less than 1 percent of its budget from nuclear industry donations. BRIDGES TO CONGRESS, WHITE HOUSE These constituencies are important to the party that's in power. Disclosure records show that the industry deftly kept its traditional base among Senate Republicans – who want 100 new nuclear units even if the climate bill fails – while building bridges to Democrats in both houses. Clyburn is one example, receiving about $195,600 from nuclear energy companies and affiliated unions since 2000, $187,000 of that in the last two election cycles. NEI contributed at least $10,000 to Clyburn’s scholarship foundation, and nuclear interests spent more than $30,000 for two six-day trips for Clyburn and his wife. One was to inspect nuclear facilities in France, and the other in the United Kingdom. He also owns stock valued at $15,000 to $50,000 in SCANA Corp., a South Carolina company that's applied to build two reactors. Clyburn has become a key ambassador for the industry, making ample use of its surrogate network. He quoted CASEnergy's Moore approvingly in an opinion column he wrote and in a keynote speech to a convention of Ayers’ building trades group. He arranged a session on nuclear power for the Congressional Black Caucus. Nuclear energy is so high on Clyburn’s agenda that he made a point of attending Senate confirmation hearings for Steven Chu, Obama’s energy secretary. When Chu spoke favorably about nuclear fission as a source of electricity, Clyburn concluded “Obama is not anti-nuclear or he would not have nominated Chu.” In an interview, Clyburn said he could report progress. Four congressional Democrats from New York, he said, are moving in his direction on nuclear power. Carol Browner, the Obama administration's energy czar and a former head of the EPA, told him that it would be inconsistent to worry about global warming and dismiss nuclear power. He raised the issue at a congressional lunch with Obama and said he left feeling reassured. The industry is plugged in on its own at the White House through labor groups and Exelon. Exelon CEO John W. Rowe is NEI’s past chairman and a current director. The company, based in the president’s home state of Illinois, has funded Obama campaigns since his Senate run, when employees contributed more than $48,000, according to CQ Moneyline, and Exelon’s political action committee gave the maximum of $10,000. Exelon employees gave Obama nearly $210,000 for his presidential campaign, according to CQ Moneyline. Exelon's management includes two Obama bundlers who are friends of the president. One, director John W. Rogers, helped direct Obama’s Illinois fundraising during his presidential race and helped plan the inauguration. The other, Frank M. Clark, has lobbied on nuclear issues for the company. White House Chief of Staff Rahm Emanuel is close to Exelon, too. The merger that created the utility was the biggest deal of Emanuel’s brief but lucrative investment-banking career. Another White House connection is strategist David Axelrod, whom Exelon subsidiary ComEd once hired to create a fake grass-roots organization supporting higher electricity rates. Exelon lobbyist David Brown said that the company had applied for the federal loan guarantees, but it didn't make the cut for the first round. Exelon hasn't contacted its high-level White House friends, he added. HELP WANTED FROM WASHINGTON The nuclear wish list is controversial. Electric utilities want more than $100 billion in guarantees for construction that's expected to cost $200 billion. The NEI contends that the guarantees wouldn't cost taxpayers a dime because the recipients would pay fees that should cover the cost of defaults, much the way that auto insurers cover the cost of accidents with premiums paid by safe drivers. However, the Congressional Budget Office concluded in 2003 that the risk of default on a nuclear loan would be “very high – well above 50 percent.” Critics of nuclear power say these sums would divert resources from other low-carbon sources of electricity that don't have nuclear’s safety or waste issues. These include wind, solar, biomass and geothermal generators. The clean energy bank as proposed would “be a big nuclear-coal slush fund,” charged Michele Boyd, who lobbies for Physicians for Social Responsibility. Carbon capture for coal and nuclear construction are so expensive that there would be little left over for renewables, she thinks. Even some advocates of new reactors say that utilities should find private financing without involving taxpayers. “It’s a proven technology. Kick back the government and let industry get about the business of building reactors,” said Jack Spencer, an analyst for the conservative Heritage Foundation, a research center in Washington. There are other options, too, for generating more nuclear electricity. By upgrading its existing reactors, Exelon expects to gain an additional 1,300 to 1,500 megawatts of capacity. That's about what a new reactor could produce for significantly less money – a total of $3.5 billion. No loan guarantees are needed for these projects, said Marshall Murphy, a spokesman for Exelon’s nuclear division. Clyburn, however, said the nuclear industry deserved help. A former employment counselor, he finds the jobs argument convincing, and he's unimpressed by local opponents who argue that the seven plants in his home state are unsafe: “Every time I talk to somebody about the dangers, they go back to Three Mile Island," he said. "In fact, Three Mile Island did not fail…That process worked. So what’s the deal?” Most of all, Clyburn said, he wonders how the U.S. will generate electricity in the future. “I just woke up one day and said, ‘Where are you gonna get it?’” he recalled. There’s no telling whether the industry’s expensive effort will succeed. Witness the fate of the full-court press a week after Obama’s inauguration. Sen. Robert Bennett, R-Utah, who received $56,000 in nuclear-interest donations from 1999 to 2008, pitched the addition of $50 billion in loan guarantees for the nuclear power industry to the economic stimulus bill. Sen. Byron Dorgan, D-N.D., allowed it; he chairs the energy appropriations subcommittee and has received $190,000 in industry contributions since 1999, nearly half of that in 2007-2008. Although nuclear power plants starting a multi-year licensing process are hardly “shovel-ready,” “You take the vehicles you can get,” Bennett said in an interview. The full Senate included the money, but critics protested and the House insisted on removing guarantees from the final version of the bill. Obama stayed out of the fight. “The President is a very smart guy,” Clyburn said. “The Energy Department hadn’t given out the (Bush-era loan guarantees of) $18.5 billion. Why tie up $50 billion?” Since then, Chu has announced talks with four finalists for those guarantees. “That 18.5 billion can only cover three or four, but no more,” he told the House energy appropriations subcommittee in June. He’d be back to ask for more, he added.

### Link – Nuke Power Popular

#### **Nuclear power’s popular – overwhelming public support.**

NEI 15 Nuclear Energy Institute “New Survey Shows Strong Support for Nuclear Energy” March 19th 2015 <https://globenewswire.com/news-release/2015/03/19/716919/10125637/en/New-Survey-Shows-Strong-Support-for-Nuclear-Energy.html> JW

Large majorities of Americans support nuclear energy and believe it will be important for the future, a new national public opinion survey shows. Public support for nuclear energy is particularly strong in the Midwest and in the South, where five reactors are being built. Americans rank reliability and clean air—two of nuclear energy's chief attributes—as their top two considerations for the way electricity is produced. "On a wide range of measures, the new survey shows an upturn in support for nuclear energy over the past year. What really stands out to me, having surveyed public opinion in this area for more than 30 years, is the sustained positive turnaround in public attitudes on nuclear energy over the past quarter century," said Ann Bisconti, president of Bisconti Research Inc. "In 1983, when the Nuclear Energy Institute's public tracking program began, only half the public favored nuclear energy. Now, more than two-thirds of Americans are favorable." Bisconti's firm, along with Quest Global Research, conducted the survey for the Nuclear Energy Institute from Feb. 18 to March 1. It has a margin of error of plus or minus three percentage points. Sixty-eight percent of those surveyed said they "favor the use of nuclear energy as one of the ways to provide electricity in the United States," with 30 percent opposed. In the Midwest, 76 percent of respondents favor the use of nuclear energy, as do 71 percent of respondents in the South.   Seventy-eight percent of respondents believe nuclear energy will be important in meeting the nation's electricity needs in the years ahead; 19 percent feel it will not be important. In a national survey by Bisconti Research one year ago, 63 percent of Americans favored the use of nuclear energy, and 74 percent felt nuclear energy will be important in meeting future electricity needs. The new survey also shows a notable increase over the past year in public perceptions of nuclear energy safety. Seventy-nine percent of respondents agree that "nuclear power plants operating in the United States are safe and secure." In two surveys in 2014, that sentiment was expressed by 70 percent of respondents.

### Internal Link – Nuke Lobby Powerful

#### The nuclear lobby is one of the most powerful and persistent in the entire country.

Diane Farsetta, 3-15-2008, "Meet the Nuclear Power Lobby," No Publication, http://www.progressive.org/news/2008/03/158588/meet-nuclear-power-lobby

The nuclear power industry is seeing its fortunes rise. "Seventeen entities developing license applications for up to thirty-one new reactors did not just happen," boasted Frank "Skip" Bowman. "It has been carefully planned." Bowman, a retired admiral, heads the Nuclear Energy Institute (NEI), the main lobbying group for the industry. His remarks, at a February gathering of more than 100 Wall Street analysts, were part of a presentation on "reasoned expectations for new nuclear plant construction." Bowman knew it was important to impress his audience of wary potential investors. "We are where we are today because this industry started many years ago on a systematic program to identify what went wrong the last time," he said, "and develop ways to eliminate or manage those risks." NEI has certainly won bragging rights. Thanks to its persistence, a growing number of commentators and policymakers see nuclear power as the solution to global warming. "Safe, secure, vital," is the mantra of the Indian Point nuclear power plant in New York -- the plant closest to a major U.S. population center -- which was recently sanctioned by the Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) for repeatedly missing deadlines to install new emergency warning sirens. Industry-funded groups with names like the "New Jersey Affordable, Clean, Reliable Energy Coalition" keep springing up near nuclear plants applying for license renewals. Credulous reporters describe NEI consultant Patrick Moore as a "Greenpeace co-founder," even though he has a longer record of flacking for the logging, mining, biotech, and nuclear industries than his increasingly distant past as an environmental activist. In what could be considered a double greenwash, General Electric counts its new nuclear reactor design among its "Ecomagination" line of environmentally friendly products. Such public relations efforts address one thing that "went wrong the last time" -- widespread public opposition to nuclear power. But the so-called nuclear renaissance, which NEI estimates will bring four to eight new nuclear plants online by 2016, also requires generous government support. Accordingly, NEI has ramped up its already-substantial lobbying operations. In addition to the sixteen NEI employees registered as federal lobbyists, the group currently retains fifteen outside lobbying firms and consultants. Last year, NEI lobbyists visited thirteen federal agencies, as well as both houses of Congress. NEI's lobbying disclosure forms show that the organization helped shape more than twenty bills in 2007, from the Nuclear Fuel Management and Disposal Act to the Tax Technical Corrections Act to the Energy Independence and Security Act. All in all, NEI spent nearly $45 million on industry coordination, policy development, communications, and "governmental affairs" in 2006, according to its most recent financial report. That doesn't include lobbying by individual companies with a stake in the nuclear power business, such as Entergy, Exelon, or Duke Energy. "We now have a fewer number of companies operating most of the nuclear plants, and so nuclear power for those companies is a core business," NEI's Scott Peterson explained to the trade publication O'Dwyer's. "They have to be much more aggressive in communicating about nuclear energy." NEI's numbers also don't include utility groups, an important part of the pro-nuclear lobby. On Yucca Mountain, the controversial proposed nuclear waste repository in Nevada, "utilities went to the mayors of the towns where nuclear waste was being stored," explains Anna Aurilio, the director of Environment America's Washington, D.C., office. "And even though it wasn't necessarily the best thing for those towns, the mayors were convinced by the utilities ... to support a bill that overrode a lot of protections for the environment and public health, when it comes to nuclear waste." And NEI's local lobbying got a substantial boost last year, when the American Legislative Exchange Council, a conservative group that brings together corporate lobbyists and state legislators, decided to promote state bills on new nuclear power plants and nuclear waste storage and reprocessing. While nuclear industry lobbying is widespread and aggressive, its impact is not always readily apparent. Take, for example, the Lieberman-Warner climate change bill, which the Senate is expected to debate this summer. The bill -- also known as S.2191, or America's Climate Security Act -- does not mention the word "nuclear" once in its 200-plus pages. Yet an aide to Senator Joe Lieberman called the measure "the most historic incentive for nuclear in the history of the United States," according to Environment & Energy Daily. One section of the Lieberman-Warner bill says that "25 percent of all the funds deposited into a new climate change worker training fund shall be reserved for zero and low-emitting carbon energy that has a rated capacity of at least 750 megawatts of power," notes Tyson Slocum, the research director of Public Citizen's energy program. "That's a huge threshold, so that's going to exclude wind and solar right off the bat.... The only thing that could possibly meet that target would be nuclear power." Similar language in another section of the bill effectively reserves another half a trillion dollars for the nuclear industry, according to Slocum. The NEI is also steamrolling the approval process for new nuclear plants. The original process required companies to obtain separate permits to construct and operate new nuclear plants. "At each of those two stages, the public or anybody could intervene, if they met standing requirements and had a valid technical contention, not just some rooted opposition to nuclear power," explains Dave Lochbaum, the director of the Union of Concerned Scientists' nuclear safety program. NEI started pushing to change the new plant approval process in the 1980s. The current process not only combines plant construction and operating permits, but also seems designed to stymie local opposition. Companies get permission to build a new nuclear plant at a particular site at any point over twenty years, while specific reactor designs are certified separately. "That process eliminates public participation, because the reactor design is being certified, but nobody knows where it will go. It's hard to fight a reactor that may or may not be built in your backyard," says Lochbaum. "The public can watch, but that's about it." Lochbaum adds that citizens have more rights to oppose a Wal-Mart in their neighborhood than they do a nuclear power plant. As NEI's Skip Bowman assured his Wall Street audience, this is no mistake. Last year, as the Nuclear Regulatory Commission was finalizing the new plant approval process, NEI worked hard to ensure that it met industry standards. "We assembled several hundred industry personnel -- the top licensing lawyers and licensing engineers in the United States," Bowman recounted. "They sifted through the proposed rule section by section, sentence by sentence, identifying ambiguities and potential uncertainties, and developing techniques to eliminate them." As is true for many high-powered interest groups, the revolving door has been kind to NEI. NEI's chief lobbyist, Alex Flint, started his career in the office of Senator Pete Domenici, Republican of New Mexico. In 2000, Flint left Congress to work as a lobbyist. His clients included NEI, Exelon, and other nuclear companies. In 2003, Flint went back to work for Domenici as majority staff director for the Senate Energy and Natural Resources Committee. Under Flint, the committee helped craft the Energy Policy Act of 2005, which contained $12 billion in subsidies for the nuclear power industry, according to Public Citizen. When Flint joined NEI in February 2006, his new boss, Skip Bowman, remarked, "Working daily with Senator Peter Domenici, Alex has played a vital role in developing a bold future for nuclear energy in America." One of NEI's current lobbying priorities is to expand the federal loan guarantees for new nuclear plants that were included in the 2005 bill. Former NRC Commissioner Jeffrey Merrifield championed several measures to hustle the new plant approval process, including a proposal that originated with NEI to narrow the meaning of the word "construction." The new definition allows companies to build roads, start digging, and even erect cooling towers for new nuclear plants without triggering the permitting process. In July 2007, just twelve days after leaving the NRC, Merrifield joined the Shaw Group, a company that describes itself as "a leading force in nuclear new plant design and construction." Ethics reform legislation may make nuclear industry lobbying slightly less flamboyant. As recently as 2006, NEI sponsored the House Energy and Commerce Committee's softball team, took part in Congressional caucus golf outings, and funded literally hundreds of Congressional "fact-finding" trips to Las Vegas that included tours of Yucca Mountain. But the reforms haven't impacted NEI's nonstop lobbying, generous political donations, and high-powered policy forums. "It's hard to imagine an industry that's more brazen in its quest for ever-larger federal subsidies," says Environment America's Anna Aurilio. "They already get their waste completely taken care of, they already get a guaranteed cap on liability in case of an accident.... Any problem that could happen with the nuclear industry, the U.S. taxpayer is ultimately going to have to pick up. And yet, they keep coming back to Congress for more and more and more."’

#### Lobbies control politics—America’s political transformation makes lobbying the single most influential component of politics.

Lee Drutman, 4-20-2015, "How Corporate Lobbyists Conquered American Democracy," Atlantic, http://www.theatlantic.com/business/archive/2015/04/how-corporate-lobbyists-conquered-american-democracy/390822/

Something is out of balance in Washington. Corporations now spend about $2.6 billion a year on reported lobbying expenditures—more than the $2 billion we spend to fund the House ($1.18 billion) and Senate ($860 million). It’s a gap that has been widening since corporate lobbying began to regularly exceed the combined House-Senate budget in the early 2000s. Today, the biggest companies have upwards of 100 lobbyists representing them, allowing them to be everywhere, all the time. For every dollar spent on lobbying by labor unions and public-interest groups together, large corporations and their associations now spend $34. Of the 100 organizations that spend the most on lobbying, 95 consistently represent business.One has to go back to the Gilded Age to find business in such a dominant political position in American politics. While it is true that even in the more pluralist 1950s and 1960s, political representation tilted towards the well-off, lobbying was almost balanced by today's standards. Labor unions were much more important, and the public-interest groups of the 1960s were much more significant actors. And very few companies had their own Washington lobbyists prior to the 1970s. To the extent that businesses did lobby in the 1950s and 1960s (typically through associations), they were clumsy and ineffective. “When we look at the typical lobby,” concluded three leading political scientists in their 1963 study, American Business and Public Policy, “we find its opportunities to maneuver are sharply limited, its staff mediocre, and its typical problem not the influencing of Congressional votes but finding the clients and contributors to enable it to survive at all.” Things are quite different today. The evolution of business lobbying from a sparse reactive force into a ubiquitous and increasingly proactive one is among the most important transformations in American politics over the last 40 years. Probing the history of this transformation reveals that there is no “normal” level of business lobbying in American democracy. Rather, business lobbying has built itself up over time, and the self-reinforcing quality of corporate lobbying has increasingly come to overwhelm every other potentially countervailing force. It has also fundamentally changed how corporations interact with government—rather than trying to keep government out of its business (as they did for a long time), companies are now increasingly bringing government in as a partner, looking to see what the country can do for them. If we set our time machine back to 1971, we’d find a leading corporate lawyer earnestly writing that, “As every business executive knows, few elements of American society today have as little influence in government as the American businessman, the corporation, or even the millions of corporate stockholders. If one doubts this, let him undertake the role of 'lobbyist' for the business point of view before Congressional committees.” That lawyer was soon-to-be Supreme Court Justice Lewis F. Powell Jr., whose now-famous “Powell Memorandum” is a telling insight into the frustration that many business leaders felt by the early 1970s. Congress had gone on a regulatory binge in the 1960s—spurred on by a new wave of public-interest groups. Large corporations had largely sat by idly, unsure of what to do. In 1972, against the backdrop of growing compliance costs, slowing economic growth and rising wages, a community of leading CEOs formed the Business Roundtable, an organization devoted explicitly to cultivating political influence. Alcoa CEO John Harper, one of the Roundtable’s founders, said at the time, “I think we all recognize that the time has come when we must stop talking about it, and get busy and do something about it.” f. They killed a major labor law reform, rolled back regulation, lowered their taxes, and helped to move public opinion in favor of less government intervention in the economy. By the early 1980s, corporate leaders were “purring” (as a 1982 Harris Poll described it). Corporations could have declared victory and gone home, thus saving on the costs of political engagement. Instead, they stuck around and kept at it. Many deepened their commitments to politics. After all, they now had lobbyists to help them see all that was at stake in Washington, and all the ways in which staying politically active could help their businesses. Those lobbyists would go on to spend the 1980s teaching companies about the importance of political engagement. But it would take time for them to become fully convinced. As one company lobbyist I interviewed for my new book, The Business of America Is Lobbying, told me, “When I started [in 1983], people didn’t really understand government affairs. They questioned why you would need a Washington office, what does a Washington office do? I think they saw it as a necessary evil. All of our competitors had Washington offices, so it was more, well we need to have a presence there and it’s just something we had to do.” To make the sell, lobbyists had to go against the long-entrenched notion in corporate boardrooms that politics was a necessary evil to be avoided if possible. To get corporations to invest fully in politics, lobbyists had to convince companies that Washington could be a profit center. They had to convince them that lobbying was not just about keeping the government far away—it could also be about drawing government close. As one lobbyist told me (in 2007), “Twenty­-five years ago… it was ‘just keep the government out of our business, we want to do what we want to,’ and gradually that’s changed to ‘how can we make the government our partners?’ It’s gone from ‘leave us alone’ to ‘let’s work on this together.’” Another corporate lobbyist recalled,“When they started, [management] thought government relations did something else. They thought it was to manage public relations crises, hearing inquiries... My boss told me, you’ve taught us to do things we didn’t know could ever be done.” As companies became more politically active and comfortable during the late 1980s and the 1990s, their lobbyists became more politically visionary. For example, pharmaceutical companies had long opposed the idea of government adding a prescription drug benefit to Medicare, on the theory that this would give government bargaining power through bulk purchasing, thereby reducing drug industry profits. But sometime around 2000, industry lobbyists dreamed up the bold idea of proposing and supporting what became Medicare Part D—a prescription drug benefit, but one which explicitly forbade bulk purchasing—an estimated $205 billion benefit to companies over a 10-year period. What makes today so very different from the 1970s is that corporations now have the resources to play offense and defense simultaneously on almost any top-priority issue. When I surveyed corporate lobbyists on the reasons why their companies maintained a Washington office, the top reason was “to protect the company against changes in government policy.” On a one-to-seven scale, lobbyists ranked this reason at 6.2 (on average). But closely behind, at 5.7, was “Need to improve ability to compete by seeking favorable changes in government policy.” While reversing history is obviously impossible, there is value in appreciating how much things have changed. And there are ways to bring back some balance: Investing more in the government, especially Congress, would give leading policymakers resources to hire and retain the most experienced and expert staff, and reduce their reliance on lobbyists. Also, organizations that advocate for less well-resourced positions could use more support. If history teaches anything, it's that the world does not need to look as it does today.

### Internal Link – Tied to Obama

#### Hillary is tied to Obama’s approval ratings – data proves.

Lazaroff 16 Leon (Leon Lazaroff has been with TheStreet since March 2013 as an editor, media industry reporter and political writer. Prior to joining TheStreet, Leon was a reporter at Bloomberg News on its media and emerging markets teams, a national correspondent for the Chicago Tribune and through much of the 1990s a foreign correspondent reporting from Mexico and Spain with the Associated Press and other outlets. Leon completed the Knight-Bagehot Fellowship in Economics and Business Journalism at Columbia University in 2002, earning a masters degree in journalism, and a bachelor of arts in history from the University of Wisconsin) “Why Hillary Clinton Is Embracing Barack Obama and His 47% Approval Rating” The Street Jan 24 2016 <https://www.thestreet.com/story/13426987/1/why-hillary-clinton-is-embracing-barack-obama-and-his-47-approval-rating.html> JW

In comments on the economy, Wall Street regulation, healthcare and negotiating with Iran, Clinton heaped plaudits on the man that she and her husband Bill once derided as inexperienced and naive. This time around, with the Iowa Caucuses just three weeks away, Hillary's appreciation or even affection for the president was effusive, or as Politico's Glenn Thrush put it "Clinton hugged Obama so hard he needs new ribs." There's a strategy at work here, and it's quite simple. Obama's most recent job approval rating stands at 47%, according to a Gallup Poll conducted Jan. 4-10. That figure is well within the margin of error of the 50% threshold needed to all but assure election of the party's nominee, explained Doug Sosnik, a Democratic strategist in a piece for Politico in July. Put aside for the moment that Sosnik used to work with Bill Clinton and certainly has a horse in the current race. Focus instead on that 47% number -- it doesn't sound like much but it could put Clinton into the White House come November. In eight of the last nine presidential elections, the candidate of the incumbent party was victorious whenever the standing president's job approval rating was near or above 50% prior to the start of the general election. The only exception to Sosnik's theory was George W. Bush's 2000 victory in which he lost the popular vote and was declared the winner by the Supreme Court following a tumultuous legal process. In all the other cases, if the incumbent president's rating was near or above that 50% line, that party's nominee strode to victory. If it was less than 40%, that party's candidate was defeated. "The job approval ratings of the incumbent president, regardless of whether they are running for re-election, serve as a proxy for the electorate's mood and have historically been the most accurate predictor of election outcomes," he wrote.

#### Clinton gets blamed for Obama’s political mishaps – would cost her the election.

Sabato 15 Larry Sabato (founder and director of the University of Virginia Center for Politics. He is also the University Professor of Politics at the University of Virginia), Kyle Kondik (Before joining the Center for Politics in 2011, Kyle served as director of policy and research for former Ohio Attorney General Richard Cordray and as a reporter, editorial page editor, and political columnist at newspapers in Northeast Ohio), and Geoffrey Skelley (Geoffrey received an M.A. in Political Science from James Madison University in 2011). “10 Factors That Will Determine The Next President.” Center for Politics. December 17th, 2015.

President Obama is not on the ballot, but he looms over the race. His national standing has remained very consistent — some would say stagnant — throughout much of his presidency. Throughout 2015, Obama’s approval has generally been around 45%, with a little bit of variation. It seems reasonable to expect that he will be around the same point next year, unless further domestic terrorism or other developments send his ratings tumbling. According to Gallup, Obama has averaged a middling 47% approval throughout his presidency, and as we found earlier this year, his approval has been the steadiest in modern history. Postwar history suggests that when a president has weak approval, his party pays a price in the next election. Harry Truman (1952), Lyndon Johnson (1968), Gerald Ford (1976), Jimmy Carter (1980), George H.W. Bush (1992), and George W. Bush (2008) all had mediocre-to-poor approval ratings, and the opposing party won all of those elections (defeating incumbents Ford, Carter, and H.W. Bush, and winning open-seat races in the others). Meanwhile, the strong approval ratings of Dwight Eisenhower (1960) and Bill Clinton (2000) couldn’t save their would-be successors, Vice Presidents Richard Nixon and Al Gore. Both lost excruciatingly close elections. Some of these approval ratings are from months before the election and don’t necessarily reflect where the incumbent’s approval was on Election Day — Truman, for example, was at 40% in late June 1948, but his approval was likely higher by November, when he won an upset victory. There’s one other factor to consider, though. It’s possible that in a partisan age, job approval doesn’t mean what it once did. Just think back to the 2014 midterm. Then-Gov. Pat Quinn (D-IL) was at about 30% approval, but he only lost by four percentage points. Gov. Sam Brownback (R) and Sen. Pat Roberts (R) of Kansas had approval ratings in the mid-30s, but both won reelection. Granted, both of those states have strong partisan tilts (Illinois is Democratic, Kansas is Republican), and these were state-level races in a midterm year, but it’s possible that low approvals aren’t as much of a drag as they might once have been. Perhaps Obama’s approval will drop below the mid-40s, but Clinton could win if the Republicans produce a poor nominee. The other thing is that, with the history of presidential approval ratings cited above, we do not have a huge sample size. There isn’t a hard-and-fast rule here, but there is a reason that Clinton, so far, is generally staying close to the president. Presenting a united Democratic front, and seeing Obama have a successful final year in office, can only be good for her chances. Plus, if Obama tanks, so probably do Clinton’s chances.

#### Clinton is tied to Obama’s popularity.

Enten 15 Harry Enten “For Better Or Worse, Clinton Is Likely Stuck Running For Obama’s Third Term” FiveThirtyEight April 15th 2015 http://fivethirtyeight.com/datalab/for-better-or-worse-clinton-is-likely-stuck-running-for-obamas-third-term/

But all that debate and posturing are largely academic. Clinton is already tied to Obama and is likely to remain so. Remember when Clinton was Obama’s secretary of state and her favorable ratings ran well ahead of his? That isn’t the case anymore. Check out this chart of YouGov data since the beginning of 2013: [Graph omitted.] Clinton’s favorable rating has fallen into line with Obama’s. The latest local regression estimate puts Clinton’s favorable rating at 48.9 percent and Obama’s at 48.5 percent. And that understates the relationship. Even when Clinton’s favorable rating was stronger than Obama’s, the two generally fell and rose at the same time. The correlation between the two has been 0.79. Now the relationship is even stronger. YouGov breaks down the favorability ratings by age, gender, income, ideology, party identification, race and region. Over the past two weeks, Clinton’s favorable rating in each of these groups mirrors Obama’s. [Graph omitted.] The average absolute difference between Clinton’s and Obama’s favorable ratings for the groups is just 2.6 percentage points; the median is just 2 percentage points. Keep in mind, all these differences are within the margin of error. The correlation between Clinton’s and Obama’s favorable rating in these 23 demographic groups is 0.99. Clinton simply doesn’t seem to have a different base of support from Obama. And that’s par for the course historically. It’s difficult for a nominee of the same party as the sitting president to run away from that president. The favorability ratings of the nominee and the incumbent president rarely differ by more than a few percentage points. Let’s go through all the elections in which a sitting president didn’t run for re-election. We’ll start with 1960, the first year for which we have favorability ratings. On the eve of the 1960 presidential election, Gallup found that President Dwight Eisenhower and Vice President Richard Nixon (the GOP’s nominee that year) — two very different politicians — had nearly equal favorability ratings: 83 percent of Americans gave Eisenhower a positive score on a 10-point scale, compared with 79 percent for Nixon. Eight years later, in 1968, President Lyndon Johnson’s approval ratings were so low that he decided not to run for re-election, although he still did fairly well on personal popularity. By the end of the campaign, Vice President Hubert Humphrey, the Democratic nominee, earned a 61 on the thermometer test, a favorability scale from 0 to 100 in the American National Elections Studies. Johnson was nearby with a 58. In 1988, Republican nominee and Vice President George H.W. Bush was trying to take over for President Ronald Reagan. Reagan was fairly popular, and the economy was doing well. Both earned a 60 on the thermometer test. The 2000 election is perhaps the most interesting because Vice President Al Gore, the Democratic nominee, was critiqued for not embracing President Bill Clinton’s legacy. Clinton, of course, was still dealing with the fallout from certain dalliances. For all of Gore’s running away, his thermometer rating of 57 was just 1 point above Clinton’s 56. Republican John McCain in 2008 is the lone exception. His thermometer score was 52. President George W. Bush’s was 40. Could Hillary Clinton pull off what McCain did? It’s possible. Clinton had a well-formed public profile before Obama came on the scene; she’s not running in Obama’s shadow. In addition, we don’t have a ton of data points here — just a handful of elections. So we can’t make any hard and fast rules. That said, McCain was an unusual case. He, unlike Clinton and everyone else on this list, did not serve in the incumbent president’s administration. McCain also had a considerably different ideological profile from Bush. Obama’s and Clinton’s are similar. Chances are that the current polling will hold. Clinton’s fate will more or less be tied to Obama’s popularity and the factors that determine it. Any difference will be small, though in a very close election perhaps a small difference is all she’ll need.

