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#### Dems projected to win the senate, but it’s impossibly close. Third party funding will determine it. PETERSON 10/26

[Peterson, Kristina. “Democrats at Odds Over Shift of Money From Florida to Senate Races in Other States.” The Wal Street Journal. October 26, 2016. 2:46 pm. LHP MK]

**Democrats are divided over a decision to pull money out of** **the expensive Florida Senate race** in favor of a trio of cheaper competitive states, with some worried they aren’t taking advantage of Democratic nominee [Hillary Clinton](http://topics.wsj.com/person/C/hillary,-clinton/6344)’s momentum in the Sunshine State and could end up boosting Sen. Marco Rubio’s [future presidential ambitions](http://www.wsj.com/articles/republican-heavy-hitters-maneuver-with-an-eye-on-2020-1469136119). **The funding shift comes as Democrats see** an **increased chance of regaining the Senate majority** they lost two years ago, **but many of the races they would need to win to recapture control remain tight. With less than two weeks before the election, outside groups are diverting funds to the handful of races that will decide which party controls the Senate next year**. In September, the Democratic Senatorial Campaign Committee began taking money out the Florida Senate race between Mr. Rubio, the GOP incumbent, and Democratic Rep. Patrick Murphy. More recently, **Senate Majority PAC, which supports Senate Democrats, has** also **pulled back from the state**. Florida is one of the country’s most expensive places to air ads, with the two groups combined canceling around $16 million in ad reservations, according to Democratic operatives. Democrats are now diverting those funds into three, cheaper states with close Senate races: North Carolina, Missouri and Indiana. Their calculation is that they are likely to rack up more wins by spreading the money across three states than concentrating it in Florida, according to supporters of the strategy. Republicans currently hold 54 of the chamber’s seats. Democrats would need to pick up four net seats to take back the Senate majority, if Mrs. Clinton wins the White House and a Democratic vice-president could cast a tie-breaking vote. Some Democrats said the decision to pull money out of Florida is likely to help Mr. Rubio, a young, telegenic Hispanic Republican who ran in his party’s presidential primary this year and could pose a threat again in 2020. They argue that Mr. Rubio’s prospects would have been blunted if he lost this year’s Senate race after [ending his unsuccessful presidential bid in March](http://www.wsj.com/articles/marco-rubio-suspends-his-campaign-1458087888). “If Marco Rubio was to lose this race, he would be severely wounded,” said Florida Democratic donor Chris Korge, who hosted a fundraiser Mrs. Clinton attended at his house this week. “Floridians can’t afford to have somebody that liberal in the U.S. Senate,” Rubio campaign spokeswoman Olivia Perez-Cubas said, referring to Mr. Murphy.. “Florida already has a senator with a strong record of fighting for them, and that’s why they’re going to re-elect Marco.” Florida Democrats said the decision also fails to capitalize on Mrs. Clinton’s lead over GOP nominee [Donald Trump](http://topics.wsj.com/person/T/donald,-trump/159) in the swing state. After trailing Mr. Trump in the state earlier, Mrs. Clinton has edged ahead of him by almost two percentage points in the Real Clear Politics average of recent polls. “The objective is to take advantage of that enthusiasm,” said former Democratic Florida Rep. Robert Wexler, a Democratic donor. Mr. Wexler said the decision had also frustrated some Democratic donors in Florida to see their state’s race abandoned. “They are becoming a bit disillusioned that Florida hasn’t been as big a priority as they would have wished,” Mr. Wexler said. He said he understood Democrats’ national strategy, but that they could have used that as a reason to return to Florida donors and seek more funds for their state’s race. There are also differing opinions of how tight the Florida Senate race is. Some Democratic operatives said internal polling shows the contest as a virtual tie. The Real Clear Politics average shows Mr. Rubio leading by 3.6 percentage points. Some **Democrats hope** Sen. Charles Schumer of New York, **a key architect of Democrats’ campaign strategy, would dip into** his own **campaign chest to help Democrats in tighter races**. Mr. Schumer had more than $20 million in cash on hand at the end of September, though he has spent money since then. Left-leaning website The Daily Kos on Wednesday [asked readers to send messages](http://www.dailykos.com/story/2016/10/26/1587109/-Tell-Chuck-Schumer-to-use-his-20-million-war-chest-to-help-Patrick-Murphy-RetireRubio) to Mr. Schumer on Twitter, Facebook or through his campaign asking him to send more of his funds to Florida. Mr. Schumer’s office declined to comment. Mr. Schumer has so far this year transferred $3 million to Senate Democrats’ campaign arm and helped raise almost $4 million with other candidates in joint committees and contributions to state parties, according to a person familiar with his campaign.

#### The plan cause police lobby backlash to politicians associated with the aff - political climate slays police accountability reform and causes counter-lobbying against democrats. TRACEY ’14:

[Tracey, Michael. “The Pernicious Power of the Police Lobby.” Vice News. December 4, 2014. LHP MK]

