# Elections – NEG

## 1NC Shell

#### Hillary should win but there’s an opening for Trump. Jackson, 4/13[[1]](#footnote--1)

Early estimates give Clinton the advantage against the GOP. Sanders looks like a stronger general election candidate than Clinton in polls, but that might not tell us much about November. And how voters assess their finances has a lot to do with partisanship. This is HuffPollster for Wednesday, April 13, 2016. PROJECTION SHOWS CLINTON TROUNCING TRUMP AND CRUZ - Morning Consult: “If the presidential election was held today, businessman Donald Trump and Texas Sen. Ted Cruz would lose to Democratic front-runner Hillary Clinton, according to an extensive Morning Consult analysis of 44,000 poll respondents. Ohio Gov. John Kasich is the only candidate who could beat Clinton in November. Both Trump and Cruz would lose to Clinton by considerable margins in a head-to-head race, winning just 210 and 206 electoral college votes, respectively. By contrast, Kasich comfortably beats Clinton, racking up 304 electoral college votes to her 234….The results show that the race is still up for grabs, with nearly 20 percent of registered voters saying they are undecided about who they’d vote for between Clinton and either Trump, Cruz or Kasich.” [Morning Consult] How they estimated those Electoral College tallies - The analysts at Morning Consult used data they had collected from national surveys since January and a statistical technique called multilevel regression and poststratification (MRP) to estimate which candidate would win each state in a hypothetical election. MRP is a way of using data at a larger geographic level — like the national level — to estimate opinion at a smaller geographic level — in this case, the states. Instead of relying solely on how people say they will vote in the survey, MRP incorporates information about the respondents and the states they live in that’s known to predict vote choice. Morning Consult used respondents’ education, gender and age, plus state-level economic information and outcomes from the 2012 Presidential election. But nothing is certain - Morning Consult specifically notes that this analysis shows a projection of what would happen if the general election were today. And even though it incorporates state-level information, the model still relies on general election polls. Those aren’t yet predictive of what could happen in November, especially when many voters are still undecided. In the Trump vs. Clinton estimates, for example, neither candidate reaches a 50 percent majority in 37 states, and the candidates are within 2 percentage points of each other in seven states. [Morning Consult]

A handgun ban will face major public and GOP opposition. **Scher 15[[2]](#footnote-0)**

**Politicians** generally **avoid proposing handgun bans** because the position doesn’t fit into the frame of exempting “responsible gun owners” from new regulations. No one needs an assault rifle to hunt or to protect themselves. But **plenty of Americans keep handguns thinking that it will protect them from harm**. **Politicians are loathe to advocate that the government “take their guns away**.” However, the reality is, as physicist David Robert Grimes put it, “actually owning and using a firearm hugely increases the risk of being shot.” Of course, this is a political impossibility for the foreseeable future. **The current Republican Congress won’t even pass an expansion of background checks, and a previous Republican Congress allowed the Clinton-era assault weapons ban to expire. A handgun ban also could run afoul of the Supreme Court, as it is currently constituted**.

Gun control is a major issue for the 2016 election—its unpopularity will get pinned to Democrats and cause GOP victory. **Tani 15[[3]](#footnote-1)**

After years of ducking presidential-campaign battles over gun laws out of fear of the powerful gun lobby, it appears that Democrats are finally ready to go on the offensive. **Democrats are becoming more** and more **outspoken about gun violence in the wake of** seemingly ever **increasing mass shootings**, despite the fact that the American public remains as opposed as ever to many gun-control measures. And the increase in mass shootings has guaranteed that candidates will have to address the issue on the campaign trail, **setting it up to become a major issue in the** 2016 presidential **election**. Democratic presidential front-runner Hillary **Clinton**, for example, set the tone early in her campaign after a mass shooting at a historically African-American church in Charleston, South Carolina. And she **has become much more vocal in her calls for stricter gun laws, making it a recurring feature in her stump speeches.** "**This is a controversial issue**. I am well aware of that. But I think it is the height of irresponsibility not to talk about it," Clinton said this week, according to The Washington Post. Clinton's increased calls for gun control mirror President Barack Obama's recent shift to refocus on gun laws in the wake of a slew of mass shootings. In addition to the Charleston incident, there have been high-profile mass shootings at military facilities in Tennessee and at a movie theater in Louisiana. **Obama** has labeled the failure of Congress to pass new gun laws the biggest frustration of his tenure. He **has spoken out multiple times recently** on the subject, including after the Charleston shooting that killed nine people. "I've had to make statements like this too many times," Obama said in a statement from the White House. "At some point, we as a country will have to reckon with the fact that this type of mass violence does not happen in other developed countries." This is a major shift from 2008, when both Clinton and Obama were criticized for failing to talk about the issue. During the heat of the 2012 campaign, Obama was reluctant to bring up the topic of guns even after the mass shooting at a Colorado movie theater. **Passing gun-control measures**, Democrats have long argued, **had helped lead Democrats to overwhelming losses** in the 1994 midterms, which swept Republicans into power in Congress. **The new focus, then, is an interesting political calculus — because many signs actually show that Americans' support for gun rights is growing**.