### Turns Case (Coal)

#### Turns case – Trump sustains coal energy while Clinton pushes us towards renewables.

Rocco 7/25 Matthew “How Trump vs. Clinton Will Impact American Energy” Fox Business July 25th 2016 <http://www.foxbusiness.com/politics/2016/07/25/how-trump-vs-clinton-will-impact-american-energy.html> JW

The November presidential election is shaping up to have far-reaching implications for the energy industry. Donald Trump, who officially became the Republican nominee for president last week, pledged in his primetime address Thursday to support the coal industry and American energy production, echoing past remarks in which the businessman has been critical of the Environmental Protection Agency and President Barack Obama’s regulatory moves. Trump’s challenger, presumptive Democratic nominee Hillary Clinton, is expected to stand by the Obama administration’s environmental regulations targeting coal. The former Senator also wants to cut U.S. oil consumption by a third through the development of alternative energy projects. S&P Global Market Intelligence recently issued a wide-ranging report examining the election’s likely impact on various industries, including energy. With sharply contrasting views, the 2016 candidates would lead America’s energy policy on two different paths. A Clinton victory would be a boon for solar companies and other alternative-energy firms, S&P said. Clinton is targeting a one-third cut to U.S. oil consumption, paired with a national goal of 500 million solar panels by the end of a hypothetical eight-year presidency. S&P estimates that another 100 million to 120 million solar panels would need to be installed to meet that goal. That implies a 20% increase in annual demand. In a four-year term, demand would need to surge 45% each year. “Generating that kind of growth is possible but highly contingent, in our view, on the continued extension of the Investment Tax Credit (ITC), which is now slated to expire in 2021,” S&P analyst Stewart Glickman wrote in the research note. Solar firms including First Solar (FSLR) and SolarCity (SCTY) stand to benefit from Clinton’s policy proposals. More from FOXBusiness.com 'America First': Donald Trump Touts Jobs Plan in RNC Speech Ivanka Trump: My Father Will Change Labor Laws to Benefit Women Billionaire Harold Hamm: Trump Will Achieve American Energy Independence Given stronger federal incentives for solar and other renewables like wind energy—not to mention the prospect of additional regulations—a Clinton administration may spell trouble for oil and natural gas. In particular, oil refiners would feel the effects of Clinton’s plan to tackle crude consumption. The International Energy Agency pegged U.S. oil demand at 19.5 million barrels per day in the first quarter, easily the highest in the world, as cheap gasoline prices encouraged Americans to drive more. Cutting that figure by one-third, or 6.5 million barrels per day, would lead refineries to become underutilized, thus hurting their earnings power. Valero Energy (VLO), Phillips 66 (PSX) and Marathon Petroleum (MPC) are a few companies that might be negatively affected. No matter who wins in November, S&P doesn’t foresee alternative energy reaching a point of cost competitiveness with fossil fuels at least until after the next four-year term. A Trump presidency would be good news for the oil and gas industry, as well as coal. In an energy-policy speech delivered in May, Trump criticized President Obama for stopping TransCanada’s (TRP) Keystone XL pipeline, working to scale back drilling on federal land and targeting coal-fired power plants with new emissions rules. Peabody Energy (BTUUQ), the nation’s largest coal company, joined many of its rivals when it filed for bankruptcy in April. Trump has said he will remove obstacles for energy exploration and support all forms of energy without picking “winners and losers,” according to his remarks in May Opens a New Window. . S&P believes Trump could seek to cut the ITC, and a significant reduction to those tax credits has the potential to drag solar installation demand as much as 60% lower. In turn, near-term demand for fossil fuels would grow. Trump’s energy plans should offer a “mild tailwind” for oil and gas companies such as Valero, Glickman wrote. Larger energy firms, namely Exxon Mobil (XOM) and Chevron (CVX), are also poised to see positive or negative trends depending on the vote. However, their international exposure should soften the blow either way.

### Impact – Warming

#### Trump reverses warming progress; pushes us past the point of no return.

Graves 16 Lucia (Guardian US columnist. She was previously a staff correspondent for National Journal magazine and a staff reporter at Huffington Post) “The Whole World Has a Stake in the Outcome of Our Presidential Election” Pacific Standard January 5th 2016 https://psmag.com/the-whole-world-has-a-stake-in-the-outcome-of-our-presidential-election-8987fb0242f2#.3062y5idu JW

Whether it’s by rolling back Obama’s Clean Power Plan — a lynchpin of the U.S. commitment to reducing greenhouse gas emissions — or by pulling out of the deal directly, a Republican president could single-handedly undo the past decade of progress on climate and propel the world far beyond the warming cap of two degrees Celsius needed to stave off the worst consequences of climate change. The U.S., as the world’s second-largest emitter currently and the biggest emitter cumulatively, has an outsized duty in preserving the planet’s future. Obama seems to be betting that a GOP president wouldn’t go through with breaking the global contract; as he told reporters in Paris: “Your credibility and America’s ability to influence events depends on taking seriously what other countries care about.” Now that there’s global consensus behind taking action, Obama added, the next president “is going to need to think this is really important.” So far, however, that looks like wishful thinking, particularly where Republican frontrunners are concerned. Ted Cruz has already said he would withdraw the U.S. from the Paris accord, telling reporters in a high school classroom in Knoxville, Tennessee: “Barack Obama seems to think the SUV parked in your driveway is a bigger threat to national security than radical Islamic terrorists who want to kill us. That’s just nutty. These are ideologues, they don’t focus on the facts, they won’t address the facts, and what they’re interested [in] instead is more and more government power.” Trump, while he hasn’t directly addressed the accord, has argued in the past that climate change is a hoax created by the Chinese to make U.S. manufacturing non-competitive. Meanwhile Rand Paul thinks granting power to the United Nations would threaten U.S. sovereignty, resulting in “a bunch of two-bit dictators telling America what to do,” as he put it recently. Marco Rubio insists the Paris climate deal is an “unfunny joke” that’s “hurting the American dream.” “Here’s the most outrageous part,” Rubio told Fox News recently. “This is a deal that’s going to require the American taxpayer to send billions of dollars to developing countries. Well, China considers itself a developing country. Does that mean the American taxpayer is going to send billions to China to help them comply with the arrangement here?” Short answer: no. Contrary to Rubio’s impressions, China played a leadership role in the Paris talks and was on the giving side of the equation, offering up to $3.1 billion to help actual developing countries. In fact, the only Republican candidate supporting clear actions on climate change, Lindsey Graham, dropped out in late December after failing for months to break the one percent mark in the polls. He never even made it onstage for anything but an undercard debate. The only other Republican contender to express (tepid) support for the deal, George Pataki, dropped out a week later. This, apparently, is what happens when you take a realistic, even semi-honest approach to climate change in the Republican primary: You’re drummed out. There remains no candidate on the Republican side who will commit to upholding the [Paris] deal, and the majority of candidates have said nothing about the agreement at all. By contrast, all three candidates on the Democratic side have said they’d not just honor the Paris Agreement, but advance it; before the gavel even went down in Paris, Bernie Sanders was lamenting that the deal doesn’t go far enough. But denial won’t play well in the general election. A recent Pew Research Center survey found 69 percent of Americans favor a multilateral commitment to limit the burning of greenhouse gas emissions; and that such statistics are sharply divided by political affiliation won’t work in Republicans’ favor come November. The leading Democratic contender, Hillary Clinton — well aware of her party’s edge here — has been increasingly vocal on climate, as when she came out against the Keystone XL pipeline even before president Obama nixed the project ahead of Paris. She’s also voiced her support for all the president’s executive actions on climate. Still, many environmental advocates still favor Sanders, who, as movement leader Bill McKibben noted in an aside at Paris climate talks, was against Keystone as early as 2011, when the pipeline first came on the national stage. Given how things looked (say) 18 months ago, environmentalists can perhaps take comfort in watching Democratic candidates argue in prime-time over who hated Keystone first, and most. The world will be presented with two stark choices come the general election. But the White House, for its part, expresses hope that the accord can be upheld regardless. “I think it’s going to be incredibly difficult to move back from this position,” a senior administration official told reporters post-Paris. “Momentum begets momentum.” “We don’t want to be naive to the domestic policies here,” he added, “but I think with every passing month and with every passing milestone, [the ideals of the Paris Agreement] will get more and more baked in.” Of course it’s possible that Republicans are just pandering and that, if elected to office, a Republican president might not seek to destroy the deal. Obama has gestured to this possibility, arguing: “Even if somebody from a different party succeeded me, one of the things you find is when you’re in this job, you think about it differently than if you’re just running for the job.” Maybe he’s right. But is it worth betting the world? For years the U.S. has had the dubious distinction of being the only country anywhere with a major party that denies the overwhelming scientific consensus that climate change is real, man-made, and accelerating. It was always a denial with far-reaching effects, given the U.S.’s hefty emissions, currently the second largest after China’s, but now that pernicious reach is extended farther still. If America elects a Republican in 2016, he (it would almost certainly be a “he”) could undermine the diplomatic efforts of almost 200 countries, offering our global partners a tempting excuse to abandon their climate commitments — and to distrust the U.S. for years to come. Given America’s long history of hypocrisy in climate negotiations and repeated broken promises to world partners, such a reversal could be devastating. In Paris, for the first time ever, the U.S. played the role of a climate leader, hero even, in these talks, a hard-won victory that’s been years in the making. That Obama has invested so much in this deal for so long, that he’s made it a centerpiece of his administration — and, many expect, the overarching mission of his final year in office — underscores just how difficult it is to achieve the kind of victory we saw in Paris, and just how much these global climate talks depend on the power of the U.S. president. If Obama could make this, the next guy could break it. It might not be easy to destroy the Paris Agreement, but it would be a whole lot easier than what the world pulled off at le Bourget.

#### Warming is real, anthropogenic, and causes extinction.

Jamail 15 Dahr “Mass Extinction: It's the End of the World as We Know It” July 6 2015 Truthout <http://www.truth-out.org/news/item/31661-mass-extinction-it-s-the-end-of-the-world-as-we-know-it> JW

Guy McPherson is a professor emeritus of evolutionary biology, natural resources and ecology at the University of Arizona, and has been a climate change expert for 30 years. He has also become a controversial figure, due to the fact that he does not shy away from talking about the possibility of near-term human extinction. While McPherson's perspective might sound like the stuff of science fiction, there is historical precedent for his predictions. Fifty-five million years ago, a 5-degree Celsius rise in average global temperatures seems to have occurred in just 13 years, according to a study published in the October 2013 issue of the Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences. A report in the August 2013 issue of Science revealed that in the near term, earth's climate will change 10 times faster than during any other moment in the last 65 million years. McPherson fears that we are well along in the process of causing our own extinction. Prior to that, the Permian mass extinction that occurred 250 million years ago, also known as the "Great Dying," was triggered by a massive lava flow in an area of Siberia that led to an increase in global temperatures of 6 degrees Celsius. That, in turn, caused the melting of frozen methane deposits under the seas. Released into the atmosphere, those gases caused temperatures to skyrocket further. All of this occurred over a period of approximately 80,000 years. The change in climate is thought to be the key to what caused the extinction of most species on the planet. In that extinction episode, it is estimated that 95 percent of all species were wiped out. Today's current scientific and observable evidence strongly suggests we are in the midst of the same process - only this time it is anthropogenic, and happening exponentially faster than even the Permian mass extinction did. In fact, a recently published study in Science Advances states, unequivocally, that the planet has officially entered its sixth mass extinction event. The study shows that species are already being killed off at rates much faster than they were during the other five extinction events, and warns ominously that humans could very likely be among the first wave of species to go extinct. So if some feel that McPherson's thinking is extreme, when the myriad scientific reports he cites to back his claims are looked at squarely and the dots are connected, the perceived extremism begins to dissolve into a possible, or even likely, reality. The idea of possible human extinction, coming not just from McPherson but a growing number of scientists (as well as the aforementioned recently published report in Science), is now beginning to occasionally find its way into mainstream consciousness. "A Child Born Today May Live to See Humanity's End, Unless ..." reads a recent blog post title from Reuters. It reads: Humans will be extinct in 100 years because the planet will be uninhabitable, according to Australian microbiologist Frank Fenner, one of the leaders of the effort to eradicate smallpox in the 1970s. He blames overcrowding, denuded resources and climate change. Fenner's prediction is not a sure bet, but he is correct that there is no way emissions reductions will be enough to save us from our trend toward doom. And there doesn't seem to be any big global rush to reduce emissions, anyway. McPherson, who maintains the blog "Nature Bats Last," told Truthout, "We've never been here as a species and the implications are truly dire and profound for our species and the rest of the living planet." Truthout first interviewed McPherson in early 2014, at which time he had identified 24 self-reinforcing positive feedback loops triggered by human-caused climate disruption. Today that number has grown to more than 50, and continues to increase. A self-reinforcing positive feedback loop is akin to a "vicious circle": It accelerates the impacts of anthropogenic climate disruption (ACD). An example would be methane releases in the Arctic. Massive amounts of methane [is] are currently locked in the permafrost, which is now melting rapidly. As the permafrost melts, methane - a greenhouse gas 100 times more potent than carbon dioxide on a short timescale - is released into the atmosphere, warming it further, which in turn causes more permafrost to melt, and so on. As soon as this summer, we are likely to begin seeing periods of an ice-free Arctic. (Those periods will arrive by the summer of 2016 at the latest, according to a Naval Postgraduate School report.) Once the summer ice begins melting away completely, even for short periods, methane releases will worsen dramatically. Is it possible that, on top of the vast quantities of carbon dioxide from fossil fuels that continue to enter the atmosphere in record amounts yearly, an increased release of methane could signal the beginning of the sort of process that led to the Great Dying? McPherson, like the scientists involved in the recent study that confirms the arrival of the sixth great extinction, fears that the situation is already so serious and so many self-reinforcing feedback loops are already in play that we are well along in the process of causing our own extinction. Furthermore, McPherson remains convinced that it could happen far more quickly than generally believed possible - in the course of just the next few decades, or even sooner.

### Impact – Totalitarianism

#### Trump creates a violent national discourse of fascism and racism—you have an ethical obligation to reject this.

Giroux 15 Henry “Fascism in Donald Trump's United States” December 8 2015 truthout <http://www.truth-out.org/news/item/33951-fascism-in-donald-trump-s-united-states> JW

Donald Trump's blatant appeal to fascist ideology and policy considerations took a more barefaced and dangerous turn this week when he released a statement call[ed]ing for "a total and complete shutdown of Muslims entering the United States." Trump qualified this racist appeal to voters' fears about Muslims by stating that such a ban is necessary "until our country's representatives can figure out what is going on." When Trump proposed the ban at a rally at the USS Yorktown in South Carolina, his plan drew loud cheers from the crowd. Many critics have responded by making clear that Trump's attempts to place a religious test on immigration and travel are unconstitutional. Others have expressed shock in the face of a proposal that violates the democratic ideals that have shaped US history. Fellow Republican Jeb Bush called Trump "unhinged." What almost none of the presidential candidates or mainstream political pundits have admitted, however, is not only that Trump's comments form a discourse of hate, bigotry and exclusion, but also that such expressions of racism and fascism are resonat[e]ing deeply in a landscape of US culture and politics crafted by 40 years of conservative counterrevolution. One of the few politicians to respond to Trump's incendiary comments was former Maryland Gov. Martin O'Malley (D), who stated rightly that Donald Trump is a "fascist demagogue." This overtly fascistic turn also revealed itself in November when Trump mocked Serge Kovaleski, a New York Times investigative reporter living with a disability, at a rally in South Carolina. This contemptuous reference to Kovaleski's physical disability was morally odious and painful to observe, but not in the least surprising: Trump is consistently a hatemonger and spreads his message without apology in almost every public encounter in which he finds himself. In this loathsome instance, Trump simply expanded his hate-filled discourse in a new direction, after having already established the deeply ingrained racism and sexism at the heart of his candidacy. Trump's mockery of Kovaleski and his blatantly discriminatory policy proposals against Muslims are of a piece with his portrayal of Mexican immigrants as violent rapists and drug dealers, and with his calls for the United States to put Syrian refugees in detention centers and create a database to control them. These comments sound eerily close to SS leader Heinrich Himmler's call for camps that held prisoners under orders of what the Nazis euphemistically called "protective custody." This fascist parallel only gains currency with Trump's latest efforts to ban Muslims from the United States. To quote the Holocaust Encyclopedia: In the earliest years of the Third Reich, various central, regional, and local authorities in Germany established concentration camps to detain political opponents of the regime, including German Communists, Socialists, trade unionists, and others from left and liberal political circles. In the spring of 1933, the SS established Dachau concentration camp, which came to serve as a model for an expanding and centralized concentration camp system under SS management. Moreover, Trump's hateful attitude toward people with disabilities points to an earlier element of Hitler's program of genocide in which people with physical and mental disabilities were viewed as disposable because they allegedly undermined the Nazi notion of the "master race." The demonization, objectification and pathologizing of people with disabilities was the first step in developing the foundation for the Nazis' euthanasia program aimed at those declared unworthy of life. This lesson seems to be lost on the mainstream media, who largely viewed Trump's despicable remarks toward people with disabilities as simply insulting. What is truly alarming is how many corporate media figures and intellectuals are defending Trump, not realizing that his candidacy is rooted in the brutal seeds of totalitarianism being cultivated in US society. Trump represents more than the anti-democratic practices and antics of Joseph McCarthy; he illustrates how totalitarianism can take different forms in specific historical moments. Rather than being dismissed as a wild card in US politics, as "careless and undisciplined," as some of his conservative supporters claim, or not a true member of the Republican Party as Ross Douthat has written in The New York Times, it is crucial to recognize that Trump's popularity represents what Victor Wallis has described as a dangerous "political space ... in both the wider culture and in recent history." This is evident not only in his race-baiting, his crude comments about women and his call to round up and deport 11 million immigrants, but also in his increasing support for violence against protesters at his rallies. There is a disturbing totalitarian message in his call to "make American great again" by any means necessary. The degree to which Trump expresses his support of violence, racism and the violation of civil liberties, visibly and without apology, is unprecedented in recent national political races. But the ideas he espouses have always been present under the surface of US politics, which is perhaps why the public and media on the whole seem unperturbed by such comments as: "We're going to have to do things that we never did before. And some people are going to be upset about it, but I think that now everybody is feeling that security is going to rule ... And so we're going to have to do certain things that were frankly unthinkable a year ago." Trump's call to do "the unthinkable" is a fundamental principle of any notion of totalitarianism, regardless of the form it takes. The roots of totalitarianism are not frozen in history. They may find a different expression in the present, but they are connected in all kinds of ways to the past. For instance, Trump's demagoguery bears a close resemblance to the discourse characteristic of other fascist leaders. There are traces of fascism's past most particularly in what has been called by Patrick Healy and Maggie Haberman, Trump's "dark power of words." As Healy and Haberman point out in a recent New York Times article, Trump's use of fearmongering and bombastic language is characterized by "divisive phrases, harsh words and violent imagery" characteristic of demagogues of the past. Moreover, Trump, like many past demagogues, presents himself as a prophet incapable of being wrong, disdains any sense of nuance and uses a militarized discourse populated by words such as "kill," "destroy," "attack" and "fight," all of which display his infatuation with violence and deep disdain for dialogue, thoughtfulness and democracy itself. Trump is an anti-intellectual who distorts the truth even when proven wrong, and his appeals are emotive rather than based on facts, reason and evidence. Trump and his ilk merge a hypernationalism, racism, economic fundamentalism and religious bigotry with a flagrant sense of lawlessness. His hate-filled speech is matched by an unsettling embrace of violence against immigrants and other oppositional voices issued by his supporters at many of his rallies. This type of lawlessness does more than encourage hate and violent mob mentalities; it also legitimates the kind of inflammatory rhetoric that gives credibility to acts of violence against others. There has been an eerie silence from Trump and other Republican Party presidential candidates in the face of the killing of three people at a Planned Parenthood clinic in Colorado, the shooting of Black Lives Matter protesters by white supremacists in Minneapolis, the increasing attacks on mosques throughout the United States, and the alarming number of shootings of Black men and youth by white police officers, not to mention the recent shooting in San Bernardino, California. Trump and his fellow right-wing extremists rail against Mexican immigrants, Syrian refugees and young people protesting police violence but said nothing about the police officer who shot Laquan McDonald, a Black 17-year-old, 16 times, or about the Chicago Police Department's refusal to make public a year-old squad-car video of the incident. And Trump's camp has remained silent about the threat of white supremacists groups in the United States, the US drone strikes that killed members of a wedding party in Afghanistan and the illegal targeted assassination of alleged terrorists. This is not simply the behavior of moral and political cowards; it is the toxic affirmation of the machineries of death we associate with fascism. Such acts point to a large climate of lawlessness in US society that makes it all the easier to ignore human rights, justice and democracy itself. There are historical precedents for this type of violence and for the hate-filled racist speech of the politicians who create the climate that legitimates it. We heard this same hatred in the words of Hitler, [and] Mussolini, Pinochet and other demagogic orators who have ranted against Jews, communists and others alleged "infidels." Trump's recent call to bring back waterboarding and to support a torture regime far exceeds what might be called an act of stupidity or ignorance. Torture in this instance becomes a means of exacting revenge on those whom the right considers to be "other," un-American and inferior - principally Muslims, immigrants and activists taking part in the movement for Black lives. We have heard this discourse before during the totalitarian regimes of the 1930s and later during the dictatorships in Latin America in the 1970s. Heather Digby Parton is right when she writes that Donald Trump "may be the first openly fascistic frontrunner for the Republican presidential nomination but the ground was prepared and the seeds of his success sowed over the course of many years. We've had fascism flowing through the American political bloodstream for quite some time." (1) This is a discourse that betrays dark and treacherous secrets not simply about Trump, but also about the state of US culture and politics. Trump's brutal racism, cruelty and Nazi-style policy recommendations are more than shocking; they are emblematic of totalitarianism's hatred of liberalism, its call for racial purity, its mythic celebration of nationalism, its embrace of violence, its disdain for weakness and its anti-intellectualism. This is the discourse of total terror. These elements of totalitarianism have become the new American normal. The conditions that produced the torture chambers, intolerable violence, extermination camps and the squelching of dissent are still with us. Totalitarianism is not simply a relic of the past. It lives on in new forms and it is just as terrifying and dangerous today as it was in the past. (2) Trump gives legitimacy to a number of fascist policies through his appeal to hypernationalism and disdain of human rights, his portrayal of Muslims and immigrants as a racial and religious threat, a rampant sexism, his obsession with national security, his aggressive mobilization of a culture of fear, his targeting of dissent and individual groups, his endorsement of human rights abuses such as torture, his support for the ongoing militarization of public life, his invocation of an external enemy as a threat to "our way of life," his call for the creation of a detention system as part of a state of emergency, support for a blind patriotism, his calls for the suspension of the rule of law, his affirmation of a belligerent masculinity, and his support for an aggressive imperial policy. Mark Summer is right in arguing that the ghost of fascism runs through US society, indicating that fascist sympathies never went away and that the threat of fascism has to be taken seriously. Summer writes that fascism didn't win on the battlefield, but it won ideologically: It won because the same fears, the same greed, the same hatred that fueled its growth in the first part of the twentieth century never went away. The symbols of fascism became anathema, but the causes ... went deep. And gradually, slowly, one step at a time, all those vices became first tolerated, then treated as virtues, and then as the only acceptable view.... [For instance,] our long, stumbling lurch to the right; the building force of corporate power; the relentless need for war; a police whose power of enforcement is divorced from law; a preening nationalism that rewards the full rights of citizenship only to those who fit an ever-narrower mold ... I'm not saying we're moving toward fascism. I'm saying we started that drift a long time ago, and now we're well across the line. Trump is not just an ethically dead aberration. Rather, he is the successor of a long line of fascists who shut down public debate, attempt to humiliate their opponents, endorse violence as a response to dissent and criticize any public display of democratic principles. The United States has reached its endpoint with Trump, and his presence should be viewed as a stern warning of the nightmare to come. Trump is not an isolated figure in US politics; he is simply the most visible and popular expression of a number of extremists in the Republican Party who now view democracy as a liability. Ben Carson, Ted Cruz and Marco Rubio all support an ideology that reduces certain human beings "to anonymous beings." Think about their prevailing attacks on Mexican immigrants, Black people and Syrian refugees. Primo Levi, the great writer and survivor of Auschwitz, called this use of dehumanizing abstractions one of the core principles of Nazi barbarism. Fast forward to Trump's endorsement of violence at his rallies, coupled with his overt racism, his call for mass surveillance, his discourse of mass hatred and his embrace of politics as an extension of war. This is not the discourse of Kafka, but of those extremists who have become cheerleaders for totalitarianism. Trump is not a straight talker, as some writers have claimed, or merely entertaining. As David L. Clark pointed out in a personal correspondence, the frankness of Trump's call for violence coupled with his unapologetic thirst for injustice position him as the "latest expression of a fascism that has poisoned political life throughout modernity. He is unabashedly vicious because he is both an agent and a symptom of a barren political landscape in which viciousness goes insolently unhidden." (3) Trump is a monster without a conscience, a politician with a toxic set of policies. He is the product of a form of finance capitalism and a long legacy of racism and violence in which conscience is put to sleep, democracy withers and public values are extinguished. This is truly a time of monsters and Trump is simply the most visible and certainly one of the most despicable. What must be acknowledged is that Trump is the most extreme visible expression of a new form of authoritarianism identified by the late political theorist, Sheldon Wolin. According to Wolin, all the elements are in place today for a contemporary form of authoritarianism, which he calls "inverted totalitarianism." Wolin writes: Thus the elements are in place: a weak legislative body, a legal system that is both compliant and repressive, a party system in which one part, whether in opposition or in the majority, is bent upon reconstituting the existing system so as to permanently favor a ruling class of the wealthy, the well-connected and the corporate, while leaving the poorer citizens with a sense of helplessness and political despair, and, at the same time, keeping the middle classes dangling between fear of unemployment and expectations of fantastic rewards once the new economy recovers. That scheme is abetted by a sycophantic and increasingly concentrated media; by the integration of universities with their corporate benefactors; by a propaganda machine institutionalized in well-funded think tanks and conservative foundations; by the increasingly closer cooperation between local police and national law enforcement agencies aimed at identifying terrorists, suspicious aliens, and domestic dissidents. (4) Totalitarianism destroys everything that makes politics possible. It is both an ideological poison and a brutal mode of governance and control. It puts reason to sleep and destroys any viable elements of democracy. Trump reminds us of totalitarianism's addiction to tyranny, its attachments to the machineries of death and its moral emptiness. What is crucial to acknowledge is that the stories, legacies and violence that are part of totalitarianism's history must be told over and over again so that it becomes possible to recognize how it appears in new forms, replicated under the banner of terror and insecurity by design, and endlessly legitimated by the image-making of the corporate disimagination machines. The call to safety in authoritarian societies is code for illicit spying, treating people as criminals, militarizing the police, constructing a surveillance state, allowing the killing of Black people as acts of domestic terrorism, and ultimately making disappear those individuals and groups that we dehumanize or consider threatening. The extremist fervor that Trump has stirred up should be a rallying cry for a struggle not simply against a crude and reactionary populism, but also against the tyranny of totalitarianism in its new and proto-fascist forms.