​E​ric Garner was standing on a sidewalk one summer afternoon in Staten Island when Officer Daniel Pantaleo appeared, and within a matter of minutes Garner was dead. Michael Brown was walking down the street one summer afternoon in Ferguson when Officer Darren Wilson appeared, and within a matter of seconds Brown ended up dead. These encounters were random in a sense, but they were produced by a political context that has established a precedent in which agents of the state can accost citizens, bark orders, cause fatalities, and get away with it. Pantaleo might have applied a choke hold that the NYPD [specifica​lly prohibits](http://www.huffingtonpost.com/2014/10/07/nypd-chokeholds_n_5948972.html), and the whole sick episode might have been viewed on YouTube the world over, but we learned yesterday that the cop [​won't be prosecuted](http://www.vice.com/read/a-grand-jury-just-decided-not-to-indict-the-cop-who-put-eric-garner-in-a-lethal-chokehold-1203). Nevertheless, you can rest assured that innumerable commenters will eventually start echoing the sentiments of Nicole Wallace, a panelist on The View who [co​mplained](http://abc.go.com/shows/the-view/episode-guide/2014-12/02-tuesday-december-2-2014) Tuesday that America shows insufficient respect for the heroism of law enforcement officers. As evidence for this claim, she cited the predominance of supposedly anti-cop media narratives that have percolated since Wilson was exonerated last week. One hears this storyline often: Despite their sacrifices, cops somehow get a raw deal, and are unfairly demonized by a public that simply doesn't understand all they do to keep us safe. This is crazy. Boatloads of "respect" are constantly being heaped on the men and women who wear badges, and the political system caters to them at every turn. When politicians issue crowd-pleasing denunciations of "[s​pecial interests](http://www.nytimes.com/2007/12/19/us/politics/19edwards.html?_r=0)," they are typically referring to a narrowly prescribed set of industries: oil, banking, pharmaceuticals. Rarely are police lobbyists similarly targeted for scorn. This might be due in part to law enforcement advocates not appearing to engage in conventional "lobbying" activities—they operate under the auspices of groups with innocuous-sounding names like "Police Benevolent Association" or "National Sheriffs Association"—but like other interest groups, these entities advocate single-mindedly on behalf their memberships, frequently to the detriment of the greater good. Because of the political leverage accumulated over decades (if not centuries) by the police lobby, officers go about their daily beats with certain guarantees. For one, they will [alm​ost never](http://www.thenation.com/article/190937/why-its-impossible-indict-cop) be held personally liable for their bad conduct while on duty thanks to well-established doctrines like [qualifi​ed immunity](http://www.npr.org/2014/05/27/316484853/supreme-court-upholds-law-enforcements-qualified-immunity), which puts taxpayers on the hook for lawsuits filed as a result of police misconduct or brutality. They can also be assured that a robust formal and informal support network will be set into motion should they ever be accused of anything. Pantaleo reportedly characterized his attack to grand jurors as a "wrestling move," and they apparently bought it. Pantaleo enjoyed this privilege when New York City's powerful police union machinery kicked into high gear immediately following the choke hold incident, pushing an exculpatory narrative which contended that Garner had committed the high crime of selling untaxed cigarettes ([a claim​ for which there is no evidence](http://www.nydailynews.com/opinion/harry-siegel-lonesome-death-eric-garner-article-1.2032281)) and had a long rap sheet. Union bosses even absurdly [de​nied](http://www.dnainfo.com/new-york/20140805/civic-center/eric-garner-was-not-put-chokehold-police-unions-say) that Pantaleo used a choke hold in the first place. Astonishingly, it worked: Pantaleo reportedly characterized his attack to grand jurors as a "[wrestling ​move](http://www.nytimes.com/2014/12/04/nyregion/officer-told-grand-jury-he-meant-no-harm-to-eric-garner.html?_r=0)," and they apparently bought it. Given their track record of successfully weighting legal processes in favor of officers, the police lobby tends to be very confident, so much so that its leaders exhibit little compunction about openly disparaging the rare politician who goes against them. **In an** [**inter​view**](http://www.bloomberg.com/politics/articles/2014-11-25/how-police-unions-stopped-congress-from-militarization-reform) **with Bloomberg's Dave Weigel, Fraternal Order of Police executive director Jim Pasco mockingly referred to Hank Johnson—the Democratic Congressman who introduced a failed amendment in the House of Representatives aimed at stymieing the flow of militarized equipment to local departments—as a "real scholar" and "whasisname from Georgia."** This helps explain why even with robust bipartisan skepticism of [police militarization](http://www.vice.com/tag/police%20militarization), lawmakers have made zero progress in halting or even slowing it. Speaking on the House floor, Florida Republican Representative Richard Nugent— himself a former sheriff—[dismi​ssed](http://www.huffingtonpost.com/2014/11/24/police-demilitarization-bill_n_6215190.html) concerns about transferring military-grade gear to police as obviously ridiculous. How can we break this grip the police lobby has on the political process? For one thing, we'd need to develop alternate avenues through which elected officials could acquire political leverage. We also need to begin to think of law enforcement not just as protectors of the common good but an interest group like any other. That doesn't mean calling individual cops "pigs" or "murderers," it means modifying how police are viewed in the macro. For instance, it's probably worth communicating to the American people that [policing is not an especially dangerous​ job](http://www.bls.gov/iif/oshwc/cfoi/cfoi_rates_2013hb.pdf). According to the Bureau of Labor Statistics, truck drivers are twice as likely to die while working—and transporting goods from one place to another is a pretty important activity. Without truck drivers, our economy would collapse overnight. So why does it seem so ridiculous that we would lower a flag to half-mast to honor a truck driver who died in the line of duty? Why don't we have a [day to remem​ber](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Peace_Officers_Memorial_Day) the truck drivers who gave their lives to our country? Maybe if we stopped thinking of policing as such a hazardous job, we could adjust our policies and discourse accordingly. As of now, "officer safety" is regarded as indisputably paramount whenever we talk about the way cops interact with civilians; despite a precipitous [nation​wide decline in violent crime](http://www.nytimes.com/2014/12/03/nyregion/violent-crime-in-new-york-has-dropped-to-historic-low-mayor-de-blasio-says.html), officers and their union representatives routinely parrot the discredited notion that police must live in constant fear for their lives. As law professor and former cop Seth Stoughton [told ​me](https://twitter.com/PoliceLawProf/status/540186544192356352) over Twitter, "Within policing, the risks of intentional targeting are typically quite exaggerated." In fact, more than half of all police fatalities are [caused by traffic accidents](http://www.governing.com/gov-data/law-enforcement-fatality-rates-by-state.html). Of course there is always a chance of some mentally deranged person consciously seeking to harm officers, but should this remote possibility dictate routine police behavior, or influence our perception of the risks inherent to policing? Probably not. What if their overriding mantras were something along the lines of "serve the community" instead of "get home from your shift alive"? Since policing is widely thought to be incredibly dangerous, and those who wear the badge are seen to be making a profound personal sacrifice, it's not surprising that politicians defer to the police lobby. This deference, in turn, means that departments across the country have more opportunities to secure [federal grants for ov​ertime](http://www.whitehouse.gov/sites/default/files/docs/federal_support_for_local_law_enforcement_equipment_acquisition.pdf) and countless other perks. The culture of police unaccountability and impunity is partly what fostered Wilson and Pantaleo's mindsets, and though that mindset doesn't always lead to death, it results in violent and unpleasant altercations far too often. A public employee who knew his job security was contingent on democratic review from the taxpayers he's supposed to be serving might not so readily pick fights. This also might make policing safer, as young men (of any race) are less likely to lash out at cops they don't perceive as assholes. Police officers are endowed with enormous discretionary authority, and often must make split-second decisions about how best to apply their state-sanctioned powers of deadly force. In those pivotal milliseconds, which can determine whether a person lives or dies, basic instinct reigns supreme. No amount of racial sensitivity training or "National Conversations" are going to change how an officer reacts in such scenarios. What needs to change, then, is the incentives that lead cops to aggressively confront people who aren't committing a violent crime. Maybe if a different set of incentives were in place when Darren Wilson and Daniel Pantaleo embarked on their fatal exchanges, things might have turned out differently. What if their overriding mantras were something along the lines of "serve the community" instead of "get home from your shift alive"? The only way to change this is through difficult, tedious governmental reform—not fancy speeches or racial sensitivity seminars—and the police lobby will ferociously oppose such efforts at every step. Maybe the American political system is just too calcified to allow for these reforms. If that's the case, we should prepare ourselves for many more Michael Browns and many more Eric Garners.