#### Trump causes great power war, kills everyone. Kristof, 16[[4]](#footnote-2)

IS there any scarier nightmare than President Donald J. Trump in a tense international crisis, indignant and impatient, with his sweaty finger on the nuclear trigger? “Trump is a danger to our national security,” John B. Bellinger III, legal adviser to the State Department under President George W. Bush, bluntly warned. Most of the discussion about Trump focuses on domestic policy. But checks and balances mean that there are limits to what a president can achieve domestically, while the Constitution gives a commander in chief a much freer hand abroad. That’s what horrifies America-watchers overseas. Der Spiegel, the German magazine, has called Trump the most dangerous man in the world. Even the leader of a Swedish nationalist party that started as a neo-Nazi white supremacist group has disavowed Trump. J. K. Rowling, author of the Harry Potter books, reflected the views of many Britons when she tweeted that Trump is worse than Voldemort. Leading American conservative thinkers on foreign policy issued an open letter a few days ago warning that they could not support Trump. The signatories include Michael Chertoff, the former secretary of homeland security, Robert Zoellick, the former deputy secretary of state, and more than 100 others. “Mr. Trump’s own statements lead us to conclude that as president, he would use the authority of his office to act in ways that make America less safe,” the letter declared. A starting point is Trump’s remarkable ignorance about international affairs. And every time he tries to reassure, he digs the hole deeper. Asked in the latest debate to name people whose foreign policy ideas he respects, Trump offered Gen. Jack Keane, and mispronounced his name. Asked about Syria, Trump said last year that he would unleash ISIS to destroy Syria’s government. That is insane: ISIS is already murdering or enslaving Christians, Yazidis and other religious minorities; executing gays; destroying antiquities; oppressing women. And Trump wants ISIS to capture Damascus? A second major concern is that Trump would start a trade war, or a real war. Trump told The New York Times in January that he favored a 45 percent tariff on Chinese goods, then denied ever having said such a thing. The Times produced the audio (that part of the conversation was on the record) in which Trump clearly backed the 45 percent tariff, risking a trade war between the world’s two largest economies. Trump has also called for more U.S. troops on the ground in Iraq, and raised the prospect of bombing North Korean nuclear sites. A poorly informed, impatient and pugnacious leader can cause devastation, and that’s true of either Kim Jong-un or Donald Trump. The third risk is to America’s reputation and soft power. Both Bush and President Obama worked hard to reassure the world’s 1.6 billion Muslims that the U.S. is not at war with Islam. Trump has pretty much declared war on all Muslims. The damage to America’s image is already done, even if Trump is never elected. Simply as a blowhard who gains headlines around the world, he reinforces caricatures of the United States and tarnishes our global reputation. He turns America into an object of derision. He is America’s Ahmadinejad. On Twitter, I suggested that Trump was pugnacious, pugilistic, preening and puerile, and asked for other P words to describe him. The result was a deluge: petulant, pandering, pathetic, peevish, prickly, pernicious, patronizing, Pantagruelian, prevaricating, phony, presumptuous, potty-mouthed, provocative, pompous, predatory and so many more, including the troubling “probably president.” There’s something heartbreaking about the prospect that America’s next commander in chief may be a global joke, a man regarded in most foreign capitals as a buffoon, and a dangerous one. Trump is not particularly ideological, and it’s possible that as president he would surround himself with experts and would back off extreme positions. It was a good sign that on Friday he appeared to reverse himself and pledged that he would not order the U.S. military to commit war crimes, yet that’s such an astonishingly low bar that I can’t believe I just wrote this sentence! In any case, Trump is nothing if not unpredictable, and it seems equally plausible that he would start new wars. It’s a risk that few sensible people want to take. As Mitt Romney notes, “This is the very brand of anger that has led other nations into the abyss.”Peter Feaver, a Duke University political scientist who was a national security official in the Bush White House, noted that most Republicans are united in believing that President Obama and Hillary Clinton have damaged the United States and added to the burdens of the next president. “Yet what Trump promises to do would in some important ways make all of the problems we face dramatically worse,” he told me. “Why, at a moment when the country desperately needs our A-team, would we send in the clowns?”

