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## Uniqueness-ToC

Trump Can Beat Hillary. Delamaide April 29, 2016:

Darrell Delamaide April 29, 2016

(Opinion: The New Donald Trump Can Beat Hillary Clinton. Market Place. Politics Columnist. <http://www.marketwatch.com/story/the-new-donald-trump-can-beat-hillary-clinton-2016-04-29>)

The making of a president 2016 has already begun. Republican frontrunner Donald Trump gave [a major foreign policy address](http://www.marketwatch.com/story/donald-trump-calls-for-america-first-foreign-policy-2016-04-27) this week with all the trappings of a commander in chief — American flags in the background, dark suit with the stars-and-stripes lapel pin, white shirt, red tie, and, wonder of wonders, a teleprompter to stay on script. Trump, who is nothing if not a good performer, mostly pulled it off, prompting MarketWatch Washington bureau chief [Steve Goldstein to comment](http://www.marketwatch.com/story/trumps-foreign-policy-speech-wasnt-such-a-huge-disaster-2016-04-27), “Squint and you can almost see Trump speaking from the Oval Office.” **The makeover that began** with Trump’s uncharacteristically short and concise victory speech after the New York primary is in full swing, **with the aim of transforming the** **rowdy**, rambling **brawler** of the primaries **into a distinguished statesman capable** of taking on the most powerful political office in the world. It **could work**. After all, Theodore White’s best-selling “Making of the President” series, which began with his chronicle of John Kennedy’s successful 1960 run, soon became Joe McGinnis’s “The Selling of the President” about the equally successful packaging and marketing of candidate Richard Nixon in 1968. And **who is better at marketing** and branding **than Donald Trump?** **The Democrats are in** more **trouble** than they realize proceeding with their rigged effort to crown Hillary Clinton as their nominee. **Who** really **thinks it’s a good idea to field a candidate with** [that much baggage](http://elections.huffingtonpost.com/pollster/hillary-clinton-favorable-rating" \t "_new) and with **a 56% unfavorable rating**? The Democratic Party bosses take comfort that **[Trump’s negatives are](http://elections.huffingtonpost.com/pollster/donald-trump-favorable-rating" \t "_new)** [even](http://elections.huffingtonpost.com/pollster/donald-trump-favorable-rating" \t "_new) **[higher,](http://elections.huffingtonpost.com/pollster/donald-trump-favorable-rating" \t "_new)**thus logically pointing to a Clinton victory in this war of attrition**. But,** as **Clinton** herself constantly proclaims, she **is the** battle-scarred **veteran** of the trenches, **and** **her favorability ratings are** **likely to move** much more **sluggishly**. Trump is new to this game and his ratings are more fluid. There is every reason to expect that as he pivots to a new look and demeanor, his favorability rating will improve. As for the content of that foreign-policy speech, the mainstream media predictably found it “incoherent” and full of “paradoxes.” As if the foreign policy followed by President Barack Obama and his erstwhile secretary of state, Hillary Clinton, was a resounding example of coherence. There is actually a good deal of internal coherence in Trump’s analysis of America’s place in the world and his policies, and it fits in well with the general themes of his campaign. [Read the speech](https://www.donaldjtrump.com/press-releases/donald-j.-trump-foreign-policy-speech" \t "_new) and judge for yourself. “America First,” like “Make America Great Again,” has considerable resonance with a wide swath of voters through any number of swing states that Trump could well move into his column in a general election. (Sorry, pundits, no one really cares if the expression was first used by Nazi sympathizer Charles Lindbergh in the 1930s.) And let’s look at the widely touted impact on the down ticket — that aversion to Trump will swing a number of contested Senate seats to the Democrats and enable them to regain control of the Senate while making considerable gains in the House. That may be too optimistic, especially considering that the trend under Obama has been for the party to lose ground. Data from University of Virginia analyst Larry Sabato published this week in the Washington Post showed that [Obama set new standards](https://www.washingtonpost.com/politics/obama-who-once-stood-as-party-outsider-now-works-to-strengthen-democrats/2016/04/25/340b3b0a-0589-11e6-bdcb-0133da18418d_story.html" \t "_new) in this regard. Democrats have lost a net 11 governorships during his tenure, as well as 13 Senate seats, 69 House seats, and control of 32 (!) state legislative chambers — far more in every case than Republicans under that party’s presidents and mostly more than other Democrats have lost. Why should Democrats gain under Clinton’s standard after she has wrapped herself in the “success” of the Obama administration? The Democratic Party leadership is for the most part geriatric and sclerotic, and even the feisty independent trying to win a new generation to progressive policies is 74. Conceivably, **Hillary Clinton could do a pivot** of her own **and** wholeheartedly **embrace the policies championed by** Bernie **Sanders**, which have generated so much of the energy and enthusiasm in the Democratic primaries. No matter how convincingly Sanders endorses Clinton once she has actually won the nomination, it is not his responsib **The ability to generate enthusiasm is nontransferable** and if Clinton wants to keep those voters, especially young people who would be voting for the first time, it is up to her to motivate them to go to the polls. She has shown little inclination so far to do that, apparently confident that she has the “Obama coalition” well enough in hand to win the election and that organization will do the rest. But it won’t be fear and loathing of Trump that gets these young people to the polls. It is Trump who is making the more successful opening to the center, with his support for Medicare and Social Security and his opposition to trade pacts. He, too, could promise some relief for student debt along with his raising hopes of more and better jobs. These young voters aren’t bogged down in the past. They don’t care if someone calls himself a socialist, and they certainly won’t care that Charles Lindbergh was the first to use the expression “America First.” Hillary Clinton, as Wall Street Journal columnist [Daniel Henninger noted this week](http://www.wsj.com/articles/the-clinton-pivot-begins-1461799244" \t "_new), is much likelier to pivot now to the halcyon days of President Bill Clinton, perhaps throwing Obama under the bus now that he has served his purpose of winning her the nomination. But for many of these young voters, the first Clinton administration is something they read about in history books, and it would be hard to overestimate the degree of Clinton fatigue among older voters. We’ll see who does a better job of packaging and selling, but **it** **would be premature to count on seeing a second President Clinton.** ility to keep that enthusiasm alive.

#### Hillary only has a slim lead against Trump – could go either way

Ryu Spaeth Feb 2016, https://newrepublic.com/minutes/130434/donald-trump-beat-hillary-clinton-general-election

According to RCP’s average of polls, Clinton enjoys only a slim lead over Trump in a head-to-head match-up. You have to think that her lead will climb once the Democratic Party revs up the Trump attack machine, which the GOP has so far mysteriously declined to use. But at the same time, in a polarized, nearly evenly divided electorate, there’s only so much the Democratic Party can do to expand its coalition. It’s unlikely that the editors of National Review and other anti-Trumpists will flock to Clinton. The real question is whether Trump can consolidate the GOP and perhaps even make inroads with blue-collar workers who have traditionally voted Democratic. As Noam Scheiber reported, even labor unions are interested in Trump, given his idiosyncratic position on trade. So, maybe?

#### Moody’s Analytics is the best predictor of presidential elections. Long ’15:

Time-tested model says a Democrat will win in 2016 by Heather Long @byHeatherLong August 6, 2015: 4:15 PM ET money.cnn.com/2015/08/06/news/economy/2016-democratic-victory-moodys-analystics/

Republicans might be in the spotlight this week with their first big debate, but Democrats received some very encouraging news. Moody's Analytics, which has correctly predicted every presidential race since Ronald Reagan's victory in 1980, just came out with its forecast for 2016**. It** will be an extremely close race, but **the next president will be** a Democrat**, according to Moody's. This doesn't mean that Hillary Clinton is on her way back to the White House. The model that Moody's uses doesn't focus on individual candidates. Instead, it predicts which party** will win **in every state, so it forecasts the results of the Electoral College. Related: Look out, Trump. Bush and Christie vow to double economic growth Moody's says** the Democratic nominee will get [with] 270 electoral votes -- the minimum number of votes needed to **win -- while** the Republican **nominee will accumulate** 268 votes. The model correctly predicted every state in the 2012 election and has a nearly 90% success rate in forecasting each state accurately since 1980. It will all come down to Virginia and Ohio this time because Moody's predicts that Republicans will win Florida. At the moment, Moody's says Virginia will go Democratic and Ohio will swing Republican, but that could change. "If President Obama's approval rating falls by any more than 2 percentage points by Election Day, Virginia will swing and the Republicans will win the president," the report says. Related: Bush stumbles into debate night So what is the key to such accurate predictions? Moody's says it's all about economics. The model takes into account how the economy is doing in each state. The researchers have tested a lot of variables over the years, but the best ones are family ("household") income, home values and gas prices. If those three variables are going up, it favors the incumbent party. If they're not, people want change in Washington. "The economy's performance strongly favors the Democratic nominee for president," says Moody's. Moody's points out that household incomes have been steadily improving lately and are likely to go up further before Election Day. "The only missing ingredient is stronger wage growth, which is expected to pick up in the coming months as the job market approaches full employment," the authors wrote.