### Impact – Nuke War

#### Trump presidency causes nuclear war—unchecked proliferation.

Kleiner 6-3 Sam (postdoctoral fellow at Yale Law School. He is the author of a forthcoming book about the U.S. air war in China during World War II) “With His Finger on the Trigger” The Atlantic June 3 2016 <http://www.theatlantic.com/international/archive/2016/06/donald-trump-nuclear-weapons/485504/> JW

A nuclear-armed Trump is indeed a scary thought. But his apparent comfort with encouraging other countries to develop their own nuclear stockpiles is just as scary, if not more so. For 70 years, American presidents of both parties have understood the simple arithmetic involved—that the more countries have nuclear weapons, the more opportunities there are for nuclear war to break out, whether by design or by accident. Yet the Republican nominee is effectively advocating the spread of arms so destructive they haven’t been used since their horrifying debut over Hiroshima and Nagasaki in 1945. In addition to remarking that the United States would be “better off” if nations like South Korea and Japan had nuclear weapons, Trump also seemed open, in an interview with CNN’s Anderson Cooper, to the possibility of Saudi Arabia, too, getting the bomb. He has since tried to walk this back—“They said that I wanted Japan to get nuclear weapons. Give me a break.” But as both Clinton and CNN have pointed out, he did say exactly that. Given contradictions like this, it can be hard to take Trump seriously on foreign policy. But the implications of what he has said on nuclear weapons are extremely serious. A Trump presidency could reverse decades of American presidents’ work to hold the line against the spread of nuclear weapons, ushering in a new era of proliferation. U.S. leaders have applied “tremendous pressure” on allies to get them to turn back their nuclear programs. They have led efforts to successfully reduce the number of states that had or were actively pursuing nuclear weapons, from 23 in the 1960s down to nine. At the core of Trump’s proliferation “policy” is a mistaken, reflexive belief that America is weak and will be powerless to stop the spread of nuclear weapons. “[I]f the United States keeps on its path, its current path of weakness,” he told The New York Times in March, Japanese and South Korean leaders would want such weapons “with or without me discussing it, because I don’t think they feel very secure in what’s going on with our country.” To CNN, he said: “It’s going to happen anyway. It’s only a question of time.” He ignores America’s past success in stemming proliferation—including in South Korea. It is unprecedented for an American leader to accept proliferation as inevitable because America is “weak.” Secretary of State Henry Kissinger, someone whom Trump praised as one of the “biggest diplomats in the country,” didn’t. In fact, he applied pressure on South Korea in 1975 to keep the country from going nuclear. This isn’t a left-vs.-right issue—among the strongest opponents of nuclear proliferation was President Ronald Reagan. More than 30 years before Obama went to Hiroshima to warn about nuclear war, it was Reagan who went to Tokyo to state definitively, “A nuclear war can never be won and must never be fought,” and to pledge that “our dream is to see the day when nuclear weapons will be banished from the face of the Earth.” In the meantime, Reagan carefully pursued policies that sought to prevent the spread of those weapons. When he declared while seeking reelection in 1984 that he would “make America great again,” he spoke of the need to “reduce the risk of nuclear war by reducing the levels of nuclear arms.” He reflected on how he had spoken “to parliaments in Europe and Asia during these last three and a half years, declaring that a nuclear war cannot be won and must never be fought. And those words, in those assemblies, were greeted with spontaneous applause.” Building on Kissinger’s efforts, Reagan was able to get South Korea to give up its nuclear program—a legacy Trump risks throwing out—and a few years later did the same with Taiwan. He did so in part with subtle diplomacy, and by reassuring allies like those two countries that America stood with them. Trump, with his bombastic style, is not seen as reassuring among world leaders. A new nuclear-arms race, moreover, could be even riskier than the one Reagan and others worked so hard to end. In retrospect, the Cold War standoff between two massive, nuclear-armed superpowers offered some stability; among other things, the fact that the United States and the Soviet Union could destroy each other, or any other challenger, in a nuclear confrontation ended up preventing either side from using nuclear weapons. Global alliances were structured in a bipolar system, with smaller powers picking one side or the other, which meant fewer possible avenues for conflict. But that world came to an end when the Cold War finished. We now live in a multipolar world that is, in many ways, a more dangerous one. Former Secretaries of State Kissinger and George Shultz, former Secretary of Defense William Perry, and Senator Sam Nunn warned in 2011 that “the growing number of nations with nuclear arms and differing motives, aims and ambitions poses very high and unpredictable risks and increased instability.” One particularly risky and region right now is East Asia, where competing territorial claims and an unpredictable North Korea threaten to flare into conflict. If Japan, which is revising its pacifist post-World War II foreign policy toward a more assertive one, or South Korea, where there is broad popular support for weaponization, go nuclear, the chances grow for a regional arms race—and for nuclear war. One possibility, as Mark Fitzpatrick of the International Institute for Strategic Studies noted: “North Korea might be tempted to launch a preemptive attack at a time when the U.S. defense commitment [to South Korea] might no longer apply.” But even “short of this worst-case scenario, rather than negotiate disarmament, North Korea more likely would claim the South’s actions as a justification for stepping up its own nuclear program.”

#### Extinction.

Wickersham 10 Bill (University of Missouri adjunct professor of Peace Studies) “Threat of ‘nuclear winter’ remains New START treaty is step in right direction.” April 11th 2010 <http://www.columbiatribune.com/news/2010/apr/11/threat-of-nuclear-winter-remains/> JW

In addressing the environmental consequences of nuclear war, Columbian Steve Starr has written a summary of studies published by the Bulletin of the International Network of Engineers and Scientists Against Proliferation, which concludes: “U.S. **researchers have confirmed** the scientific validity of the concept of **‘nuclear winter’ and have demonstrated that** any conflict which targets **even a tiny fraction of the global arsenal will cause catastrophic disruptions of the global climate**.” In another statement on his Web site, Starr says: “**If 1% of the nuclear weapons** now ready for war **were detonated** in large cities, **they would utterly devastate the environment, climate, ecosystems and inhabitants of Earth. A war** fought with thousands of strategic nuclear weapons **would leave the Earth uninhabitable**.”

### Impact – Native Americans

#### Trump is disastrous for Native Americans – sparks a violent national discourse and racist policies.

Ross 15 Gyasi (Editor at Large Blackfeet Nation/Suquamish Territories) “What a Trump Presidency Would Mean For Native People (Yeah, It's As Crazy As You'd Expect)” October 19th 2015 Indian Country Today Media Network <http://indiancountrytodaymedianetwork.com/2015/10/19/what-trump-presidency-would-mean-native-people-yeah-its-crazy-youd-expect-162144> JW

That’s right: there is one singularly bad candidate for Native people who shows an ugly hate toward Native people and just shows a nastiness towards brown people in general. That’s right: Donald Trump. He’s kind of a scumbag. I laughed about it early on, “He doesn’t even believe what he’s saying.” And I still don’t think that he believes 90% of what he says—but it doesn’t matter. If you rile up enough racist/xenophobic/misogynistic energy—as he has done—things get dangerous. It changes the tone; America already struggles getting past it’s racist past. It certainly doesn’t need new bigots stirring the pot. And even if Trump doesn’t believe the racist garbage that he spews, it still has a hateful effect and stirs up the genuinely racist folks within America. And it’s not just the toothless, uneducated masses that have latched onto Trump’s prejudiced dog-whistles (they have); the neo-conservative bigots who utilize passive aggressive race-neutral language to antagonize people of color also have heeded his call. Of course his hate speech toward brown skinned migrants is epic; he seems to despise our brothers and sisters to the south (who have more right to be on this continent than he does). Yet, he says that the Mexicans who come here “… have lots of problems, and they’re bringing those problems with us. They’re bringing drugs. They’re bringing crime. They’re rapists.” Well damn. It’s no surprise that his hate speech inspired hate crimes by some Neanderthals in Boston against a homeless Latino man. When the men were arrested they said, “Donald Trump was right, all these illegals need to be deported.” Idiots call this type of racism “Nativist,” but that’s an evil lie. Donald Trump is not Native to this land and it’s not Native people carrying out this hate. It’s other immigrants. White immigrants who don’t like brown immigrants. He’s kinda equal opportunity in his hate of people of color. When speaking about the Black Lives Matter movement, a movement dedicated to securing basic human rights for black folks in this nation, Trump said, “I think they’re trouble. I think they’re looking for trouble…And I think it’s a disgrace that they’re getting away with it.” But even with his obvious distaste of Mexican folks and Black folks, he has the longest history of antagonizing Native people. Obviously, there’s the history of Trump crying to Congress that American Indian casinos should be shut down because Indian casinos are going to create “…the biggest organized crime problem in the history of this country. Al Capone is going to look like a baby.” Then, there was Trump playing racial police about mixed members of the Mashantucket Pequot Tribe saying "They don't look like Indians to me.” Additionally, recently Trump was kind enough to speak for Native people about the Washington Redskins franchise, saying , "I know Indians that are extremely proud of that name." (in fairness, Jeb Bush did this same thing—these over-privileged and rich white men love to speak for Native people). Trump also recently went on record to say that if he were elected President, “I will immediately approve the Keystone XL pipeline...” that tramples on the sacred sites and water supplies of many, many Native people. Bad news. There are plenty more examples. And while we don’t have absolute certainty as to who will be best for Native people in this upcoming election cycle, we do know who will be the worst for Native people, Mexicans and black folks. Thank you Donald Trump for making that clear.

#### Trumps racist towards Native Americans

Stein 6/27 Sam “Donald Trump Has A History Of Mocking People’s Native American Heritage” Huffington Post June 27th 2016 <http://www.huffingtonpost.com/entry/donald-trump-elizabeth-warren-native-americans_us_57718e80e4b0f168323a9743> JW

For months now on the campaign trail, Donald Trump has preoccupied himself with mocking Sen. Elizabeth Warren’s (D-Mass) identification with Native American lineage. He’s derisively called her Pocahontas and, on Monday, insisted that she was a racist for having listed that heritage while on the faculty of Harvard Law School. The attacks are beyond the norms of traditional campaign behavior. For Trump, however, they’re par for the course. Prior to being the GOP frontrunner, Trump was a real estate tycoon who was trying to hack it as a casino magnate. And while the LA Times reported that he would court Native American tribes when it worked to his advantage, he also routinely targeted their casino operations in hostile, racially provocative terms. Trump accused the Native-American-run casinos of being fronts for the mob to get unfair tax breaks and avoid anti-corruption regulations. But he didn’t stop there. He used racial epithets and funded secretive campaigns to drum up opposition to those casinos. Like with Warren, he questioned whether the main operators were actually Native American at all. The most famous instance of this came during congressional testimony Trump gave in 1993, when he triumphantly declared: “They don’t look like Indians to me and they don’t look like Indians to Indians.” Trump would go on to tell radio host Don Imus that same year that he would “perhaps become an Indian myself” if he felt that it might give him an economic advantage. “I think I might have more Indian blood than a lot of the so-called Indians that are trying to open up the reservations,” he said. Imus concurred: “A couple of these Indians up in Connecticut look like Michael Jordan, frankly.” Trump took a lot of heat for this. Then-Connecticut Gov. Lowell Weicker called him a “dirtbag” — to which Trump responded by calling Weicker a “fat slob who couldn’t get elected dog catcher in Connecticut.” “60 Minutes” ran a segment on the whole affair. And for a while, the real estate magnate begged off talking about the episode saying it would just get him in trouble. But, over time, Trump became unapologetic about his assessment that Native Americans were not only faking it, but that he could tell as much just by looking at them. In an interview with Steve Forbes in 2011, the topic came up again. And Trump was unbowed.

### Impact – Ableism

#### Republicans kill disability programs – causes ableism.

Thompson 15 Vilissa Thompson 12- 1, 2015 (Donald Trump, Ableism, & the Disabled Vote) (Vilissa is the Founder & CEO of Ramp Your Voice!, an organization she created to establish herself as a Disability Rights Consultant & Advocate.) (A Self-Advocacy and Empowerment movement for People with Disabilities)

**The GOP Does Not Like Disabled People**. **The subheading may be strong, but it personifies the actions and language Republican politicians have undertaken about disabled people and the lack of support towards our rights and the programs our livelihoods depend on**. **The Republican Party, over the last few years, have led a crusade, of sorts, to either dismantle or extinguish the very programs and policies both able-bodied and disabled Americans heavily rely on for our day-to-day living and/or protect the rights we are entitled to. They have** also haphazardly **targeted many programs by attaching misinformation to garner misguided support from the public about members who are on the rolls of these programs.** These “scare” tactics not only implant fallacies about these such policies and programs into America’s consciousness, but also widen the “deserving” versus “undeserving” mentality regarding the protections and supports offered by these institutions. Threats to Social Security & Medicaid **The perfect examples to the threats to Social Security** and Medicaid the Republican party has spearheaded **transpired when we experienced** several looming government deep spending cuts, states refusing to expand Medicaid to align with the Affordable Care Act (ACA, or commonly known as Obamacare), and **the claim that there are an astronomical amount of people on the disability benefits rolls who are committing disability fraud.** Constant Threats to Cut Social Security Earlier this year, progressive disability advocates had to advocate to Congress about the impending devastation of the suggested deep cuts and policy restrictions to Social Security, especially to SSDI (Social Security Disability Insurance). Each fiscal year, disability beneficiaries have had to not only stress about the possibility of the Treasury Department running out of money to fund Social Security in general, but **also if Congress would take misguided steps in attempting to reduce the Social Security fund deficit by making cuts to the program and/or failing to provide more support to keep the program afloat.** **The majority of the restrictions and funding cuts proposed have been Republican-led and backed; with key figures within the Party being the ones to “rationalize” why they believed it would be beneficial to save a few dollars at the expense of ensuring that disabled Americans had the resources and financial means they need to survive.** Failure of States to Expand Medicaid When it comes to Medicaid expansion, **many of the states that have refused to expand the program are Republican-governed.** For example, my home state, South Carolina, is one of those states that have not expanded the Medicaid rolls to comply with the healthcare mandate, and consequently, had lost out to receiving millions of federal dollars to assist with maintaining the program. That money could have helped not only the new Medicaid enrollees that would have qualified for the program, but also current Medicaid beneficiaries. The health care quality and accessibility of disabled and low-income individuals and families who would have tremendously benefited from being on Medicaid has taken a backseat, it seems, to the Party’s leading rejection of the ACA due to its loathsome opinion for President Obama. **Many disability advocates and advocacy organizations have come forth stating why it is crucial to expand Medicaid: the healthcare law entails key non-discrimination provisions, as well as improvements to Medicaid’s long-term services and support system, which are critical to meeting the needs of the disabled community. Des**pite the monumental advantages of expanding Medicaid, political leaders have failed by allowing their most vulnerable residents to remain uninsured and with limited options to accessing dire healthcare treatments, services, and supports.

**Trump’s ableist – plays into societal stereotypes.**

Thompson 15 Vilissa Thompson 12- 1, 2015 (Donald Trump, Ableism, & the Disabled Vote) (Vilissa is the Founder & CEO of Ramp Your Voice!, an organization she created to establish herself as a Disability Rights Consultant & Advocate.) (A Self-Advocacy and Empowerment movement for People with Disabilities)

**Trump’s mocking was meant to discredit and degrade the reporter**. **The discrediting** factor **stemmed from the insinuation**, through the combined jerky physical arm movements and incoherent vocalization, **that there is something intellectually** and physically “**wrong” with the offending reporter, and that his claim should be dismissed because he is not someone of an authority to be trusted to give accurate news information to the public. The degrading factor came into play from the aforementioned insinuation: a disabled person’s limitations makes them inferior to someone of Trump’s prestige and power. Disabled people should know “their place” – that place is being non-confrontational when reporting about or interacting with someone of Trump’s caliber.** Mocking Kovaleski’s movements reduced him to a lower status; he is “different” from the majority, and his difference is not to be forgotten or ignored. **Trump’s antics played strongly into the stereotypes society has about disabled people.** Though Trump later stated that he does not “mock folks that have problems,” the damage had been done. The considerable amount of outrage surrounding the offensive moment has overtaken the presidential campaigning spotlight, as do most of Trump’s outlandish behaviors that seems to shock America. Trump’s blatant disregard for the disabled is nothing new. Over the summer, Trump made remarks about a conservative critic who is paralyzed. In this particular incident, Trump degrades Charles Krauthammer, who is paralyzed from the waist down, by stating that he could not believe that he was being called names by someone who could not “buy a pair of pants.” (Krauthammer called Trump a “rodeo clown.”)

### Impact – Militarism

#### Trump presidency increases militarism by expanding the military and using military power to negotiate with foreign countries

Dalmia 16. Shikha Dalmia, (Reason Foundation Senior Analyst Shikha Dalmia is a columnist at The Week and a Bloomberg View contributor.) 7-20-2016, "The Dangers of Trump's Militaristic Isolationalism," Reason, http://reason.com/archives/2015/11/11/the-dangers-of-trumps-militaristic-isola, accessed 7-19-2016. NP

Many attribute his success to a loud-mouthed, no-holds-barred persona. That's certainly part of it, but that's not all there is. Indeed, the core element of his attraction to conservatives isn't his un-PC pomposity, but his promise of radical isolationism. Trump promises to "Make America Great Again" by using its military might to cordon the U.S. off from the evils of the world. To understand Trump the isolationist, you have to first understand what he's not. He isn't a liberal, for sure. But his Republican rivals are also correct when they grumble that he's no conservative either. Trump is, after all, an erstwhile supporter of a Canadian-style single-payer health care system. He has no discernible commitment to limiting the size or scope of government. In fact, his campaign rhetoric is remarkably free from obligatory jeremiads against a lumbering federal bureaucracy crushing the animal spirits of American entrepreneurs. He pays lip service to the evils of crony capitalism because he instinctively understands its populist appeal, yet he simultaneously boasts about exploiting it. ("If you can't get rich dealing with politicians, there's something wrong with you," he harumphs.) Meanwhile, Trump issues blasphemous defenses of eminent domain—maintaining, incredibly, that rank-and-file conservatives oppose government seizures of poor people's private property on behalf of rich developers like himself only because no one has explained to them the public benefits of such grabs. Trump is similarly not a fiscal conservative worried that America's ballooning entitlement state will bankrupt the country—a concern that has preoccupied serious Republicans for decades. The hapless Jeb Bush is promising to slash 10 percent of the federal workforce. Paul Ryan, the new speaker of the House, has staked his career on reforming old-age entitlement programs such as Social Security and Medicare and offering serious proposals to repeal and replace ObamaCare. Trump just yawns at all of this. Trump is not a cultural conservative either; he wouldn't know "family values" if they hit him in the face. A twice-divorced Manhattan playboy, he once actually said if Ivanka Trump weren't his daughter, he'd date her because she has a "very nice figure." More to the point, he has no serious religious convictions, was never against gay marriage, and actually supported abortion rights for women. None of this bothers Trump's conservative supporters. Why? Because they are preoccupied with the threat a fast-changing external world poses to them far more than the depredations of their own government. Hence, Trump's radically isolationist ideology—seeing the world not as a place full of opportunities waiting to be harnessed but a giant rip-off—resonates with them. His vow to "Make America Great Again" by nixing America's overseas commitments, slashing trade, and ejecting welfare-mooching foreigners makes perfect sense to many conservatives. Ann Coulter, perhaps Trump's biggest fan, has declared that she wouldn't care if he conducted abortions in the White House so long as he mass deported immigrants as he's promised. In a fundamental sense, Trump is the anti-Reagan—and not only because his dour belligerence contrasts sharply with Reagan's sunny optimism. Reagan saw endless opportunities for mutual advancement in the world—and some threats. To guard against the threats, he wanted to build an impenetrable (if pie-in-the-sky) defensive shield around America. Other than that he wanted the country to stay open to foreign workers and foreign businesses—and he wanted the world to do the same. His exhortation to Mikhail Gorbachev to "tear down" the Berlin Wall was based on Reagan's desire to open the Soviet Union to the outside world. Trump wants to do the opposite. Sure, he calls himself the "most militaristic person" there is, and promises to make America's already strong military even bigger and stronger and greater. But what precisely does he want to use it for? He says he has no intention of spreading American democracy at gunpoint—a la George W. Bush's Iraq debacle (Trump rightly calls rivals like Marco Rubio, who want to escalate America's involvement in Syria to counter Vladimir Putin, not "hawks but fools"). Trump also has no interest in engaging in humanitarian interventions to protect vulnerable populations—a la Obama's Libya disaster. Trump's military would be used as leverage to strong arm the world into doing America's bidding—whether that means forcing Mexico to build a wall on the Rio Grande, forcibly taking Iraqi oil as payment for getting rid of Saddam Hussein, imposing massive tariffs on companies that shift operations abroad, stopping China from "manipulating" its currency, or forcing South Korea and Europe to pay for America's security guarantee. In his universe, there is no win-win. It is either exploit or be exploited. Everything on that wish list is bonkers, with the possible exception of the last item. But what's genuinely unhinged about it is that Trump is convinced that such policies can painlessly restore the American middle class. "All the Republicans are talking about, 'We're gonna cut, we're gonna raise the age, we're gonna do this, your Medicare, your Medicaid, your Social Security,'" he thunders. "I can bring wealth in so that we can save your Social Security without cuts." In short, Americans don't have to compete for jobs or endure cuts to old-age entitlement programs; they just have to keep thuggish foreigners from bilking their wealth or taking advantage of them. This might be a comforting vision—but it is also cartoonish and dangerous. The last time America tried Trump-style protectionism and imposed the 1930 Smoot-Hawley tariffs, it triggered a global trade war that turned an economic downturn into the Great Depression. His plans to shake down Mexico to pay for a wall would incense all of Latin America. And his proposal to forcibly take away Iraqi oil would breed even more anti-American hatred around the world—not to mention terrorism. If Trump's challengers want to prevent his loopy ideas from permanently poisoning the policy conversation, they'll have to stop pussyfooting around—and start exposing Trump for the snake-oil salesman he is. He is dangerous for America and the world.

#### Trump causes aggressive foreign policy and interventionism

Eggert, 10/28/15 (Jessica, staff writer at the Mic, 2016 Presidential Election: Where Top Republican Candidates Stand on ISIS∂ http://mic.com/articles/127393/2016-presidential-election-where-top-republican-candidates-stand-on-isis)

The top Republican presidential candidates will [face off](http://mic.com/articles/127233/2016-presidential-election-where-the-top-republican-candidates-stand-on-taxes) on Wednesday during the third Republican primary debate, hosted by CNBC at the University of Colorado Boulder. The main event is slated to begin at 8 p.m. Eastern. ∂ The debate will focus on key economic issues like jobs, [taxes](http://mic.com/articles/127233/2016-presidential-election-where-the-top-republican-candidates-stand-on-taxes) and healthcare, but it is also expected to stray into other, more controversial topics like [immigration](http://mic.com/articles/127282/2015-cnbc-republican-debate-where-the-candidates-stand-on-immigration) and their strategies for combatting the terrorist group Islamic State in Iraq and Syria, also known as [ISIS](http://mic.com/articles/121757/these-horrifying-drawings-show-the-real-price-of-isis-terrorism-on-children).∂ Here's where the top Republican candidates stand on ISIS.∂ Business tycoon Donald Trump: Trump is confident in his ability to defeat ISIS through hostile military strategy. In August, Trump said he wants U.S. troops fighting ISIS on the ground in the Middle East — and that he's going to take their oil for the United States.∂ "I would knock out the source of their wealth, the primary sources of their wealth, which is oil," he said on MSNBC's [Morning Joe](http://on.msnbc.com/1P1ccbk). "And in order to do that, you would have to put boots on the ground. I would knock the hell out of them, but I'd put a ring around it and I'd take the oil for our country. I'd just take the oil."∂ On Monday's episode of NBC's Today, Trump said he approves of Russia bombing ISIS in Syria, as long as the U.S. does it too. "If Russia wants to go into Syria and bomb the hell out of ISIS, I'm sort of okay with that," Trump told Today, the [Huffington Post](http://www.huffingtonpost.com/entry/donald-trump-russia-bomb-isis_562e15f0e4b0ec0a3894e3cf) reports. "But we have to do it too."∂ The problem with Trump's statement is that Russia is actually [bombing](http://www.reuters.com/article/2015/10/26/us-mideast-crisis-syria-idUSKCN0SK0QR20151026) Syrian rebels and civilians who oppose the regime of President Bashar al-Assad. Additionally, the U.S. and its allies have already been bombing ISIS for over a year. The U.S. spends $10 million each day launching aircrafts from the Middle East, according to Sunday's episode of [60 Minutes](http://www.cbsnews.com/news/inside-the-air-war-against-isis-60-minutes/), which disclosed that there are more than 160 aircrafts over Iraq and Syria every day. ∂ Huffington Post reports Trump also said onToday that he "would build our military so strong and so good ... that no one is going to mess with us."∂ Retired neurosurgeon Ben Carson: Carson has a [theme](http://mic.com/articles/127233/2016-presidential-election-where-the-top-republican-candidates-stand-on-taxes) of building his political theories on the Bible, and his stance on ISIS is no exception. In a March [interview](http://www.hughhewitt.com/dr-ben-carson-on-foreign-policy-and-national-defense-issues/) with conservative radio host Hugh Hewitt, Carson compared the story of radical Islam to the Biblical [story](https://www.biblegateway.com/passage/?search=Genesis%2025:19-34) of Jacob and Esau.∂ "Well, first of all you have to recognize they go back thousands and thousands of years, really back to the battle between Jacob and Esau," he said in the interview. "But it has been a land issue for a very long period of time."∂ In February, Carson told [Fox News](https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=7ZiA7Ro3EFc) that the war against ISIS can't have rules, because "war" and "rules" contradict each other. ∂ "Our military needs to know that they're not going be prosecuted when they come back, because somebody has said, 'You did something that was politically incorrect,'" Carson told Fox News

## Uniqueness Debate

### Bronx: Uniqueness

#### Clinton’s set to win now but Trump is getting very close. Best predictions prove.

Bedard 9/20 Paul “Nate Silver: Trump surges from 3% to 48% chance of winning” Washington Examiner September 20th 2016 http://www.washingtonexaminer.com/lawmaker-gun-free-zones-kill-people-warns-of-war-on-cops/article/2602486#! JW

The latest vote projection from elections guru Nate Silver has Republican Donald Trump just six electoral votes short of winning and one point away from equaling Hillary Clinton's popular vote. The newest Five Thirty Eight survey Trump at 264 and Clinton at 272, two more than needed. It's the closest in recent weeks. What's more, he has the popular vote within the margin of victory, Clinton 45.4 percent to Trump's 44.3 percent. Silver is famous for making a prediction of victory and that's nearly close to, Clinton at 51.9 percent and Trump at 48 percent, his closest since the conventions. The chart shows a huge gain for Trump, recovering from just a 3 percent chance of winning a month ago.

#### It’s not in the bag for Clinton- diminished enthusiasm and third party candidates.

Dutton et al 9/15 Sarah Dutton, Jennifer De Pinto, Fred Backus and Anthony Salvanto “Donald Trump and Hillary Clinton locked in tight race nationally - CBS/NYT poll” CBS News September 15th 2016 <http://www.cbsnews.com/news/donald-trump-and-hillary-clinton-locked-in-tight-race-nationally-cbsnyt-poll/> JW

With the first debate less than two weeks away, Donald Trump and Hillary Clinton are in a tight race for the presidency nationally. Clinton has just a 2-point edge in a two-way match-up among likely voters. The race is tied when third party candidates are included. Among the broader electorate of registered voters, Clinton leads Trump by five points. One disadvantage for Clinton is diminished voter enthusiasm. Democrats are less enthusiastic about voting now than they were in August. More than four in 10 voters think each presidential candidate should release more of their medical records. This poll was conducted before either candidate’s recent release of medical information. With Election Day just under eight weeks away, the race for President nationwide is tight. In a two-way match-up, Clinton has a slim edge over Trump, 46 - 44 percent among likely voters who support or lean toward a candidate. This is the first national poll in which CBS News and the New York Times have measured the presidential race among likely voters. The measure for likely voters takes into account voters’ reported intent to vote, enthusiasm about voting and other factors that historically affect an individual’s decision to vote. Among the broader electorate – registered voters nationwide – Clinton leads Trump by five points, 46 percent to 41 percent. When third party candidates Gary Johnson and Jill Stein are factored in, the race is tied, with Trump and Clinton each getting the backing of 42 percent of likely voters. While Clinton and Trump retain most of their support when Johnson and Stein are included, slightly more of Clinton’s supporters move to Johnson or Stein, compared to Trump’s supporters. Among registered voters, Clinton has a slight edge over Trump in a four-way contest. Most Clinton and Trump voters say they’re sticking with their candidate. Ninety-two percent of Trump voters and 94 percent of Clinton voters say their choice is set. Few say they will change their minds before the election. Enthusiasm and Strength of Support Thirty-six percent of registered voters overall now say they are very enthusiastic about voting, the same as a month ago. But one disadvantage for Clinton is that enthusiasm among Republican voters has remained steady, while enthusiasm among Democrats has dropped. Among Democratic voters, the percentage that is at least somewhat enthusiastic has dropped from 77 percent in August to 64 percent today, while the percentage of Democrats who are very enthusiastic has dropped nine points – from 47 percent to 38 percent. More specifically, Trump supporters are more excited about voting than Clinton’s supporters are. Forty-five percent of Trump voters say they are very enthusiastic about voting, compared to 36 percent of Clinton backers who feel that way. Just over half of each candidate’s voters say they strongly support their candidate, but for many, support is not so strong - including a quarter who are voting for their candidate because they dislike the other choice. Who’s Supporting Whom? Trump now garners support from just under nine in ten Republican voters, as does Clinton among Democrats. A look at the candidates’ demographic support also illustrates why the race is close. A gender gap remains: Trump has a double-digit lead over Clinton among men, while Clinton is ahead by a similar margin among women. Trump continues to struggle with African American voters but has an advantage over Clinton among whites. Whites without a college degree are strong supporters of Trump (58 percent back him), while Clinton leads Trump among white voters with a college degree. Clinton is ahead of Trump among voters under 30 but she is not getting the level of support Barack Obama received in 2012. 48 percent of young voters are currently backing her, while Obama won 60 percent of the young vote in 2012. Only 29 percent of young voters are supporting Trump, but 21 percent say they’ll vote for someone else or won’t vote. The Candidates’ Medical Records After Clinton’s bout of illness at the 9/11 ceremony and the announcement of her pneumonia diagnosis, more than four in 10 voters think each presidential candidate should release more of their medical records. About as many think the candidates have released enough information about their health already. The poll was conducted before either candidate’s recent release of medical records. Over half of Republicans think Clinton should release more medical records concerning her health, but 52 percent think their nominee has released enough information already. Among Democrats, most (53 percent) say Clinton has released enough health information already, but want Trump to release more of his records.