#### Also takes out the AFF--GOP President overturns gun control- gun lobbies. Press TV 1/23[[5]](#footnote-3)

The Gun Owners of America is rallying the grassroots in opposition to the president’s unlawful executive actions," Erich Pratt, the gun group's executive director, told a news agency on Saturday. "Our hope is to produce enough pressure that either the president backs off of his plans to restrict Second Amendment rights, as he did last year when he withdrew the ban on ‘green tip’ ammunition, or we generate so much momentum that the next president is compelled to rescind Obama’s unlawful decrees during the first week in office," Pratt said. The offensive is reportedly comprised of a series of videos, newspaper ads and email alerts from the NRA, the Gun Owners of America (GOA) and the National Shooting Sports Foundation in an effort to swing public opinion against the measures. Reports said the gun groups were also working to make opposition to Obama's gun actions a litmus test for any Republican candidate with GOP voters poised to hit the polls. “The easiest solution is to elect a pro-gun president,” the group stated in an email alert. “While several presidential hopefuls have already indicated they would repeal Obama’s executive actions if elected, the GOA-endorsed candidate, Ted Cruz, has promised to erase Obama’s gun control legacy,” it continued. Earlier this month, Senator Ted Cruz (R-Texas) called Obama “the most anti-gun president” in history, while front-runner Donald Trump said he'll “unsign" the actions "so fast."

## Uniqueness

### Clinton Will Win

#### Clinton will win – demographics and favorability.

Salvanto, 4/14 (Anthony, CBS News's Manager of Surveys "CBS poll: Hillary Clinton v. Donald Trump - who would win in November?" CBS, [www.cbsnews.com/news/cbs-poll-hillary-clinton-leads-donald-trump-but-voters-view-both-unfavorably/](http://www.cbsnews.com/news/cbs-poll-hillary-clinton-leads-donald-trump-but-voters-view-both-unfavorably/))

Looking ahead to some possible November election match-ups between the remaining presidential candidates, registered voters give Democratic front-runner Hillary Clinton a 10-point lead over Donald Trump, the same as last month. But Clinton does not fare as well against the other two Republican candidates actively seeking their party's nomination -- Ted Cruz and John Kasich. Clinton holds just a three-point lead over Cruz, and she trails Kasich by six points in head-to-head match-ups. Clinton's Democratic rival, Bernie Sanders, fares better. Bernie Sanders beats all three Republican candidates among registered voters: he holds a 17-point lead over Trump, a 12-point lead over Cruz, and a five-point lead over John Kasich. 2016 General Election Match-Ups: The Demographics Women and younger voters favor the Democratic candidate - whether Clinton or Sanders - in all of these scenarios, with Trump faring the worst among these two groups. Bernie Sanders is the stronger candidate among younger voters, and he outpaces Hillary Clinton among men. While men choose all three of the Republican candidates over Clinton by double-digit margins, Sanders runs evenly with Trump and Cruz among men (though he loses to Kasich). 2016 Primaries - Results, Calendar and Polls - CBS News Independents vote Democratic against both Donald Trump and Ted Cruz no matter which candidate runs against them. Trump does particularly poorly with independents, losing them by 18 points against Clinton and 26 points against Sanders. John Kasich - the only Republican who beats Hillary Clinton in these match-ups - wins against Clinton among independents by nine points, but loses independents against Sanders by six points. Kasich gets strong support against both Clinton and Sanders from voters over 65. Nearly six in 10 registered voters are now paying a lot of attention to the presidential campaign, and interest is about the same among both Democrats and Republicans. Among this group of voters, John Kasich has a slight lead over Bernie Sanders. Trump does slightly better among this group as well, though he still trails both Hillary Clinton and Bernie Sanders. Views of the Candidates The two party's frontrunners are both the best known and the most disliked candidates among registered voters overall. Sixty-three percent of registered voters view Donald Trump unfavorably, a six-point increase from just last month. Trump's unfavorable rating has risen 10 points among independent voters. CBS News poll: Donald Trump holds onto national lead On the Democratic side, Hillary Clinton fares better, but over half (54 percent) of registered voters still view Clinton unfavorably, similar to a month ago. Ted Cruz is also viewed negatively - more than twice as many voters view him unfavorably (48 percent) than favorably (22 percent). Bernie Sanders and John Kasich are both viewed more favorably than unfavorably, though just over half still don't have an opinion of Kasich. All of the candidates have net favorable ratings among the members of their respective parties, but Democrats are more favorable towards their two potential nominees. About six in 10 Democrats view both Clinton and Sanders favorably, though more view Clinton unfavorably (20 percent) than Sanders (12 percent). In contrast, just about half of Republicans view Donald Trump favorably, while less than half have favorable opinions of Ted Cruz or John Kasich. Negative views are also higher among Republicans for their candidates, particularly for Trump and Cruz -- about a third of Republicans have unfavorable opinions of each of them. It's noteworthy that just under half of Republicans don't have an opinion of Kasich. Most independents view Trump, Clinton, and Cruz unfavorably, though they have a net favorable opinion of both John Kasich and Bernie Sanders. Views of Trump For voters who view Trump favorably, his outspokenness is most often volunteered as what they like best about him (27 percent), followed by what they see as his honesty and integrity (15 percent). Further down on the list are that they think he's not beholden to special interests (9 percent), that he's a political outsider (8 percent), and that he's tough and is a strong leader (6 percent). But for those who dislike Trump, his outspokenness is not a positive. Voters with an unfavorable opinion of Trump are divided about what they dislike most about him: the top three responses are they think he has a big mouth and doesn't think before he speaks (14 percent), that he is an egocentric narcissist (14 percent), and that his comments are racist and anti-immigrant (14 percent). Views of Clinton There is more of a consensus on what voters like and dislike about Hillary Clinton. Forty-two percent of voters who view Clinton favorably volunteer her experience and qualifications as what they like best about her, far ahead of any other positive attribute.