They say that it’s close and the President’s approval rating will be the deciding factor. White April 4, 2016:

Dan White. Moody’s Analytics. Another Tick in the democrats Direction. <https://www.economy.com/dismal/analysis/todays-economy/282402/Another-Tick-in-the-Democrats-Direction/>

**The Moody’s Analytics [election model](https://www.economy.com/dismal/topics/election-model" \t "_blank) has been updated** to reflect the March economic forecast, and **the needle has moved** further **in the direction of the Democratic party**. On strength in the president’s approval rating and low gasoline prices, Nevada has moved from the Republican column into the Democratic column. **This brings the projected electoral** vote **count** **to 332 votes** for the future Democratic nominee **and 206 votes** for the Republican nominee. However, **several important swing states remain extremely close**. **Nevada, Ohio, Colorado, Virginia, Florida and New Hampshire could all swing** very easily **with** only **small changes to** the underlying **economic drivers.** **The two drivers giving the most support** in the model to Democrats **are gasoline prices and the president’s approval rating**. In fact, without gasoline prices in the model, Republicans would be projected to win. Prices have rebounded in the last few weeks, but chances are remote that they could move enough by November to alter the projected outcome in and of themselves. **The president’s approval rating**, on the other hand, **is a variable that could move quickly enough**, even with our smoothing process, in concert with higher gasoline prices to change the forecast. President Obama appears to be benefiting from the chaos in the primary elections over the last few months, boosting his approval rating by almost 3 percentage points since our first projection in August 2015.

## B. Link:

#### A handgun ban is wildly unpopular – it’s the tipping point for competitive states. This also means Republicans would undo the aff if they win, so the aff has zero solvency. Scher ’15:

Will Any Presidential Candidate Support Banning Handguns? OCTOBER 2, 2015 Bill Scher Bill Scher https://ourfuture.org/20151002/will-any-presidential-candidate-support-banning-all-handguns

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 expan[d]sion 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. But will any presidential candidate be willing to push the envelope, shake up the debate, and put a handgun ban on the table? It’s unlikely to be Sen. Bernie Sanders. Gun control is pretty much the only area where Sanders, long-time representative of rural hunting state, could be classified as a moderate. He opposed background checks in 1993, though supported them in 2013. He once supported a law protecting gun manufacturers from lawsuits, but he also voted for the assault weapons ban and supports closing the so-called gun show loophole. His rhetoric on the subject involves a bit of triangulation, “I think that urban America has got to respect what rural America is about, where 99 percent of the people in my state who hunt are law abiding people.” It’s unlikely to be Hillary Clinton. While she is stressing gun control in her campaign — a rare opportunity for her to get to Bernie’s left — she is a pragmatist at heart. Democrats for years have been careful to avoid sounding like “gun grabbers,” skirting the gun control issue so they can be competitive in states with high gun ownership like Colorado, Iowa and Nevada. In fact, if Democrats had not pursued this strategy, arguably Barack Obama never would have become president. For Clinton to push the issue now is shift left from where Obama was rhetorically in 2008 and 2012. But what’s on the table are provisions like “universal background checks, cracking down on illegal gun traffickers, and keeping guns out of the hands of domestic abusers and stalkers.” A handgun ban is not in the cards.

## C. Impacts:

### Patriarchy

#### Republicans mean more patriarchy – laundry list of policies, which inherently outweighs on scope of impacts. Haraldsson ‘15:

I Would Like to Say Goodbye to Patriarchy By: Hrafnkell Haraldsson Saturday, September, 29th, 2012, 8:14 am www.politicususa.com/2012/09/29/goodbye-patriarchy.html

I would like to take the time to say goodbye to patriarchy. I’d like to say goodbye to the idea that women are nothing but sexual playthings, something to be undressed, or something to be used to satisfy the male ego. I would like to put forward the idea that women are people too, somebody who, like another guy, you can pal around, not somebody to get drunk and take advantage of. I’d like to put forward that idea that we can talk to women and take what they have to say seriously. The idea that on some basic level, women are absolutely equal with men, and like the Constitution says, have the same inalienable rights. Sadly, I cannot say any of that. Patriarchy shows no sign of going quietly into the night. Look at not only the anti-woman legislation coming from Republicans everywhere, legislation attacking women’s reproductive choices and health, but at comments about rape, about equal pay for equal work. Can we really expect people who think women’s bodies are magical to treat women like people? It was one thing for ancient peoples to be confused by the workings of the human body but in the 21st century, we know where babies come from. At least, liberals do. Why do Republicans cling to ideas that, like David Niose said, would have been out of date a century ago? Look at Todd Akin and his rape comments. And he’s not alone or even the first. Imagine having somebody running as a major-party vice presidential candidate who thinks there is such a thing as “forcible” rape? And we do. I think Abe Lincoln would have bitch-slapped Paul Ryan and felled him like a rotten tree. But look at that charming smile. Todd Akin had something to say about pay too, you know. He isn’t just interested in raping women’s bodies. He wants to rape them economically too. He says businesses should be able to pay women less than men, showing that on a fundamental level Tood Akin misunderstands the principles upon which America was founded. He defended voting against the Lilly Ledbetter Fair Pay Act by saying, Well, first of all, the premise of your question is that I’m making that particular distinction. I believe in free enterprise. I don’t think the government should be telling people what you pay and what you don’t pay. I think it’s about freedom. If someone what’s to hire somebody and they agree on a salary, that’s fine, however it wants to work. So, the government sticking its nose into all kinds of things has gotten us into huge trouble. Coming from a politician belonging to a party that has also attacking restrictions on child labor, perhaps this attitude should not surprise us. After all, how successful can a wealthy Republican be if he can’t underpay and overwork the women and children? After all, if they’re not weak and malnourished enough he won’t be able to get to the lifeboats ahead of them when the ocean liner sinks. Meanwhile, Forbes reported in May that “former General Electric chairman and chief Jack Welch thinks women just aren’t working hard enough.” Oh, that’s all it is. Men get paid more because they work harder? There you go ladies. Forbes’ Jenn Goudreau was moved to say, “It should be no surprise to anyone breathing that performance matters. But by the way Welch framed this conversation, one would infer that he assumes women are just 3% of corporate CEOs, 7% of top earners, 14% of executive officers and 16% of board members because they’re slacking off.” Women haven’t missed all this. They are as aware of what Republicans are saying – and doing – as they are of what President Obama is saying – and doing. They heard Obama when he said, “My administration will continue to fight for a woman’s right for equal pay for equal work.” Ann Romney says she wants women to wake up, but I think women have woken up. What is this Republican[s] message, that patriarchy is good for you? That it’s all for your own good, and by the way, yes, we insist? After all, what business do women [should] have working in the first place? They’re supposed to be at home, pregnant and having babies and taking care of her man. What difference does it make that as CNN reported back in 2004, midway through Bush’s administration, that “according to the AFL-CIO, the average 25-year-old woman who works full-time, year-round until she retires at age 65 (if that’s when she’s able to retire) will earn $523,000 less than the average working man?” It’s all because of the woman’s choices. Like rape, it’s all the woman’s fault. Yeah, I don’t think we’re at patriarchy’s end, just yet. That same CNN article predicated equal pay not before 2050, leaving another couple of generations of women to work their fingers to the bone for less. Another Republican administration bent on imposing patriarchal values out of the Bible rather than Democratic values out of the U.S. Constitution will set women back even farther. Lilly Ledbetter, in a special report to the CNN Election Center, wrote back in April that America has Romney’s answer on the question of equal pay for women: crickets. We’ll get back to you on that. Given a chance to embrace and engage America’s women, the Romney campaign acted like deer in headlights. There is no doubt Romney would like women to vote for him. But Romney can’t appeal to women without enraging the patriarchal forces he so much depends upon, the voices of religious extremism and bigotry. He wants women to vote for him anyway, just because, I suppose, it’s a woman’s place to do what a man wants her to do. I don’t call that much of a sales pitch. The simple fact is that in the America of 2012, the forces of patriarchy have coalesced in the Republican Party. It’s not to say there aren’t misogynists out there who are liberals or progressives, but as a party, as a politico-theological movement, the GOP has embraced the ancient idea that man is the master and woman should submit to him simply because that’s how God wants it. You can’t reason with these people because they will tell you that you don’t negotiate with God. The only defense you have is to keep them out of power in the first place. And keep in the back of your mind the fact that the last time they were in a position of authority like that, they kept it for over sixteen hundred years. I don’t know about you, but if they win, talk of equal pay in 2050 is hopelessly optimistic

#### Republicans glorify masculinity causing an ideological shift, outweighs on duration. Winter ‘10

Masculine Republicans and Feminine Democrats: Gender and Americans’ Explicit and Implicit Images of the Political Parties Nicholas J. G. Winter Springer Science+Business Media, LLC 2010 faculty.virginia.edu/nwinter/papers/winter-pb-forthcoming.pdf