#### It’s getting close but not too close to call- Hillary has the edge.

Drabold 9/16 “Is Hillary Clinton or Donald Trump winning the election? Here's what the latest polls say.” Policy Mic September 16th 2016https://mic.com/articles/154116/is-hillary-clinton-or-donald-trump-winning-the-election-here-s-what-the-latest-polls-say#.jOt0ZYYZG JW

Hillary Clinton's six-point lead from a month ago has almost vanished as a new round of polls show Donald Trump close to the Democrat nationwide. Clinton's national lead is down to two points, according to poll tracking from RealClearPolitics. The latest polls have Trump and Clinton about even in Florida, North Carolina and Ohio — all must-win states for the Republican nominee. But Clinton still has the edge with less than two weeks until the first presidential debate. Trump trails the former Secretary of State in New Hampshire and Nevada. And traditional Republican strongholds like Arizona, Georgia and Missouri have polls showing Clinton within the margin of error. While election projections have tightened, Clinton is still the clear favorite among election analysts. The Upshot, FiveThirtyEight, Princeton, Cook Political Report and Sabato's Crystal Ball all have Clinton as a heavy favorite to win the election. This is mainly because the math is not in Trump's favor: He must win all the swing states and at least one state where polling shows Clinton is substantially in the lead, such as New Hampshire or Michigan.

#### Trump’s gaining now- real chance of winning even though Clinton’s ahead.

Jacobs and Kapur 9/16 Jennifer Jacobs and Sahil Kapur “Trump Gains on Clinton But Pulling Ahead Will Be a Daunting Task” Bloomberg Politics September 16th 2016 <http://www.bloomberg.com/politics/articles/2016-09-16/trump-gains-on-clinton-but-pulling-ahead-will-be-a-daunting-task> JW

Kellyanne Conway took over a struggling Trump campaign in late August and made a brazen prediction on CNBC: They would look back at the previous two weeks “and say, ‘Why in the world didn’t Hillary Clinton’s campaign totally put us away?’” It took a few weeks longer than that for Trump to close the gap with the Democratic presidential nominee, who returned to the campaign trail on Thursday eager to move past visualizations of her stumbling and dizzy amid a health episode over the weekend. Democratic presidential nominee Hillary Clinton walks on stage during the 39th annual awards gala of the Congressional Hispanic Caucus Institute on Sept. 15, 2016, in Washington. Democratic presidential nominee Hillary Clinton walks on stage during the 39th annual awards gala of the Congressional Hispanic Caucus Institute on Sept. 15, 2016, in Washington. As Clinton has reached a low point in polls of the 2016 presidential race, the question remains: is this the beginning of Trump’s rise to the White House, or the closest he’ll get? Trump “is definitely in a better position now,” said Doug Heye, a Republican strategist who still doesn’t like Trump and doesn’t intend to vote for him. “Such is the soft bigotry of low expectations for Donald Trump.” David Plouffe, President Barack Obama’s 2008 campaign manager, acknowledged the tightening race but remained optimistic about a Clinton victory. “This is the high-water mark of Donald Trump’s campaign,” Plouffe said Thursday on the podcast Keepin’ It 1600. As if on cue, Trump’s campaign found itself on the defensive Thursday evening over the question of whether the candidate believes that President Barack Obama was born in the U.S. In a statement, Trump senior communications adviser Jason Miller said the Republican presidential nominee had performed “a great service” in getting Obama to release his birth certificate. Trump failed to say as much himself in an interview with the Washington Post published Thursday about whether he would drop his push to prove Obama wasn’t born in the U.S. Critics pounced, and the campaign rushed to set the record straight with its statement. Trump on Friday said he would address the issue himself later in the day. Before that latest self-inflicted wound, Trump had been on a roll. On Sunday, the Trump campaign decided this was the week to hit the trail hard, sensing an opportunity to turn the race in their favor, finally. With Clinton at home recovering from pneumonia and video footage on repeat on newscasts and social media of the dehydrated, overheated candidate struggling to stand up on her own, Trump went on daytime TV and introduced his testosterone levels into the political conversation; released a plan to help parents with childcare expenses; showed up at a black church in Michigan knowing he could face a tough crowd (and did); held rallies with energetic supporters in three battleground states; toured the Pro Football Hall of Fame where he jauntily tossed a football (a few feet) on camera, and stepped up his appearances on cable news shows. By Thursday, after Clinton had missed three days on the campaign trail, Trump had raked in a set of poll numbers that suggested a much stronger position against the Democratic nominee. As she returned to campaigning Thursday, Clinton found that her lead has narrowed to 2 points in the latest polls by New York Times/CBS News and Economist/YouGov. Some recent polls show Trump pulling ahead, if narrowly, in Ohio, Florida, North Carolina, Nevada and Iowa. “The election feels like a jump ball right now with Trump having an edge of growing momentum while Clinton seems to be trying to regain her sea legs coming back into the mix,” said Republican strategist Ron Bonjean, arguing that the health episode shifted attention to whether Clinton “could even handle” the presidency. GOP pollster Frank Luntz said the race outlook has changed. “Now, after the last week, he is capable of winning,” Luntz said. Pollster J. Ann Selzer said she noticed something worrisome for Clinton in the results of the most recent Bloomberg state poll. “This is only from Ohio, but it’s telling,” Selzer said Thursday. Clinton’s favorables were in the 40s the first two nights—Friday and Saturday. The next two nights, on Sunday and Monday after the video of her nearly collapsing leaving a Sept. 11 anniversary service at Ground Zero, they were in the 30s. “So, this seems to be about Hillary losing support,” Selzer said. “Trump may very well capitalize on it—and that may show up in other polls, of course.” The polls started to move toward Trump at the beginning of September, even before Clinton faced criticism for describing some of Trump’s voters as racist and sexist, and for her botched handling of a health episode over the weekend, politics watchers said. “Clinton falling down all the time did not exactly reassure people that she is up for the job, but, more importantly, it gave people permission to do what they’ve wanted to all along: vote for change,” said Alex Castellanos, a GOP operative who spoke out against Trump during the primary but now guides a pro-Trump super-PAC. Trump ends the week looking better than Clinton even though she hardly said anything and he had plenty of cringe-worthy moments, GOP strategists said. Keep up with the race of a lifetime. Get our politics newsletter daily. Enter your email Sign Up On Monday night, Trump talked about how fun his rallies were minutes before one of his North Carolina supporters threw punches at protesters. On “The Dr. Oz Show” Wednesday, he made a comment about kissing his daughter Ivanka as often as he can, audience members told Bloomberg. (That part was edited out of the footage the show aired Thursday.) After a tour of a now-dormant Flint water plant that caused a crisis of contaminated drinking water, he thanked the facility’s “very, very good executives.” He caught more criticism for telling the audience at an Ohio rally Wednesday night that people are making less real wages than 18 years ago, but “me, I’m working harder also, so I don’t feel sorry for any of you.” On Thursday, he told fellow New York business leaders at the Economic Club he’d choose government administrators who show “heart,” something he said is lacking in the business world. But for Trump, that’s a “largely gaffe free week,” said New Hampshire GOP strategist Jim Merrill, who describes himself as a serious skeptic of the Republican nominee. “Clinton has little margin for error,” Merrill said. “Her negatives are high while enthusiasm for her is low. Any other competent Democrat would be putting Trump away, but she can’t.” Peter Hart, a leading Democrat pollster, said the recent tightening of the race reflects the fact that Trump’s numbers are stabilizing after an atrocious August, when he “tried to be as offensive as he could be to every voting group,” and Clinton’s support dropped after a bump following her “superb convention” in July. “The unfortunate fact is Hillary Clinton got pneumonia at the wrong moment, and it played into a narrative about transparency and openness,” Hart said. He said Libertarian Party candidate Gary Johnson is “eating into the millennial vote,” exacerbating Clinton's current standing, and predicted that the most competitive states will be Ohio, Florida and North Carolina, with the Rust Belt as a wildcard. “I believe the American voters don't want Donald Trump as their next president. What they are trying to figure out is: can they support Hillary Clinton?” Hart said. “Voters are still going through the process,” he said, cautioning against the assumption that Clinton has the election locked up. The landscape still favors Clinton. Even if Trump wins every state in which he currently leads or is statistically tied, which is anything but assured, Clinton would eke out a victory in the electoral college. Her steady leads in Pennsylvania, Virginia and Colorado have served as a firewall during the rough stretch. But for the moment, anyway, things are looking up for Trump. “Of course, this could simply be a fleeting snapshot,” Bonjean said, “and the spotlight could immediately switch back to Trump at any moment if he strays off message like he did most of August.”

### Loyola: Uniqueness

#### Clinton’s ahead but its too close to call one side or another definitely. Trump still has a real chance

Kurtz 9/6 Howard (Howard Kurtz currently serves as host of Fox News Channel's (FNC) "MediaBuzz" (Sundays 11 a.m.-12 p.m. ET). Based in Washington, D.C., he joined the network in July 2013 and debuted on "Special Report with Bret Baier" to discuss the media's coverage of the George Zimmerman murder trial. Kurtz, a veteran journalist and renowned media reporter, had been the host of CNN's weekly media criticism program, "Reliable Sources," since 1998. He had also served as the Washington, D.C. bureau chief for The Daily Beast and Newsweek writing on the intersection of politics and media. Prior to that role, Kurtz spent 29 years at The Washington Post in various capacities. He became the media reporter for the paper in 1990 and wrote the weekly Media Notes column, one of the most widely read media columns. Kurtz joined The Washington Post in 1981, after being hired by Bob Woodward, and went on to serve as a Justice Department and congressional reporter, New York bureau chief and deputy national editor before covering the media beat as a reporter, columnist and blogger. Kurtz is the author of five books, including "Media Circus," "Reality Show" and the New York Times bestseller "Spin Cycle." A graduate of the Columbia University Graduate School of Journalism, he also contributed to a number of magazines ranging from Vanity Fair to New York. Kurtz has received multiple awards for his work in media, including the National Press Club Award for Media Criticism in 2006. Kurtz graduated from the University of Buffalo (SUNY) with a B.A. in English and psychology. He then attended the Columbia School of Journalism.) “Polling mania: Why are many pundits still convinced that Trump can't win?” Fox News September 6th 2016 <http://www.foxnews.com/politics/2016/09/06/polling-mania-why-are-many-pundits-still-convinced-that-trump-cant-win.html> JW

The presidential race is tightening, according to the polls that journalists swear by. But much of the coverage still portrays Donald Trump as a long shot and Hillary Clinton as a virtual shoo-in. What’s up with that? A giant caveat: those of us in the news business are way too addicted to polls. We treat every 2-point, margin-of-error swing in a swing state as a tremor, if not an earthquake. It’s early September, we haven’t had the debates yet, and too many of us are impersonating Karnak the Magnificent. When Clinton jumped out to as much as a 12-point lead after the Democratic convention, many pundits were convinced, privately if not publicly, that Trump was toast. But it was fairly obvious that the race would tighten, as races tend to do, and Hillary has been slipping, especially in the wake of new revelations about her email and family foundation. And yet here was a major headline on Politico: “Clinton’s Advisers Tell Her to Prep for a Landslide.” 2016 Election Headquarters The latest headlines on the 2016 elections from the biggest name in politics. See Latest Coverage → Yes, “advisers to Hillary Clinton’s campaign have identified so many paths to an Election Day victory they are now focusing not only on the one or two battlegrounds that would ensure a win but on opening up the possibility of an Electoral College landslide.” And these advisers’ leaked assessments reveal “a level of confidence Clinton’s inner circle has been eager to squash for weeks.” The same day, there was another Politico headline. “Inside Trump Tower: Facing Grim Reality.” That story flatly declared: “Donald Trump’s campaign is teetering, threatening to collapse under the weight of a candidate whose personality outweighs his political skill.” Threatening to collapse. Wow. No wonder we’re seeing more stories about Clinton’s White House agenda, Clinton’s potential Cabinet picks, and whether reaching out to moderate Republicans will push Madame President toward the center. Now Clinton is the front-runner, no question about it. But a Fox News poll has her up by just 2 points in a four-way race (and 6 points in a head-to-head, down from 10 points in early August). Morning Consult shows Clinton by 2. IBD has them tied. Rasmussen has Trump by 1 point. The L.A. Times puts Trump up by 2. USA Today has Clinton by 7. After the horrible stretch that Trump endured over the summer, that is a competitive race. Now the battleground polls are what count, and there Clinton is ahead, by varying margins, in virtually all key states. She has succeeded in making such reliably red states as Arizona and Utah at least competitive, while Trump hasn’t been able to do that in such traditionally blue states as Pennsylvania and Michigan. But he’s within striking distance in enough states that he could wind up at 270. Bottom line: The geniuses who declared that Trump could never win the GOP nomination ought to be careful about saying, implying or insinuating that he can never win the White House. At least until October.

#### Clinton’s ahead but polls are tightening and there’s a high degree of uncertainty for the next two months.

Silver 9/6 Nate “Election Update: Clinton’s Lead Keeps Shrinking” Five Thirty Eight <http://fivethirtyeight.com/features/election-update-clintons-lead-keeps-shrinking/> JW

I, for one, welcome the unofficial end of summer. I’ll miss the Olympics and fancy tomato salads. But it’s an election year, and Labor Day is usually accompanied by a return to more substantive news cycles — along with a significant increase in the amount of polling. That was certainly true Tuesday morning, which brought a bevy of new data, including about a half-dozen new national polls and a 50-state poll from SurveyMonkey (conducted in conjunction with The Washington Post). People are focusing on the flashier results among these polls: that CNN’s poll shows Donald Trump narrowly ahead among likely voters, for instance, while SurveyMonkey has Hillary Clinton tied with Trump in Texas. At times like these, though, it’s especially useful to zoom out and take a more holistic approach. The clearest pattern is simply that Trump has regained ground since Clinton’s post-convention peak. He now has a 31 percent chance of winning the election according to our polls-only model, and a 33 percent chance according to polls-plus. For a deeper look, let’s run through our set of 10 framing questions about the election1 in light of the most recent polling: 1. Who’s ahead in the polls right now? Clinton’s ahead, by a margin of about 3 percentage points in an average of national polls, or 4 points in our popular vote composite, which is based on both national polls and state polls. While the race has tightened, be wary of claims that the election is too close to call — that isn’t where the preponderance of the evidence lies, at least for the moment. If one candidate is ahead by 3 or 4 percentage points, there will be occasional polls showing a tied race or her opponent narrowly ahead, along with others showing the candidate with a mid- to high single-digit lead. We’ve seen multiple examples of both of those recently. In swing states, the race ranges from showing Trump up by 1 point in Iowa to a Clinton lead of about 6 points in her best states, such as Virginia. That’s a reasonably good position for Clinton, but it isn’t quite as safe as it might sound. That’s because the swing states tend to rise and fall together. A further shift of a few points in Trump’s favor, or a polling error of that magnitude, would make the Electoral College highly competitive. 2. What’s the degree of uncertainty? Higher than people might assume. Between the unusually early conventions and the late election — Nov. 8 is the latest possible date on which Election Day can occur — it’s a long campaign this year. But just as important, many voters — close to 20 percent — either say they’re undecided or that they plan to vote for third-party candidates. At a comparable point four years ago, only 5 to 10 percent of voters fell into those categories. High numbers of undecided and third-party voters are associated with higher volatility and larger polling errors. Put another way, elections are harder to predict when fewer people have made up their minds. Because FiveThirtyEight’s models account for this property, we show a relatively wide range of possible outcomes, giving Trump better odds of winning than most other statistically based models, but also a significant chance of a Clinton landslide if those undecideds break in her favor. 3. What’s the short-term trend in the polls? It’s been toward Trump over the past few weeks. Clinton’s lead peaked at about 8.5 percentage points in early August, according to our models, and Trump has since sliced that figure roughly in half. Of Trump’s roughly 4-point gain since then, about 2 points come from Trump’s having gained ground, while the other 2 points come from Clinton’s having lost ground — possibly a sign that her lofty numbers in early August were inflated by a convention bounce. One slight caveat: If you’re talking about the very short term, it’s not quite as clear who’s gaining, as the most recent daily and weekly tracking polls have been flat lately instead of showing continued gains for Trump. By late this week, we should have a better sense of whether Trump’s position is still improving. 4. What’s the medium-term trend in the polls? It depends on where you measure it from. Clinton had a lead of 6 to 7 percentage points when we launched our forecast in June. That dwindled to about 3 percentage points just before the conventions got underway, and then a tie once Trump got a modest bounce after the Republican convention. Clinton then got a comparatively large bounce after her convention, bringing her lead to about 8 points, but it’s receded some. Overall, her current lead of 4 percentage points is close to or slightly below where the race has been on average throughout the campaign. 5. Which states shape up as most important? It’s still early enough — and we’re lacking recent, high-quality polling in enough states — that I’d discourage you from fixating on any one exact combination of states that Clinton or Trump might win to clinch the Electoral College. Instead, you might think of this election as a battle between the Big Ten states and the ACC states, either of which offer a plausible path to victory for Clinton. If she holds on to most of the Big Ten states that President Obama won four years ago, such as Pennsylvania, Ohio, Michigan and Wisconsin, she can afford to lose ACC states such as Florida, Virginia and North Carolina. If she can win either Florida or both Virginia and North Carolina — and certainly if she sweeps all three ACC states — she can sacrifice quite a bit of ground in the Big Ten. The handful of competitive states outside of these groups, such as Nevada and New Hampshire, have few enough electoral votes that they’ll serve as tiebreakers only in the event of an extremely close race. According to our tipping-point index, however, the single most important state is Florida. That’s because its 29 electoral votes are as much as many combinations of two and three swing states put together. 6. Does one candidate appear to have an overall edge in the Electoral College, relative to his or her position in the popular vote? Our models, somewhat in contrast to the conventional wisdom, have usually found that Trump is more likely to win the Electoral College while losing the popular vote than the other way around. Some of this is for a quirky reason: Trump is underperforming recent Republican nominees in polls of deeply red states. Last week, for instance, there were new polls of Kansas and Alaska that showed Trump winning by 7 points and 10 points, respectively. By comparison, Mitt Romney won Kansas by 22 points and Alaska by 14. Losing states like those by 10 points instead of 20 would yield a better popular vote margin for Clinton, but wouldn’t help in the Electoral College. The SurveyMonkey poll showing a tied race in Texas is in line with this theme. The race probably isn’t really tied there, as other recent polls in Texas have Trump ahead. But a close call — Clinton losing Texas by only 5 percentage points — could yield wasted votes for Clinton in terms of their impact on the Electoral College. It’s plausible that Clinton gains among Hispanic voters are contributing to this pattern, since most Hispanics are not concentrated in swing states. (Almost half the Hispanic population is in Texas or California alone.) 7. How do the “fundamentals” look? Some “fundamentals”-based models, which look at economic data and other nonpolling factors to forecast the election, suggest that a generic Republican candidate should be a slight favorite over a generic Democrat in this election. Our polls-plus model also contains a fundamentals model based on an economic index, and it slightly disagrees, finding that the economy is about average or, based on more recent data, very slightly above average — conveying just the slightest re-election edge to Democrats. This is literally something of an academic debate, however. Overall, the fundamentals imply that the election ought to be close. If Clinton or Trump win by a significant margin, it probably has more to do with the peculiarities of the candidates than the underlying conditions of the race. 8. How do FiveThirtyEight’s forecasts compare against prediction markets? Trump’s chances are currently about 30 percent in betting markets, a close match for FiveThirtyEight’s forecasts. 9. What would keep me up late at night if I were Clinton? My first question would be whether the race has settled into a 4-point Clinton lead, as the polls have it now, or is continuing to trend toward Trump. If I’m still ahead by 4 points or more at the time of the first debate on Sept. 26, I’ll feel reasonably good about my position: A Trump comeback would be toward the outer edges of how much trailing candidates have historically been able to move the polls with the debates. If the race gets much closer, though, my list of concerns gets a lot longer. It would include geopolitical events that could work in Trump’s favor, third-party candidates who seem to be taking more votes from me than from Trump, and the tendency for incumbent candidates (since Clinton is a quasi-incumbent) to lose ground in the polls after the first debate. 10. What would keep me up late at night if I were Trump? As the polls have ebbed and flowed, I’ve been 8 or 10 points behind Clinton at my worst moments, but only tied with her at my best moments. I’ve also never gotten much above 40 percent in national polls, at least not on a consistent basis, and I’ve alienated a lot of voters who would allow me to climb higher than that. In other words, maybe that dreaded Trump ceiling is there after all, in which case I’ll have to get awfully lucky to win the election, probably needing both a favorable flow of news in the weeks leading up to Nov. 8 and a large third-party vote that works against Clinton.

#### Clinton’s ahead now but it’s close.

Reston and Collinson 9/7 Maeve Reston and Stephen Collinson “How Hillary Clinton could win” CNN Politics September 7th 2016 <http://www.cnn.com/2016/09/07/politics/how-hillary-clinton-could-win/> JW

Hillary Clinton has advantages heading into the final stretch of the campaign that any presidential candidate would envy: a fleet of popular surrogates, a mountain of cash and an opponent who is often sidetracked by self-inflicted wounds. Yet the Democratic nominee enters this home stretch in a dead heat against Donald Trump, according to a CNN/ORC poll released Tuesday. The close contest heading into the fall underscores Clinton's vulnerabilities on trust and honesty -- and her need to summon a relentless and efficient ground game, even if many of her voters are fueled more by revulsion toward Trump than excitement about her. But in many ways, the nation's changing demographics make this Clinton's race to lose. "In a sense, Trump can't win this election," said veteran pollster Neil Newhouse. "But Hillary can lose it." In order to succeed where 17 Republican candidates failed to beat Trump, Clinton must maintain an incessant focus on her unpredictable rival and persuade voters that he lacks the temperament, character and knowledge required of a potential commander-in-chief. Clinton has already adopted an aggressive approach this week. She's held briefings for reporters on her new campaign jet two days in a row. She slammed Trump's character and failure to release his tax returns. And she blasted his business career, which is at the center of his campaign as full of "scams" and "frauds." That is one way of trying to keep the conversation away from the private email server and accusations about the Clinton Foundation that appear to have hurt her standing in recent weeks. Despite signs the race is narrowing -- the CNN/ORC national poll showed her two points behind Trump among likely voters -- Clinton's insists she's not rattled. "I don't really pay attention to polls," she told reporters on her plane Tuesday. "When they are good for me, and there have been a lot of them that have been good for me recently, I don't pay attention. When they are not so good, I don't pay attention. We are on a course that we are sticking with." A senior Clinton campaign official predicted single-digit battles across the swing states that will decide the election. But ultimately her campaign stresses it expected a close race and single digit battles in swing states, but believes it has multiple routes to 270 electoral votes and that Trump has a much narrower path Some Clinton critics have, however, warned that her approach in August -- spending much of the month fundraising away from TV cameras after the Democrats' successful convention in Philadelphia -- lacked the go-for-broke energy of her rival. "Trump is running a high-risk campaign right now. They have to, because they are behind and have eight weeks to go," Newhouse, who was a pollster for 2012 Republican presidential nominee Mitt Romney, said before Clinton upped the pace after Labor Day. "I don't think her campaign has shown any real guts or faith in their candidate. They're not bold. They are setting themselves up for a potential loss by a thousand cuts."

#### Clinton’s lead is shrinking but she is still set to win. It could be very close.

Voorhees 9/7 Josh “What the Heck Polls: A Weekly Guide to the Trump-Clinton Numbers” Slate September 7th 2016 <http://www.slate.com/blogs/the_slatest/2016/09/07/how_trump_and_hillary_are_faring_in_the_polls_this_week.html> JW

The polls—so many polls. They will just keep coming between now and Election Day, making it easy to forget the golden rule of polling: Don’t get distracted by a single survey. With that in mind, Slate will be checking in once a week to see what’s changed—and what hasn’t—in the 2016 presidential polls. Where Do the Polls Stand Today? Donald Trump is closing in on Hillary Clinton—and even passed her in one recent overhyped national poll—but the Democratic nominee remains the clear leader in the national averages, which offer a far better snapshot of the race than any single survey can. RealClearPolitics: Head-to-head: Clinton +3.0 points (Clinton 45.9 percent, Trump 42.9 percent) Four-way race: Clinton +2.1 points (Clinton 41.3, Trump 39.2, Gary Johnson 8.4, Jill Stein 3.2) Huffington Post: Head-to-head: Clinton +5.3 points (Clinton 46.5 percent, Trump 41.2 percent) Three-way race: Clinton +4.3 points (Clinton 42.0, Trump 37.7, Johnson 8.9, other 4.1) Depending on which average you prefer, Clinton’s lead has fallen by as much 2.1 points (RCP’s four-way) or as little as a single tenth of a point (HuffPo’s head-to-head) in the past week. Those aren’t seismic changes, but they were enough to decrease her projected odds of winning the White House according to the moneyball crowd. Nate Silver’s FiveThirtyEight now gives Clinton a roughly 68 percent chance of victory in its polls-only forecast, down about 6 points from last week and down more than 20 from her all-time high in that model, which she hit in mid-August. Silver’s projections, however, are among the more pessimistic when it comes to avoiding the Trump-ocalypse. The New York Times’ Upshot gives Hillary an 83 percent chance of victory while the Princeton Election Consortium pegs her odds at 93 percent. Why Are the Polls Tightening? For starters: Things realistically couldn’t have gotten much worse for Trump than they were a few weeks ago, and so it’s not a shock that they instead have gotten a little better of late. This time last month, the GOP nominee was in the middle of a post-convention controversy tour that careened from insulting the parents of a fallen U.S. soldier to suggesting President Obama “founded” ISIS and beyond. More recently, though, he’s avoided veering too far from his intentionally muddled message, which appears to have convinced some skeptical conservatives that it might not be the worst idea in the world to vote for him. At the same time, Clinton went largely MIA from the campaign trail to instead fundraise behind closed doors. Toss in a rough news cycle or two concerning the Clinton Foundation, and Hillary’s numbers have slipped from where they were immediately after the Democratic convention. Some of the recent volatility may also be explained by the reality that Americans tend to start paying more attention to the presidential race after Labor Day, so many are only weighing their options seriously for the first time now. And then there’s this: Pollsters are beginning to shift their attention from registered voters to those they believe are likely to vote. Different pollsters make different assumptions about who will show up on Election Day and, as a result, weight their responses accordingly. Consider this week’s CNN/ORC poll that showed Trump with a two-point lead over Clinton in a four-way race: Working with the same raw data and different assumptions about the turnout of white Americans without a college degree, NBC News says it would have looked at the same responses CNN collected and instead concluded it was a four-point race—in Clinton’s favor. How Should Trump Supporters Feel Today? Pretty darn relieved, for now. Trump still has a long way to go to catch Clinton, but the latest polling suggests he’s at least heading in the right direction. And the longer he keeps it close, the more difficult it will be for the Republican Party to cut him adrift to focus its resources on down-ballot House and Senate races. Still, Trump’s bigger-picture problems remain: It’s unclear whether his ceiling is high enough to win unless third-party candidates disproportionately siphon off votes from Clinton, and he has far fewer paths to winning the Electoral College than does his Democratic rival. How Should Clinton Supporters Feel Today? Good, but not great. A few weeks ago, Trump’s campaign was in shambles and it appeared possible that Clinton might win the White House in a landslide. While that’s still possible, the current polls suggest that the polarization of the electorate—coupled with Americans’ not-unrelated intense dislike of both candidates—will mean a final outcome that looks like a relatively run-of-the-mill election. Clinton’s currently up by about three or four points in national polls; Obama beat Romney by roughly four points in 2012. If you’re a Hillary fan, then, you’re nervous Trump has made up ground and perhaps disappointed Clinton hasn’t run a stronger campaign—but you’re still in a better position than fans of her opponent. What Are the States to Watch? Reliable polling at the state level is still a little hard to come by at the moment, which means you’re better off looking at the bigger picture for now. But if you are going to focus anywhere, your best bets are probably Florida and Pennsylvania. Winning the former represents one of the simpler paths to the White House for Clinton. If she wins the 19 states (plus the District of Columbia) that have voted for the Democratic nominee in each of the past six presidential elections, she’d be able to clinch the election simply by adding the Sunshine State’s 29 electoral votes to that haul. For Trump, meanwhile, winning Pennsylvania appears to be a necessity barring some sort of surprise elsewhere. Right now, both states offer good news for Clinton: She’s up roughly two or three points in Florida, and up about six or seven points in Pennsylvania. Those numbers will likely rise and fall along with the national numbers in the weeks to come.