#### Hillary will win – GOP disunity and Obama polls.

Hersch, 4/19 (Warren S., Senior Editor, Advanced Markets & Sales, for National Underwriter Life & Health magazine, "Dodd forecasts Clinton victory in November, PPACA overhaul," Benefits Pro, [www.benefitspro.com/2016/04/19/dodd-forecasts-clinton-victory-in-november-ppaca-o?t=regulatory&slreturn=1461892762](http://www.benefitspro.com/2016/04/19/dodd-forecasts-clinton-victory-in-november-ppaca-o?t=regulatory&slreturn=1461892762))

When the polls close on Election Day in November, Hillary Clinton will emerge as the winner of the campaign the presidency. Her victory will likely secure for the Democrats new seats in the House and Senate. And those gains will prompt renewed bipartisan cooperation on pressing national issues, not least provisions of the Affordable Care Act that need fixing. Former U.S. Senator Christopher Dodd made these predictions during a Tuesday keynote address at Benefits Selling Expo, being held in Fort Lauderdale April 18-20. Now Chairman and CEO of the Motion Picture Association of America, Dodd offered a wide-ranging critique of current events and the fraught political landscape. Amid the rancor of the current election season and Americans' pessimism about the future, Dodd said he remains "hopeful" that, come 2017, the nation's political leaders will put aside differences to address legislation needed to reform the immigration system, taxation, Social Security, Medicare and other top national concerns. "Historically, the country has had its share of rough times," said Dodd. "But we've managed to emerge stronger from past crises. I remain optimistic that we can overcome domestic and international policy issues -- if we all come together." That may seem at present a tall order. Voter anger and outrage about the state of the nation, he noted, has been growing in recent years. Despite economic achievements touted by the Obama administration, Americans have suffered since the 2007-2009 recession. Many pin the blame for their woes on the financial excesses of Wall Street, a lowering of trade barriers that have ravaged industries, market pressures that have depressed wages, and the high cost of maintaining America's military footprint overseas. These factors, combined with growing disillusionment with continuing gridlock in Washington, help to explain higher voter support for Bernie Sanders and Donald Trump--insurgent candidates whose policy positions fall outside the mainstream of their respective parties. A Clinton victory in November would yield for the Democrats' nominee three consecutive terms in the White House--a first for the party since Roosevelt-Truman era. Dodd pinned his prediction in part on continuing economic growth and President Obama's overall approval rating, which (based on a recent Gallup poll) now stands at 51 percent. "Over the last 9 presidential election cycles, this has been been most accurate predictor of future president," said Dodd. "In every case where a majority of Americans approved of the president's performance, the incumbent's party has won." Enhancing the Democratic Party's chances of securing the White House are the divisions with the Republican Party. The likelihood of an "acrimonious" GOP convention in Cleveland come July -- notably a schism between Trump supporters and opponents -- could irreparably damage the party's efforts to unite behind the nominee for the general election. By contrast, Sanders' supporters will back Clinton if, as Dodd expects, Hillary secures the nomination at the party's national convention in Philadelphia in July.