If one of the overt Democratic lines of attack against Republicans is that Republicans are conducting a war on women, one of the low-simmering, implicit lines of attack from Republicans is that Democrats are conducting a war on men, or at least traditional views of masculinity. The idea of the effete, feminized liberals threatening to suffocate the last remaining expression of true manliness is rife in Republican rhetoric. They are selling the right wing as the last refuge of real men. When the Chris Christie bridge scandal erupted, Brit Hume, the Fox senior political analyst, said in Christie’s defense: “I would have to say that in this sort of feminized atmosphere in which we exist today, guys who are masculine and muscular like that in their private conduct, kind of old-fashioned tough guys, run some risks.” He sought to clarify this way:“By which I mean that men today have learned the lesson the hard way that if you act like a kind of an old-fashioned guy’s guy, you’re in constant danger of slipping out and saying something that’s going to get you in trouble and make you look like a sexist or make you look like you seem thuggish or whatever. That’s the atmosphere in which he operates. This guy is very much an old-fashioned masculine, muscular guy, and there are political risks associated with that. Maybe it shouldn’t be, but that’s how it is.”Guy’s guys are an aggrieved class in that world. Portraying Republican men as manly and Democratic ones as effete has been a consistent line of attack against post-Bill Clinton Democratic presidential candidates. As Glenn Greenwald put it in 2007, “For some time now, it has been commonplace for Democratic candidates to be depicted as gender-confused freaks.” He added, “One can make a strong argument, as some have, that those personality-attack themes have played a far larger role in the outcome of the last two presidential elections than any substantive issues, and liberals simply have nothing close to the potency of the right-wing filth machine in advancing these gender themes.” The problem with having your message powered by machismo is that it reveals what undergirds such a stance: misogyny and chauvinism. The masculinity for which they yearn draws its meaning and its value from juxtaposition with a lesser, vulnerable, narrowly drawn femininity. We have seen recent research suggesting that men with daughters are more likely to be Republican and a study finding that men with sisters are more likely to be Republican. The study of men with sisters was conducted by researchers at Stanford Graduate School of Business and Loyola Marymount University. A report from Stanford about the study concluded, “Watching their sisters do the chores ‘teaches’ boys that housework is simply women’s work, and that leads to a traditional view of gender roles [is] — a position linked to a predilection for Republican politics.” And as Republican candidates oppose a full range of reproductive options for women as well as same-sex marriage, and publicly bemoan the notion that Democrats make women “believe that they are helpless without Uncle Sugar” around to “control their libido,” in the words of Mike Huckabee, the former Arkansas governor and a possible Republican presidential contender, the Republican Party is, in fact, becoming a shrinking, male-dominated party. Only one Democrat has won the male vote in presidential races since 1992 — and that was Barack Obama, who won it in 2008 by one percentage point.

### Environment

#### A Republican president would overturn COP 21, which is the lynchpin against global warming. Freking ‘15

KEVIN FREKING, The Associated Press Posted: Sunday, December 13, 2015, 3:06 AM http://www.philly.com/philly/news/politics/20151213\_ap\_9e941f0026124fd09459f8597277e433.html#xfJtXVfLegfrCDhU Obama optimism over climate pact tempered by GOP opposition

WASHINGTON (AP) - President Barack Obama and Secretary of State John Kerry hailed the newly passed international climate change agreement as a major achievement that could help turn the tide on global warming, but got a quick reminder that Republicans will fight it all the way. Obama said the climate agreement made Saturday night by almost 200 nations "can be a turning point for the world" and credited his administration for playing a key role. He and Kerry predicted it would prompt widespread spending on clean energy and help stem carbon pollution blamed for global warming. "We've shown that the world has both the will and the ability to take on this challenge," Obama said from the White House. He said the climate agreement "offers the best chance we have to save the one planet we have." "In short, this agreement will mean less of the carbon pollution that threatens our planet and more of the jobs and economic growth driven by low-carbon investments," Obama said. Obama said the world leaders meeting in Paris "met the moment" and that people can be more confident "the planet will be in better shape for the next generation." Obama said the agreement is not perfect, but sets a framework that will contain periodic reviews and assessments to ensure that countries meet their commitments to curb carbon emissions. The immediate reaction of leading Republican critics was a stark reminder of the conflict that lies ahead. Senate Majority Leader Mitch McConnell of Kentucky said Obama is "making promises he can't keep" and should remember that the agreement "is subject to being shredded in 13 months." McConnell noted that the presidential election is next year and the agreement could be reversed if the GOP wins the White House. And Republican Sen. James Inhofe of Oklahoma said that Americans can expect the administration to cite the agreement as an excuse for establishing emission targets for every sector of the U.S. economy. Kerry said from Paris: "I have news for Senator Inhofe. The United States of America has already reduced its emissions more than any other country in the world." "This has to happen," he said of the agreement. "I believe this will continue because I just personally cannot believe that any person who doesn't understand the science and isn't prepared to do for the next generation what we did here today and follow through on it cannot and will not be elected president of the United States." In an interview taped for CBS' "Face the Nation," Kerry called the climate pact "a breakaway agreement" that will change how countries make decisions and "spur massive investment." He acknowledged that a Republican president could undo the agreement, but said there is already plenty of evidence that climate change is having a damaging and expensive impact with more intense storms, wildfires and melting glaciers.

#### Climate change causes extinction and outweighs on irreversibility and empirical verfiability. Dyer ‘12:[[1]](#footnote-1)

Here's how bad it could get. The scientific consensus is that we are still on track for 3 degrees C of warming by 2100, but that's just warming caused by human greenhouse- gas emissions. The problem is that +3 degrees is well past the point where the major feedbacks kick in: natural phenomena triggered by our warming, like melting permafrost and the loss of Arctic sea-ice cover, that will add to the heating and that we cannot turn off. The trigger is actually around 2C (3.5 degrees F) higher average global temperature. After that we lose control of the process: ending our own carbon- dioxide emissions would no longer be enough to stop the warming. We may end up trapped on an escalator heading up to +6C (+10.5F), with no way of getting off. And +6C [which] gives you the mass extinction. There have been five mass extinctions in the past 500 million years, when 50 per cent or more of the species then existing on the Earth vanished, but until recently the only people taking any interest in this were paleontologists, not climate scientists. They did wonder what had caused the extinctions, but the best answer they could come up was "climate change". It wasn't a very good answer. Why would a warmer or colder planet kill off all those species? The warming was caused by massive volcanic eruptions dumping huge quantities of carbon dioxide in the atmosphere for tens of thousands of years. But it was very gradual and the animals and plants had plenty of time to migrate to climatic zones that still suited them. (That's exactly what happened more recently in the Ice Age, as the glaciers repeatedly covered whole continents and then retreated again.) There had to be a more convincing kill mechanism than that. The paleontologists found one when they discovered that a giant asteroid struck the planet 65 million years ago, just at the time when the dinosaurs died out in the most recent of the great extinctions. So they went looking for evidence of huge asteroid strikes at the time of the other extinction events. They found none. What they discovered was that there was indeed major warming at the time of all the other extinctions - and that the warming had radically changed the oceans. The currents that carry oxygen- rich cold water down to the depths shifted so that they were bringing down oxygen- poor warm water instead, and gradually the depths of the oceans became anoxic: the deep waters no longer had any oxygen. When that happens, the sulfur bacteria that normally live in the silt (because oxygen is poison to them) come out of hiding and begin to multiply. Eventually they rise all the way to the surface over the whole ocean, killing all the oxygen-breathing life. The ocean also starts emit[s]ting enormous amounts of lethal hydrogen sulfide gas that destroy the ozone layer and directly poison land-dwelling species. This has happened [before] many times in the Earth's history.

Warming causes extinction from Earth exploding.

**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...**

### Racism

#### Republicans perpetuate racism through hella policies, which inherently outweighs on scope of impacts. Their messaging also promotes racism, and mindset shifts outweigh on duration. Caldwell ’15:

Trump decodes the racism and bigotry within GOP Posted: Thursday, December 31, 2015 7:34 pm Roger Caldwell | 0 comments www.phillytrib.com/commentary/trump-decodes-the-racism-and-bigotry-within-gop/article\_93595acb-613f-523b-b6ce-3a61309730da.html