#### Clinton is suffering losses in the polls – the election is still hers to lose.

Cassidy 9/6 John “THE ELECTION IS STILL HILLARY CLINTON’S TO LOSE” New Yorker September 6th 2016 <http://www.newyorker.com/news/john-cassidy/the-election-is-still-hillary-clintons-to-lose> JW

With nine weeks left until the general election, most signs point to a victory for Hillary Clinton. In head-to-head national polling she has been ahead of Donald Trump for much of the past year, and in most recent surveys she has retained the lead. At the state level, too, Clinton holds the advantage: over the summer she moved ahead of Trump in many key battleground states, greatly complicating his path to accumulate two hundred and seventy votes in the Electoral College. Of course, polls aren’t infallible—we relearned that lesson in the recent Brexit referendum. But in the past eight U.S. elections, the candidate who was leading on Labor Day went on to become President. At the online bookmakers, where real money is wagered, Clinton remains the strong favorite. On Tuesday the polls-based forecasting model maintained by the Times Upshot team estimated the probability of her winning at eighty-four per cent. FiveThirtyEight’s “polls-only” model put the probability of a Clinton victory at 68.5 per cent. Why, then, is there so much anxiety among Clinton supporters? One reason is a new CNN poll, released on Monday, which generated headlines saying Trump had taken the lead. Among respondents the pollsters deemed “likely voters” that was true: the poll showed Trump at forty-four per cent, and Clinton at forty-two per cent. But among the broader pool of registered voters, Clinton was still ahead, forty-four per cent to forty-one per cent. Essentially, the pollsters screened out some of Clinton’s supporters because they didn’t adjudge them likely to turn out on November 8th. There’s nothing unusual or untoward in that. As elections approach, many polling organizations switch their focus from registered voters to likely voters. But all such screens are somewhat arbitrary, because each polling organization has its own criteria for screening out unlikely voters. When inspecting the trend in a given poll, it is also better to compare like with like. In this case, we can still look at registered voters: among those voters, Clinton’s lead in the CNN poll has shrunk from eight points a month ago to three points now. That finding is in line with other recent polls. On August 10th the Real Clear Politics poll average, which combines the results of numerous surveys, showed Clinton leading Trump 47.8 per cent to 39.9 per cent, a gap of almost eight percentage points. By Tuesday morning the gap had narrowed to 3.3 percentage points. (Clinton: 46.2 per cent; Trump: 42.9 per cent.) Just as there are many ways to decide who is a likely voter, numerous methods can be used to construct poll averages. The key decisions are which polls to include and how to weigh them. The Huffington Post’s poll average, which is somewhat different than the Real Clear Politics average, indicates that Clinton is still leading by more than five percentage points—48.1 per cent to 42.5 per cent. But it, too, indicates that the race has narrowed over the past month. Why has it narrowed? Part of the explanation may be that Clinton’s recent slippage reflects a predictable correction to the polling gains she enjoyed after a successful Democratic Convention and Trump’s self-defeating attacks on the Khan family. As memories of Conventions fade, the bounce that candidates get from them often subsides, partially or wholly. In this case, it could be argued that the polls have largely reverted to where they were before the Conventions. On July 11th, a week before the gavel came down in Cleveland, the R.C.P. poll average showed Clinton leading Trump by 4.5 percentage points—not far from where the gap is today. Looking at the numbers this way, the key fact about modern American politics is that the country is divided pretty evenly, with this year being no exception. We should always have expected a close race. A more pointed explanation for the recent polling trends acknowledges the possible effect of the recent barrage of negative press about the Clinton Foundation and Clinton’s private e-mail server. In an ABC News/Washington Post poll, which was carried out on August 24th through 28th, fifty-six per cent of respondents said they had an unfavorable opinion of Clinton. That was a jump of six points compared with a poll taken at the start of August. The Post’s Aaron Blake noted that Clinton’s favorable/unfavorable numbers were the worst she “has had in her quarter-century of national public life.” Monday’s CNN poll confirmed that Clinton has a serious image problem. Asked to choose the most honest and trustworthy candidate, just thirty-five per cent of respondents picked her, and fifty per cent chose her opponent. Given Trump’s long record of bankrupting companies, stiffing suppliers, exaggerating his net worth, and running a sham university that charged high fees to low-income people, this was a remarkable (and depressing) finding. But it needs putting in perspective. To come out on top in November, Clinton doesn’t need to transform herself into a beloved leader. She just needs to defeat Trump, who, by most measures, is even more unpopular than she is. Here again, the poll averages provide more reliable information than individual surveys. According to the Huffington Post’s poll average, Trump’s net favorability rating—that is, his favorable rating minus his unfavorable rating—is minus nineteen. Clinton’s figure is minus 14.6. Ultimately, of course, the race will come down not to polls but to the Electoral College and the outcome of voting in the battleground states. For these purposes, I’ll put eleven states in the battleground category: Colorado, Florida, Iowa, Michigan, Nevada, New Hampshire, North Carolina, Ohio, Pennsylvania, Virginia, and Wisconsin. According to the Real Clear Politics polling database, Trump is narrowly ahead in only two of these states: Iowa and Missouri. Clinton is up by five points or more in six: Colorado, Michigan, New Hampshire, Pennsylvania, Virginia, and Wisconsin. In the three remaining states—Florida, Ohio, and North Carolina—Clinton holds narrow leads. Mimicking the national trends, polls published last week showed the race tightening in Pennsylvania, Virginia, and Wisconsin. But Clinton was still ahead of Trump in these surveys, and her unfavorability ratings were better than his. In Pennsylvania, for instance, which is shaping up as a must-win state for the Republicans, a poll from Franklin & Marshall College showed Clinton leading Trump by seven percentage points: forty-seven per cent to forty per cent. Clinton’s net favorability rating was minus sixteen, which is pretty bad. But Trump’s net favorability rating was minus twenty-one. It should be noted that numbers like these have seldom, if ever, been seen before in a U.S. Presidential election. To many Americans, the election has come down to a choice between the unpalatable and the unthinkable. But in this strange and dystopian contest, Clinton retains a distinct advantage. In the weeks ahead, which will see three Presidential debates and, almost certainly, more surprises, we will find out if she can maintain it all the way to the finish line.

#### It will be close.

Schneider 9/4 Bill “Hillary’s Win Will Not Be A Landslide” September 4th 2016 Huffington Post <http://www.huffingtonpost.com/bill-schneider/no-landslide_b_11862676.html> JW

Don’t count on a landslide. As the presidential campaign enters the final stretch, two things are becoming clear. One is that Hillary Clinton is almost certain to win. Donald Trump suffers from sheer implausibility. It becomes more apparent every day that he is not qualified to be President by knowledge, experience or temperament. The other is that the election will be fairly close. Trump can win only if something unexpected happens. Like another financial crash. Or criminal charges against Hillary Clinton. Or a sensational terrorist attack (both Russian President Vladimir Putin and ISIS have indicated a preference for Trump). Democrats hoping for a landslide — like 1964, when Lyndon Johnson beat Barry Goldwater by 23 points — are likely to be disappointed. Hillary Clinton rarely breaks 50 percent in the polls. And the polls have been narrowing as her convention bounce has faded. As of Labor Day, she had a four-point lead in the RealClearPolitics polling average, 46 to 42 percent. Clinton is losing a lot of young voters for whom she has never had much appeal. She lost young voters big time to Bernie Sanders in the Democratic primaries. While young voters don’t trust Clinton, they are strongly opposed to Trump. Right now, third-party candidates are pulling about a quarter of the youth vote. Sooner or later many young voters will realize that by voting for a third-party candidate, they are helping Trump. They need to be reminded of how Green candidate Ralph Nader elected George W. Bush in Florida in 2000. There are other reasons why the outcome is likely to be close. It’s an open race. There’s no incumbent President or Vice President on the ballot. That’s only happened twice since 1950 (1952 and 2008). The relevant incumbent this year is President Obama, and his approval ratings are hovering at just over 50 percent. The increasing polarization of the electorate means that Republicans and Democrats will stick with their party. Polls show roughly 80 percent of partisans doing just that, with Independents closely divided. Then there’s the “time for a change’’ factor. After a party has been in office for eight years, voters usually want change. The only exception since 1950 was in 1988, when voters elected George H.W. Bush because they wanted a third term for Ronald Reagan. Expect Republicans to repeat incessantly that a vote for Hillary Clinton is a vote for a third term for Obama. Clinton has become the status quo candidate. She’s linked to eight years of Barack Obama and, before that, eight years of Bill Clinton. The prevailing sentiment is, elect Clinton and nothing will change. That puts her in a marginally better position than Trump. Voters believe if they elect Trump, things will change for the worse. Clinton’s biggest problem is that she is a charter member of the political establishment. She’s the elitist, while Trump is the complete populist. He speaks the language of the disgruntled white working class. He says “notsupposedtas’’ — things his supporters believe but establishment politicians are “not supposed to’’ say. Like foreign trade is a rip-off and immigration is a threat and torture is O.K. Trump’s hostility to foreign trade and immigration and military intervention are pure populism. Hillary Clinton supports immigration reform. She favors foreign trade (though she has shifted her position on the pending Trans-Pacific Partnership and now opposes what she once called the “gold standard’’ of trade deals). She has a record of supporting military interventions. Pure elitism. Back in the 2008 Democratic primaries, Clinton was the populist. Obama was the elitist. Remember how he criticized economically disgruntled small-town voters who “cling to guns or religion . . . or anti-immigrant or anti-trade sentiment’’? Obama mocked Clinton as “Annie Oakley’’ because she boasted about how her father took her out behind the cottage her grandfather built in Pennsylvania and taught her how to shoot. Obama is still the elitist. He has always been the prince of education. Mitt Romney, his 2012 opponent, was the prince of wealth. They represented two bitterly competitive elites. Neither has a populist bone in his body. Obama’s elitism gave us Donald Trump, the populist un-Obama. Which leaves Hillary Clinton in the awkward position of defending Washington, the political establishment and the status quo. Her handling of government emails, her Wall Street payoffs and her hobnobbing with ultra-rich donors re-enforce the impression of privilege and elitism. It made her vulnerable to a surprisingly strong challenge from Bernie Sanders, an economic populist. And it’s creating a alarming amount of support for Trump, a social populist who has scandalized the Republican establishment by embracing economic and foreign policy populism. Bill Clinton tried his best to redefine his wife as the candidate of change. Speaking at the Democratic convention in July, he called Hillary Clinton “the best darn change-maker I have ever met in my entire life.’’ Nice try. But Trump will never concede the change issue, and Clinton is not in a good position to claim it. She will win, not because she represents change, but because the kinds of changes Trump is talking about are threatening to minority voters and scary to voters with an informed understanding of the issues. But it won’t be an easy victory. Elitism is always a tough sell.

## Warming

### Hillary K2 Warming

#### Clinton is key to offset massive GOP environmental degradation—a Trump win causes deregulation and major emissions increases.

Klare 15, (Michael T. Klare is a professor of peace and world security studies at Hampshire College, “A Republican Neo-Imperial Vision for 2016,” Feb 13, 2015, http://www.truthdig.com/report/item/keystone\_xl\_cold\_war\_20\_and\_the\_gop\_vision\_for\_2016\_20150213)

This approach has been embraced by other senior Republican figures who see increased North American hydrocarbon output as the ideal response to Russian assertiveness. In other words, the two pillars of a new energy North Americanism—enhanced collaboration with the big oil companies across the continent and reinvigorated Cold Warism—are now being folded into a single Republican grand strategy. Nothing will prepare the West better to fight Russia or just about any other hostile power on the planet than the conversion of North America into a bastion of fossil fuel abundance.¶ This strange, chilling vision of an American (and global) future was succinctly described by former Secretary of State Condoleezza Rice in a remarkable Washington Post op-ed in March 2014. She essentially called for North America to flood the global energy market, causing a plunge in oil prices and bankrupting the Russians. “Putin is playing for the long haul, cleverly exploiting every opening he sees,” she wrote, but “Moscow is not immune from pressure.” Putin and Co. require high oil and gas prices to finance their aggressive activities, “and soon, North America’s bounty of oil and gas will swamp Moscow’s capacity.” By “authorizing the Keystone XL pipeline and championing natural gas exports,” she asserted, Washington would signal “that we intend to do exactly that.”¶ So now you know: approval of the Keystone XL pipeline isn’t actually about jobs and the economy; it’s about battling Vladimir Putin, the Iranian mullahs, and America’s other adversaries. “One of the ways we fight back, one of the ways we push back is we take control of our own energy destiny,” said Senator Hoeven on January 7th, when introducing legislation to authorize construction of that pipeline.¶ And that, it turns out, is just the beginning of the “benefits” that North Americanism will supposedly bring. Ultimately, the goals of this strategy are to perpetuate the dominance of fossil fuels in North America’s energy mix and to enlist Canada and Mexico in a U.S.-led drive to ensure the continued dominance of the West in key regions of the world. Stay tuned: you’ll be hearing a lot more about this ambitious strategy as the Republican presidential hopefuls begin making their campaign rounds.¶ Keep in mind, though, that this is potentially dangerous stuff at every level—from the urge to ratchet up a conflict with Russia to the desire to produce and consume ever more North American fossil fuels (not exactly a surprising impulse given the Republicans’ heavy reliance on campaign contributions from Big Energy). In the coming months, the Obama administration and Hillary Clinton’s camp will, of course, attempt to counter this drive. Their efforts will, however, be undermined by their sympathy for many of its components. Obama, for instance, has boasted more than once of his success in increasing U.S. oil and gas production, while Clinton has repeatedly called for a more combative foreign policy. Nor has either of them yet come up with a grand strategy as seemingly broad and attractive as Republican North Americanism. If that plan is to be taken on seriously as the dangerous contrivance it is, it evidently will fall to others to do so.¶ This Republican vision, after all, rests on the desire of giant oil companies to eliminate government regulation and bring the energy industries of Canada and Mexico under their corporate sway. Were this to happen, it would sabotage efforts to curb carbon emissions from fossil fuels in a major way, while undermining the sovereignty of Canada and Mexico. In the process, the natural environment would suffer horribly as regulatory constraints against hazardous drilling practices would be eroded in all three countries. Stepped-up drilling, hydrofracking, and tar sands production would also result in the increased diversion of water to energy production, reducing supplies for farming while increasing the risk that leaking drilling fluids will contaminate drinking water and aquifers.¶ No less worrisome, the Republican strategy would result in a far more polarized and dangerous international environment, in which hopes for achieving any kind of peace in Ukraine, Syria, or elsewhere would disappear. The urge to convert North America into a unified garrison state under U.S. (energy) command would undoubtedly prompt similar initiatives abroad, with China moving ever closer to Russia and other blocs forming elsewhere. ¶ In addition, those who seek to use energy as a tool of coercion should not be surprised to discover that they are inviting its use by hostile parties—and in such conflicts the U.S. and its allies would not emerge unscathed. In other words, the shining Republican vision of a North American energy fortress will, in reality, prove to be a nightmare of environmental degradation and global conflict. Unfortunately, this may not be obvious by election season 2016, so watch out.

#### Hilary best hope for climate leadership – Senate years prove energy advocacy

Drury 5/16 (Shawn Drury, senior editor of Blue Nation Review and Senior Editor MOKO Social Media, 5/16/15, ‘On Environmental Issues, Hillary Clinton is a No-Brainer Over Rivals’, BNR.com, http://bluenationreview.com/environmental-issues-hillary-clinton-brainer-rivals/, 7/5/15, ACC)

Conversely, Hillary Clinton’s record during her eight years in the Senate should be encouraging to environmentalists. The League of Conservation Voters issues a report card every year on members of Congress. During then-Sen. Clinton’s time in office, she amassed a lifetime score of 82 out of 100. As a means of comparison, current Republican Senators Ted Cruz, Lindsey Graham, Rand Paul, and Marco Rubio have lifetime scores of 11, 11, 9, and 9, respectively. There is no comparison. While in the senate, Clinton voted to: Keep drillers out of public lands, including Alaska’s Arctic National Wildlife Refuge. Support clean, safe, renewable energy. Protect families by ensuring water and air are clean. Seek alternatives to coal. Provide assistance for low income families for help with energy bills. The challenge for environmentalists is to push their issues up the priority list so they make it into the discussion of a general election campaign. That would benefit Clinton, given her record, and it would help her with younger, undecided voters for whom the environment is a priority.

#### EPA key to international climate negotiations – next president determines success

Plumer 5/5 (Brad Plumer, senior editor at Vox.com, where he oversees the site's science, energy, and environmental coverage and he was previously a reporter at the Washington Post covering climate and energy policy, 5/5/15, “The next president can have a big impact on climate policy — even without Congress”, http://www.vox.com/2015/5/5/8542787/climate-change-2016-election, 7/7/15, ACC)

Where the EPA rules could have a more important effect is on the international stage — at least in the near term. Remember, the United States only accounts for about 17 percent of worldwide greenhouse gas emissions. There's also China, India, Brazil, Europe, Russia, and so on. That's why international cooperation on climate change is so crucial. Right now, the world is groping toward a very, very weak international agreement. The US put forward its pledge to cut emissions at least 26 percent between 2005 and 2025. That spurred China to respond by vowing to get its emissions to peak around 2030. Other countries have started to pitch in, too. Add all these pledges up, and we're still not close to tackling global warming. The Climate Action Tracker estimates that we're on pace for global average temperatures to rise 3.1°C (or 5.6°F) above pre-industrial levels, give or take — a seriously disruptive change. Even so, some experts think even these weak promises could lead, iteratively, to stronger action over time. "You can see how those plans could start to connect together and create a positive negotiating dynamic," David Victor, a political scientist at UC San Diego's School of International Relations and Pacific Studies, told me. "The encouraging precedent here is in trade ... You build credibility and trust over time and then move to bigger issues." The next US president can help decide how this agreement continues to evolve in the years to come. The US can keep pushing its own emissions down and try to persuade countries like China and India to respond in kind. Or it could abandon this budding framework entirely. Abandoning the US climate targets, says Wara, "would do real damage to whatever credibility the US has left on the international stage. What Obama has done with China is a big step in changing the dynamics in a very positive way. And if the US were to walk away from that, that would be very damaging for future climate negotiations and commitments."

### Warming O/W

#### Warming outweighs:

#### A. Magnitude: mass extinctions threaten human survival and kill species on which all life depends—starvation and displacement of populations threatens all life.

#### B. Timeframe: Jamail 15 says the catastrophic impacts from climate change are happening exponentially fast, and our time to mitigate the severity of those impacts is running out—that means its try or die for a Clinton presidency.

#### C. Reversibility: Cascading warming and feedback loops can’t be stopped beyond critical tipping points. Intervening actors can always check risk of military conflict, but there’s no coming back from catastrophic warming.

#### D. Probability: Permian mass extinction proves warming is real and happening now, the impact’s empirically proven.

### Explosion Add-On

#### Warming’s the largest existential threat – it explodes the earth.

Chalko 4 Dr. Tom J. Chalko, MSc, PhD (Head of Geophysics Division, Scientific E Research P/L, Mt Best, Australia). “No second chance? Can Earth explode as a result of Global Warming?” NU Journal of Discovery. Revised October 30th, 2004. http://nujournal.net/core.pdf

**Consequences of** global **warming are** far more **serious** than previously imagined. **The REAL danger** for our entire civilization **comes** not from slow climate changes, but **from overheating of the planetary interior. Life** on Earth **is possible** only **because of** the **efficient cooling of the** planetary **interior** - a process that is **limited primarily by the atmosphere**. This cooling is responsible for a thermal balance between the heat from the core reactor, the heat from the Sun and the radiation of heat into space, so that the average temperature on Earth’s surface is about 13 degrees Celsius. This article examines the possibility of **overheating and** the **“meltdown” of the solid planetary core due to** the atmospheric pollution trapping progressively more solar heat (**the** so-called **greenhouse effect**) and reducing the cooling rate of the planetary interior. The most serious consequence of such a ”meltdown” could be centrifugal segregation of unstable isotopes in the molten part of the spinning planetary core. Such segregation **can “enrich”** the **nuclear fuel in the core** to the point of **creating conditions for** a chain reaction and a **gigantic atomic explosion**. Will Earth become another ”asteroid belt” in the Solar system? It is common knowledge (experiencing seasons) that solar heat is the dominant factor that determines temperatures on the surface of Earth. Under the polar ice however, the contribution of solar heat is minimal and this is where the increasing contribution of the heat from the planetary interior can be seen best. Rising polar ocean temperatures and melting polar ice caps should therefore be the first symptoms of overheating of the inner core reactor. While politicians and businessmen debate the need for reducing greenhouse emissions and take pride to evade accepting any responsibility, the process of overheating the inner core reactor has already begun - polar oceans have become warmer and polar caps have begun to melt. Do we have enough imagination, intelligence and integrity to comprehend the danger before the situation becomes irreversible? **There will be NO SECOND CHANCE...**

### AT: Warming Fake

Only 0.01% of scientists think warming is not real- 99.99% of scientists are on my side.

Jogalekar 14 Ashutosh “About that consensus on global warming: The Curious Wavefunction, Scientific American Blog Network” Scientific American Global January 10th 2014 from <http://blogs.scientificamerican.com/the-curious-wavefunction/2014/01/10/about-that-consensus-on-global-warming-9136-agree-one-disagrees/>

**It’s worth noting how many authors agree with the basic fact of global warming – more than nine thousand. And that’s just in a single year**. Now I understand as well as anyone else that consensus does not imply truth but I find it odd how there aren’t even a handful of scientists who deny global warming presumably because the global warming mafia threatens to throttle them if they do. **It’s not like we are seeing a 70-30% split, or even a 90-10% split. No, the split is more like 99.99-0.01%.** Isn’t it remarkable that **among the legions of scientists working around the world**, many with tenured positions, secure reputations and largely nothing to lose, **not even a hundred out of ten thousand come forward to deny the phenomenon in the scientific literature**? **Should it be that hard for them to publish papers if the evidence is really good enough**? Even detractors of the peer review system would disagree that the system is that broken; after all, studies challenging consensus are quite common in other disciplines. So are contrarian climate scientists around the world so utterly terrified of their colleagues and world opinion that they would not dare to hazard a contrarian explanation at all, especially if it were based on sound science? The belief stretches your imagination to new lengths.

#### The warming debate is over – it’s real and caused by humans

McKibben 9 – Environmental Studies @ Middlebury (Bill, Foreign Policy, Iss. 170, p. 32, Jan/Feb)

"Scientists Are Divided" No, they re not. In the early years of the global warming debate, there was great controversy over whether the planet was warming, whether humans were the cause, and whether it would be a significant problem. That debate is long since over. Although the details of future forecasts remain unclear, there's no serious question about the general shape of what's to come. Every national academy of science, long lists of Nobel laureates, and in recent years even the science advisors of President George W. Bush have agreed that we are heating the planet. Indeed, there is a more thorough scientific process here than on almost any other issue: Two decades ago, the United Nations formed the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (lPCC) and charged its scientists with synthesizing the peer-reviewed science and developing broad-based conclusions. The reports have found since 1995 that warming is dangerous and caused by humans. The panel's most recent report, in November 2007, found it is "very likely" (defined as more than 90 percent certain, or about as certain as science gets) that heattrapping emissions from human activities have caused "most of the observed increase in global average temperatures since the mid-20th century." If anything, many scientists now think that the IPCC has been too conservative - both because member countries must sign off on the conclusions and because there's a time lag. Its last report synthesized data from the early part of the decade, not the latest scary results, such as what we're now seeing in the Arctic. In the summer of 2007, ice in the Arctic Ocean melted. It melts a little every summer, of course, but this time was different - by late September, there was 25 percent less ice than ever measured before. And it wasn't a one-time accident. By the end of the summer season in 2008, so much ice had melted that both the Northwest and Northeast passages were open. In other words, you could circumnavigate the Arctic on open water. The computer models, which are just a few years old, said this shouldn't have happened until sometime late in the 21st century. Even skeptics can't dispute such alarming events.

### AT: Adaptation

#### Adaptation doesn’t solve.

Reilly 14 John Reilly (co-director of the MIT Joint Program on the Science and Policy of Global Change) “Why We Can’t Just Adapt to Climate Change” MIT Technology Review April 3rd 2014 http://www.technologyreview.com/view/526116/why-we-cant-just-adapt-to-climate-change/

That is where a measure of wealth brings some resilience—I have those options, others do not. The report “quantifies” in some sense by establishing an element of “relative risk,” concluding that the poor and marginalized in society are more vulnerable because they do not have the means to adapt. Beyond this, it is not clear that climate prediction is at a high enough level to offer information that I can use to take concrete actions for most day-to-day decisions and investments. What the report does provide is some documentation of adaptation in action—what different regions, cities, sectors, and groups are doing to adapt—concluding that there is a growing body of experience from which to learn. However, perhaps the greatest truth in the report is in the following statement: “Adaptation is place and context specific, with no single approach for reducing risks appropriate across all settings (high confidence). Effective risk reduction and adaptation strategies consider the dynamics of vulnerability and exposure and their linkages with socioeconomic processes, sustainable development, and climate change.” Hence, while it’s possible to learn from others’ adaptation experiences, in the end, the specifics of climate change in my place, given my circumstances, and the socio-economic environment in which I live will present me with very different climate outcomes and opportunities to adapt than you will have where you live. This fact alone raises the cost of adaptation, because to some degree each recipe needs to be invented anew. What worked in the past likely won’t work in the future—or at least, not as well. And we need to process a lot of highly uncertain climate projections in developing the new recipe. The report also concludes, not surprisingly, that risks increase and extend to more people, places, and things if the global temperature rise is three degrees Celsius or greater than if there is only a one-degree rise. Overall, the report provides, in my judgment, a compelling case for more serious mitigation efforts—the topic of the next IPCC report, to come out later this month.

### AT: Too Late

#### It’s not too late but action now is key.

Moss and Scheer 15 Earthtalk (EarthTalk® is produced by Doug Moss & Roddy Scheer and is a registered trademark of Earth Action Network Inc.) “Have We Passed the Point of No Return on Climate Change?” Scientific American April 13th 2015 http://www.scientificamerican.com/article/have-we-passed-the-point-of-no-return-on-climate-change/ JW

While we may not yet have reached the “point of no return”—when no amount of cutbacks on greenhouse gas emissions will save us from potentially catastrophic global warming—climate scientists warn we may be getting awfully close. Since the dawn of the Industrial Revolution a century ago, the average global temperature has risen some 1.6 degrees Fahrenheit. Most climatologists agree that, while the warming to date is already causing environmental problems, another 0.4 degree Fahrenheit rise in temperature, representing a global average atmospheric concentration of carbon dioxide (CO2) of 450 parts per million (ppm), could set in motion unprecedented changes in global climate and a significant increase in the severity of natural disasters—and as such could represent the dreaded point of no return. Currently the atmospheric concentration of CO2 (the leading greenhouse gas) is approximately 398.55 parts per million (ppm). According to the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA), the federal scientific agency tasked with monitoring the health of our oceans and atmosphere, the current average annual rate of increase of 1.92 ppm means we could reach the point of no return by 2042. Environmental leaders point out that this doesn’t give us much time to turn the tide. Greenpeace, a leading environmental advocacy group, says we have until around 2020 to significantly cut back on greenhouse gas output around the world—to the tune of a five percent annual reduction in emissions overall—if we are to avoid so-called “runaway” climate change. “The world is fast approaching a 'point of no return' beyond which extremely dangerous climate change impacts can become unavoidable,” reports the group. “Within this time period, we will have to radically change our approach to energy production and consumption.” In a recent lecture at Georgetown University, World Bank president Jim Yong Kim reported that whether we are able to cut emissions enough to prevent catastrophe likely depends on the policies of the world’s largest economies and the widespread adoption of so-called carbon pricing systems (such as emissions trading plans and carbon taxes). International negotiators meeting in Paris next December are already working to hammer out an agreement mandating that governments adopt these types of systems to facilitate emissions reductions. “A price on carbon is the single most important thing we have to get out of a Paris agreement,” Kim stated. “It will unleash market forces.” While carbon pricing will be key to mitigating global warming, Greenpeace adds that stemming the tide of deforestation in the world’s tropical rainforests and beyond and adapting our food systems to changing climatic conditions and increasingly limited resources will also be crucial to the health of the planet. “Without additional mitigation, and even with adaptation, warming by the end of the 21st century will lead to high to very high risk of severe, widespread and irreversible impacts globally,” reports the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC), an international group of leading climate experts convened by the United Nations to review and assess the most recent scientific, technical and socio-economic information on global warming. Indeed, there’s no time like the present to start changing our ways.

### AT: CO2 Ag

#### Benefits are short-term – can’t act as a sufficient negative feedback and warming kills other resources needed to sustain agriculture.