#### Clinton ahead.

Pianin, 3/17 (Eric, writing for The Fiscal Times, "Clinton vs. Trump: Get Ready for the Nastiest General Election in Memory," [www.thefiscaltimes.com/2016/03/17/Clinton-vs-Trump-Get-Ready-Nastiest-General-Election-Memory](http://www.thefiscaltimes.com/2016/03/17/Clinton-vs-Trump-Get-Ready-Nastiest-General-Election-Memory))

What’s more, most recent polls suggest that Clinton would beat Trump in a head-to-head matchup this fall, if they become their parties’ nominees. A recent CNN/ORC poll, for instance, shows Clinton easily topping Trump in a matchup, 52 percent to 44 percent, while Sanders, the Vermont democratic socialist senator, would beat Trump as well, 55 percent to 43 percent.

### AT: U o/w L

#### Clinton is the favorite, but Trump can win – broad constituency in the center.

Rahn, 4/28 (Will, political correspondent and managing director in politics for CBS News Digital, "Commentary: Yes, Donald Trump can beat Hillary Clinton," CBS News, www.cbsnews.com/news/yes-trump-can-beat-hillary-clinton/)

How would Donald Trump fare in a general election against Hillary Clinton? The conventional wisdom is that he wouldn't stand a chance. The GOP is divided. His campaign, despite a recent spate of landslide primary wins, appears to have its own civil war going on. His favorability numbers are at historic lows for a nominee. The case against Trump's electability is strong. But it is also perhaps overstated. The Manhattan billionaire does have a narrow path to the White House. In fact, he may be the GOP's most electable option at this point, at least among the candidates who are actually still running for the job. John Kasich argues he's the only guy who can beat Clinton, an idea mostly predicated on his performance in head-to-head election polls. But head-to-head polls this far out, historically speaking, are not all that predictive, and Kasich has struggled to turn his on-paper attractiveness into actual votes at the ballot box. Ted Cruz, meanwhile, would likely be the most right-wing nominee since Barry Goldwater. His act appears to have worn thin among even the Republican grassroots, his natural constituency. Cruz might somehow still manage to pull the nomination away from Trump, but there's approximately zero reason to believe he can win over the swing voters who typically decide presidential contests. So back to Trump, who still has a few things going for him. His general election strategy, such as it is, seems to be predicated on two strategies: pivot left as far as possible and launch a scorched earth campaign against Clinton. Let's look at these one at a time. On the face of it, insulting your way to the presidency seems like a stupid, unworkable idea. Then again, Clinton has shown herself vulnerable to attacks on her character, not to mention her husband's. The reaction to Rosario Dawson's in-passing reference to Monica Lewinsky over the weekend shows how sensitive the Clinton camp is to such things. Lewinsky is a sympathetic figure wrapped up in a sympathetic cause; Dawson only said that she agrees with her anti-bullying efforts. And yet still there were calls for Dawson to get off the trail for Bernie Sanders, that she had somehow crossed a line just by mouthing the word "Monica." What happens when Trump, after Hillary inevitably accuses him of sexism, says that Bill is a rapist, a serial assaulter of women, and that she is his enabler? What happens when he incorporates this into his stump speech? The upside, if you can call it that, to Trump's refusal to act "presidential" is that he is the only candidate who will go that far. Trump, and Trump alone, is the only candidate who would not only resurrect all the Clinton sex scandals, but make them a centerpiece of his campaign. It could backfire, sure. But the fact is we have no idea how Trump dredging up all this will play, particularly among the younger voters Hillary will be somewhat dependent on. We don't know how Americans who've grown up marinating in discussions of rape culture, who watched the Cosby and Catholic and Dr. Luke scandals unfold, would respond to the renewed visibility of someone like Juanita Broaddrick. And that's just the sex stuff. The Clintons are no strangers to scandals financial and otherwise, and while bringing up all that baggage, in some cases discredited, would seem too-low for a normal candidate, Trump will almost certainly embrace all of it. Hillary's weak points aside, Trump also has one main advantage, which is that he'd be probably the most moderate nominee in decades. Now, Trump is not normally what we think of when we think of moderates - "reactionary moderate" is perhaps the best term to describe him. But border walls and Muslim bans aside, Trump really most closely resembles an old-school northeastern centrist Republican. Trump likes the welfare state. He's made protecting entitlements central to his pitch. It's safe to say that he's likely, at heart, socially liberal -- the story of how he became anti-abortion, for example, doesn't make a great deal of sense. (That story, in brief: friends of his debated having an abortion. They did not. The kid turned out to be "a winner." When pressed if he would have stayed pro-abortion if the kid was a loser, Trump once replied "probably not.") He clearly doesn't like these "Bathroom Bills" popping up in red states; bad for business, and that's always Trump's bottom line. Regardless of what he says in the lead-up to next week's Indiana primary, that probably goes for RFRAs as well. And given the milieu he's always existed in, it's hard to believe he really opposes gay marriage, either. Trump has had the benefit of never really fleshing out what he believes about specific policies; nearly a year into his campaign, we still don't know what he'd replace Obamacare with. He is, as his longtime advisor Roger Stone says, a "big picture" guy: pro-business, pro-military, pro-America. The rest is all open to negotiation, to making the best deal. And, as Jim Antle notes over at The Washington Examiner, that puts him pretty squarely into the vast middle of the American electorate. "The New American Center", as NBC News recently called it, is patriotic. It thinks America is the best country in the world. But it hates our political system and our elites. It doesn't like immigration or Affirmative Action or other programs explicitly designed to help minorities. It is, in other words, Trump's natural base, at least on paper. Now, there are still plenty of reasons why someone who agrees with Trump on a whole mess of issues might still be unwilling to vote for him. But it's a mistake to assume that the man doesn't have a natural constituency outside the GOP. There are a lot of "ifs" in all this. Trump can alienate his own base if he triangulates too much between now and Election Day. His seeming inability to set up any kind of nationwide infrastructure might alone doom him in a race with Clinton. Voters just might decide that they really do hate the guy and will do anything from seeing him become president. There are endless variables here, and Clinton should be considered the odds-on favorite for the presidency. But that doesn't mean Trump doesn't have a chance. He does.