In this election cycle, the Republican candidates have decided to think and behave as an outsider. By acting as an outsider, they are not obligated to tell the truth and they can make up the story as they go along. Racism and bigotry is the platform that many of the Republican presidential candidates are building their campaign around, but it is being done with code words. Political correctness is one of the phrases that has a subliminal message, and means its okay to control things because you are white. There was a time when there were very few regulatory agencies, and there were very few civil rights laws, and being white was right. The Republicans would like to turn back the clock, so it’s OK for Donald Trump to talk about [deporting] sending 10 million Hispanics to their homeland, even if it is breaking the law. Trump is standing on a platform of hate, and many of the Republican candidates condemn his policy statements. But once the dust has cleared, many of the Republican candidates are adopting his racist policies in their own campaigns. The GOP ideological position since President Barack Obama has been elected is to take an extreme position on conservatism, and the Republican Party is primarily for White people. With Trump every week attacking a different minority group, racism is alive and well. A few months ago, Ted Cruz was considered a radical extremist, but in the presidential campaign, he is thought of as a middle mainstreamer. There is something frightening happening in the Republican Party, when it is not trying to improve its relevancy with an increasing diverse American population. Instead of trying to diversify with other minority voter groups, the candidates’ major focus is connecting with their base, which is mostly White. The base is angry, and they want to change the way things are going in America. For some reason the Republicans think they will be able to snap their fingers, and many of their problems will simply disappear. The Republicans refuse to discuss issues with race on the campaign trail, and they keep their heads buried in the sand. Racism exists in every system in America, and infects the very structure of daily life, but the Republicans don’t see it as a problem. The Democrats are starting to acknowledge that racism exists and they are open to dialogue, but it is a very complex problem. They understand in order to win the presidential election, they must get the Blacks and Hispanics engaged in the election and campaign. Diversity is the reason President Obama won the election in 2008 and 2012. But in 2016, the Republicans have decided that they can win with a small percentage of the minority vote, or none at all. This is a problem for the leadership in the Republican Party, because after losing the presidential race in 2012, they had decided to be more inclusive. They understood that the voting demographics were changing and it was necessary to engage more minorities. But everything has been radically shifted since Trump has been the frontrunner for six months straight. Trump is standing on a platform of hate, which he built for himself because conservatism is a code word for white supremacy and white control. “This sort of racism has been prevalent in Republican politics for decades. Trump is saying out loud what other Republicans merely suggest. Political leaders must condemn these hateful un-American statements with their words and their actions,” said Sen. Minority Leader Harry Reid (D-Nev.). Racism and bigotry should be a campaign issue for every candidate on the trail and in all the debates. It is time to stop dancing around racism in America, and confront it with policies and discussions.

### Ableism

#### Republicans are ableist. Thompson ’15:

Vilissa Thompson, LMSW Vilissa is the Founder & CEO of Ramp Your Voice!, an organization she created to establish herself as a Disability Rights Consultant & Advocate. Ramp Your Voice! is a prime example of how macro-minded Vilissa truly is, and her determination to leave a giant "tire track mark" on the world.her determination to leave a giant "tire track mark" on the world.

Donald Trump, the name (and the hair) evokes a plethora of responses when you bring up the businessman who is now a serious contender for the 2016 Republican presidential nomination. Regardless of how you feel about Donald Trump, there is no escaping the controversies he starts that gets everyone’s attention and stark reactions. The latest Donald Trump outrage has caused many to wonder what more can Donald Trump do to offend people, and still maintain the frontrunner power grip he has. Since Donald Trump’s newest antics involved the disabled experience, I decided to write my perspective on Donald Trump’s influence, and how his remarks and actions affects one of the largest voting blocs in the country. Though Trump is the catalyst for the existence of this article, this post is not meant to be purely about bashing Donald Trump; it is moreso about the responsibility we have as voters to pay ardent attention to the rhetoric presidential candidates spew, and not fail to recognize the dangers of electing officials who unapologetically stereotype, ostracize, and degrade marginalized groups in our society. Not Donald Trump’s First Ride on the Ableism Train Last week at one of his campaign rallies, Donald Trump went on a tirade about how he saw thousands of Muslims celebrate the collapse of the 9/11 Twin Towers in New York. This claim has been reportedly debunked by news reports over the years; yet it came up during Trump’s speech at the rally. The reporter Trump felt was responsible for negating his claim is Serge Kovaleski. Kovaleski has Arthrogryposis, a rare, congenital musculoskeletal condition that limits the movements in his arms. During the speech, as seen in the video footage above, Trump made a series of gross imitations to mock Kovaleski’s physical condition as a way to “reiterate” Kovaleski supposedly not remembering what he wrote in the article that Trump believes should have been retracted. My Reaction, & Seeing a Pattern in Trump’s Behavior to Opposition My initial reaction – pure disgust. 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.”) Trump’s criticism to Krauthammer’s name-calling shows a reoccurring pattern: Trump’s berating his critics functions as a defense mechanism. Trump has proven time and time again with these incidences that he is not the kind of person who takes objection well, and will stoop to gross levels of verbal retaliation to defend and protect his reputation. That kind of belittling mechanism is both toxic and dangerous, especially regarding the ways Trump has reacted to his critics with disabilities. Why We Cannot Afford to Dismiss Trump’s Ableist Antics Being president is one of the most important jobs a citizen can have in this country. No matter the background of the president, she or he represents the melting pot America is glorified of being. Every American, regardless of race, gender, orientation, disability, religion, national origin, etc., expects two things from their president: respect their experiences in this country; and to act on and in the best interests of everyone, not a small few. Donald Trump’s ableist antics creates a separation of that collective view presidents are supposed to embody. For disabled Americans, how can we truly believe that a potential President Donald Trump would respect who we are, the unique challenges and barriers we endure, and will fulfill the expectation of improving our lives and protecting the rights we have if he has a history of belittling our existence? Most importantly, during his entire campaign run, Trump has managed to offend not only disabled people, but also Latinos and Muslims with his perceived racist and Islamophobic statements. Before even becoming the official Republican presidential nominee, Trump has shunned millions of people who represent marginalized groups that battle multiple oppressions within their own plights. Members within these groups also make up key voting blocs, as well; particularly, Latinos being the largest racial minority group, and the disabled community being the largest minority group overall. Though Trump is considered to be problematic by many who are offended by his actions and have questioned how he has gotten this far in the nomination race; realistically, none of us should be surprised at the lack of reprimanding or the firm support he has within the Republican party. The GOP has a history of excluding and offending marginalized groups, including the disabled. The GOP’s stance on disabled people and our lives will shed some light as to how the Party views the disabled American experience, and why Trump’s conduct is not a new occurrence by members within the Party.

### Militarism

#### A republican president would cause rampant militarism. Outweighs the aff on scope – these are policy changes that affect the entire population

Sean Illing 2015, The GOP’s pathological militarism: These dangerous neocons belong nowhere near the White House, http://www.salon.com/2015/11/11/the\_gops\_pathological\_militarism\_these\_dangerous\_neocons\_belong\_nowhere\_near\_the\_white\_house/

But what doesn’t get discussed enough is their pathological militarism and their historical amnesia. In debate after debate, Republican presidential candidates speak as though the last fifteen years never happened. We’re still mired in two quagmires in the Middle East, one of which is largely responsible for creating the menace that is ISIS, and none of them, with the exception of Rand Paul, appears to have learned anything from our mistakes.¶ At the last Republican presidential debate in Milwaukee, you heard almost everyone on stage competing to out-hawk one another. Trump bragged about how “militaristic” he is. (Although, to Trump’s credit, he acknowledged our foolhardiness in waging war in Iraq.) Carson wants more troops in Syria and Iraq and so we can “take their energy field” and “all of that land from them.”¶ Jeb Bush thinks the “lesson of history” is that America has to “exercise leadership” (read: intervene) in the Middle East in order to preserve world order, which means arming “moderates” in Syria and enforcing no fly zones over sovereign countries even though that’s impossible to do without risking full-scale war.¶ Jeb also argued that when we fail to intervene in foreign countries, we create a dangerous power vacuum. And yet creating a power vacuum, which was filled by Iran and ISIS, is precisely what our failed experiment in Iraq accomplished. But in Jeb’s world, none of this happened. ISIS only exists because we didn’t stay in Iraq long enough, because we didn’t occupy the country interminably.¶ Carly Fiorina, arguably the most enthusiastic warmonger in the Republican field, gave a rehearsed speech about our need to “rebuild the Sixth Fleet” and “the missile defense program in Poland” and to “conduct very aggressive military exercises in the Baltic States.” She also wants “put in a few more thousand troops in Germany, not to start a war, but to make sure that Putin understands that the United States of America” means business.¶ Marco Rubio wants to cut spending across the board except, of course, on defense, where the budget is the most bloated and where we spend more than the next seven countries combined. And he sees no connection whatsoever between our military misadventures in the Middle East and the pervasive anti-American sentiment in the region. “They hate us because of our values,” Rubio said. “They hate us because our girls go to school. They hate us because women drive in the United States.”¶ This is a stupid, Manichean ideology that reduces the world into the simplest terms possible. It’s also a convenient way to avoid acknowledging our own follies, which is necessary if we’re to learn anything from them.¶ The Democratic Party was also complicit in our Iraq blunder. The difference is that the Democratic candidates all accept this. There’s no historical revisionism or blustering talk about doubling down on failed policies. For the GOP candidates, however, history starts in 2008, when Obama was elected. It’s Obama’s economy, Obama’s wars and Obama’s blunders. They simply refuse to see what went wrong before 2008 and how those errors shaped the political realities today.