#### That’ll flip democratic momentum --- the police lobby will lash out against democrats who they perceive to support the plan. BERND ’15:

[Bernd, Candice. “Is Campaign Cash From Police Unions Watering Down Democrats' Reform Efforts?” Truth-Out. October 14, 2015. All brackets originally in the document. Brackets from the original evidence. LHP MK]

At every turn, **police unions and law enforcement lobbying groups have staunchly opposed measures aimed at policing reform.** They have been the first and loudest voices to defend the perpetrators of each new incident of police murder and brutality caught on camera - no matter how heinous. Most recently, in California, unions called on Gov. Jerry Brown to veto a [recently passed bill](http://www.huffingtonpost.com/entry/california-law-police-racial-profiling_5612fd05e4b0368a1a60c3ff) that aims to curb racial profiling by requiring police to report the race and other demographic features of any person stopped by an officer. Craig Lally, the president of the Los Angeles Police Protective League, called the law "a joke," while Lt. Steve James, who is president of the Long Beach Officers Association and the national trustee for the California Fraternal Order of Police (FOP), asserted that racial profiling does not exist, saying that police simply engage in "criminal profiling." But even **as Democratic lawmakers introduce** and pass **bills seeking police reforms** throughout the United States, **national police unions and law enforcement lobbying groups** like the FOP **are contributing campaign cash** to Democratic candidates this election cycle. Some of these candidates have embraced the mainstream rhetoric of "improving" and "rebuilding" police-community relations viewed as problematic by racial justice activists seeking a fundamentally different relation entirely. "**The Fraternal Order of Police have always been a force in supporting and lobbying against police reform**." It's these liberal-leaning politicians, the beneficiaries of police union campaign contributions, who have supported the Community Oriented Policing Services (COPS) program, established with the passage of the 1994 Violent Crime Control and Law Enforcement Act, which funnels federal grant money to local police forces that then use the money to hire more cops and purchase more equipment, including military gear and surveillance technologies. Rather than establishing trust in communities, this additional funding for local police [has exacerbated tensions and violence](http://www.truth-out.org/opinion/item/28267-liberals-trojan-horses-and-the-myth-of-police-community-relations), especially in urban, low-income communities of color. "[The FOP] have always been a force in supporting and lobbying against police reform, and for those kind of draconian police engagements that were based in 'law and order,'" said Ron Hampton, who is the former executive director of the National Black Police Association (NBPA). Hampton was also formerly a police officer in Washington, DC, from 1971 to 1994. "That has been their agenda and they have invested money in those politicians that support that." Hampton told Truthout that the 1994 omnibus crime bill passed under former President Bill Clinton with wide support among Democrats, and that the NBPA withheld support for the law because of its role in expanding the federal death penalty, and establishing an array of new crimes that would disproportionately impact communities of color, especially as it related to how the law affected immigration law statutes and gang-related crimes. "Twenty years later ... Bill Clinton and his wife should apologize for the mass incarceration that those laws created," Hampton said. "But there were Democrats, a whole lot of Democrats, that supported that ... because that was the theme of the day, and the unions had a lot to do with gathering up that support because that was what they wanted ... and they got it." Today, Democrats receiving campaign contributions from the national FOP still support the COPS program created by the 1994 crime bill, the largest such crime bill in US history. COPS' Campaign Cash According to [data provided by the nonpartisan research organization MapLight](http://maplight.org/us-congress/lobbying?client=Police), police unions and law enforcement lobbying groups have spent millions since 2008 to influence elected representatives and candidates, most of them Democrats. According to [MapLight data from April 1, 2009 to March 31, 2015](http://maplight.org/us-congress/interest/L1400), the top 10 Senate recipients of police and firefighter union and law enforcement lobbying contributions for the last six years are all Democrats. But while several of the top 10 Democrats on the list have introduced bills aimed at police reform, some have simultaneously supported the COPS hiring program or solicited funds for additional cops through other means. For example, after the uprisings in Baltimore following the death of Freddie Gray in police custody, [Sen. Gary Peters](http://maplight.org/us-congress/interest/L1400) (D-Michigan), who has received more than $20,000 from police and firefighter interests since 2009, authored the National Criminal Justice Commission Act of 2015, which would appoint 14 experts in law enforcement, civil liberties and human rights to review the criminal legal system and propose reforms. But in September, Peters [showed](http://www.peters.senate.gov/newsroom/press-releases/peters-stabenow-announce-more-than-2-million-to-hire-officers-for-west-michigan-police-departments) his support for the COPS program when he announced more than $2 million in grants from the program to hire additional officers for Michigan police departments in Grand Rapids and Kalamazoo. Additionally, Peters' bill to establish the National Criminal Justice Commission does not take a hard line against police practices; according to MapLight, police union and law enforcement lobbying groups [remain split regarding their position on the bill](http://maplight.org/us-congress/interest/L1400/bills). "[Police interests] spend the money so that they don't have to be held accountable." Another Democrat on the list, [Sen. Amy Klobuchar](http://maplight.org/us-congress/interest/L1400) (D-Minnesota), has received at least $20,000 from national police and firefighter interests since 2012 (and [at least $10,000](http://maplight.org/us-congress/contributions?s=1&office_party=all&election=all&politician=724&business_id=L1400&start=04%2F01%2F2009&end=03%2F31%2F2015) from the national FOP), and [introduced a bill in 2014](http://www.startribune.com/klobuchar-bill-would-extend-police-hiring/255735711/) proposing a $900 million extension of the COPS program that would have paid for 2,600 additional cops in cities across the United States, and kept the COPS program going for another six years. (The bill was not enacted.) Sen. Martin Heinrich (D-New Mexico) has received $18,500 from police and firefighter union interests during the last six years. While he has [called for full funding](http://www.heinrich.senate.gov/press-releases/heinrich-urges-full-funding-for-police-body-camera-program) of a US Department of Justice program that assists police departments in outfitting officers with body-worn cameras, [he also announced in June](http://www.heinrich.senate.gov/press-releases/nm-counties-to-receive-345-million-in-pilt-funding-for-schools-roads-local-police) that he secured more than $34.5 million in funding for counties throughout New Mexico through the payment in lieu of taxes program, which would, in part, provide additional funding for hiring police officers. According to the [MapLight data](http://maplight.org/us-congress/interest/L1400), from April 1, 2013 to March 31, 2015, the top 10 House recipients of police and firefighter union and law enforcement lobbying contributions for the previous two years were also all Democrats. [Rep. Steny Hoyer](http://maplight.org/us-congress/interest/L1400) (D-Maryland) has received more than $20,000 from police and firefighter interests since 2013, with [at least $10,000](http://maplight.org/us-congress/contributions?s=1&office_party=all&election=all&politician=293&business_id=L1400&start=04%2F01%2F2013&end=03%2F31%2F2015) from the FOP in 2014. He[called for increased investment](http://hoyer.house.gov/press-releases/hoyer-announces-release-of-police-hiring-funds-for-prince-georges-county/) in the COPS hiring recovery program when he announced the release of $11,782,760 in COPS grants for the hiring of 55 officers in Prince George's County in 2009. [Rep. Julia Brownley](http://maplight.org/us-congress/interest/L1400) (D-California), who has received $16,200 from police and firefighter interests in the last two years, [has advocated](https://juliabrownley.house.gov/media-center/press-releases/brownley-announces-cops-hiring-grant-for-santa-paula-police-department) for the House Appropriations Committee to increase funding of the COPS program. Law Enforcement's Lobbying Agenda According to MapLight's data, the national FOP has spent nearly $1.6 million since 2008 to lobby US lawmakers. Each year, the organization has spent about $220,000 on lobbying. The National Association of Police Organizations has spent at least $1.16 million since 2008 to lobby US lawmakers, [according to MapLight](http://maplight.org/us-congress/lobbying?client=Police). Among other police unions and groups that are [top lobbying spenders](http://maplight.org/us-congress/lobbying?client=Police) are the Bossier Parish Police Jury, spending $835,000; the International Association of Chiefs of Police, spending $760,000; and the International Union of Police Associations, spending $580,000. The Ohio Police and Fire Pension Fund is among the top spenders, spending $280,000 on lobbying since 2011. According to Hampton, Ohio has always been a stronghold for police unions, especially the FOP, where one of its national offices is located in Columbus. Former FOP president Dewey R. Stokes, who headed the organization from 1987 to 1995, came out of the Columbus, Ohio, police department. Again, another president, Steve Young, who led the FOP from 2001 to 2003, came from Marion, Ohio's department. Recently, two investigations in the shooting death of 12-year-old Tamir Rice in Cleveland, Ohio, [concluded](http://www.nytimes.com/2015/10/11/us/2-outside-reviews-say-cleveland-officer-acted-reasonably-in-shooting-tamir-rice-12.html?_r=0) that the officer who shot the boy last year, Timothy Loehmann, acted "reasonably" after he confronted Rice, who was carrying a toy gun. The Cleveland Police Patrolman's Association [has been criticized](http://www.nytimes.com/2015/10/12/us/tamir-rice-outside-reviews-cleveland-police-charges.html) for encouraging Loehmann and his partner, Frank Garmback, to maintain silence about the incident before investigators. Two Texas-based groups - the Dallas Police & Fire Pension System, spending $265,000, and the Texas Municipal Police Association, spending $205,000 - also neared the top of the national list. Dallas resident Collette Flanagan, who lost her son Clinton Allen, a 25-year-old who was unarmed, to a Dallas officer, Clark Staller, in March 2013, isn't surprised that these Texas associations were among the top lobbying spenders. "[Police interests] spend the money so that they don't have to be held accountable," Flanagan told Truthout. "They enjoy their immunity and impunity, and in their mind, because of the corrupt way of policing that has become the norm in the culture, they don't want to change." Flanagan founded [Mothers Against Police Brutality](http://www.mothersagainstpolicebrutality.com/) to be a voice for the families of police shooting victims who have been isolated by the criminal legal system. She described her recent experience testifying in Austin for changes to a Texas Senate bill authorizing grants for body-worn cameras to certain law enforcement agencies. She testified in support of requirements for how the cameras can be used. Flanagan told Truthout, however, that the capitol was packed with police union representatives from nearly every major city in the state who "got exactly what they wanted." The bill has since languished in the House. Exactly how much money law enforcement agencies spend on lobbying - largely to resist all manner of police reforms - remains difficult to surmise because of state-to-state differences in the types of reporting requirements for lobbyists working for public-sector unions compared to other kinds of lobbying groups. The actual totals are likely much, much higher than they seem on paper. According to the [latest Bureau of Justice Statistics census data](http://www.bjs.gov/content/pub/pdf/csllea08.pdf), there are more than 12,501 local police departments, 3,063 sheriffs' offices, 50 primary state police agencies and 1,733 special jurisdiction law enforcement agencies, among other agencies - some of which lobby, or hire lobbyists, operating under different standards than public-sector unions. "Most traditional unions have always been pro-people and pro-human rights and pro-civil rights, except for police unions." The law enforcement lobby [worked hard in 2014 to kill a bill](http://www.huffingtonpost.com/2014/04/02/sentencing-reform-opposition_n_5065403.html) that would roll back tough mandatory sentences for people convicted of federal drug offenses. This year, the lobby may have partially succeeded in influencing the recently unveiled Sentencing Reform and Corrections Act of 2015. Although the bill has been widely celebrated as a bipartisan achievement, many activists say it does not go far enough to reform existing mandatory minimum sentences - and also creates new mandatory minimums. In California and Minnesota, law enforcement lobbying [has worked to pressure