### Clinton Will But – Not Guaranteed

#### Clinton will win but could lose.

Bennett, 4/28 (Anthony, covers politics for Heavy, and writes for US and international audiences in a variety of media and subject areas, "Clinton vs. Trump Odds & Predictions: Clinton Has Substantial Lead," heavy.com/news/2016/04/clinton-trump-odds-predictions-probabilities/)

While neither of the primary elections are over quite yet, Donald Trump and Hillary Clinton are both within a few hundred of the delegates they need to clinch the Republican and Democratic nominations. After the April 26 primaries, where Trump swept and Clinton took the delegate-richest four of five states, the delegate counts show formidable leads for the party frontrunners: Republican Delegate Count 1,237 Needed Donald Trump 987 Ted Cruz 562 John Kasich 153 Democratic Delegate 2,383 Needed Hillary Clinton 2,164 Bernie Sanders 1,355 With the conventions looming, a lot of minds are turning to the general election. OddShark general election odds show that Clinton beats Trump soundly in the betting markets, with other markets favoring Democrats in general. This can change quickly, though, as an acrimonious Republican race ends. Here’s a look at the state of the race: OddShark Presidential Betting: Clinton Well Ahead OddShark provides “stats and odds from multiple sources” so users have “the information they need to make the most of their sports bets and fan predictions.” As of April 28, the odds greatly favored Hillary Clinton: OddShark Presidential Odds As of April 28 Hillary Clinton -340 Donald Trump +280 Clinton’s large lead is likely due to Clinton’s large lead in matchup polling and favorability. So far, Clinton has established double-digit polling lead son Trump and, while viewed unfavorably overall, is doing more than 20 points better than Trump on average. PredictWise Market Aggregations Favor Democrats While betting markets aggregations by PredictWise don’t track hypothetical matchups, and likely won’t handle general election candidates by name until they’re named as such at the party conventions, they are tracking the general election in party terms, and like the Democrats’ chances: PredictWise: General Election Odds Democrats 73% Republicans 27%.

### Obama Popularity Key

#### Perception of Obama’s policies determines the election.

Jacobson, 4/21 (Dave R., campaign consultant nd political analyst at Shallman Communications, Democratic strategist, "Timing and Obama's popularity will have profound impact on which party prevails in November, Huffington Post, [www.huffingtonpost.com/dave-r-jacobson/timing-and-obamas-popular\_b\_9749424.html](http://www.huffingtonpost.com/dave-r-jacobson/timing-and-obamas-popular_b_9749424.html))