### Nuke War

Trump causes nuclear war. Rapp-Hooper March 29, 2016

(Trump's nuclear views are terrifying: Column. USA today. Mira Rapp-Hooper. Senrio Fellow at the Asia Pacific Security Program. <http://www.usatoday.com/story/opinion/2016/03/29/donald-trump-nuclear-weapons-treaties-nato-terrifying-column/82341964/>)

The contours of **Donald Trump’s** foreign policy are becoming disturbingly clear. Newspapers have labeled his thinking on international affairs "**isolationist” and “**[**unabashedly non-interventionist**](https://www.washingtonpost.com/politics/a-whirlwind-day-in-dc-showcases-trumps-unorthodox-views-and-shifting-tone/2016/03/21/ef06d276-ef7b-11e5-85a6-2132cf446d0a_story.html)**,**" yet those terms fail to capture the more alarming elements of his philosophy. **Trump** apparently **is prepared to abandon the United States’ most important alliances**, even at the risk of those countries acquiring nuclear weapons. In other words, **he is prepared to end** the decades-long U.S. policy of **extended deterrence** — protecting close partners against nuclear attack and thereby **limiting the spread of nuclear weapons**. Moreover, **the** presidential **candidate gives little indication that he understands the implications of** these radical policies for **global security and stability**. One theme running through Trump’s foreign policy is his disdain for U.S. alliances and allies. In recent news media interviews**, he has called U.S. treaties “**[**one-sided**](http://www.nytimes.com/2016/03/27/us/politics/donald-trump-transcript.html)**,"** **labeled NATO “**[**obsolete**](http://www.realclearpolitics.com/video/2016/03/27/trump_europe_is_not_safe_lots_of_the_free_world_has_become_weak.html)**”** and repeatedly called on South Korea and Japan to contribute more to U.S. basing costs overseas. Trump appeared surprised in a [Washington Postinterview](https://www.washingtonpost.com/blogs/post-partisan/wp/2016/03/21/a-transcript-of-donald-trumps-meeting-with-the-washington-post-editorial-board/) to learn that allies pay a substantial portion of U.S. overseas basing costs, with none more supportive than Japan. Yet he also seemed unmoved by this information, insisting that allies should pay no less than a full 100% of U.S. overseas costs. A refusal to do so would force a President Trump to begin withdrawing troops, [he told The New York Times](http://www.nytimes.com/2016/03/27/us/politics/donald-trump-transcript.html). **When** **informed** this might cause **South Korea and Japan** to **acquire their own nuclear weapo**ns, **Trump** **demonstrated** a flippant **comfort**, stating that the U.S. “may very well be better off.” It hardly bears noting that abandoning U.S. treaty commitments and acquiescing to nuclear proliferation are completely at odds with decades of U.S. foreign policy. In the darkest days of World War II, American civilian and military leaders identified the merits of establishing a network of overseas bases to allow the United States to address foreign military threats before they could reach the homeland. U.S. planners understood that establishing a forward posture would require cooperation with allies who shared similar security concerns. Furthermore, since shortly after its own use of nuclear weapons against Japan, it has been U.S. policy to oppose any new countries from developing nuclear weapons, be they friend or foe. U.S. presidents have actively opposed allies such as France and Taiwan in their nuclear quests, on the theory that **more arsenals would lead to a more dangerous world**, no matter who owned the weapons. Academic research has borne out the close relationship between U.S. security guarantees and nuclear non-proliferation. Political science **studies** [**show**](http://jcr.sagepub.com/content/58/3/429.short) **that countries under a major power’s “nuclear umbrella” are far less likely to seek their own weapons**. The converse [holds](http://www.sup.org/books/title/?id=653) true: When allies grow acutely concerned about whether their security patron will make good on their treaty promises, they are more likely to seek an independent arsenal. In fact, when the United States began a major troop withdrawal from Asia during the Nixon administration, both Japan and South Korea seriously considered going nuclear themselves, and allied assurance continues to be a significant challenge in East Asia today. To understand why Trump’s views on extended deterrence are terrifying, one must examine his other positions on nuclear policy and strategy. In a December GOP debate, the candidate appeared to be [unfamiliar with the nuclear triad](http://freebeacon.com/national-security/rubio-explains-to-trump-what-the-nuclear-triad-is/), made up of the intercontinental ballistic missile, submarine-launched ballistic missiles, and bombers that can deliver nuclear weapons to their targets. Just days ago, **he** [**refused to rule out**](http://fortune.com/2016/03/23/trump-nuclear-weapons-isis/) **the use of a nuclear weapons against** the **Islamic State** terrorist group. In one of the many national security non sequiturs in his Times interview, Trump commented that no one could be sure whether the [U.S. nuclear arsenal even worked](http://www.nytimes.com/2016/03/27/us/politics/donald-trump-transcript.html?_r=0). This was presumably an allusion to the fact that America observes a de facto moratorium on nuclear testing, but it is contrary to all scientific and technical evidence and a wildly misleading comment at best. POLICING THE USA: A [look at race, justice, media](http://policing.usatoday.com/) Perhaps most unsettling, Trump repeatedly insists that the United States must be more “unpredictable” in its national security policy — a chilling assertion, particularly when uttered in such close proximity to such irresponsible nuclear policies. Trump’s naiveté about the world’s most dangerous weapons leads one to infer that he might not have considered the fact that a nuclear Japan and South Korea could lead to dangerous arms racing with China and North Korea, proliferation by other states in East Asia and regional instability that invites major crises. Trump’s foreign policy interviews might appear to be itinerant ramblings, but on at least one issue, he is crystal clear: He is absolutely not sold on the role that alliances and extended deterrence have played in U.S. global security policy since 1945. Coupled with **his erratic nuclear policy positions**, this prospective commander in chief’s views are not just irresponsible: They **are cataclysmically dangerous.**

# 2NR Frontlines

## Uniqueness Overview

#### Prefer Scher ‘15

A) It’s based on empirics not just mere speculation – key since media outlets try to spin interesting stories from nothing.

B) It’s success has been verified before – it predicted every state correctly in 2012 and hasn’t gotten an election wrong since Reagan.

C) The model is constantly being improved, so it’s even more likely accurate than last year.

### Polls are Inaccurate

## A2 Link Defense

### A2 Clinton wouldn’t be tied to Obama’s policy

#### 1. Even if this is generally true, a gun ban is an exception. Mataconis ’15:

Gun Control Advocates May Not Like Political Reality, But They Can’t Ignore It DOUG MATACONIS · MONDAY, OCTOBER 19, 2015 www.outsidethebeltway.com/gun-control-advocates-may-not-like-political-reality-but-they-cant-ignore-it/

Right off the bat, it’s worth noting that this poll in and of itself doesn’t really tell us very much about public attitudes on specific gun control issues, or how important voters will actually think this issue is when it comes time to vote. An affirmative response to a question about whether laws covering the sale of firearms should be “more strict” doesn’t tell us, for example, what the voters questioned might thing about specific proposals, or what they might think when they head to the polls to vote next year. In the wake of the shootings in Oregon, of course, President Obama tried to ignite a public debate on the issue with a statement and press conference that pretty much just amounted to empty rhetoric about policies that most likely wouldn’t work and wouldn’t have done anything to stop any of the recent shootings even if they did. Hillary Clinton, meanwhile, responded to the shootings in Oregon by unveiling what she said would be an aggressive push for broader gun control laws if she’s elected President, including the possibly use of Executive Orders and other powers if Congress fails to act. More recently, Clinton used last week’s Democratic Presidential debate to attack her chief rival Vermont Senator Bernie Sanders for a record on gun control issues that doesn’t fit easily into the Democratic Party’s current narrative and even suggested that she would consider the type of mandatory gun buyback program, essentially gun confiscation, utilized by Australia in 1996 and 2003. The odds that much or any of this would be implemented if Clinton becomes President, though, especially the most radical ideas like gun confiscation, lies somewhere between slim and none because of the nature of the gun debate in the United States.

#### 2. The popularity of Obama’s decisions directly impact the 2016 election. Bacon ’15:

POLITICS NOV 3 2015, 3:22 PM ET How President Obama's Legacy Will Define the 2016 Election by PERRY BACON JR. www.nbcnews.com/politics/2016-election/how-president-obamas-legacy-will-define-2016-election-n451616