lawmakers](http://www.mintpressnews.com/the-law-enforcement-lobbys-heavy-hand-in-american-policy/191557/) to once again prohibit medical marijuana and water down other kinds of medical marijuana legislation. The lobby is widely pushing back against the scaling back of drug war policies that have proved to be a cash cow for local police departments. The law enforcement lobby has also been [pushing back against increased transparency measures](https://www.aclu.org/blog/law-enforcements-lobbying-priority-states-fighting-transparency) like reporting and notice requirements, as well as legal protections regarding the police's use of location-tracking technologies, domestic drones, automatic license plate readers and access to electronic communications. Hampton witnessed several police unions testify in Washington, DC, in front of the President's Task Force on 21st Century Policing, telling Truthout that several union representatives, including those of the national FOP and the National Sheriffs' Association, testified that Michael Brown, Eric Garner and other victims of police killings essentially brought their deaths upon themselves. They even went so far as to claim their representatives should have a position on the President's Task Force on 21st Century Policing, he said. Hampton watched the national FOP and other police unions lobby strongly against affirmative action policies throughout the 1980s and challenge the NBPA as it brought affirmative action challenges on behalf of Black police officers. "They put their money where their mouth was," he said. "They invested in a great deal of litigation and legislation that opposed affirmative action." Flint Taylor, a founding partner of the People's Law Office in Chicago, has litigated many police brutality cases over the years as a civil rights defense attorney, including representing victims who were tortured under the watch of former Chicago Police Commander Jon Burge. In an [In These Times article](http://inthesetimes.com/working/entry/17520/police_unions_racist) earlier this year, Taylor outlined a history of police unions' role in thwarting and watering down efforts at police reform over the years. He traced the draconian criminal legal laws, including mandatory minimum drug sentencing, passed under Ronald Reagan's war on drugs to the rise of the law enforcement lobby's power nationally. "**That lobby hasn't gone away, and we see it as a counterforce now with 'Blue Lives Matter,**'" Taylor told Truthout. "**The cops are seizing on a counterattack politically." That reactionary counterattack has involved entrenched opposition and resistance to almost every kind of police reform effort that grassroots activists involved in the movement for Black lives have brought to the fore in the past year.** This law enforcement lobbying agenda has even caused tension within the labor movement over the role police unions play in the larger struggle for workers' rights. Graduate student employees in the University of California system and union members of the United Auto Workers Local 2865 [formed the Black Interests Coordinating Committee](http://www.truth-out.org/op-ed/item/32342-black-labor-organizers-urge-afl-cio-to-reexamine-its-ties-to-the-police) in an effort to pressure the AFL-CIO to end its the relationship with the International Union of Police Associations. "I have never ever in my career seen a police union in a traditional union light. Most traditional unions have always been pro-people and pro-human rights and pro-civil rights, except for police unions," Hampton said. He never joined a police union during his time as an officer in Washington, DC, because of his views about what the police unions represent. In fact, he even sued the Washington, DC, FOP over a dispute relating to his testimony opposing the death penalty for a Texas death row prisoner who had killed a police officer. Hampton says his refusal to join the union created tension with some of the other officers he worked with. "They wanted everybody to be 'blue,' but I'm not 'blue,' I'm Black," he said. In Taylor's view, the unions' efforts to thwart reforms and influence politicians would be stronger if not for the sustained pressure on elected representatives from a powerful grassroots movement. "It's very important and crucial that movements continue the pressure and the demands that they've been making, and that they don't let the Democratic or Republican or progressive politicians off the hook on this," Taylor said. The Local Impacts of the Law Enforcement Lobby Taylor said that **police unions like the FOP can have an even stronger impact at the local level,** citing Chicago [Judge Nicholas Ford's strong ties](http://www.chicagoreader.com/chicago/blind-justices/Content?oid=923777) to the FOP, which he says contributed to his campaign. In dealing with a case involving a Jon Burge torture victim, Taylor argued that a judge be recused from a case because of the judge's background in law enforcement and ties to the FOP. "There are too many judges who were former cops or state's attorneys, who had a law enforcement background, and once you have that law enforcement background, you normally also have either a direct or indirect connection to the union, the FOP," Taylor told Truthout. "**The FOP has a real impact on politics** at the local level in Chicago, which is Democratic politics." Taylor believes the influence of police unions during Jesus "Chuy" Garcia's campaign against Chicago Mayor Rahm Emanuel [partially led to Garcia's hesitancy](http://inthesetimes.com/article/17706/why_chuy_garcia_needs_to_condemn_rahms_secret_interrogation_site) in speaking out against the Homan Square black site that was revealed by the Guardian this spring. "The feeling was that Garcia had to pay some kind of deference to the FOP," Taylor said. "I think Chuy was trying to keep the FOP at bay." Flanagan cited similar problems in Dallas at the local level: Police unions often contribute to district attorney and judges' campaigns. She said that with police interests financing these local campaigns, the cops basically "own their seats." Flanagan went on to call for a federal mandate that would prohibit district attorneys and judges from accepting money from any police unions. "**You can't get [cops] indicted because the district attorneys and the judges are in bed with the police**," Flanagan said. Hampton says **the power that police unions have** on the local level is **why activists and advocates for police reform must support alternative, community-controlled oversight board structures for police agencies that would decrease the unions' local influence**. "[The unions] go straight for the jugular, in other words, they go straight for the politicians," Hampton said. "**They've got the money to invest. They've got the money to spend hours and days and weeks up on Capitol Hill, whether it's national or locally, because they also have the hand in the local legislation in this country**."