As we look to 2016, timing will yet again be a key factor in determining which of the two election categories will prevail at the ballot box. And, as the clock ticks closer to the General Election, President Obama’s increasing or decreasing popularity with voters will have a profound impact on which trend will swing the election. It’ll affect whether voters are relishing for a dramatic overhaul of the last eight years through change by sending a Republican to the White House, or if they want to maintain some relevance of continuity by sticking with more of the same liberal and Democratic Obama-like policies. Much of this will stem from voters’ perception of the President. For instance, in the wake of the Brussels, Paris and San Bernardino terrorist attacks, do Americans view the President as tough enough on ISIS, and by extension, do they think a Democrat in the White House can keep the homeland safe? Is the economy still on the mend? Is the middle class growing or shrinking? What is America’s standing around the globe? No President is in full control of all these issues. Justified or not, however, every President bears the brunt of blame from Americans who perceive these issues to be their successes or failures. As a direct result of this, the President, as the leader of the Democratic Party, is tied at the hip to the eventual Democratic nominee. While the likely Democratic nominee, former Secretary of State Hillary Clinton, is certainly not an exact carbon copy of the President, she nonetheless will be widely perceived by voters as a relative continuation of the Obama legacy. That equates to an extension of his agenda, on the economy, combatting climate change, gun safety laws, immigration policies, healthcare, his foreign policy, and scores of other issues. To voters, all of this will amount to more of the same. Conversely, whichever candidate wins the Republican Party’s nomination for President— whether it’s businessman Donald Trump, Senator Ted Cruz, Governor John Kasich or someone else who might be picked at a contested GOP convention— will represent a rejection of the last eight years, something new, fresh and different. Timing will likely dictate which way the wind blows this election cycle. It’ll determine if a popular Obama translates into voters wanting more of the same progressive ideologies as the President, which then carries Clinton into the White House. Otherwise, in contrast, it will influence whether a seemingly unpopular Obama means that Americans are salivating for major change and want a new Party to hold the highest office in the nation. Only time will tell.

# Elections – AFF

## Uniqueness

### AT: Polls

#### Too early – polls are bad.

Frizell, 4/23 (Sam, covers politics and current events for Time Magazine, "The Problem With Bernie Sanders' Polling Argument," Time, time.com/4305514/bernie-sanders-hillary-clinton-general-election-polls/)

General election polls taken months before voting day have a history of being wrong. According to data compiled by FiveThirtyEight, general election polls taken a year in advance have been inaccurate by more than 5 percentage points in the last 10 out of 14 elections for which there is data. Even polls six months out are inaccurate, too. For example, at this point in the 2000 election, late April polls showed then-Gov. George W. Bush with a strong national lead of five points over then-Vice President Al Gore. Bush lost the popular vote to Gore by half a percentage point that November.

## Link Debate

### Not Unique

#### Obama pushing smart guns – triggers DA.

NYT, 4/29 (Michael D. Shear and Eric Lichtblau, "Obama puts his weight behind smart-gun technology," [www.nytimes.com/2016/04/30/us/politics/obama-puts-his-weight-behind-smart-gun-technology.html](http://www.nytimes.com/2016/04/30/us/politics/obama-puts-his-weight-behind-smart-gun-technology.html))

WASHINGTON — President Obama will use the power of his office to try to jump-start long-stalled “smart-gun” technology that could eventually allow only the owner of a firearm to use it, the White House announced Friday. Over the opposition of gun rights groups, he also vowed to push ahead with a new federal policy giving the F.B.I. access to more mental health records of some Social Security recipients to better flag people who might be banned from buying a gun. The dual moves expand on a series of steps that a tearful Mr. Obama pledged to take in January to confront gun violence with or without Congress, which has offered stiff opposition to broader gun control measures. But the steps announced Friday generated objections not only from usual opponents like the National Rifle Association, but also from some police groups, which raised safety concerns about officers’ using untested smart guns in real-life situations. The administration stopped short of mandating the use of smart guns by federal agencies but said it saw promise in committing more federal money and attention to a technology that has evolved in fits and starts over more than two decades. The idea behind the smart-gun technology is to limit the use of a firearm to its owner, through personalized identifiers like a biometric sensor on the gun grip, a ring sensor worn by the owner or a digital pass code entered on a wristband. Advocates see the technology as a way of stopping criminals from using stolen guns — or children from accidentally shooting themselves or others. Just this month, the nation saw nine accidental shootings in one week involving children as young as 2 years old. But despite millions of dollars in federal grant money awarded to gun manufacturers and researchers, no commercially viable smart gun has emerged, officials said. In New Jersey, lawmakers passed a 2002 law requiring that guns be “smart” once they have been available on the market for three years. That three-year countdown has never been started in part because of pressure from gun rights activists on manufacturers not to develop the technology. Earlier this year, Gov. Chris Christie vetoed a new smart-gun measure. The latest push was introduced on the White House website Friday, along with a report from the administration’s law enforcement agencies on the viability and effectiveness of smart-gun technology. It concluded that the federal government could do more — by making it cheaper for gun manufacturers to bring smart guns to the market and by using the federal government’s enormous purchasing power to encourage development. To that end, the Justice and Homeland Security Departments will develop criteria for gun manufacturers that want to sell smart guns to federal, state and local law enforcement agencies. The administration will also offer millions more in cash awards and grants to gun manufacturers to encourage development of the technology. In a post on his Facebook page, Mr. Obama wrote that “as long as we’ve got the technology to prevent a criminal from stealing and using your smartphone, then we should be able to prevent the wrong person from pulling a trigger on a gun.” James O. Pasco Jr., executive director of the National Fraternal Order of Police, which has more than 330,000 members, said in a telephone interview that he was glad to see that the plan announced by the White House did not mandate the testing of smart-gun technology by law enforcement agencies. But he said he remained concerned by a renewed push. “They’ve been talking about smart guns for 25 years,” he said. “But we don’t want unproven technology to be tried out on law enforcement officers, who are most likely to be in the line of fire when they need their weapons to work. This is fine if the concept works, but we don’t want people going helter-skelter to embrace the latest shiny object.” The Obama administration also posted online Friday a proposed regulation from the Social Security Administration that officials believe could help keep guns out of the hands of people who are not allowed to own a firearm because of mental illness. A summary of the draft proposal said the Social Security Administration would identify people who receive disability payments because of mental impairment or because they are not competent to handle their own affairs, and would provide information on them to the Justice Department four times a year to include in the F.B.I.’s gun-purchase review system. The Social Security Administration would also notify those people — thought to total about 75,000 — that they are banned from buying or possessing a firearm under federal law. Advocates for the mentally ill say that those with mental illnesses would be unfairly stigmatized even though they account for only about 4 percent of all incidents of gun violence. The National Rifle Association, meanwhile, said that both the Social Security plan and the push for smart-gun technology were unwarranted “distractions” by an administration intent on imposing more restrictions on gun ownership. “President Obama’s obsession with gun control knows no bounds,” said Jennifer Baker, a spokeswoman for the N.R.A.’s lobbying arm. Mr. Obama signaled that he would take steps on the smart-gun technology and firearms purchases by Social Security recipients in January, when he announced a series of executive actions that also expanded background checks for some gun purchases and improved the tracking of stolen weapons. The president said he was forced to act on his own authority out of frustration after Congress stymied him in trying to enact broader gun control measures. In 2013, he failed to convince Congress to pass a universal background check requirement even after the massacre at Sandy Hook Elementary School in Newtown, Conn, and other mass shootings.