His name won't be on the ballot on November 8, 2016, but Barack Obama will be one of the most important factors in who becomes the next president of the United States. Voters will likely face a choice between Hillary Clinton, who served in Obama's cabinet and has said she will look to build on the president's policies on many issues, and a Republican candidate who has pledged to repeal the Affordable Care Act, suspend Obama[care]'s executive actions on immigration and climate change, and sever the nuclear accord with Iran. Watch the second installment of Lester Holt's interview with President Obama on the "NBC Nightly News" at 6:30 p.m. ET. Obama's legacy is complicated, creating challenges and opportunities for both parties. Image: Obama walks to the Oval Office President Barack Obama walks to the Oval Office at the White House in Washington on Oct. 21, 2015. SAUL LOEB / AFP - Getty Images The Upside for Democrats The most obvious boon for the eventual Democratic nominee is that the president has strongly embraced a changing America, where a growing number of people are openly gay, lesbian or transgender, either non-religious or practicing a faith other than Christianity, and non-white. His support for gay marriage, measures to legalize the largely Latino population of undocumented immigrants and appointments of Asians, blacks, gays and Latinos to key posts, often for the first time in U.S. history, has solidified the Democratic Party as the one perceived as more inclusive. That gives Clinton, or whoever is the Democratic nominee, a key advantage in swing states like Virginia or Florida. It's not only that the growing number of minority voters back Democrats, but that many moderate white voters are also likely to favor gay marriage and be wary of measures like those favored by Donald Trump that would limit the rights of Latino migrants. On these cultural issues, the official positions of the Republican Party, like opposition to gay marriage, will force the GOP nominee to campaign on positions that are in the minority among Americans. "I believe we will never again elect a president that opposes same-sex marriage. The rhetoric has cooled some, but the Republicans are still more than a couple of steps behind the country, and dozens of steps behind younger Americans of both parties. Watching a politician explain to younger voters why they oppose marriage equality is so uncomfortable it makes you cringe, it's almost as if they are speaking two separate languages," says Dan Pfeiffer, who was President Obama's top political adviser until earlier this year. The Downside for Democrats For Democrats, the most obvious challenge posed by Obama's legacy is on foreign policy. U.S. presidents have limited power to alter events abroad. But the rise of the Islamic State, an increasingly assertive Russia and sectarian conflicts throughout the Middle East have happened on Obama's watch. On the campaign trail, Marco Rubio, one of the leading GOP 2016 candidates, says all these crises show America is being "humiliated" by foreign leaders. And ObamaZZ's foreign affairs record includes a number of blunders, perhaps most notably when referred to ISIS as a "jayvee team" only eight months before he was forced to start U.S. airstrikes to fight the Sunni insurgent organization. Clinton of course was both the president's secretary of state and a key architect of the Iran nuclear agreement. She has already started campaigning against some of Obama's foreign policy moves, arguing the president and his team should have been forceful in taking on Russian President Vladimir Putin and not allowed relations to become so tense between the U.S. and Israeli Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu. But it will be hard for Clinton to suggest every mistake in Obama's foreign affairs approach happened after she left the State Department in 2013. Obama's emphasis on diplomacy and cautious posture in terms of intervention abroad were what he campaigned on: a complete reverse from the muscular, aggressive foreign policy of George W. Bush. The president has brought most U.S. troops home from Iraq and Afghanistan and not started another war effort with large numbers of troops. So the Republican candidates must avoid seemingly like they will repeat Bush's approach, which the public strongly opposed. If they oppose the nuclear deal, GOP candidates must illustrate how they can restrain Iran's weapons development without starting a war. Political scientists argue that one of the most important factors determining which party will win a presidential election is the economy. And on this issue, the Obama legacy is mixed. He has presided over a recovery from the deep recession that started in 2008. Because of that job growth and Obamacare, the number of Americans without health insurance has plunged downward. At the same time, wages in the middle-class have been largely stagnant and many of the gains in the recovery have gone to the wealthy, as even Clinton has argued. "Our poor families are becoming poorer, and 70 percent of us are earning the same, or less than we were 12 years ago. We need new leadership, and we need action," said ex-Maryland Gov. Martin O'Malley in last month's Democratic primary debate, using words Republicans will likely repeat next fall in suggesting Obama's party should not have a third straight term in the White House. The Uncertain Big Picture These policy results in part shape a fourth critical factor that will help determine which party wins the White House: Obama's overall approval rating. Currently, between 45 and 50 percent of Americans approve of the president. If he maintains that number, he will be much more popular than Bush, who had just a 25 percent approval rate when Obama was elected in November 2008. At the same time, Obama is unlikely to reach 57 percent, the approval ratings of both Ronald Reagan in November 1988 and Bill Clinton in November 2000. Both of those presidents' designated successors won the popular vote, although Gore's eventually lost the Electoral College, and the White House, to George W. Bush. Obama, according to his aides, is deeply invested in having a Democrat succeed him, aware that some of his biggest accomplishments, like Obamacare, could be reversed by a GOP president and Republican-controlled Congress. What is unknown is how he will position himself over the next year, aware that his decisions will affect the prospects of the Democratic nominee. The president has been very aggressive in his seventh year, speaking out bluntly on racial issues that he had often been silent about before, pushing through the Iran deal, fighting for the controversial Trans-Pacific Partnership and proposing to make community college free and universal. He is already intent on pushing through either this year or next a bipartisan bill that would reduce jail sentences for non-violent offenders of drug crimes. And the president is considering an executive action to expand background checks for gun sales, taking on an issue that many Democrats say hurts their chances of winning elections. Obama's actions next year may have little impact. There appear to be relatively few swing voters in America, so a large swath of the country's vote is already known, a year from the election. It's hard to see either the Democratic or Republican presidential nominee getting below 45 percent of the vote. But Obama's legacy is already on the ballot next year, even if he is not. Clinton is not his vice-president, but some of Obama's top staffers now work for her, and she is campaigning to expand his policies, particularly on economic and cultural issues. Perhaps the most consequential president of this era was Ronald Reagan and that was in part because George H.W. Bush, Reagan's vice-president, was in office and achieved one of Reagan's biggest goals: the fall of the Soviet Union. Obama is already a historic figure, for having been the first non-white person elected president. But his push to make American more inclusive would look even successful if he helped ensure his successor was the first female president.

### A2 One bad policy won’t stop the dems from winning

1. Long ‘15. According to the best model, the race literally could not be closer. One bad policy WOULD be game-over.

2. Scher ’15 is explicit. It’s literally *impossible* politically to support gun bans.

3. Actions towards the end of Obama’s administration would more strongly alter perception of his legacy than actions taken long ago.

4. The NRA supercharges my link – they’d mobilize millions.

## A2 Link Turns

### Overview

### A2 Winners Win

### A2 Clinton Needs Gun Control

James B November 2, 2015

(DEMOCRATS FOCUSING ON GUN CONTROL WILL HURT THEIR EFFORTS IN REGAINING THE SENATE….. Political Dog 101. <http://www.politicaldog101.com/2015/11/02/democrats-focusing-on-gun-control-will-hurt-their-efforts-in-regaining-the-senate/>)

I have pointed out in this place that **Democrats pushing gun control** in certain parts of the country **is** just plain **stupid**…. **It** is a one issue thing than **HAS cost the party around the country**…. While it si STRONGLY support among the base and IS a common sense issue to pursue….It does NOT play weel in certain places ….. The parties prosective nominee may have made a few speeches about the issue But she isn’t gonna lean on the issue come next November…. Other shouldn’t either….. It WILL cost them…. There’s division within the Democratic Party over how aggressively to push gun control, an issue that is growing more urgent among the liberal base but threatens to hurt centrists running in battleground states. **While Democratic senators** from liberal states such as Connecticut and Oregon are **roll**ing **out** new **gun control** legislation in Washington, some **strategists** **warn** **the issue could alienate** **pro-gun voters in key states** such as Colorado, New Hampshire, Florida, Pennsylvania and Nevada. But it could be difficult for Democratic Senate candidates to keep the gun issue at bay, given the rising fervor in the liberal base for action. Democratic presidential candidates Hillary Clinton and Martin O’Malley have tried to tap into the grassroots anger over gun violence, zeroing in on the issue during their first presidential debate…. … Democratic strategists based in Colorado, however, warn that **presidential candidates would pay a price for such talk come general-election time**. “**I have a feeling that [Clinton] is wise enough** from her Arkansas roots **not to come to Denver, Colorado, or Colorado Springs and decide** **what I’m going to do is** a major speech on **gun control**,” said Rick Ridder, a Democratic consultant based in Denver. “She’s got enough political wisdom, and if not somebody will kick the tires off her campaign plane, make sure she doesn’t land here and give that speech.” **Another** Colorado-based **Democratic strategist said gun control is not a great issue for** embattled **Democratic candidates** such as Bennet. “**I don’t feel** like **any Democrat needs to run on gun control** as a primary concern. **There are larger, more pressing issues at play. I don’t think it’s great ground for any Democratic candidate to be spending their time** on,” said the strategist, who requested anonymity….