Mann 4 Michael E, PHD in Geology and Geophysics from Yale, member of the Penn State University faculty, holding joint positions in the Departments of Meteorology and Geosciences, and the Earth and Environmental Systems Institute (EESI). He is also director of the Penn State Earth System Science Center (ESSC), "CO2 Fertilization," <http://www.realclimate.org/index.php/archives/2004/11/co_2-fertilization/>

**It has** sometimes **been argued** that the **earth’s biosphere** (in large part, the terrestrial biosphere) may **have the capacity to sequestor** much of the increased carbon dioxide (**CO2**) in the atmosphere associated with human fossil fuel burning. **This** effect **is known as “CO2 fertilization**” because, in the envisioned scenario, higher ambient CO2 concentrations in the atmosphere literally “fertilize” plant growth. Because plants in turn, in the process of photosynthesis, convert CO2 into oxygen, it is thus sometimes argued that such “co2 fertilization” could potentially provide a strong negative feedback on changing CO2 concentrations. **Recent experiments and model calculations**, however, **suggest** that **this is unlikely** to be the case. A set of controlled experiments known as FACE (“Free Air CO2 Enrichment”) **experiments have been performed in which ambient CO2 levels are elevated in forest stands and changes in various measures of productivity are made over several years**. Experiments of this sort that have been done at Duke Forest indicate (in agreement with models), that **any** elevation of **productivity is likely to be short-lived and is unlikely to significantly offset any gradual, long-term increases in co2 due to human activity. This is due in part to the fact that other conditions** (e.g. availability of nutrients such as Nitrogen and Phosphorus) **appear to quickly become limiting, even when carbon availability is removed as a constraint on plant growth when ambient CO2 concentrations are sufficiently increased**. A few simple calculations indicate that any hypothesized co2 fertilization response is unlikely to offset a significant fraction of projected increases in atmospheric co2 concentration over the next century. At present, **about 600 billion tons of carbon are tied up in the above-ground vegetation. About 2-3 times this much is tied up in roots and below ground carbon, which is a more difficult carbon pool to augment. By comparison, scenarios for fossil fuel emissions for the 21st century range** from about 600 billion tons (if we can keep total global emissions at current levels) **to over 2500 billion tons** if the world increases its reliance on combustion of coal as economic growth and population increase dramatically. **These numbers** clearly **indicate** that **sequestering** a significant fraction of projected emissions in vegetation **is likely to be very difficult**, especially as forests are cleared to make way for agriculture and communities. While there are possibilities of storage in wells and deep in the ocean, **stabilizing the atmospheric CO2 concentration would require gathering up the equivalent of 1 to 2 times the world’s existing above ground vegetation and putting it down abandoned oil wells or deep in the ocean**. While CO2 fertilization could help to increase above ground vegetation a bit, storing more than a few tens of percent of the existing carbon would be quite surprising, and this is likely to be more like a few percent of global carbon emissions projected for the 21st century.

#### CO2 is net worse for food.

Gillis 11 Justin Gillis June 4, 2011 is an assistant business editor at The New York Times, in charge of the paper's coverage of food, agriculture and energy. He joined the Times last year after a dozen years as an editor and reporter at The Washington Post, and before that, a dozen years at The Miami Herald. A Warming Planet Struggles to Feed Itself <http://www.nytimes.com/2011/06/05/science/earth/05harvest.html?pagewanted=1&_r=1>

Now, **the latest scientific research suggests that a** previously discounted **factor is helping to destabilize the food system:** [climate change](http://topics.nytimes.com/top/news/science/topics/globalwarming/index.html?inline=nyt-classifier)**. Many** of the **failed harvests of the past decade were a consequence of weather disasters**, like floods in the United States, drought in Australia and blistering heat waves in Europe and Russia. **Scientists believe some**, though not all, of those **events were caused or worsened by human-induced global warming. Temperatures are rising rapidly during the growing season in some of the most important agricultural countries**, and a paper published several weeks ago found that this had shaved several percentage points off potential yields, adding to the price gyrations. For nearly two decades, **scientists had predicted that climate change would be relatively manageable for agriculture,** suggesting that even under worst-case assumptions, it would probably take until 2080 for [**food prices**](http://topics.nytimes.com/top/reference/timestopics/subjects/f/food_prices/index.html?inline=nyt-classifier) to double. In part, **they** **were counting on** a counterintuitive ace in the hole: that **rising carbon dioxide levels**, the primary contributor to global warming, **would act as a powerful plant fertilizer and offset many of the ill effects of climate change**. Until a few years ago, these assumptions went largely unchallenged. But lately, **the destabilization of the food system and the soaring prices have rattled many leading scientists**. “The success of agriculture has been astounding,” said [Cynthia Rosenzweig](http://www.giss.nasa.gov/staff/crosenzweig.html), a researcher at NASA who helped pioneer the study of climate change and agriculture. “But I think **there’s starting to be premonitions that it may not continue forever**.” A scramble is on to figure out whether climate science has been too sanguine about the risks. **Some researchers**, analyzing computer forecasts that are used to advise governments on future crop prospects, are **point**ing **out** what they consider to be **gaping holes. These include a failure to consider the effects of extreme weather**, like the floods and the heat waves that are increasing as the earth warms. A rising unease about the future of the world’s food supply came through during interviews this year with more than 50 agricultural experts working in nine countries. These experts say **that in coming decades, farmers need to withstand whatever climate shocks come their way while roughly doubling the amount of food they produce to meet rising demand. And they need to do it while reducing the considerable environmental damage caused by the business of agriculture.**

### AT: Ice Age

#### Alt causes to ice age.

World Net Daily, ’07 (World Net Daily, September 29, 2007, “Study finds CO2 didn't end ice age.”,

http://www.worldnetdaily.com/news/article.asp?ARTICLE\_ID=57895)//CC

A new peer-reviewed scientific study counters a major premise of global warming theory, concluding carbon dioxide did not end the last ice ageThe study, led by University of Southern California geologist Lowell Stott, concluded deep-sea temperatures rose 1,300 years before the rise in atmospheric CO2, which would rule out the greenhouse gas as the main agent of the meltdown. "There has been this continual reference to the correspondence between CO2 and climate change as reflected in ice core records as justification for the role of CO2 in climate change," said Stott. "You can no longer argue that CO2 alone caused the end of the ice ages."Another new study published in Science refutes the "Hockey Stick" temperature graph, used by man-made global warming theorists such as former Vice President Al Gore to argue for a recent spike in average global temperature after centuries of relative stability. Stott's new study suggests the rise in greenhouse gas likely was a result of warming. It may have accelerated the meltdown, he says, but was not its main cause. He cautioned that the study does not discount the role of CO2.

#### Even the worst ice age won’t cause extinction—technology solves.

Jaworowski 4 Zbigniew (Chairman of the Scientific Council of the Central Laboratory for Radiological Protection in Warsaw) “Solar Cycles, Not CO2, Determine Climate” http://www.21stcenturysciencetech.com/Articles%202004/Winter2003-4/global\_warming.pdf

However **lets assume** that Budyko has been right and **that everything, to the very ocean bottom, will be frozen. Will mankind survive this?** I **think yes, it would**. The present technology of **nuclear power**, based on the nuclear fission of uranium and thorium, **would secure heat and electricity supplies for 5 billion people for about 10,000 years**. At the same time, the **stock of hydrogen in the ocean for future fusion-based reactors would suffice for 6 billion years. Our cities, industrial plants, food-producing greenhouses, our livestock, and also zoos and botanical gardens turned into greenhouses, could be heated virtually forever, and we could survive, together with many other organisms, on a planet that had turned into a gigantic glacier.** I think, however, that **such a "passive" solution would not fit the genius of our future descendants, and they would learn how to restore a warm climate** for ourselves and for everything that lives on Earth.

#### Ice age won’t happen.

IBTimes 12 IBTIMES, an international business news corporation, January 9th 2012“Next Ice Age in 1,500 years prevented by carbon dioxide emissions.” http://www.ibtimes.com/articles/279016/20120109/next-ice-age-years-carbon-emissions.htm

**The next ice age, due in the next 1,500 years, won't arrive** because of high levels of carbon dioxide greenhouse gases in the atmosphere, scientists reported Monday. **Researchers already discovered evidence of at least five Ice Ages on Earth and** around 3,500, the world will be due for another round of chilling and frozen wastelands. However, because of greenhouse gases that already exist in the atmosphere, **another Ice Age likely won't happen.** The research appeared in the Monday edition of the journal Nature Geoscience. "**At current levels of CO2, even if emissions stopped now we'd** probably **have a long interglacial duration** determined by whatever long-term processes could kick in and bring [atmospheric] CO2 down," Luke Skinner, lead author and professor at Cambridge University told BBC News. The study also included researchers from University College London, Bergen University in Norway and the University of Florida. The study concluded that **for an Ice Age to occur, concentrations of carbon dioxide would have to fall to 240 parts per million** - a 40 percent reduction of the 390 ppm in the current atmosphere.

### AT: Idso

#### Idso is paid by right-wing hacks and his PhD is a sham.

Davies 14Kert, Director of the Climate Investigations Center, former Research Director at Greenpeace, former Science Policy Director at Ozone Action and researcher at the Environmental Working Group, holds degrees in Environmental Studies from Hampshire College and the University of Montana, “Heartland Institute NIPCC Climate Denier Craig Idso: “Climate Change Is Good For You”,” April 8th 2014 http://www.desmogblog.com/2014/04/08/heartland-institute-nipcc-craig-idso-climate-change-good-you

Heartland Institute on the other hand, in its NIPCC “Climate Change Reconsidered II: the Biological Impacts” document, will say that climate change is good for the world, will have a net benefit for both plants and human health. This is the latest line run by right wing think tanks like Heartland, the coal industry’s ACCCE coalition, Peabody Coal, the American Legislative Exchange Council, and echoed across the blogosphere by climate deniers. This set of messaging and all 'reports' to back this line, all appear to be coming from one organization, the Center for the Study of Carbon Dioxide and Global Change, and specifically from its chairman and former president, Craig Idso, one of the NIPCC’s lead authors, who has been arguing the same “C02 is beneficial” line for nearly 20 years, along with his father, Sherwood Idso. Background Craig Idso, his father Sherwood B. Idso, and brother Keith Idso, founded Arizona-based organization in 1998. The Center's claimed mission is to “separate reality from rhetoric in the emotionally-charged debate that swirls around the subject of carbon dioxide and global change.” Its main publication is CO2 Science, a weekly magazine that features articles questioning the science verifying man-made climate change and its impacts. In 2012, **leaked documents from the Heartland Institute revealed that they were paying** Craig **Idso $11,600 a month** for his NIPCC work. We do not know how much Idso has been paid since that time, or prior. The organization’s total funding peaked in 2009 at $1.5 million a year. Funders have included ExxonMobil (total, $100,000 since 1998), Donors Trust, Sarah Scaife Foundation and a number of other right wing funders. See Conservative Transparency for a recent (but not full) breakdown. The Center's IRS 990’s are here at Citizen Audit. Publications produced by Craig Idso, with members of C02Science,org: In 2011 he and Sherwood wrote a book entitled “The Many Benefits of Atmospheric CO2 Enrichment”. Idso has produced a series of video documentaries espousing his theory of C02’s beneficial effect on plant life. Keith and Sherwood Idso wrote a paper in 1992 about how C02 benefits plant life, referenced in the NIPCC’s Summary for Policymakers. After founding the organisation, Idso got his PhD in geography at Arizona State University under the tutelage of one of the very early climate deniers employed by the fossil fuel industry, Robert C Balling Jr. More resources at DeSmogBlog: Craig Idso; Sherwood Idso Idso, the Greening Earth Society and the Western Fuels Association Robert Balling, Idso's mentor, was one of the leading scientists paid by the Greening Earth Society, the climate science-denying front group created by the Western Fuels Association, one of the first and earliest coal industry groups funding the denial of climate change. But the coal industry's line was not 'climate denial' but 'climate change is good for you'. The Western Fuels Association is a cooperative of utilities and power companies supplying coal from the Powder River Basin in the western U.S.

### AT: Warming Slow

#### Warming is fast.

Griffiths 13 [Sarah, Science and Tech Reporter for Mail Online, citing Stanford climatology studies, “Global warming is happening is '10 times faster than at any time in the Earth's history', climate experts claim,” http://www.dailymail.co.uk/sciencetech/article-2383472/Global-warming-happening-10-times-faster-time-Earths-history-climate-experts-claim.html]

American scientists claim the planet is undergoing one of the largest changes in climate in the past 65 million years. Climatologists at Stanford Woods Institute for the Environment have warned the likely rate of change over the next century will be at least 10 times quicker than any climate shift since the dinosaurs. became extinct. If the trend continues at its current rapid pace, it will place significant stress on terrestrial ecosystems around the world, and many species will need to make behavioral, evolutionary or geographic adaptations to survive, they said. The findings come from a review of climate research by Earth system science expert Noah Diffenbaugh and Chris Field, a professor of environmental Earth system science and the director of the Department of Global Ecology at the Institution. The work is part of a special report on climate change in the current issue of Science. However, the research is part of a much bigger picture and other scientists have recently claimed that global warming has 'paused' for the time being. The professors in this latest study reviewed scientific literature on aspects of climate change that can affect ecosystems, and investigated how recent observations and projections for the next century compare to past events in Earth's history. For instance, the planet experienced a sharp rise in temperature by 5 degree Celsius 20,000 years ago, as Earth emerged from the last ice age. This is a change comparable to the high-end of the projections for warming over the 20th and 21st centuries, according to the reserachers. The geologic record shows that, 20,000 years ago, as the ice sheet that covered much of North America receded northward, plants and animals recolonised areas that had been under ice. As the climate continued to warm, those plants and animals moved northward, to cooler climes. Professor Diffenbaugh said: 'We know from past changes that ecosystems have responded to a few degrees of global temperature change over thousands of years. 'But the unprecedented trajectory that we're on now is forcing that change to occur over decades. 'That's orders of magnitude faster, and we're already seeing that some species are challenged by that rate of change.' Some of the strongest evidence for how the global climate system responds to high levels of carbon dioxide comes from paleoclimate studies. 55 million years ago, carbon dioxide in the atmosphere was elevated to a level comparable to today, the scientists said. The Arctic Ocean did not have ice in the summer and nearby land was warm enough to support alligators and palm trees. 'There are two key differences for ecosystems in the coming decades compared with the geologic past,' Professor Diffenbaugh said. 'One is the rapid pace of modern climate change. 'The other is that today there are multiple human stressors that were not present 55 million years ago, such as urbanisation and air and water pollution.' The professors also examined results from two-dozen climate models to describe possible climate outcomes from present day to the end of the century. In general, extreme weather events, such as heat waves and heavy rainfall, are expected to become more severe and more frequent. For example, the researchers said that, with continued emissions of greenhouse gases at the high end of the scenarios, annual temperatures over North America, Europe and East Asia will increase by two to four degrees Celsius between 2046 and 2065.

### AT: SO2 Screw

#### T-Large amounts of SO2 causes extinction.

Ward 9 Peter Ward, Ph.D. from Colombia University and natural scientist for more than 40 years, 02/11/2009, tetontectonics.org, http://www.tetontectonics.org/Climate/Ward2009SulfurDioxide.pdf

Most paleontologists conclude that mass extinctions are not instantaneous; they tend to occur over at least thousands of years. While a meteorite may have complicated the extinction around 65.5 Ma, it is now clear that radiation did not kill the dinosaurs and that large percentages of animals could have survived a large impact by sheltering. **Mass extinctions typically involve runaway greenhouse warming, major changes of acidity of air and water**, dramatic increases in light carbon isotopes, and anoxia over hundreds to tens of thousands of years. Given that **massive increases in SO2 appear to have caused mass extinctions in the past and that there has been a signiﬁcant increase in SO2 gases since 1925, we should not be too surprised to discover that we are currently in the midst of a major mass extinction**. In 2005, more than 1360 scientists under the auspices of the United Nations, completed the Millennium Ecosystem Assessment. This was followed by the Global Biodiversity Outlook 2 under the Convention on Biological Diversity, a legally binding global treaty created in 1992 with nearly universal participation of countries. Among their conclusions are: 1. “15 out of 24 ecosystem services are in decline including the ability to provide fresh water and the ability of the atmosphere to cleanse itself of pollutants.” 2. “Trends among 3000 wild populations of species show a consistent decline in average species abundance of about 40% between 1970 and 2000.” 3. “Between 12% and 52% of species within well-studied higher taxa are threatened with extinction.” 4. “The global demand for resources exceeds the biological capacity of the Earth to renew these resources by some 20%.” 5. “Humans are currently responsible for the sixth major extinction event in the history of the earth, and the greatest since the dinosaurs disappeared, 65 million years ago.”

#### Sulfate models are uncertain and susceptible to author manipulation.

Smith et al. 11 (S. J., Joint Global Change Research Institute, Paciﬁc Northwest National Laboratory, “Anthropogenic sulfur dioxide emissions: 1850–2005.”)

The uncertainty methodology used here uses a relatively simple procedure whereby conﬁdence intervals, based largely on¶ the authors’ judgment, but also informed by analysis of inventory differences, are applied to broad emissions sectors¶ and regions. The relatively small resulting global uncertainty¶ that results indicates that a more complex global uncertainty¶ analysis may not be warranted. Regional uncertainty can be¶ far higher than global uncertainty, however, and more detailed analysis of high-emitting regions, and the countries of¶ the Former Soviet Union in particular, may be useful to better bound current and past environmental impacts of sulfur¶ dioxide emissions.¶ Because the simple methodology used here does not incorporate correlations between uncertainty assumptions in¶ different regions and sectors (parameters that can be difﬁcult to estimate in any event), a systemic uncertainty component was added. Systematic errors and biases are difﬁcult¶ to quantify, but are particularly important for emissions such¶ as sulfur dioxide, where most input values are only weakly¶ correlated between regions, which results in relatively small¶ global uncertainties as random errors tend to statistically cancel across regions.¶ When comparing data sets, it should be noted that most¶ of these estimates rely on similar, if not identical, data sets¶ for historical fossil fuel use and for historical emissions from¶ Europe and the United States. Errors or biases in these data,¶ such as the apparent underestimate of SO2 emissions from¶ petroleum products in the United States prior to 1980, are¶ likely to be common to most of these estimates.¶ As shown by an analysis of inventory values from the¶ USA (§S.14), however, signiﬁcant changes can occur over¶ time in national inventory values. Substantial changes have¶ also occurred for inventory estimates for Europe (e.g., see¶ Konovalov et al., 2008 for NOx emissions). Analysis of the¶ sources of such changes would be valuable for both improving both inventory methodologies and uncertainty estimates.

## AT: Impact Turns

### AT: Hawk

#### “Hawkishness” doesn’t mean war—Clinton favors diplomacy and is less likely than Trump to start a war in every relevant hotspot.

Fisher 4-27 (Max Fisher, Vox, “Is Hillary Clinton really the foreign policy super-hawk she is portrayed to be?” April 27, 2016, http://www.vox.com/2016/4/27/11504272/hillary-clinton-hawk)

It was a simple scorecard, assembled by a non-partisan nuclear nonproliferation group called Global Zero, comparing the five remaining candidates on a battery of eight foreign policy issues.¶ On every issue that Global Zero measured, Clinton is indicated as far less hawkish than all three of the Republican candidates, and as basically tied with Bernie Sanders. She supports the Iran nuclear deal; the Republicans all oppose it. She supports using diplomacy to solve the North Korean nuclear crisis; John Kasich is the only Republican to do so. She supports negotiating with Russia to reduce nuclear weapons; no Republican candidate does.¶ This measured only policies related to nuclear weapons, and so is far from comprehensive. But on these major geopolitical challenges — including the Iranian and North Korean nuclear programs, which seem among the few crises that could plausibly draw the US into war — Clinton is significantly more dovish than all three Republican candidates.¶ How to reconcile these two seemingly contradictory stories about Hillary Clinton's foreign policy, in which the conventional wisdom portrays her as a super-hawk surpassing every remaining Republican, whereas a straight reading of her policies often suggests almost the exact opposite?¶ (Landler's piece, to be fair, is far more nuanced than the one line I've quoted. I bring it up only to illustrate the degree to which this has become conventional wisdom.)¶ Put another way: Is the conventional wisdom right? Is Clinton really the biggest hawk in the race?¶ That turns out to be a difficult question to answer. But it's not impossible. We have three distinct ways of evaluating a candidate's foreign policy, and you really need to look at all three: her past record, her current policies, and her larger worldview.¶ Taken together, in Clinton's case, these three metrics give a more complicated view of her foreign policy than the conventional wisdom suggests.¶ They reveal Clinton as someone who is exceptionally enthusiastic about the merits and potential of American engagement in the world. She is indeed, more than any other candidate in the race, a true believer in American power.¶ But Clinton's policies and past record suggest that her vision of power includes military force as well as diplomacy, so that while she is more likely to act in foreign affairs, she is also more likely to do so peacefully.¶ While the Republican candidates express greater skepticism about engagement with the outside world, they tend to argue against diplomacy and to emphasize, much more then Clinton, imposing order through force and coercion.¶ Evaluating Clinton on these three metrics shows some ways in which she is indeed quite hawkish in her belief in American military force, but others in which she nonetheless seems less likely than the Republican candidates to actually lead the US into war. They reveal just how difficult it can be to compare candidates on "hawkishness" — a word that can have many different meanings — or to make black-and-white categorical determinations on foreign policy at all.

#### **Hillary is not a hawk and allegations are media bias**

LaFauci 3-21 Trevor “A Hawk She is Not: The Truth About Hillary Clinton's Foreign Policy Views” March 21st 2016 The People’s View <http://www.thepeoplesview.net/main/2016/3/20/hillary-clinton-is-not-a-hawk-foreign-policy>

So **the media attempts to smear this candidate's record** to bring her down on a level playing field with everybody else. This year, the media has prided itself on trying to twist and manipulate former Secretary of State Hillary Clinton's stellar foreign policy experience time and time again. We've seen it in debates where Jorge Ramos asked Clinton about her involvement in everyone's favorite non-scandal in Benghazi which led to eight seconds of booing from the live audience in Miami. A few days later at the MSNBC Town Hall, anchor Chris Matthews asked Hillary Clinton point blank if she was a "hawk" and attempted to list several foreign policy decisions that Clinton was a part of that resulted in military action abroad. It was a question directed at Clinton for the sole reason that she, unlike any other candidate running, was a key part of an administration and was involved at the elite level of the decision making process when it came to foreign affairs. The question also was a reflection of Matthews' personal beliefs that the United States should not be the world's policemen as Matthews himself previously admitted he voted for George W. Bush because he mistakenly believed Bush would prevent us from being an occupying force around the globe. ¶ Both **questions**, asked within a week of each other, **began to shift the media's attention toward Hillary Clinton's foreign policy. Bernie** Sanders has consistently **used** Hillary **Clinton's vote on Iraq as a talking point** about what he considers to be her lack of judgment and it has gotten so ubiquitous in either his stump speech or a debate that audience members can now predict when and how Sanders will mention her Iraq vote. **Jorge Ramos was** apparently like the vast majority of Republicans and was **still concerned about Clinton's involvement in Benghazi despite seven separate investigations having cleared her of any wrongdoing including an 11-hour marathon hearing 'designed to go after' her where Republicans learned nothing new that they hadn't already known.** And Chris Matthews was apparently concerned that as Secretary of State, Clinton had somehow adopted a 'hawkish' mentality where she would push for war if elected president even though she was part of the Obama administration that Matthews said as recently as December has been 'right about war policy.' Funny how that works. ¶ Because people like Bernie Sanders, Jorge Ramos, and Chris Matthews know that to question **Hillary Clinton's foreign policy** credentials is to attack her strength. They are leery of both her **worldview and** her understanding of the world and the **pragmatic approach** she takes to various situations. When she responds openly and honestly at a town hall event that she can't promise not to use the American military they see this as an indication of a warlike mentality rather than one of brutal sincerity where she knows that the world is unpredictable in a way that military intervention should always be a last resort but at the same time it should always be an option. This **is the same view that Barack Obama has taken and he has wound down two disastrous wars and has avoided additional quagmires despite the consistent beating of the drums of war from both congressional Republicans as well as our mainstream media**. ¶ But don't take my word for it. To truly understand Hillary Clinton's record, let's look at her own words and actions in an effort to see if she truly is a war hawk. Let's start with **the Iraq vote [was] because** that is seen as the apex of her warlike desires. Clinton has gone on record by describing the reasoning behind her vote and the reason is as follows: **George W. Bush lied about his intentions**. **To understand this, you have to look back to the events of October 2002 where Congress was about to vote on a resolution that would force Saddam Hussein to allow United Nations inspectors to verify whether or not Hussein had destroyed his chemical, biological, and nuclear weapons sites. Hillary Clinton, like many of her peers, believed that a yes vote would be a strong piece of leverage to finish the negotiations between the United Nations and Saddam Hussein**. In fact, she spoke on the Senate floor and explained her position: “The question is, how do we do our best to both diffuse the threat Saddam Hussein poses to his people, the region, including Israel, and the United States—and, at the same time, work to maximize our international support and strengthen the United Nations... ...There is no perfect approach to this thorny dilemma...people of good faith and high intelligence can reach diametrically opposing conclusions...I believe the best course is to go to the United Nations for a strong resolution for complete, unlimited inspections with cooperation expected and demanded... ...If we get the resolution the president seeks, and Saddam complies disarmament can proceed and the threat can be eliminated...If we get the resolution and Saddam does not comply, we can attack him with far more support and legitimacy than we would have otherwise... ...Even though the resolution before the Senate is not as strong as I would like in requiring the diplomatic route first...I take the president at his word that he will try hard to pass a United Nations resolution and seek to avoid war, if possible. Because bipartisan support for this resolution makes success in the United Nations more likely and war less likely—and because a good faith effort by the United States, even if it fails, will bring more allies and legitimacy to our cause—I have concluded, after careful and serious consideration, that a vote for the resolution best serves the security of our nation. If we were to defeat this resolution or pass it with only a few Democrats, I am concerned that those who want to pretend this problem will go away with delay will oppose any United Nations resolution calling for unrestricted inspections... ...This is a difficult vote. This is probably the hardest decision I have ever had to make. Any vote that may lead to war should be hard, but I cast it with conviction...My vote is not, however, a vote for any new doctrine of preemption or for unilateralism or for the arrogance of American power or purpose...is not a vote to rush to war; it is a vote that puts awesome responsibility in the hands of our president. And we say to him: Use these powers wisely and as a last resort.” — <https://www.gpo.gov/fdsys/pkg/CREC-2002-10-10/html/CREC-2002-10-10-pt1-PgS10233-7.htm> Seventy-six other senators agreed with Clinton's views including Joe Biden, Dianne Feinstein, Chris Dodd, and John Kerry and the resolution passed with a vote of 77-23. Of course, as we now know, President Bush did not use his powers as a last resort as Clinton implored but instead he used to vote to assert his authority to make war on Iraq in what became the worst foreign policy decision in forty years. However, to read Clinton's speech on the Senate floor and to understand the subsequent betrayal by President Bush, one can see that Clinton's vote simply echoes her philosophy that one should use military intervention only as a last resort. Unfortunately for the country, President Bush did not share this philosophy and he chose to engage in a preemptive military intervention, the effects of which led to a huge quagmire that our country, the Middle East, and the entire world as is still feeling to this day. In addition to Iraq, Clinton has also been criticized for her role in the United States' military intervention in Libya in 2011. With conditions in the country currently deteriorating, Republicans are using Libya as an example of the "failed policies" of Hillary Clinton's tenure as Secretary of State. In fact, during the MSNBC Town Hall event, Chris Matthews attempted to paint Clinton's foreign policy experience as one broad stroke that included both Iraq and Libya. Clinton was having none of it, and she informed Matthews that each situation was unique and each required a knowledgeable understanding of both the situation as well as the region. She then launched into a staunch defense of the Obama administration's efforts in Libya. ¶ Despite what the media will tell you about Libya, it is more than simply Benghazi. In fact, Clinton described how **in 2011** it was a matter of national security and **the decision was made to take out a brutal dictator in Muammar Gaddafi before he could inflict further harm on his people.** Unlike in Iraq where we came into a country unwelcomed and uninvited, **American forces in Libya worked closely with NATO European and Arab allies and were able to eliminate Gaddafi** is just over seven months **without losing a single American life** and spending only $1 billion. **This** intervention **helped Libya avoid the current situation being faced by Syria**. As Clinton said during the Town Hall, "Now, is Libya perfect? It isn't. But did they have two elections that were free and fair where they voted for moderates. Yes, they did. So you know, changing from a dictator who has hollowed out your country to something resembling a functioning state and even hopefully more of a democratic one doesn't happen overnight." And that, in essence, seems to be central to the critique of Hillary Clinton's foreign policy: the notion of 20/20 hindsight. Because the role of any elected official and especially the President is to make the best decision possible with the information available at the time. At the time in question in 2002, Hillary Clinton supported giving President Bush authority because she mistakenly believed he would not abuse that power. At the time in question in 2011, Hillary Clinton supported intervention in Libya because Muammar Gaddafi was a brutal dictator who was openly willing to attack his own citizens in an effort to hold onto power in what had the makings of becoming a brutal civil war similar to what we've seen in Syria. For comparative sake, anti-war candidate Bernie Sanders openly supported military intervention in Kosovo in 1999 but his judgment is never called into question because that particular intervention is generally seen as a success. In twenty years from now if Libya is able to create a stable democracy, we might very well look back on the 2011 intervention and view it largely as a success as well. However, in politics you simply don't have the ability to predict the future and thus politicians are held accountable for the immediate aftermath of their decisions. ¶ Which brings us to our last point of Hillary Clinton's foreign policy: her ability to plant seeds for the future. **Our media is lazy and chooses to focus mostly on Clinton's involvement in Iraq and Libya.** Yet as Secretary of State she was active behind the scenes in helping to initiate several policies that didn't become law or practice until years later. For example, in 2011 then Secretary of State Clinton visited the country of Myanmar where she met with Nobel Prize winner Aung Sang Suu Kyi, who had recently been freed after having been detained for twenty years for speaking against the military junta that had controlled the country for nearly a half-century. Clinton also used her trip to call for the release of political prisoners and to encourage the country to engage in democratic reforms. Just over four years later in November of 2015, Kyi's National League for Democracy Party (NLD) won its first-ever national election and Kyi is set to be the party head despite being formally barred from having an official position by her political opposition.¶ In addition to getting the ball rolling in Myanmar, Hillary **Clinton was** also **instrumental** **in** helping to bring Iran to the negotiating table for what later became **the Iran Deal**. Through the course of eighteen months, Clinton was heavily involved in a process that took place between January 2009 and June of 2010. To even get Iran to negotiate, there had to be a series of heavy sanctions placed upon the country and Clinton was instrumental in getting those sanctions in place. A large part of the success **this diplomatic solution was due to Clinton successfully convincing both China and Russia to join the United States in its calls for stricter sanctions against Iran.** These sanctions were approved by the UN Security Council in June of 2010 in what President Barack Obama called "the toughest sanctions ever faced by the Iranian government." By getting these sanctions in place and despite constant fear mongering and war cries from neo-Conservatives, **Iran eventually did come to the negotiating table** and the Obama administration was able to work out its historic Iran Deal in a case where diplomacy proved to be the correct course of action. And lastly, we would be remiss not to mention Hillary Clinton's involvement in opening up Cuba, something that has only now come to light. The reason, again, is that sometimes the seeds of democracy take several years to bloom. In regard to Cuba, Clinton and her top aides worked for nearly her entire tenure as Secretary of State in an effort to help keep President Obama's campaign promise to engage countries like Cuba that had previously been deemed our "enemies." In fact, it was Clinton herself who convinced President Obama to continue to work to establish a relationship with the country as she saw the embargo as outdated and ineffective. Clinton witnessed how the leaders of other Latin American countries were perplexed by the United States' antiquated policy toward the island nation of Cuba and how our treatment of the country was hurting our reputation in the eyes of our allies. President Obama heeded Clinton's sound advice and the workings for what became a thawing of the relationship with Cuba were based on recommendations that Clinton had made while Secretary of State. Even now as a candidate for president, Clinton remains fighting for this cause and has continuously called for the trade embargo with Cuba to be lifted as a further sign of the newfound goodwill between our two nations.¶ People like Bernie **Sanders**, Jorge **Ramos, and** Chris **Matthews** know that Hillary Clinton is the most polished political candidate when it comes to foreign policy that many of us have seen in our lifetime. It is undoubtedly a strength of hers and something that sets her head and shoulders above her Democratic opponent when the topic is broached at any debate or town hall. They also **know that the American public thinks of foreign policy in broad strokes rather than subtle nuance so they can easily manipulate their audiences into making an uneducated conclusion based on one or two examples of an otherwise encompassing topic. To say that Hillary Clinton is a hawk is much simpler than saying "Hillary Clinton has made some very difficult foreign policy decisions but in each case she has exhausted all diplomatic options before resorting to military intervention as her last course of action."** Because an explanation like that doesn't make for a good stump speech, a challenging debate question, or an opportunity to make a political candidate slip up and provide a highly-viewed moment on network TV. Foreign policy is hard work. Hillary Clinton has worked hard at it while all other candidates have chosen to brush it off in broad generalizations or quirky sound bites. The other candidates know that foreign policy is consistently seen as one of the more 'boring' issues of the campaign. It is why the third presidential debate of the general election is nearly always the lowest rated. Yet the role of foreign policy is essential for any commander-in-chief. Not only will he or she have to make decisions about our military involvements overseas but he or she will also have to decide how to engage both our allies and our enemies through diplomatic means in an effort to avoid conflict whenever possible. Decisions made today will have ramifications that will last for generations to come both at home and abroad. Foreign policy might not get all the headlines but it can very well determine what our country and even the world will look like fifty years from now. ¶ **Today in Myanmar, the country is transitioning power to a democratically-elected political party for the first time in a half-century. Today in Iran, children of all ages are getting a little more food and experiencing a little more freedom because sanctions placed upon their country are gradually being lifted after their political leaders chose to come to the negotiating table for the first time in forty years. And today in Cuba President Barack Obama became the first sitting American president to visit the country in eighty-eight years, giving hope to a nation that has been hopeless for decades. In all these instances, Hillary Clinton helped to create a situation where diplomacy triumphed and won out to create a path where democracy and increased freedoms may one day come to these great lands.** She won't get headlines or even credit, but Hillary Clinton knew that diplomacy would win out and she fought to make it happen. **Without diplomacy we are left with only perpetual war and as we have seen, Hillary Clinton will go to great lengths to ensure it doesn't come to tha**t. No matter what her critics say.