### U o/w L

#### U overwhelms the link – even if Clinton is vulnerable, Trump cannot win.

Cillizza, 4/18 (Chris, WP reporter/The Fix writer in DC, "Hillary Clinton is totally beatable in a general election. Just not by Donald Trump or Ted Cruz," Washington Post - The Fix, <https://www.washingtonpost.com/news/the-fix/wp/2016/04/18/hillary-clinton-is-totally-beatable-in-a-general-election-just-not-by-donald-trump-or-ted-cruz/>)

Take two minutes to flip through the new NBC-Wall Street Journal poll and you are left with two very clear takeaways: 1. Hillary Clinton is deeply vulnerable in a general election. 2. Donald Trump and, to a lesser extent, Ted Cruz, are the exact wrong candidates to take advantage of Clinton's weaknesses. That is the reality that faces Republicans as they look down the road at the general election. A totally winnable race after eight years out of the White House that may be unwinnable -- or close to it -- because of a primary process that has put forward two of their least appealing general election candidates. Start with this: Just one in three (32 percent) of general election voters see Clinton in a positive light while 56 percent regard her negatively. That's Clinton's worst score since NBC-WSJ started asking about Clinton's image in early 2001. And, the NBC-WSJ numbers are far from an outlier. Her numbers -- particularly when it comes to the number of people who view her as "honest" and "trustworthy" have long been in net negative territory -- and the ongoing questions surrounding her private email server while serving as Secretary of State doesn't help matters. The simple fact is that Clinton is totally known by the general electorate and somewhere between mildly and strongly disliked by a majority of them. That's a problem. In a "normal" election year it's a really BIG problem. This is not a normal election year, which of course you know unless you've been hiding under a pile of coats for the last 15 months. So, yes, Clinton is unpopular. But her numbers look positively great when compared to where Donald Trump stands in that same NBC-WSJ poll. Just one in four (24 percent) of respondents give Trump a positive rating while 65 percent give him a negative one. That's a "historic low for a major presidential candidate in the NBC/WSJ poll," according to NBC deputy political director Carrie Dann. But, when you look inside those Trump numbers, things get even worse. Check this out: Neil King @NKingofDC Negative views on Trump, from our latest poll: Overall 65% Indies 67% Women 69% College grads 74% Millennials 75% Hispanics 79% Blacks 88% Seven in ten women view Trump negatively! Three in four millennials! Eight in ten Hispanics! Those numbers are historically bad. And, I would say that no candidate could win a general election with them except that I have witnessed Trump flip his negatives to positives with Republican voters so I am not ready to rule it totally out. What I will say is those numbers make it virtually impossible for a candidate to win a general election.
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