#### Republican majority kills climate change reform --- uniqueness and internal link. BAGLEY ’16:

BY KATHERINE BAGLEY, INSIDECLIMATE NEWS JAN 6, 2016 2016: The Politics of Climate Unlikely to Change

Environmental leaders said they will use advertising campaigns to emphasize how high the stakes are. The 12 remaining Republican presidential contenders either deny the scientific evidence for global warming or question humans' role in it. Businessman and TV personality Donald Trump, the leading GOP candidate, told CNN in September that he is "not a believer in climate change." In 2012, Trump posted on Twitter that global warming is a "concept...created by and for the Chinese in order to make U.S. manufacturing non-competitive." Mostof President Obama'sclimate action has been done through executive order, or through federal regulation, including the Clean Power Plan to cut carbon emissions from power plants. That means they are reversible by whoever wins the White House next. The international climate treaty signed in December did not require approval by Congress, but compliance is also voluntary. Congress has been one of the biggest roadblocks to climate action in the U.S., but with more than one-third of the Senate up for reelection along with the entire House, that could shift after Nov. 8. The same goes for the state level. Eight of the 12 open gubernatorial seats are considered winnable by either party, though some are more of a toss up then others.

### 1NC – Link/I-L Warming

#### Dems projected to win the senate, but it’s impossibly close. Third party funding will determine it. PETERSON 10/26

[Peterson, Kristina. “Democrats at Odds Over Shift of Money From Florida to Senate Races in Other States.” The Wal Street Journal. October 26, 2016. 2:46 pm. LHP MK]

**Democrats are divided over a decision to pull money out of** **the expensive Florida Senate race** in favor of a trio of cheaper competitive states, with some worried they aren’t taking advantage of Democratic nominee [Hillary Clinton](http://topics.wsj.com/person/C/hillary,-clinton/6344)’s momentum in the Sunshine State and could end up boosting Sen. Marco Rubio’s [future presidential ambitions](http://www.wsj.com/articles/republican-heavy-hitters-maneuver-with-an-eye-on-2020-1469136119). **The funding shift comes as Democrats see** an **increased chance of regaining the Senate majority** they lost two years ago, **but many of the races they would need to win to recapture control remain tight. With less than two weeks before the election, outside groups are diverting funds to the handful of races that will decide which party controls the Senate next year**. In September, the Democratic Senatorial Campaign Committee began taking money out the Florida Senate race between Mr. Rubio, the GOP incumbent, and Democratic Rep. Patrick Murphy. More recently, **Senate Majority PAC, which supports Senate Democrats, has** also **pulled back from the state**. Florida is one of the country’s most expensive places to air ads, with the two groups combined canceling around $16 million in ad reservations, according to Democratic operatives. Democrats are now diverting those funds into three, cheaper states with close Senate races: North Carolina, Missouri and Indiana. Their calculation is that they are likely to rack up more wins by spreading the money across three states than concentrating it in Florida, according to supporters of the strategy. Republicans currently hold 54 of the chamber’s seats. Democrats would need to pick up four net seats to take back the Senate majority, if Mrs. Clinton wins the White House and a Democratic vice-president could cast a tie-breaking vote. Some Democrats said the decision to pull money out of Florida is likely to help Mr. Rubio, a young, telegenic Hispanic Republican who ran in his party’s presidential primary this year and could pose a threat again in 2020. They argue that Mr. Rubio’s prospects would have been blunted if he lost this year’s Senate race after [ending his unsuccessful presidential bid in March](http://www.wsj.com/articles/marco-rubio-suspends-his-campaign-1458087888). “If Marco Rubio was to lose this race, he would be severely wounded,” said Florida Democratic donor Chris Korge, who hosted a fundraiser Mrs. Clinton attended at his house this week. “Floridians can’t afford to have somebody that liberal in the U.S. Senate,” Rubio campaign spokeswoman Olivia Perez-Cubas said, referring to Mr. Murphy.. “Florida already has a senator with a strong record of fighting for them, and that’s why they’re going to re-elect Marco.” Florida Democrats said the decision also fails to capitalize on Mrs. Clinton’s lead over GOP nominee [Donald Trump](http://topics.wsj.com/person/T/donald,-trump/159) in the swing state. After trailing Mr. Trump in the state earlier, Mrs. Clinton has edged ahead of him by almost two percentage points in the Real Clear Politics average of recent polls. “The objective is to take advantage of that enthusiasm,” said former Democratic Florida Rep. Robert Wexler, a Democratic donor. Mr. Wexler said the decision had also frustrated some Democratic donors in Florida to see their state’s race abandoned. “They are becoming a bit disillusioned that Florida hasn’t been as big a priority as they would have wished,” Mr. Wexler said. He said he understood Democrats’ national strategy, but that they could have used that as a reason to return to Florida donors and seek more funds for their state’s race. There are also differing opinions of how tight the Florida Senate race is. Some Democratic operatives said internal polling shows the contest as a virtual tie. The Real Clear Politics average shows Mr. Rubio leading by 3.6 percentage points. Some **Democrats hope** Sen. Charles Schumer of New York, **a key architect of Democrats’ campaign strategy, would dip into** his own **campaign chest to help Democrats in tighter races**. Mr. Schumer had more than $20 million in cash on hand at the end of September, though he has spent money since then. Left-leaning website The Daily Kos on Wednesday [asked readers to send messages](http://www.dailykos.com/story/2016/10/26/1587109/-Tell-Chuck-Schumer-to-use-his-20-million-war-chest-to-help-Patrick-Murphy-RetireRubio) to Mr. Schumer on Twitter, Facebook or through his campaign asking him to send more of his funds to Florida. Mr. Schumer’s office declined to comment. Mr. Schumer has so far this year transferred $3 million to Senate Democrats’ campaign arm and helped raise almost $4 million with other candidates in joint committees and contributions to state parties, according to a person familiar with his campaign.

#### The plan cause police lobby backlash to politicians associated with the aff - political climate slays police accountability reform and causes counter-lobbying against democrats. TRACEY ’14:

[Tracey, Michael. “The Pernicious Power of the Police Lobby.” Vice News. December 4, 2014. LHP MK]