### AT: Trump Lies

#### Empirically Presidents enact their campaign promises—your ev is media bias.

Bernstein 12 (onathan Bernstein, political scientist who writes about American politics, especially the presidency, Congress, parties, and elections, January/February 2012, “Campaign Promises”, Washington Monthly, http://www.washingtonmonthly.com/magazine/january\_february\_2012/features/campaign\_promises034471.php?page=all#

The solution was obvious, and for the U.S. budget, fateful: Bush ran on a radical regressive tax cut, thereby destroying the rationale for the Forbes campaign and leaving the Texas governor a clear path to the nomination. And, as everyone knows, that tax cut also became part of Bush’s general election campaign platform, and was eventually enacted into law in the massive 2001 and 2003 tax cuts—tax cuts that have set the terms of budget politics for the last decade. The lesson: we can be governed now by measures that were adopted years ago, in some cases decades ago, based on what some candidate said in reaction to the particular dynamics of some now-obscure nomination battle. Or, to be more blunt: presidents usually try to enact the policies they advocate during the campaign. So if you want to know what Mitt Romney or the rest of the Republican crowd would do in 2013 if elected, the best way to find out is to listen to what they are saying right now. I suspect that many Americans would be quite skeptical of the idea that elected officials, presidents included, try to keep the promises they made on the campaign trail. The presumption is that politicians are liars who say what voters want to hear to get elected and then behave very differently once in office. The press is especially prone to discount the more extreme positions candidates take in primaries on the expectation that they will “move to the center” in the general election. Certainly everyone can recall specific examples of broken promises, from Barack Obama not closing Gitmo to George W. Bush and “nation building” to, well, you may remember this from the Republican National Convention in 1988: And I’m the one who will not raise taxes. My opponent, my opponent now says, my opponent now says, he’ll raise them as a last resort, or a third resort. But when a politician talks like that, you know that’s one resort he’ll be checking into. My opponent won’t rule out raising taxes. But I will. And the Congress will push me to raise taxes, and I’ll say no, and they’ll push, and I’ll say no, and they’ll push again, and I’ll say, to them, “Read my lips: no new taxes.” Political scientists, however, have been studying this question for some time, and what they’ve found is that out-and-out high-profile broken pledges like George H. W. Bush’s are the exception, not the rule. That’s what two book-length studies from the 1980s found. Michael Krukones in Promises and Performance: Presidential Campaigns as Policy Predictors (1984) established that about 75 percent of the promises made by presidents from Woodrow Wilson through Jimmy Carter were kept. In Presidents and Promises: From Campaign Pledge to Presidential Performance (1985), Jeff Fishel looked at campaigns from John F. Kennedy through Ronald Reagan. What he found was that presidents invariably attempt to carry out their promises; the main reason some pledges are not redeemed is congressional opposition, not presidential flip-flopping. Similarly, Gerald Pomper studied party platforms, and discovered that the promises parties made were consistent with their postelection agendas. More recent and smaller-scale papers have confirmed the main point: presidents’ agendas are clearly telegraphed in their campaigns. Richard Fenno’s studies of how members of Congress think about representation are relevant here, even though his research is based on the other side of Pennsylvania Avenue. Fenno, in a series of books beginning with Home Style in 1978, has followed members as they work their districts, and has transcribed what the world looks like through politicians’ eyes. What he has found is that representatives and senators see every election as a cycle that begins in the campaign, when they make promises to their constituents. Then, if they win, they interpret how those promises will constrain them once they’re in office. Once in Washington, Fenno’s politicians act with two things in mind: how their actions match the promises they’ve made in the previous campaign; and how they will be able to explain those actions when they return to their district. Representation “works,” then, because politicians are constantly aware that what they do in Washington will have to be explained to their constituents, and that it will have to be explained in terms of their original promises. Of course, there’s more to it than that; at the presidential level, one of the key ways that campaigns constrain presidents is that the same people who draft the candidate’s proposals usually wind up working on those same issue areas in the White House or the relevant departments and agencies, and they tend to be highly committed to the ideas they authored. And don’t sell short the possibility that candidates themselves are personally committed to the programs they advocate—either because those issues sparked their interest in politics to begin with (and that’s why they were advocating them on the campaign trail), or because it’s just a natural human inclination to start believing your own rhetoric. So why are most Americans (and many members of the working press) so skeptical of campaign promises? One reason is that we tend to care a lot when promises are broken, and so those examples get a lot more attention than do the ones that are redeemed, which often can seem by the time they are finally acted on as foregone conclusions, not news. That’s especially true for the president’s strongest supporters, who are the most likely to be upset about a broken presidential promise, and “Democrats upset with Obama” or “Republicans upset with Bush” is more unexpected and therefore more newsy than when the other party attacks the president. Another reason is that the Madisonian system of checks and balances, especially in eras of frequent divided government, often yields situations in which a president may try hard to achieve a goal he campaigned for, only to be stymied by Congress. (And not just Congress: the bureaucracy doesn’t automatically implement even those initiatives that can be accomplished without legislation.) But given the media’s intense focus on the president at the expense of the rest of the system, activists often blame the president for falling short, rather than holding Congress or others responsible for blocking presidential initiatives. The result is that people systematically underestimate the importance of positions taken on the presidential campaign trail. For illustrations of this, it’s useful to look back on the last few elections, including at least one—the close 2000 election between George W. Bush and Al Gore—in which many pundits and voters (not to mention Ralph Nader) believed that it didn’t matter what happened. As it turned out, of course, some of the things that Bush did that Gore might not have done were only dimly predictable from the campaign. But in fact the 2000 campaign was a good guide to many of Bush’s initiatives as president, from No Child Left Behind to his faith-based initiative to, most notably, his tax and budget preferences. A look back at the Republican debates leading into the primaries makes that very clear. Republicans held a debate in Iowa in December 1999, just before the caucuses (this was the debate in which Bush was asked about his favorite philosopher, and he answered, “Christ”). Other than pandering to social conservatives, what did Bush promise to do if he was elected? If we look at public policy issues mentioned in the debate, Bush supported the following: ethanol; trade agreements as a key way of boosting the economy, including easier trade with China; missile defense, and withdrawing from the ABM treaty; more military spending; and the status quo (but tougher) on drugs. These are all ideas he went on to support as president. His proposed tax cuts were mentioned in that debate a few times, as well.

### AT: Trump solves Terrorism

#### A Trump presidency destroys effective responses to terrorism—Trump’s “Muslim equals terrorist” mentality violates civil liberties, won’t stop attacks, and causes retaliatory backlash within the US.

Sanchez 15, (Mary Sanchez, The Chicago Tribune, “Want less terrorism? Start by rejecting Trump's crusade,” December 11, 2015, http://www.chicagotribune.com/news/columnists/sns-201512111230--tms--msanchezctnms-a20151211-20151211-column.html)

Since the slaughter of 14 innocents by two radicalized Muslim terrorists in San Bernardino, Calif., common sense has been a collateral casualty. Leading a wave of hysteria has been Republican presidential candidate Donald Trump, with his harebrained ideas for denying various civil liberties to Muslims.¶ None of them would pass constitutional muster, thank goodness, and while his diatribes have found fertile ground among his party’s base, the Republican establishment has begun to push back against Trump.¶ That’s good sign, because we do have a terrorism problem that requires clear thinking and sober judgment. Our actions and policies must be grounded in accurate and detailed information. A report that received relatively little press at the time of its release in early December deserves a spotlight.¶ It’s far from comforting. The main message is that there is no snapshot profile to identify the jihadist on the block. That fact alone renders much of the blather we’re hearing about restrictions on this group or that beside the point.¶ “ISIS in America: From Retweets to Raqqa” is the result of a six-month study by the Program on Extremism at George Washington University. It studied online chatter, arrest data and other information in the cases of the 71 people arrested since March 2014 for crimes related to support of the Islamic State, along with counter-terrorism research. Fifty-six were arrested in 2015, a record number in a single year since the 9/11 attacks.¶ The report asks a crucial question, in the context of students and others caught heading to Syria, intending to join the Islamic State: “How could these seemingly ordinary young American men and, in growing numbers, women, be attracted to the world’s most infamous terrorist organization?” The answer is that we don’t know, “as each individual’s radicalization has its own unique dynamics.”¶ Average age of those studied was 26, but they ranged in age from 15 to 47; 86 percent were male, and most were U.S. citizens or permanent residents.¶ Another point that might surprise those who obsessed with Islamic immigrants: Converts to the faith were 40 percent of the people arrested.¶ In some ways, the study proved to be a bit prophetic about San Bernardino. It noted a decrease in the numbers traveling to join the Islamic State overseas, which raises the possibility that homegrown terrorists will increasingly focus on U.S. targets.¶ At less than 1 percent of the total adult population, Muslims in America are at a disadvantage with respect to public perception. Many Americans literally don’t know a single one of the estimated 1.8 million adults in the U.S. who are Muslim.¶ Assimilation and acceptance, as opposed to isolation, the report notes, are key to blocking radicalization. That’s actually a hopeful point we can look to. Despite the caustic debates about Islam playing out in our media of late, America’s Muslims are far more integrated than their coreligionists in many European countries. That’s a huge strength — and one that should not be undermined.¶ About 63 percent of Muslims in the U.S. are immigrants. They are also more likely to hold a college degree than native-born citizens, and Muslim women stand out for educational attainment.¶ They’re an asset to our nation, and it’s in everybody’s interest, in the measures we take to protect ourselves from terrorism, not to alienate them.¶ If American citizens are truly to follow the “if you see something, say something” mode of alertness, we need to be knowledgeable. A mentality of Muslim-equals-terrorist will not help keep us safe.

## 1NC – Util

### Util fwk.

#### Phenomenal introspection is reliable and proves that util is objectively valid.

Sinhababu Neil (National University of Singapore) “The epistemic argument for hedonism” [http://philpapers.org/archive/SINTEA-3 accessed 2-4-16](http://philpapers.org/archive/SINTEA-3%20accessed%202-4-16) JW

The Odyssey's treatment of these events demonstrates how dramatically ancient Greek moral intuitions differ from ours. It doesn't dwell on the brutality of Telemachus, who killed twelve women for the trivial reasons he states, making them suffer as they die. While gods and men seek vengeance for other great and small offenses in the Odyssey, no one finds this mass murder worth avenging. It's a minor event in the denouement to a happy ending in which Odysseus (who first proposes killing the women) returns home and Telemachus becomes a man. That the[y] Greeks could so easily regard these murders as part of a happy ending for heroes shows how deeply we disagree with them. It's as if we gave them a trolley problem with the 12 women on the side track and no one on the main track, and they judged it permissible for Telemachus to turn the trolley and kill them all. And this isn't some esoteric text of a despised or short-lived sect, but a central literary work of a long-lived and influential culture. Human history offers similarly striking examples of disagreement on a variety of topics. These include sexual morality; the treatment of animals; the treatment of other ethnicities, families, and social classes; the consumption of intoxicating substances; whether and how one may take vengeance; slavery; whether public celebrations are acceptable; and gender roles.12 Moral obligations to commit genocide were accepted not only by some 20th century Germans, but by much of the ancient world, including the culture that gave us the Old Testament. One can only view the human past and much of the present with horror at the depth of human moral error and the harm that has resulted. One might think to explain away much of this disagreement as the result of differing nonmoral beliefs. Those who disagree about nonmoral issues may disagree on the moral rightness of a particular action despite agreeing on the fundamental moral issues. For example, they may agree that healing the sick is right, but disagree about whether a particular medicine will heal or harm. This disagreement about whether to prescribe the medicine won't be fundamentally about morality, and won't support the argument from disagreement. I don't think the moral disagreements listed above are explained by differences in nonmoral belief. This isn't because sexists, racists, and bigots share the nonmoral views of those enlightened by feminism and other egalitarian doctrines – they don't. Rather, their differing views on nonmoral topics often are rationalizations of moral beliefs that fundamentally disagree with ours.13 Those whose fundamental moral judgments include commitments to the authority of men over women, or of one race over another, will easily accept descriptive psychological views that attribute less intelligence or rationality to women or the subjugated race.14 Moral disagreement supposedly arising from moral views in religious texts is similar. Given how rich and many-stranded most religious texts are, interpretive claims about their moral teachings often tell us more about the antecedent moral beliefs of the interpreter than about the text itself. This is why the same texts are interpreted to support so many different moral views. Similar phenomena occur with most moral beliefs. Environmentalists who value a lovely patch of wilderness will easily believe that its destruction will cause disaster, those who feel justified in eating meat will easily believe that the animals they eat don't suffer greatly, and libertarians who feel that redistributing wealth is unjust will easily believe that it raises unemployment. We shouldn't assume that differing moral beliefs on practical questions are caused by fundamental moral agreement combined with differing nonmoral beliefs. Often the differing nonmoral beliefs are caused by fundamental moral disagreement. As we have no precise way of quantifying the breadth of disagreement or determining its epistemic consequences, it's unclear exactly how much disagreement the argument requires. While this makes the argument difficult to evaluate, it shouldn't stop us from proceeding, as we have to use the unclear notion of widespread disagreement in ordinary epistemic practice. If 99.9% of botanists agree on some issue about plants, non-botanists should defer to their authority and believe as most of them do. But if disagreement between botanists is suitably widespread, non-botanists should remain agnostic. A more precise and systematic account of when disagreement is widespread enough to generate particular epistemic consequences would be very helpful. Until we have one, we must employ the unclear notion of widespread disagreement, or some similar notion, throughout epistemic practice. Against the background of widespread moral disagreement, there may still be universal or near-universal agreement on some moral questions. For example, perhaps all cultures agree that one should provide for one’s elderly parents, even though they generally disagree elsewhere. How do these narrow areas of moral agreement affect the argument? This all depends on whether the narrow agreement is reliably or unreliably caused. If narrow agreement results from a reliable process of belief-formation, it lets us avoid error, defeating the argument from disagreement. But widely accepted moral beliefs may result from widely prevailing unreliable processes leading everyone to the same errors. There's no special pressure to explain agreement in terms of reliable processes when disagreement is widespread. Explaining agreement in terms of reliable processes is preferable when we have some reason to think that the processes involved are generally reliable. Then we would want to understand cases of agreement in line with the general reliability of processes producing moral belief. But if disagreement is widespread, error is too. Since moral beliefs are so often false, invoking unreliable processes to explain them is better than invoking reliable ones. The next two sections discuss this in more detail. We have many plausible explanations of narrow agreement on which moral beliefs are unreliably caused. Evolutionary and sociological explanations of why particular moral beliefs are widely accepted often invoke unreliable mechanisms.15 On these explanations, we agree because some moral beliefs were so important for reproductive fitness that natural selection made them innate in us, or so important to the interests controlling moral education in each culture that they were inculcated in everyone. For example, parents' influence over their children's moral education would explain agreement that one should provide for one's elderly parents. Plausible normative ethical theories won't systematically connect these evolutionary and sociological explanations with moral facts. If disagreement and error are widespread, they'll provide useful ways to reconcile unusual cases of widespread agreement with the general unreliability of the processes producing moral belief. 1.3 If there is widespread error about a topic, we should retain only those beliefs about it formed through reliable processes Now I'll defend 3. First I'll show how the falsity of others' beliefs undermines one's own belief. Then I'll clarify the notion of a reliable process. I'll consider a modification to 3 that epistemic internalists might favor, and show that the argument accommodates it. I'll illustrate 3's plausibility by considering cases where it correctly guides our reasoning. Finally, I'll show how 3 is grounded in the intuitive response to grave moral error. First, a simple objection: “Why should I care whether other people have false beliefs? That's a fact about other people, and not about me. Even if most people are wrong about some topic, I may be one of the few right ones, even if there's no apparent reason to think that my way of forming beliefs is any more reliable.” While widespread error leaves open the possibility that one has true beliefs, it reduces the probability that my beliefs are true. Consider a parallel case. I have no direct evidence that I have an appendix, but I know that previous investigations have revealed appendixes in people. So induction suggests that I have an appendix. Similarly, I know on the basis of 1 and 2 that people's moral beliefs are, in general, rife with error. So even if I have no direct evidence of error in my moral beliefs, induction suggests that they are rife with error as well. 3 invokes the reliability of the processes that produce our beliefs. Assessing processes of belief-formation for reliability is an important part of our epistemic practices. If someone tells me that my belief is entirely produced by wishful thinking, I can't simply accept that and maintain the belief. Knowing that wishful thinking is unreliable, I must either deny that my belief is entirely caused by wishful thinking or abandon the belief. But if someone tells me that my belief is entirely the result of visual perception, I'll maintain it, assuming that it concerns sizable nearby objects or something else about which visual perception is reliable. While providing precise criteria for individuating processes of belief-formation is hard, as the literature on the generality problem for reliabilism attests, individuating them somehow is indispensable to our epistemic practices.16 Following Alvin Goldman's remark that “It is clear that our ordinary thought about process types slices them broadly” (346), I'll treat cognitive process types like wishful thinking and visual perception as appropriately broad.17 Trusting particular people and texts, meanwhile, are too narrow. Cognitive science may eventually help us better individuate cognitive process types for the purposes of reliability assessments and discover which processes produce which beliefs. Epistemic internalists might reject 3 as stated, claiming that it isn't widespread error that would justify giving up our beliefs, but our having reason to believe that there is widespread error. They might also claim that our justification for believing the outputs of some process depends not on its reliability, but on what we have reason to believe about its reliability. The argument will still go forward if 3 is modified to suit internalist tastes, changing its antecedent to “If we have reason to believe that there is widespread error about a topic” or changing its consequent to “we should retain only those beliefs about it that we have reason to believe were formed through reliable processes.” While 3's antecedent might itself seem unnecessary on the original formulation, it's required for 3 to remain plausible on the internalist modification. Requiring us to have reason to believe that any of our belief-formation processes are reliable before retaining their outputs might lead to skepticism. The antecedent limits the scope of the requirement to cases of widespread error, averting general skeptical conclusions. The argument will still attain its conclusion under these modifications. Successfully defending the premises of the argument and deriving widespread error (5) and unreliability (7) gives those of us who have heard the defense and derivation reason to believe 5 and 7. This allows us to derive 8. (Thus the pronoun 'we' in 3, 6, and 8.) 3 describes the right response to widespread error in many actual cases. Someone in the 12th century, especially upon hearing the disagreeing views of many cultures regarding the origins of the universe, would do well to recognize that error on this topic was widespread and retreat to agnosticism about it. Only when modern astrophysics extended reliable empirical methods to cosmology would it be rational to move forward from agnosticism and accept a particular account of how the universe began. Similarly, disagreement about which stocks will perform better than average is widespread among investors, suggesting that one's beliefs on the matter have a high likelihood of error. It's wise to remain agnostic about the stock market without an unusually reliable way of forming beliefs – for example, the sort of secret insider information that it's illegal to trade on. 3 permits us to hold onto our moral beliefs in individual cases of moral disagreement, suggesting skeptical conclusions only when moral disagreement is widespread. When we consider a single culture's abhorrent moral views, like the Greeks' acceptance of Telemachus and Odysseus' murders of the servant women, we don't think that maybe the Greeks were right to see nothing wrong and we should reconsider our outrage. Instead, we're horrified by their grave moral error. I think this is the right response. We're similarly horrified by the moral errors of Hindus who burned widows on their husbands' funeral pyres, American Southerners who supported slavery and segregation, our contemporaries who condemn homosexuality, and countless others. The sheer number of cases like this requires us to regard moral error as a pervasive feature of the human condition. Humans typically form moral beliefs through unreliable processes and have appendixes. We are humans, so this should reduce our confidence in our moral judgments. The prevalence of error in a world full of moral disagreement demonstrates how bad humans are at forming true moral beliefs, undermining our own moral beliefs. Knowing that unreliable processes so often lead humans to their moral beliefs, we'll require our moral beliefs to issue from reliable processes. 1.4 If there is widespread error about morality, there are no reliable processes for forming moral beliefs A reliable process for forming moral beliefs would avert skeptical conclusions. I'll consider several processes and argue that they don't help us escape moral skepticism. Ordinary moral intuition, whether it involves a special rational faculty or our emotional responses, is shown to be unreliable by the existence of widespread error. The argument from disagreement either prevents reflective equilibrium from generating moral conclusions or undermines it. Conceptual analysis is reliable, but delivers the wrong kind of knowledge to avert skepticism. If all our processes for forming moral beliefs are unreliable, moral skepticism looms. 4 is false only because of one process – phenomenal introspection, which lets us know of the goodness of pleasure, as the second half of this paper will discuss. Widespread error guarantees the unreliability of any process by which we form all or almost all of our moral beliefs. While widespread error allows some processes responsible for a small share of our moral beliefs to predominantly create true beliefs, it implies that any process generating a very large share of moral belief must be highly error-prone. Since the process produced so many of our moral beliefs, and so many of them are erroneous, it must be responsible for a large share of the error. If more of people's moral beliefs were true, things would be otherwise. Widespread truth would support the reliability of any process that produced most or all of our moral beliefs, since that process would be responsible for so much true belief. But given widespread error, ordinary moral intuition must be unreliable. This point provides a forceful response to Moorean opponents who insist that we can't give up the reliability of a process by which we form all or nearly all of our beliefs on an important topic, since this would permit counterintuitive skeptical conclusions. Even if this Moorean response helps against external world skeptics who employ counterfactual thought experiments involving brains in vats, it doesn't help against moral skeptics who use 1 and 2 to derive widespread actual error. Once we accept that widespread error actually obtains, a great deal of human moral knowledge has already vanished. Insisting on the reliability of the process then seems implausible and pointless. I'll briefly consider two conceptions of moral intuition – as a special rational faculty by which we grasp non-natural moral facts, and as a process by which our emotions lead us to form moral beliefs – and show how widespread error guarantees their unreliability. Some philosophers regard moral intuition as involving a special rational faculty that lets us know non-natural moral facts.18 They argue that knowledge on many topics including mathematics, logic, and modality involves this rational faculty, so moral knowledge might operate similarly. This suggests a way for them to defend the reliability of moral intuition in the face of widespread error: if intuition is reliable about these other things, its overall reliability across moral and nonmoral areas allows us to reliably form moral beliefs by using it. This defense won't work. When an epistemic process is manifestly unreliable on some topic, as widespread error shows any process responsible for most of our moral beliefs to be, the reliability of that process elsewhere won't save it on that topic. Even if testimony is reliable, this doesn't imply the reliability of compulsive gamblers' testimony about the next spin of the roulette wheel. Even if intuition remains reliable elsewhere, widespread disagreement still renders it unreliable in ethics. I see ordinary moral intuition as a process of emotional perception in which our feelings cause us to form moral beliefs.19 Just as visual experiences of color cause beliefs about the colors of surfaces, emotional experiences cause moral beliefs. Pleasant feelings like approval, admiration, or hope in considering actions, persons, or states of affairs lead us to believe they are right, virtuous or good. Unpleasant emotions like guilt, disgust, or horror in considering actions, persons, or states of affairs lead us to believe they are wrong, vicious, or bad. We might have regarded this as a reliable way to know about moral facts, just as visual perception is a reliable way to know about color, if not for widespread error. But because of widespread error, we can only see it as an unreliable process responsible for our dismal epistemic situation. Reflective equilibrium is the prevailing methodology in normative ethics today. It involves modifying our beliefs about particular cases and general principles to make them cohere. Whether or not nonmoral propositions like the premises of the argument from disagreement are admissible in reflective equilibrium, widespread error prevents reflective equilibrium from reliably generating a true moral theory, as I'll explain. If the premises of the argument from disagreement are admitted into reflective equilibrium, the argument can be reconstructed there, and reflective equilibrium will dictate that we give up all of our moral beliefs. To avoid this conclusion, the premises of the argument from disagreement would have to be revised away on moral grounds. These premises are a metaethical claim about the objectivity of morality which seems to be a conceptual truth, an anthropological claim about the existence of disagreement, a very general epistemic claim about when we should revise our beliefs, and a more empirically grounded epistemic claim about our processes of belief-formation and their reliability. While reflective equilibrium may move us to revise substantive moral beliefs in view of other substantive moral beliefs, claims of these other kinds are less amenable to such revision. Unless ambitious arguments for revising these nonmoral claims away succeed, we must follow the argument to its conclusion and accept that reflective equilibrium makes moral skeptics of us.20 If only moral principles and judgments are considered in reflective equilibrium, it won't make moral skeptics of us, but the argument from disagreement will undermine its conclusions. The argument forces us to give up the pre-existing moral beliefs against which we test various moral propositions in reflective equilibrium. While we may be justified in believing something because it coheres with our other beliefs, this justification goes away once we see that those beliefs should be abandoned. Coherence with beliefs that we know we should give up doesn't confer justification. Now I'll consider conceptual analysis. It can produce moral beliefs about conceptual truths – for example, that the moral supervenes on the nonmoral, and that morality is objective. It also may provide judgments about relations between different moral concepts – perhaps, that if the only moral difference between two actions is that one would produce morally better consequences than the other, doing what produces better consequences is right. I regard conceptual analysis as reliable, so that the argument from disagreement does not force us to give up the beliefs about morality it produces. Unfortunately, if analytic naturalism is false, as has been widely held in metaethics since G. E. Moore, conceptual analysis won't provide all the knowledge we need to build a normative ethical theory.21 Even when it relates moral concepts like goodness and rightness to each other, it doesn't tell us that anything is good or right to begin with. That's the knowledge we need to avoid moral skepticism. So far I've argued that our epistemic and anthropological situation, combined with plausible metaethical and epistemic principles, forces us to abandon our moral beliefs. But if a reliable process of moral belief-formation exists, 4 is false, and we can answer the moral skeptic. The rest of this paper discusses the only reliable process I know of. 2.1 Phenomenal introspection reveals pleasure's goodness Phenomenal introspection, a reliable way of forming true beliefs about our experiences, produces the belief that pleasure is good. Even as our other processes of moral belief-formation prove unreliable, it provides reliable access to pleasure's goodness, justifying the positive claims of hedonism. This section clarifies what phenomenal introspection and pleasure are and explains how phenomenal introspection provides reliable access to pleasure's value. Section 2.2 argues that pleasure's goodness is genuine moral value, rather than value of some other kind. In phenomenal introspection we consider our subjective experience, or phenomenology, and determine what it's like. Phenomenal introspection can be reliable while dreaming or hallucinating, as long as we can determine what the dreams or hallucinations are like. By itself, phenomenal introspection doesn't produce beliefs about things outside experience, or about relations between our experiences and non-experiential things. So it doesn't produce judgments about the rightness of actions or the goodness of non-experiential things. It can only tell us about the intrinsic properties of experience itself. Phenomenal introspection is generally reliable, even if mistakes about immediate experience are possible. Experience is rich in detail, so one could get some of the details wrong in belief. Under adverse conditions involving false expectations, misleading evidence about what one's experiences will be, or extreme emotional states that disrupt belief-formation, larger errors are possible. Paradigmatically reliable processes like vision share these failings. Vision sometimes produces false beliefs under adverse conditions, or when we're looking at complex things. Still, it's so reliable as to be indispensible in ordinary life. Regarding phenomenal introspection as unreliable is about as radical as skepticism about the reliability of vision. While contemporary psychologists reject introspection into one's motivations and other psychological causal processes as unreliable, phenomenal introspection fares better. Daniel Kahneman, for example, writes that “experienced utility is best measured by moment-based methods that assess the experience of the present.”22 Even those most skeptical about the reliability of phenomenal introspection, like Eric Schwitzgebel, concede that we can reliably introspect whether we are in serious pain.23 Then we should be able to introspectively determine what pain is like. So I'll assume the reliability of phenomenal introspection. One can form a variety of beliefs using phenomenal introspection. For example, one can believe that one is having sound experiences of particular noises and visual experiences of different shades of color. When looking at a lemon and considering the phenomenal states that are yellow experiences, one can form some beliefs about their intrinsic features – for example, that they're bright experiences. And when considering experiences of pleasure, one can make some judgments about their intrinsic features – for example, that they're good experiences. Just as one can look inward at one's experience of lemon yellow and recognize its brightness, one can look inward at one's experience of pleasure and recognize its goodness.24 When I consider a situation of increasing pleasure, I can form the belief that things are better than they were before, just as I form the belief that there's more brightness in my visual field as lemon yellow replaces black. And when I suddenly experience pain, I can form the belief that things are worse in my experience than they were before. Having pleasure consists in one's experience having a positive hedonic tone. Without descending into metaphor, it's hard to give a further account of what pleasure is like than to say that when one has it, one feels good. As Aaron Smuts writes in defending the view of pleasure as hedonic tone, “to 'feel good' is about as close to an experiential primitive as we get.” 25 Fred Feldman sees pleasure as fundamentally an attitude rather than a hedonic tone.26 But as long as hedonic tones are real components of experience, phenomenal introspection will reveal pleasure's goodness. Opponents of the hedonic tone account of pleasure usually concede that hedonic tones exist, as Feldman seems to in discussing “sensory pleasures,” which he thinks his view helps us understand. Even on his view of pleasure, phenomenal introspection can produce the belief that some hedonic tones are good while others are bad. There are many different kinds of pleasant experiences. There are sensory pleasures, like the pleasure of tasting delicious food, receiving a massage, or resting your tired limbs in a soft bed after a hard day. There are the pleasures of seeing that our desires are satisfied, like the pleasure of winning a game, getting a promotion, or seeing a friend succeed. These experiences differ in many ways, just as the experiences of looking at lemons and the sky on a sunny day differ. It's easy to see the appeal of Feldman's view that pleasures “have just about nothing in common phenomenologically” (79). But just as our experiences in looking at lemons and the sky on a sunny day have brightness in common, pleasant experiences all have “a certain common quality – feeling good,” as Roger Crisp argues (109).27 As the analogy with brightness suggests, hedonic tone is phenomenologically very thin, and usually mixed with a variety of other experiences.28 Pleasure of any kind feels good, and displeasure of any kind feels bad. These feelings may or may not have bodily location or be combined with other sensory states like warmth or pressure. “Pleasure” and “displeasure” mean these thin phenomenal states of feeling good and feeling bad. As Joseph Mendola writes, “the pleasantness of physical pleasure is a kind of hedonic value, a single homogenous sensory property, differing merely in intensity as well as in extent and duration, which is yet a kind of goodness” (442).29 What if Feldman is right and hedonic states feel good in fundamentally different ways? Then phenomenal introspection suggests a pluralist variety of hedonism. Each fundamental flavor of pleasure will have a fundamentally different kind of goodness, as phenomenal introspection more accurate than mine will reveal. This isn't my view, but I suggest it to those convinced that hedonic tones are fundamentally heterogenous. If phenomenal introspection reliably informs us that pleasure is good, how can anyone believe that their pleasures are bad? Other processes of moral belief-formation are responsible for these beliefs. Someone who feels disgust or guilt about sex may not only regard sex as immoral, but the pleasure it produces as bad. Even if phenomenal introspection on sexual pleasure disposes one to believe that it's good, stronger negative emotional responses to it may more strongly dispose one to believe that it's bad, following the emotional perception model suggested in section 1.4. Explaining disagreement about pleasure's value in terms of other processes lets hedonists maintain that phenomenal introspection univocally supports pleasure's goodness. As long as negative judgments of pleasure come from unreliable processes instead of phenomenal introspection, the argument from disagreement eliminates them. The parallel between yellow’s brightness and pleasure’s goodness demonstrates the objectivity of the value detected in phenomenal introspection. Just as anyone's yellow experiences objectively are bright experiences, anyone's pleasure objectively is a good experience.30 While one's phenomenology is often called one's “subjective experience”, facts about it are still objective. “Subjective” in “subjective experience” means “internal to the mind”, not “ontologically dependent on attitudes towards it.” My yellow-experiences objectively have brightness. Anyone who thought my yellow-experiences lacked brightness would be mistaken. Pleasure similarly is objectively good. It's true that anyone's pleasure is good. Anyone who denies this is mistaken. As Mendola writes, the value detected in phenomenal introspection is “a plausible candidate for objective value” (712). Even though phenomenal introspection only tells me about my own phenomenal states, I can know that others' pleasure is good. Of course, I can't phenomenally introspect their pleasures, just as I can't phenomenally introspect pleasures that I'll experience next year. But if I consider my experiences of lemon yellow and ask what it would be like if others had the same experiences, I must think that they would be having bright experiences. Similarly, if in a pleasant moment I consider what it's like for others to have exactly the experience I'm having, I must think that they're having good experiences. If they have exactly the same experiences I'm having, their experiences will have exactly the same intrinsic properties as mine. This is also how I know that if I have the same experience in the future, it'll have the same intrinsic properties. Even though the only pleasure I can introspect is mine now, I should believe that others' pleasures and my pleasures at other times are good, just as I should believe that yellow experienced by others and myself at other times is bright. My argument thus favors the kind of universal hedonism that supports utilitarianism, not egoistic hedonism.