### More Link Stuff

1. Democrats can not afford to pass gun control- affects their chances of winning seats in Congress and key swing states. Hille and Richie December 20, 2012:

Why America Can’t Pass gun Control. The Atlantic. Steven and Robert. http://www.theatlantic.com/politics/archive/2012/12/why-america-cant-pass-gun-control/266417/

Sure, Americans like their guns more than other nations, but polls often have shown [a majority of Americans](http://www.bloomberg.com/news/2012-12-17/majority-of-americans-favor-gun-control-laws-poll-shows.html" \t "_blank) wanting more gun control, with [two-thirds](http://partners.nytimes.com/library/national/082699poll-watch.html" \t "_blank) calling for more regulation following the Columbine massacre in 1999. But the political system - including the Democratic Party -- has failed to respond. And it's not because Democrats and Obama are afraid of the NRA's deep pockets, as so many pundits are wrongly concluding. Quite the contrary, **the NRA has money because it is powerful**, not the other way around. And **the NRA** is powerful because it **is clever at working the clunky architecture of our political system**, **which gives immense clout to a tiny slice of swing voters** in a handful of congressional districts. To understand the importance of this factor, Obama and gun control advocates have to grapple with the fact that Mitt Romney carried 228 out of 435 House districts (52.4 percent) despite losing the national popular vote to Obama by 4 points. [According to an analysis](http://www.fairvote.org/fair-voting-solution" \t "_blank) by FairVote, the median House district (the 218th) is one that leans 52 percent Republican. [Cook Political Report analysis](http://online.wsj.com/article_email/SB10001424127887324339204578171180887571110-lMyQjAxMTAyMDEwMTExNDEyWj.html?mod=wsj_valettop_email" \t "_blank)found that of the 234 Republicans elected to the 435-seat U.S. House in November, fully 219 came from districts that were carried by Mitt Romney. That means that these **Republicans don't need to worry much about challenges from the left** or accommodating the president over the next two years. It also means that Democrats will have a very steep uphill climb to retake the House in 2014, since their candidates would have to run well ahead of their presidential nominee in at least a dozen Republican-leaning districts. Just like our recent presidential election was settled in only a handful of battleground states, **control of the U.S. House of Representatives comes down to only about 35 districts -**- **fewer than 10 percent of the 435 districts** -- every two years. **That gives overwhelming power to undecided voters who live in these swing districts, many of which are rural and conservative-leaning**. **This** set-up also **gives enormous power to the NRA,** **because many NRA members** [**live in these rural swing districts**](http://professional.wsj.com/article/SB10001424127887324731304578189864148514602.html?mg=reno64-wsj). So the Democrats and Obama know that the NRA doesn't have clout because it has lots of money -- it spent $18 million in congressional elections in 2012 -- but the contrary. The NRA has money because it has clout. And it has clout because it has a lot of votes in key battleground House districts and battleground states voting for president and U.S. senators. Back in 2000, Republican strategist and NRA board member [Grover Norquist summed it up nicely, saying](http://www.thenation.com/article/nra-wants-you?page=0,2" \t "_blank), "The question is intensity versus preference. **You can always get a certain percentage to say they are in favor of some gun controls. But are they going to vote on their 'control' position?"** **Though many voters back gun control,** says Norquist, **their support doesn't really motivate them when they go to the polls. "But for that 4-5 percent who care about guns, they will vote on this**." Things have hardly changed since Norquist made those comments. **The NRA's job** **is** **made easier because it can target its resources at the three dozen swing districts** like a military strategist dividing quadrants on a battlefield.
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#### Most recent evidence says Bernie wins – young people, independents, trust and the black community

Shaun King, Feb. 10, 2016, King: Here’s how — and why — Bernie Sanders will make his way to the White House

Young People & Women

Yesterday, in New Hampshire, an astounding 84% of young people ages 17 to 29 voted for Bernie Sanders. 82% of young women under the age of 30 voted for Bernie yesterday in New Hampshire.¶ The same numbers were true in Iowa. Young voters aren’t just marginally breaking for Bernie — it’s not even close.¶ It’s not just super young voters who love and respect Bernie Sanders, either. In Iowa, voters ages 30 to 44 chose Bernie over Hillary by a 21% margin. In New Hampshire, this demographic was even more pronounced — Bernie won voters ages 30 to 44 by a 66% to 32% margin. On Tuesday, in a widely shared op-ed for The Guardian, RoseAnn DeMoro said, “I’m a woman and I will vote for the best feminist for president: Bernie Sanders. I won’t vote against Hillary Clinton because she’s female, but I don’t intend to vote for her because I am. We need more fundamental changes in this country.”¶ The Trust Factor¶ We live in an age where people just don’t trust conventional politicians. Bernie Sanders, though, may be the most trusted politician in America.¶ Asked which politician was “honest and trustworthy,” New Hampshire voters chose Bernie Sanders over Hillary Clinton 91% to 5%. Remember, Hillary only lost the state by 21%, so what we’re seeing is that even huge volumes of her own voters admit they actually trust Bernie more. That is almost identical to what I heard from my conversations at Facebook.¶ In fact, polls have determined that Bernie Sanders is the only candidate from either party with a net positive favorability rating.¶ Guess who the three least liked candidates are nationally? In this order — Donald Trump, Jeb Bush and Hillary Clinton.¶ Just as Democrats of every persuasion will rally against someone like Donald Trump, Republicans of every persuasion will do so against Hillary Clinton. This notion that come a general election Clinton is going to become someone that the majority of Americans trust or have a favorable view on just isn’t based in fact.¶ Independents¶ An increasing number of Americans don’t closely identify themselves with any political party. Bernie Sanders is the longest serving Independent congressman in the history of America. When he speaks of being free from corporate interests, he has been able to say this for so long, in great part, by also staying free from the burdensome restraints of the Democratic party. This is what gave him the freedom to vote against the wars in Iraq and Afghanistan. This is what gave him the freedom to vote against the draconian welfare bill famously touted by Bill Clinton. This is how he has been able to continue to say he’s against the death penalty. Bernie Sanders has been independent his entire political career and has received virtually zero support from the party elites this primary season.¶ Consequently, independents are coming out for Bernie in big numbers — which is essential in any Presidential election. In New Hampshire, 72% of Independents broke for Bernie. In Iowa he won 69% of Independents.¶ Head to Head, Bernie Does Better¶ In every available poll showing Bernie Sanders running against every Republican candidate and Hillary Clinton running against those candidates, Bernie outperforms Hillary in all of them. This was true in October. This was true in December. It was true in January. Some key Republican leaders are actually starting to say they think they’d prefer to go against Hillary.¶ While the Bernie Sanders campaign has worked hard to promote these head to head polls, the information just hasn’t trickled down enough for people on the ground to know that this is the case.¶ Prominent African-American voters are turning toward Bernie¶ Bernie Sanders, particularly compared to Hillary Clinton, has not been well known for very long among most African-Americans. As people have time to investigate and understand the differences between the two, the tide will start to really turn.¶ Just today, Ta-Nehisi Coates, perhaps the most respected and widely read author of issues important to black voters, said he intends to vote for Bernie Sanders.¶ Michelle Alexander, the legal scholar who authored “The New Jim Crow,” which may be the most quoted and leaned on book of the Black Lives Matter Movement, wrote a scathing op-ed entitled, “Hillary Clinton Does Not Deserve the Black Vote.”¶ Ben Jealous, the former head of the NAACP, and a widely respected and connected organizer, endorsed Bernie Sanders last week and has been working full-force on the campaign trail.¶ And the Rev. Al Sharpton met with Bernie at Sylvia’s, a Harlem soul food mecca, on Wednesday morning, just hours after Bernie’s commanding win in New Hampshire.¶ While no single individual represents or speaks for all of black America, these four men and women are among the most respected, trusted, experienced leaders and thinkers in the country. Cornel West, another leading scholar, has already been on the trail with Bernie for months.¶ When the leading scholars, thinkers, and organizers are starting to break for Bernie, it will have a ripple effect.¶ In my opinion, the candidate who people trust, who strongly wins the youth and independent vote, who beats the opponents better head to head, and who earnestly garners the support of African-Americans, is a winning candidate.¶ It seems crazy that a 74-year-old man who has called himself a Democratic Socialist for most of his life could become our next president, but the path is clear, and it is very possible.

### Stanford new link /uq

#### Bernie will win the election. Goodman three days ago:

H. A. Goodman Become a fan Columnist published in The Cleveland Plain Dealer, The Baltimore Sun, The Hill, Salon, The Jerusalem Post www.hagoodman.com Email Bernie Sanders Will Win the Democratic Nomination and Presidency in a Landslide Posted: 01/13/2016 9:45 am EST Updated: 01/14/2016 1:59 pm EST [www.huffingtonpost.com/h-a-goodman/bernie-sanders-will-win-the-democratic-nomination-and-presidency-in-a-landslide\_b\_8968048.html](http://www.huffingtonpost.com/h-a-goodman/bernie-sanders-will-win-the-democratic-nomination-and-presidency-in-a-landslide_b_8968048.html)