​E​ric Garner was standing on a sidewalk one summer afternoon in Staten Island when Officer Daniel Pantaleo appeared, and within a matter of minutes Garner was dead. Michael Brown was walking down the street one summer afternoon in Ferguson when Officer Darren Wilson appeared, and within a matter of seconds Brown ended up dead. These encounters were random in a sense, but they were produced by a political context that has established a precedent in which agents of the state can accost citizens, bark orders, cause fatalities, and get away with it. Pantaleo might have applied a choke hold that the NYPD [specifica​lly prohibits](http://www.huffingtonpost.com/2014/10/07/nypd-chokeholds_n_5948972.html), and the whole sick episode might have been viewed on YouTube the world over, but we learned yesterday that the cop [​won't be prosecuted](http://www.vice.com/read/a-grand-jury-just-decided-not-to-indict-the-cop-who-put-eric-garner-in-a-lethal-chokehold-1203). Nevertheless, you can rest assured that innumerable commenters will eventually start echoing the sentiments of Nicole Wallace, a panelist on The View who [co​mplained](http://abc.go.com/shows/the-view/episode-guide/2014-12/02-tuesday-december-2-2014) Tuesday that America shows insufficient respect for the heroism of law enforcement officers. As evidence for this claim, she cited the predominance of supposedly anti-cop media narratives that have percolated since Wilson was exonerated last week. One hears this storyline often: Despite their sacrifices, cops somehow get a raw deal, and are unfairly demonized by a public that simply doesn't understand all they do to keep us safe. This is crazy. Boatloads of "respect" are constantly being heaped on the men and women who wear badges, and the political system caters to them at every turn. When politicians issue crowd-pleasing denunciations of "[s​pecial interests](http://www.nytimes.com/2007/12/19/us/politics/19edwards.html?_r=0)," they are typically referring to a narrowly prescribed set of industries: oil, banking, pharmaceuticals. Rarely are police lobbyists similarly targeted for scorn. This might be due in part to law enforcement advocates not appearing to engage in conventional "lobbying" activities—they operate under the auspices of groups with innocuous-sounding names like "Police Benevolent Association" or "National Sheriffs Association"—but like other interest groups, these entities advocate single-mindedly on behalf their memberships, frequently to the detriment of the greater good. Because of the political leverage accumulated over decades (if not centuries) by the police lobby, officers go about their daily beats with certain guarantees. For one, they will [alm​ost never](http://www.thenation.com/article/190937/why-its-impossible-indict-cop) be held personally liable for their bad conduct while on duty thanks to well-established doctrines like [qualifi​ed immunity](http://www.npr.org/2014/05/27/316484853/supreme-court-upholds-law-enforcements-qualified-immunity), which puts taxpayers on the hook for lawsuits filed as a result of police misconduct or brutality. They can also be assured that a robust formal and informal support network will be set into motion should they ever be accused of anything. Pantaleo reportedly characterized his attack to grand jurors as a "wrestling move," and they apparently bought it. Pantaleo enjoyed this privilege when New York City's powerful police union machinery kicked into high gear immediately following the choke hold incident, pushing an exculpatory narrative which contended that Garner had committed the high crime of selling untaxed cigarettes ([a claim​ for which there is no evidence](http://www.nydailynews.com/opinion/harry-siegel-lonesome-death-eric-garner-article-1.2032281)) and had a long rap sheet. Union bosses even absurdly [de​nied](http://www.dnainfo.com/new-york/20140805/civic-center/eric-garner-was-not-put-chokehold-police-unions-say) that Pantaleo used a choke hold in the first place. Astonishingly, it worked: Pantaleo reportedly characterized his attack to grand jurors as a "[wrestling ​move](http://www.nytimes.com/2014/12/04/nyregion/officer-told-grand-jury-he-meant-no-harm-to-eric-garner.html?_r=0)," and they apparently bought it. Given their track record of successfully weighting legal processes in favor of officers, the police lobby tends to be very confident, so much so that its leaders exhibit little compunction about openly disparaging the rare politician who goes against them. **In an** [**inter​view**](http://www.bloomberg.com/politics/articles/2014-11-25/how-police-unions-stopped-congress-from-militarization-reform) **with Bloomberg's Dave Weigel, Fraternal Order of Police executive director Jim Pasco mockingly referred to Hank Johnson—the Democratic Congressman who introduced a failed amendment in the House of Representatives aimed at stymieing the flow of militarized equipment to local departments—as a "real scholar" and "whasisname from Georgia."** This helps explain why even with robust bipartisan skepticism of [police militarization](http://www.vice.com/tag/police%20militarization), lawmakers have made zero progress in halting or even slowing it. Speaking on the House floor, Florida Republican Representative Richard Nugent— himself a former sheriff—[dismi​ssed](http://www.huffingtonpost.com/2014/11/24/police-demilitarization-bill_n_6215190.html) concerns about transferring military-grade gear to police as obviously ridiculous. How can we break this grip the police lobby has on the political process? For one thing, we'd need to develop alternate avenues through which elected officials could acquire political leverage. We also need to begin to think of law enforcement not just as protectors of the common good but an interest group like any other. That doesn't mean calling individual cops "pigs" or "murderers," it means modifying how police are viewed in the macro. For instance, it's probably worth communicating to the American people that [policing is not an especially dangerous​ job](http://www.bls.gov/iif/oshwc/cfoi/cfoi_rates_2013hb.pdf). According to the Bureau of Labor Statistics, truck drivers are twice as likely to die while working—and transporting goods from one place to another is a pretty important activity. Without truck drivers, our economy would collapse overnight. So why does it seem so ridiculous that we would lower a flag to half-mast to honor a truck driver who died in the line of duty? Why don't we have a [day to remem​ber](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Peace_Officers_Memorial_Day) the truck drivers who gave their lives to our country? Maybe if we stopped thinking of policing as such a hazardous job, we could adjust our policies and discourse accordingly. As of now, "officer safety" is regarded as indisputably paramount whenever we talk about the way cops interact with civilians; despite a precipitous [nation​wide decline in violent crime](http://www.nytimes.com/2014/12/03/nyregion/violent-crime-in-new-york-has-dropped-to-historic-low-mayor-de-blasio-says.html), officers and their union representatives routinely parrot the discredited notion that police must live in constant fear for their lives. As law professor and former cop Seth Stoughton [told ​me](https://twitter.com/PoliceLawProf/status/540186544192356352) over Twitter, "Within policing, the risks of intentional targeting are typically quite exaggerated." In fact, more than half of all police fatalities are [caused by traffic accidents](http://www.governing.com/gov-data/law-enforcement-fatality-rates-by-state.html). Of course there is always a chance of some mentally deranged person consciously seeking to harm officers, but should this remote possibility dictate routine police behavior, or influence our perception of the risks inherent to policing? Probably not. What if their overriding mantras were something along the lines of "serve the community" instead of "get home from your shift alive"? Since policing is widely thought to be incredibly dangerous, and those who wear the badge are seen to be making a profound personal sacrifice, it's not surprising that politicians defer to the police lobby. This deference, in turn, means that departments across the country have more opportunities to secure [federal grants for ov​ertime](http://www.whitehouse.gov/sites/default/files/docs/federal_support_for_local_law_enforcement_equipment_acquisition.pdf) and countless other perks. The culture of police unaccountability and impunity is partly what fostered Wilson and Pantaleo's mindsets, and though that mindset doesn't always lead to death, it results in violent and unpleasant altercations far too often. A public employee who knew his job security was contingent on democratic review from the taxpayers he's supposed to be serving might not so readily pick fights. This also might make policing safer, as young men (of any race) are less likely to lash out at cops they don't perceive as assholes. Police officers are endowed with enormous discretionary authority, and often must make split-second decisions about how best to apply their state-sanctioned powers of deadly force. In those pivotal milliseconds, which can determine whether a person lives or dies, basic instinct reigns supreme. No amount of racial sensitivity training or "National Conversations" are going to change how an officer reacts in such scenarios. What needs to change, then, is the incentives that lead cops to aggressively confront people who aren't committing a violent crime. Maybe if a different set of incentives were in place when Darren Wilson and Daniel Pantaleo embarked on their fatal exchanges, things might have turned out differently. What if their overriding mantras were something along the lines of "serve the community" instead of "get home from your shift alive"? The only way to change this is through difficult, tedious governmental reform—not fancy speeches or racial sensitivity seminars—and the police lobby will ferociously oppose such efforts at every step. Maybe the American political system is just too calcified to allow for these reforms. If that's the case, we should prepare ourselves for many more Michael Browns and many more Eric Garners.