#### This outweighs other frameworks.

Sinhababu 2 Neil (National University of Singapore) “The epistemic argument for hedonism” [http://philpapers.org/archive/SINTEA-3 accessed 2-4-16](http://philpapers.org/archive/SINTEA-3%20accessed%202-4-16) JW

A full moral theory including accounts of rightness and virtue can be built from the deliverances of phenomenal introspection combined with conceptual analysis. Shaver, Kagan, and I suggest that phenomenal introspection reveals pleasure to have a kind of goodness that makes states of affairs better in consequentialist moral theories. A state of affairs thus is pro tanto better as there is more pleasure and pro tanto worse as there is more displeasure. More pleasure makes states of affairs better. Conceptual analysis here connects the concept of goodness with the concept of a better state of affairs, and with other moral concepts like rightness and virtue. Even if conceptual analysis cannot connect the moral and the nonmoral as a full normative ethical theory requires, it reveals connections between our moral concepts. For example, the following propositions or something like them seem to be conceptual truths: states of affairs are pro tanto better insofar as they include more goodness, an action is pro tanto better insofar as it causally contributes to better states of affairs, and agents are pro tanto more virtuous insofar as they desire that better states of affairs obtain. These putative conceptual truths about pro tanto relations do not contradict strong forms of deontology, as they allow that obligations may trump good consequences in determining right action. Utilitarians who build their theories along these lines can treat deontology as a conceptually coherent position whose substantive claims are in fact not favored by evidence from any reliable processes. So they need not treat utilitarianism itself as a conceptual truth and run afoul of Moore's open question argument. If the argument from disagreement forces us to abandon belief in all other moral facts, introspecting pleasure's goodness and following these conceptual pro tanto connections to conclusions involving other moral concepts may be the only way to develop a full moral theory through reliable processes.

#### Thus, the standard is maximizing happiness.

### Reductionism

#### Personal identity doesn’t exist.

Olson Eric T. (Professor of Philosophy at the University of Sheffield) “Personal Identity” Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy Aug 20, 2002; substantive revision Oct 28, 2010 <http://plato.stanford.edu/entries/identity-personal/#PsyApp> JW

Whatever psychological continuity may amount to, a more serious worry for the Psychological Approach is that you could be psychologically continuous with two past or future people at once. **If your cerebrum**—the upper part of the brain largely responsible for mental features—**were transplanted, the recipient would be** psychologically continuous with **you** by anyone's lights (even if there would also be important psychological differences). The Psychological Approach implies that she would be you. If we destroyed one of your cerebral hemispheres, the resulting being would also be psychologically continuous with you. (Hemispherectomy—even the removal of the left hemisphere, which controls speech—is considered a drastic but acceptable treatment for otherwise-inoperable brain tumors: see Rigterink 1980.) What **if we** did both at once, **destroy**ing **one hemisphere and transplant**ing **the other**? Then too, **the one who got the transplant**ed hemisphere would be psychologically continuous with you, and according to the Psychological Approach **would be you.** But now **suppose** that **both hemispheres are transplanted, each into a different empty head.** (We needn't pretend, as some authors do, that the hemispheres are exactly alike.) **The two recipients**—call them Lefty and Righty—**will each be** psychologically continuous with **you.** The Psychological Approach as I have stated it implies that any future being who is psychologically continuous with you must be you. It follows that you are Lefty and also that you are Righty. **But that cannot be**: Lefty and Righty are two, and **one thing cannot be** numerically identical with **two things.** Suppose Lefty is hungry at a time when Righty isn't. If you are Lefty, you are hungry at that time. If you are Righty, you aren't. If you are Lefty and Righty, you are both hungry and not hungry at once: **a contradiction.**

#### This means util: only states of affairs have value.

Shoemaker Shoemaker, David (Dept of Philosophy, U Memphis). “Utilitarianism and Personal Identity.” The Journal of Value Inquiry 33: 183–199, 1999. http://www.csun.edu/~ds56723/jvipaper.pdf

Extreme reductionism might lend support to utilitarianism in the following way. Many people claim that we are justified in maximizing the good in our own lives, but not justified in maximizing the good across sets of lives, simply because each of us is a single, deeply unified person, unified by the further fact of identity, whereas there is no such corresponding unity across sets of lives. But if the only justification for the different treatment of individual lives and sets of lives is the further fact, and this fact is undermined by the truth of reductionism, then nothing justifies this different treatment. **There are no** deeply unified **subjects** of experience. **What remains are** merely the **experiences** themselves, and so **any ethic**al theory **distinguishing between individual lives** and sets of lives **is mistaken.** If the deep, further fact is missing, then there are no unities. **The moral**ly significant **units should** then **be the states people are in at particular times**, and **an ethic**al theory that **focused on them** and attempted to improve their quality, whatever their location, **would be** the **most plausible. Util**itarianism **i**s just **such a theory.**

### Determinism

#### Determinism is true.

#### A. Early experiences shape who we are.

Strawson Galen Professor of Philosophy at Reading “The Impossibility of Moral Responsibility” 1993

This may seem contrived, but essentially the same argument can be given in a more natural form. (1) It is undeniable that one is the way one is, initially, as a result of heredity and early experience, and it is undeniable that these are things for which one cannot be held to be in any way responsible (morally or otherwise). (2) One cannot at any later stage of life hope to accede to true moral responsibility for the way one is by trying to change the way one already is as a result of heredity and previous experience. For (3) both the particular way in which one is moved to try to change oneself, and the degree of one's success in one's attempt at change, will be determined by how one already is as a result of heredity and previous experience. And (4) any further changes that one can bring about only after one has brought about certain initial changes will in turn be determined, via the initial changes, by heredity and previous experience. (5) This may not be the whole story, for it may be that some changes in the way one is are traceable not to heredity and experience but to the influence of indeterministic or random factors. But it is absurd to suppose that indeterministic or random factors, for which one is ex hypothesi in no way responsible, can in themselves contribute in any way to one's being truly morally responsible for how one is. The claim, then, is not that people cannot change the way they are. They can, in certain respects (which tend to be exaggerated by North Americans and underestimated, perhaps, by Europeans). The claim is only that people cannot be supposed to change themselves in such a way as to be or become truly or ultimately morally responsible for the way they are, and hence for their actions.

#### B. Our bodies are controlled by mechanical principles.

Drescher Gary L. (Visiting Fellow at the Center for Cognitive Studies at Tufts University, PhD in Computer Science from MIT) “Good and Real: Demystifying Paradoxes from Physics to Ethics” Bradford Books May 5th 2006

One prominent notion is that we have both a ghostlike component (our consciousness or soul) and a mechanical component (everything else, including our body). The mechanical component is governed by the usual physical laws. The ghostlike component, unconstrained by those laws, can be said to be extraphysical. That is, the ghostlike component is something in addition to the kinds of things that exist in the physical realm, something ontologically extra.1 This so-called dualist view was advanced by Descartes in the 1600s. Dualism is a tempting compromise, but an awkward one, for reasons that are well known. The problem is that the mechanical principles that govern each particle of our bodies (and of the things around us) already specify how each of those particles behaves, which in turn specifies how each of us behaves as a whole. But in that case, there is no room for the ghostlike component to have any influence—if it did so, it would have to make some of the particles sometimes violate the principles that all particles are always observed to obey whenever we check carefully. (Descartes was admirably precise about the locus of this supposed intervention—he proposed that the interface between the ghostlike component and the physical world occurs within the brain in the pineal gland.)2 Thus, we have the mind– body problem: how can we reconcile the nature of the mind with the mechanical nature of the body? Some see quantum-mechanical uncertainty as the wiggle room that could let a ghostlike consciousness nudge some of the particles in our body without violating the rules of physics. But in fact—even apart from the newer, deterministic interpretation of quantum mechanics discussed in chapter 4—any such nudging would at least constitute a change in the probability distribution for some of the particles in our body, and even that would break the (probabilistic) rules that particles always seem to obey. Granted, it could be the case that particles somewhere in our brains behave differently than particles ever do when we watch them carefully, violating otherwise exceptionless rules (be they deterministic or probabilistic rules). But since the rules are otherwise exceptionless (as far as we can tell), there should be a strong presumption that there’s no exception in our brains either—especially in view of the longstanding retreat of other beliefs about the alleged physically exceptional behavior of conscious or living organisms. The doctrine of vitalism, for instance, supposed that there is some distinctive ‘‘life force’’ that animates living things, enabling them to grow and move. But the more we learned of biochemistry—DNA and RNA, ATP energy cycles, neurotransmitters, and the like—the more we understood that the growth and movement of living things is explicable in terms of the same molecular building blocks, following the same exceptionless rules, as when those building blocks exist outside of animate objects. And the more we learn about computation and neuroscience, the more we discover how cognitive processes that were once supposed to require an ethereal spirit—perception, motor control, memory, spatial reasoning, even key aspects of more general reasoning (e.g., deduction, induction, planning)—can be implemented by basic switching elements (e.g., neurons or transistors) that need not themselves be conscious, or even animate. By monitoring brain activity, we can see different regions of the brain performing computations when different sorts of cognitive functions are performed (language, singing, spatial imaging, etc.). And when certain brain regions are damaged by injury or illness, the corresponding cognitive abilities degrade or vanish. To be sure, we are still far from understanding human cognition as a whole. But the trend in our knowledge does not lend comfort to the expectation that any particles in our brain will, at long last, ever be found to deviate sometimes from the same rules that such particles otherwise always obey.

#### Only consequentialism is consistent with a deterministic world.

Greene and Cohen 4 Joshua Greene and Jonathan Cohen (Department of Psychology, Center for the Study of Brain, Mind, and Behavior, Princeton University) “For the law, neuroscience changes nothing and everything” November 26th 2004 Phil.Trans.R.Soc.Lond.B (2004)359,1775–1785 <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC1693457/pdf/15590618.pdf> JW

The forward-looking–consequentialist approach to punishment works with all three responses to the problem of free will, including hard determinism. This is because consequentialists are not concerned with whether anyone is really innocent or guilty in some ultimate sense that might depend on people’s having free will, but only with the likely effects of punishment. (Of course, one might wonder what it means for a hard determinist to justify any sort of choice. We will return to this issue in x 8.) The retributivist approach, by contrast, is plausibly regarded as requiring free will and the rejection of hard determinism. Retributivists want to know whether the defendant truly deserves to be punished. Assuming one can deserve to be punished only for actions that are freely willed, hard determinism implies that no one really deserves to be punished. Thus, hard determinism combined with retributivism requires the elimination of all punishment, which does not seem reasonable. This leaves retributivists with two options: compatibilism and libertarianism. Libertarianism, for reasons given above, and despite its intuitive appeal, is scientifically suspect. At the very least, the law should not depend on it. It seems, then, that retributivism requires compatibilism. Accordingly, the standard legal account of punishment is compatibilist.

### Actor Specificity

#### Actor specificity. Policymaking must be consequentialist since collective action results in conflicts that only util can resolve. Side constraints paralyze state action since policy makers have to consider tradeoffs between multiple people. States lack intentionality since they're composed of multiple individuals—there is no act-omission distinction for them since they create permissions and prohibitions in terms of policies so authorizing action could never be considered an omission since the state assumes culpability in regulating the public domain.

### TJFs

#### Ethical frameworks must be theoretically legitimate. Any standard is an interpretation of the word ought-thus framework is functionally a topicality argument about how to define the terms of the resolution. Definitions should be subject to theoretical contestation in the same way other words should be. My framework interprets ought as maximizing happiness. Prefer this definition:

#### A. Ground- every impact can function under my standard but other ethics exclude arguments and flow to one side- kills fairness since we both need arguments to win.

#### B. Topic lit- most articles are written through the lens of util because they’re crafted for policymakers and the general public who take consequences to be important, not philosophy majors. Key to fairness and education- the lit is where we do research and determines how we engage in the round.

#### Fairness is a voter since debate is a competitive activity-no debater ought to have an advantage otherwise you’re picking the better cheater. Education is a voter since it’s why schools fund debate and also provides portable skills for the real world. This is a framework warrant, not a reason to drop the debater.

### Extinction 1st

#### Extinction first

#### 1. It precludes the possibility of any kind of moral value.

Seeley 86 Robert A., Central Committee for Conscientious Objectors, The Handbook of Non-Violence, p. 269-70

In moral reasoning prediction of consequences is nearly always impossible. One balances the risks of an action against its benefits; one also considers what known damage the action would do. Thus a surgeon in deciding whether to perform an operation weighs the known effects (the loss of some nerve function, for example) and risks (death) against the benefits, and weighs also the risks and benefits of not performing surgery. Morally, however, human extinction is unlike any other risk. No conceivable human good could be worth the extinction of the race, for in order to be a human good it must be experienced by human beings. Thus extinction is one result we dare not-may not-risk. Though not conclusively established, the risk of extinction is real enough to make nuclear war utterly impermissible under any sane moral code.

#### 2. Moral uncertainty means we should minimize existential risk—it’s irreversible and prevents ethical deliberation or value.

Bostrom 13 Nick Bostrom (Professor, Faculty of Philosophy & Oxford Martin School Director, Future of Humanity Institute Director, Oxford Martin Programme on the Impacts of Future Technology University of Oxford) “Existential Risk Prevention as Global Priority” Global Policy Volume 4 . Issue 1 . February 2013 <http://www.existential-risk.org/concept.pdf> JW

Keeping our options alive These reflections on moral uncertainty suggest[s] an alternative, complementary way of looking at existential risk; they also suggest a new way of thinking about the ideal of sustainability. Let me elaborate. Our present understanding of axiology might well be confused. We may not now know—at least not in concrete detail—what outcomes would count as a big win for humanity; we might not even yet be able to imagine the best ends of our journey. If we are indeed profoundly uncertain about our ultimate aims, then we should recognise that there is a great option value in preserving—and ideally improving—our ability to recognise value and to steer the future accordingly. Ensuring that there will be a future version of humanity with great powers and a propensity to use them wisely is plausibly the best way available to us to increase the probability that the future will contain a lot of value. To do this, we must prevent any existential catastrophe.

#### 3. State existence comes first under any moral standard—it’s the only way to create the possibility for good action.

Matusek 5 Ed “THE FRIEND-ENEMY DISTINCTION” 2005 Virginia Tech Graduate Student Conference Fall 2005 <http://www.phil.vt.edu/HTML/events/Fall2005_gradconf/matusek.pdf>

Thus, liberals do “concede”, although in an indirect fashion, that “the existence of a functioning political entity is necessarily prior to any normativ[e]istic restraints on it,” which amounts to a tacit admission that “normativism can never provide an adequate basis for a political community.” 15 Stated another way, “The very differentiation of a people from the ‘alien foe’ is inevitably supranormative;” 16 Schmitt is doubtful that “political identity can rest meaningfully on ‘normativistic’ ideas,…because political conflict with ‘existential’ enemies reaches such a pitch of intensity that ‘normativities’ are likely to prove meaningless.” As a result, the very idea that Schmitt’s necessary point of departure transcends ethics has, of course, enormous ramifications for the liberal political models of his time with their particular notions of normativity. Schmitt’s existential twist in his political theory renders liberal models essentially irrelevant right from the beginning from two angles: either the idea of how the state began is not covered in the model at all, or any serious proposal to answer that question would have to necessarily involve Schmittian concepts to justify the existence of any type of state. Scheuermann elaborates on the second angle by delineating more precisely the connection Schmitt draws between the “enemy” concept and the inadequacies of normativism in this regard: “A people is ‘constituted’17 first and foremost by means of possessing a capacity for undertaking violence against external threats, by the fact that it is ‘awakened’ and ‘capable of action’ against potential political enemies.”18 Therefore, “only if a political entity can successfully ward off the ‘stranger’19 and thus guarantee its survival do liberal legal normativities even have a chance to function successfully.” A connection, then, arguably exists between external and domestic factors in justifying the existence and purpose of the state in Schmittian terms. Regardless of how liberals of Schmitt’s time would construe what the ideal model of government would be for the inner workings of society within the territory in question, the presence of a reasonably powerful state, powerful enough to ensure the continued stability of the society under discussion, must be existentially present prior to a domestic scene that meets the liberal ideal popular in that period.

### Extinction K Module

#### Extinction precludes the aff – no moral value.

Seeley 86 Robert A., Central Committee for Conscientious Objectors, The Handbook of Non-Violence, p. 269-70

In moral reasoning prediction of consequences is nearly always impossible. One balances the risks of an action against its benefits; one also considers what known damage the action would do. Thus a surgeon in deciding whether to perform an operation weighs the known effects (the loss of some nerve function, for example) and risks (death) against the benefits, and weighs also the risks and benefits of not performing surgery. Morally, however, human extinction is unlike any other risk. No conceivable human good could be worth the extinction of the race, for in order to be a human good it must be experienced by human beings. Thus extinction is one result we dare not-may not-risk. Though not conclusively established, the risk of extinction is real enough to make nuclear war utterly impermissible under any sane moral code.

#### Magnitude first—we must calculate future descendants.

Matheny 7 (Jason, Department of Health Policy and Management, Bloomberg School of Public Health, Johns Hopkins University, “Reducing the Risk of Human Extinction,” Risk Analysis, Vol 27, No 5)

**Even if extinction events are improbable, the expected values of countermeasures could be large, as they include the value of all future lives. This introduces a discontinuity between** the CEA of **extinction and nonextinction risks.** **Even though the risk to any existing individual of dying in a car crash is much greater than the risk of dying in an asteroid impact, asteroids pose a much greater risk to the existence of future generations** (we are not likely to crash all our cars at once) (Chapman, 2004). **The “death-toll” of an extinction-level asteroid impact is the population of Earth, plus all the descendents of that population who would otherwise have existed if not for the impact. There is thus a discontinuity between risks that threaten 99% of humanity and those that threaten 100%.**

#### Death controls the internal link to every moral value and impact

Jonas 96 (Hans, Former Alvin Johnson Prof. Phil. – New School for Social Research and Former Eric Voegelin Visiting Prof. – U. Munich, “Morality and Mortality: A Search for the Good After Auschwitz”, p. 111-112)

With this look ahead at an ethics for the future, we are touching at the same time upon the question of the future of freedom. The unavoidable discussion of this question seems to give rise to misunderstandings. My dire prognosis that not only our material standard of living but also our democratic freedoms would fall victim to the growing pressure of a worldwide ecological crisis, until finally there would remain only some form of tyranny that would try to save the situation, has led to the accusation that I am defending dictatorship as a solution to our problems. I shall ignore here what is a confusion between warning and recommendation. But I have indeed said that such a **tyranny would still be better than total ruin**; thus, I have ethically accepted it as an alternative. I must now defend this standpoint, which I continue to support, before the court that I myself have created with the main argument of this essay. For **are we not contradicting ourselves in prizing physical survival at the price of freedom**? Did we not say that freedom was the condition of our capacity for responsibility—and that this capacity was a reason for the survival of humankind?; **By tolerating tyranny as an alternative to physical annihilation are we not violating the principle we established: that the How of existence must not take precedence over its Why?** **Yet we can make a terrible concession to the primacy of physical survival in** the conviction that the ontological capacity for freedom, inseparable as it is from man's being, cannot really be extinguished, **only temporarily banished from the public realm**. **This conviction can be supported by experience we are all familiar with. We have seen that even in the most totalitarian societies the urge for freedom on the part of some individuals cannot be extinguished, and this renews our faith in human beings.** Given this faith, we have reason to hope that, as long as there are human beings who survive**,** the image of God will continue to exist along with them and will wait in concealment for its new hour. **With that hope**—which in this particular case takes precedence over fear—**it** **is** permissible**, for the sake of physical survival, to accept if need be a temporary absence of freedom in the external affairs of humanity**. This is, I want to emphasize, a worst-case scenario, and it is the foremost task of responsibility at this particular moment in world history to prevent it from happening. This is in fact one of the noblest of duties (and at the same time one concerning self-preservation), on the part of the imperative of responsibility to avert future coercion that would lead to lack of freedom by acting freely in the present, thus preserving as much as possible the ability of future generations to assume responsibility. But more than that is involved. **At stake is the preservation of Earth's entire miracle of creation, of which our human** existence **is a part and before which [hu]man reverently bows,** even without philosophical "grounding." Here too faith may precede and reasonfollow; it is faith that longs for this preservation of the Earth (fides quaerens intellectum), and reason comes as best it can to faith's aid with arguments, not knowing or even asking how much depends on its success or failure in determining what action to take. With this confession of faith we come to the end of our essay on ontology.