My latest Huffington Post article on Clinton's 2008 persona as "Pro-Gun Churchgoer" was recently quoted in The Atlantic, along with another reference to Obama calling today's anti-gun crusader "Annie Oakley." Yes, Clinton has evolved on federal gun legislation, along with Iraq, Keystone XL, the TPP, gay marriage, marijuana legislation, sending U.S. ground troops to fight ISIS, and other contentious issues. Like a recent headline in The International Business Times states, "Hillary Clinton Flip-Flopping On Ground Troops To Fight ISIS? Before US Sends Troops To Iraq, Clinton Says No To Deployment After First Saying Yes." Clinton's latest attempt at labeling Bernie Sanders the Ted Nugent of Democrats doesn't only ignore his lifetime D-minus rating from the NRA; it illustrates fear. Sanders has once again surpassed Clinton in Iowa and New Hampshire, and when he wins both, could easily take South Carolina. With three initial losses, Clinton's Southern "firewall" and hopes at a big Super Tuesday would be done, and the positive media coverage alone would propel Sanders throughout the primaries. Then of course, wins in Iowa and New Hampshire would focus attention on the reasons non-white Democrats throughout the South and the nation would vote for Clinton. When more attention is paid to Clinton's 3 a.m. ad against Obama, use of race and Islamophobia against Obama, and Congressman James Clyburn's recollection of how both Clintons treated Obama in 2008, South Carolina will easily shift to Sanders. Boston's Black Lives Matter President Daunasia Yancey referred to Clinton's racial justice record as "abysmal." The Clinton campaign accepted money from prison lobbyists. In addition, for some unknown reason, Hillary Clinton waited almost three weeks to make a statement on Michael Brown's death and Ferguson, despite the fact African Americans vote around 90% for Democrats in presidential elections. Nobody knows why Clinton waited so long to make a statement on Ferguson. When media coverage is given to Clinton's record on race and her 2008 campaign against Obama (Sanders wins in Iowa and New Hampshire will lead to this coverage), early leads in South Carolina will dwindle as fast as leads in Iowa and New Hampshire. Like Barack Obama in 2008, Bernie Sanders is the far more progressive and trustworthy candidate with immense grass roots support. While 59% of American voters believe Clinton is "not honest and trustworthy" and 51% of Americans have an unfavorable view of Clinton (one poll cites 55% of voters), Bernie Sanders has positive favorability ratings. In fact, while both Donald Trump and Clinton are viewed in a negative manner by most people, Sanders is the only leading presidential candidate with positive trustworthiness and favorability ratings. The only leading candidate in 2016 (Ted Cruz, like Trump and Clinton has a negative favorability rating) with positive favorability numbers is Bernie Sanders. Think about that for a moment. The candidate with the least amount of media coverage, and the candidate thought of as unable to win a general election by some pundits (even though he beats Trump in a "landslide of epic proportions"), is the only candidate in 2016 with positive favorability numbers. Hillary Clinton has negative favorability scores in 10 out 10 national polls according to HuffPost Pollster, with seven polls indicating over 50% of Americans possess an "unfavorable" viewpoint of the former Secretary of State. Donald Trump also has negative favorability scores in 10 out of 10 national polls, one of the many similarities both share with one another. In contrast, Bernie Sanders has positive favorability scores in 6 out of 10 national polls, with two polls leaning negative by less than three points. This helps explain why Sanders was able to attract crowds totaling over 100,000 people, just several months after announcing his bid for the presidency. For these reasons, and the three reasons listed below, Bernie Sanders will defeat both Clinton and a billionaire xenophobe named Trump to win the presidency. He'll also be able to achieve a stunning victory, primarily because even today (without the benefit of Iowa and New Hampshire wins), Bernie Sanders "destroys" Trump in a general election by 13 points. When the three issues presented below erase the myth of inevitability from the Clinton campaign, and the hollow arrogance from Trump's manufactured brand image, voters will elect Sanders in a landslide. 1. Bernie Sanders continues to surge in the polls, despite getting 1/23 the television coverage of Donald Trump, and without Clinton's universal name recognition. Imagine when Bernie wins Iowa and New Hampshire, and the notion of Clinton's inevitability, along with fears pertaining to Bernie's inability to win, are shattered. Despite a lack of media coverage and other obstacles, Sanders has achieved record-breaking fundraising totals, as illustrated in a Huffington Post piece titled Bernie Sanders Becomes the First Presidential Candidate to Reach Two Million Individual Campaign Contributions: In 2008, Obama Had Just One Million: Tonight, Bernie Sanders received the final dollars he needed to break a historic milestone. The senator officially hit two million individual campaign contributions, a feat that no other U.S. presidential candidate has achieved at this point in an election. To put that number in context, Barack Obama's historic 2008 campaign managed to break just one million contributions. Sanders literally has twice what Obama had. Not only that, but Sanders reached two million faster than President Obama reached one. Sanders was able to break Obama's records without massive media attention and widespread name recognition. He also had the Democratic establishment scheduling debates in Clinton's favor. Imagine what happens after two initial wins. 2. Remember the poll stating Americans won't vote for a socialist? Well, Bernie Sanders isn't a Fox News socialist, he's a Democratic Socialist like Theodore Roosevelt and FDR. Iowa and New Hampshire wins, along with widespread media coverage, will highlight this fact. Nothing exemplifies Bernie Sanders becoming a modern-day Theodore Roosevelt like Robert Reich's latest piece in The Huffington Post titled The Big Short and Bernie's Plan to Bust Up Wall Street: Most importantly, the movie shows why Bernie Sanders's plan to break up the biggest banks and reinstate the Glass-Steagall Act (separating investment from commercial banking) is necessary -- and why Hillary Clinton's more modest plan is inadequate. ...More than a century ago, Teddy Roosevelt broke up the Standard Oil Trust because it posed a danger to the U.S. economy. Today, Wall Street's biggest banks pose an even greater danger. They're far larger than they were before the crash of 2008. Like Joseph Stiglitz, Nouriel Roubini, and others, Reich agrees with Bernie Sanders on Wall Street reform. Reich also states that Bernie's plan is "necessary," while Clinton's "more modest plan is inadequate." 3. Vice President Joe Biden's praise of Bernie Sanders highlights the main difference between Sanders and Clinton, and explains why Sanders would easily defeat a GOP challenger for the presidency. A recent CNN article titled Biden praises Sanders on income inequality, calls Clinton 'relatively new' to the fight, highlights exactly why only Bernie Sanders will address the structural issues plaguing the U.S. economy: "Bernie is speaking to a yearning that is deep and real. And he has credibility on it," Biden said during an interview with CNN chief political analyst Gloria Borger. "It's relatively new for Hillary to talk about that," Biden continued... "Hillary's focus has been other things up to now, and that's been Bernie's -- no one questions Bernie's authenticity on those issues," he said. Wealth inequality is a major issue in both parties and 63% of Americans according to Gallup believe "money and wealth distribution is unfair." In addition to so many other differences, "authenticity" separates Sanders, from both Trump and Clinton. Iowa and New Hampshire will be remembered forever as the two states that ushered in a new era of American politics, one where Bernie Sanders will emulate Teddy Roosevelt and battle the "malefactors of great wealth" to defend against future financial collapses and endless military quagmires. After these initial wins for Bernie Sanders, the media will finally jump on the bandwagon, leading to a landslide victory for Sanders in 2016. The three reasons above (as well as the possibility of the FBI ending Clinton's campaign with future revelations) reflect an undercurrent of support that will become a nationwide phenomenon after Iowa and New Hampshire. I explain why I'm only voting for Bernie Sanders in this 60 second YouTube segment. In my recent appearance on The Thom Hartmann Program, I explain why Bernie Sanders will become president.

#### The dems have a slight edge, but it’s close – best model confirms. Obama’s popularity is the deciding factor. Long ’15:

Time-tested model says a Democrat will win in 2016 by Heather Long @byHeatherLong August 6, 2015: 4:15 PM ET money.cnn.com/2015/08/06/news/economy/2016-democratic-victory-moodys-analystics/

Republicans might be in the spotlight this week with their first big debate, but Democrats received some very encouraging news. Moody's Analytics, which has correctly predicted every presidential race since Ronald Reagan's victory in 1980, just came out with its forecast for 2016. It will be an extremely close race, but the next president will be a Democrat, according to Moody's. This doesn't mean that Hillary Clinton is on her way back to the White House. The model that Moody's uses doesn't focus on individual candidates. Instead, it predicts which party will win in every state, so it forecasts the results of the Electoral College. Related: Look out, Trump. Bush and Christie vow to double economic growth Moody's says the Democratic nominee will get [with] 270 electoral votes -- the minimum number of votes needed to win -- while the Republican nominee will accumulate 268 votes. The model correctly predicted every state in the 2012 election and has a nearly 90% success rate in forecasting each state accurately since 1980. It will all come down to Virginia and Ohio this time because Moody's predicts that Republicans will win Florida. At the moment, Moody's says Virginia will go Democratic and Ohio will swing Republican, but that could change. "If President Obama's approval rating falls by any more than 2 percentage points by Election Day, Virginia will swing and the Republicans will win the president," the report says. Related: Bush stumbles into debate night So what is the key to such accurate predictions? Moody's says it's all about economics. The model takes into account how the economy is doing in each state. The researchers have tested a lot of variables over the years, but the best ones are family ("household") income, home values and gas prices. If those three variables are going up, it favors the incumbent party. If they're not, people want change in Washington. "The economy's performance strongly favors the Democratic nominee for president," says Moody's. Moody's points out that household incomes have been steadily improving lately and are likely to go up further before Election Day. "The only missing ingredient is stronger wage growth, which is expected to pick up in the coming months as the job market approaches full employment," the authors wrote.

1. Gwynne Dyer is a London-based independent journalist whose articles are published in 45 countries. 19/06/2012 “How bad could climate change get?“ [↑](#footnote-ref-1)