#### That’ll flip democratic momentum --- the police lobby will lash out against democrats who they perceive to support the plan. BERND ’15:

[Bernd, Candice. “Is Campaign Cash From Police Unions Watering Down Democrats' Reform Efforts?” Truth-Out. October 14, 2015. All brackets originally in the document. LHP MK]

At every turn, **police unions and law enforcement lobbying groups have staunchly opposed measures aimed at policing reform.** They have been the first and loudest voices to defend the perpetrators of each new incident of police murder and brutality caught on camera - no matter how heinous. Most recently, in California, unions called on Gov. Jerry Brown to veto a [recently passed bill](http://www.huffingtonpost.com/entry/california-law-police-racial-profiling_5612fd05e4b0368a1a60c3ff) that aims to curb racial profiling by requiring police to report the race and other demographic features of any person stopped by an officer. Craig Lally, the president of the Los Angeles Police Protective League, called the law "a joke," while Lt. Steve James, who is president of the Long Beach Officers Association and the national trustee for the California Fraternal Order of Police (FOP), asserted that racial profiling does not exist, saying that police simply engage in "criminal profiling." But even **as Democratic lawmakers introduce** and pass **bills seeking police reforms** throughout the United States, **national police unions and law enforcement lobbying groups** like the FOP **are contributing campaign cash** to Democratic candidates this election cycle. Some of these candidates have embraced the mainstream rhetoric of "improving" and "rebuilding" police-community relations viewed as problematic by racial justice activists seeking a fundamentally different relation entirely. "**The Fraternal Order of Police have always been a force in supporting and lobbying against police reform**." It's these liberal-leaning politicians, the beneficiaries of police union campaign contributions, who have supported the Community Oriented Policing Services (COPS) program, established with the passage of the 1994 Violent Crime Control and Law Enforcement Act, which funnels federal grant money to local police forces that then use the money to hire more cops and purchase more equipment, including military gear and surveillance technologies. Rather than establishing trust in communities, this additional funding for local police [has exacerbated tensions and violence](http://www.truth-out.org/opinion/item/28267-liberals-trojan-horses-and-the-myth-of-police-community-relations), especially in urban, low-income communities of color. "[The FOP] have always been a force in supporting and lobbying against police reform, and for those kind of draconian police engagements that were based in 'law and order,'" said Ron Hampton, who is the former executive director of the National Black Police Association (NBPA). Hampton was also formerly a police officer in Washington, DC, from 1971 to 1994. "That has been their agenda and they have invested money in those politicians that support that." Hampton told Truthout that the 1994 omnibus crime bill passed under former President Bill Clinton with wide support among Democrats, and that the NBPA withheld support for the law because of its role in expanding the federal death penalty, and establishing an array of new crimes that would disproportionately impact communities of color, especially as it related to how the law affected immigration law statutes and gang-related crimes. "Twenty years later ... Bill Clinton and his wife should apologize for the mass incarceration that those laws created," Hampton said. "But there were Democrats, a whole lot of Democrats, that supported that ... because that was the theme of the day, and the unions had a lot to do with gathering up that support because that was what they wanted ... and they got it." Today, Democrats receiving campaign contributions from the national FOP still support the COPS program created by the 1994 crime bill, the largest such crime bill in US history. COPS' Campaign Cash According to [data provided by the nonpartisan research organization MapLight](http://maplight.org/us-congress/lobbying?client=Police), police unions and law enforcement lobbying groups have spent millions since 2008 to influence elected representatives and candidates, most of them Democrats. According to [MapLight data from April 1, 2009 to March 31, 2015](http://maplight.org/us-congress/interest/L1400), the top 10 Senate recipients of police and firefighter union and law enforcement lobbying contributions for the last six years are all Democrats. But while several of the top 10 Democrats on the list have introduced bills aimed at police reform, some have simultaneously supported the COPS hiring program or solicited funds for additional cops through other means. For example, after the uprisings in Baltimore following the death of Freddie Gray in police custody, [Sen. Gary Peters](http://maplight.org/us-congress/interest/L1400) (D-Michigan), who has received more than $20,000 from police and firefighter interests since 2009, authored the National Criminal Justice Commission Act of 2015, which would appoint 14 experts in law enforcement, civil liberties and human rights to review the criminal legal system and propose reforms. But in September, Peters [showed](http://www.peters.senate.gov/newsroom/press-releases/peters-stabenow-announce-more-than-2-million-to-hire-officers-for-west-michigan-police-departments) his support for the COPS program when he announced more than $2 million in grants from the program to hire additional officers for Michigan police departments in Grand Rapids and Kalamazoo. Additionally, Peters' bill to establish the National Criminal Justice Commission does not take a hard line against police practices; according to MapLight, police union and law enforcement lobbying groups [remain split regarding their position on the bill](http://maplight.org/us-congress/interest/L1400/bills). "[Police interests] spend the money so that they don't have to be held accountable." Another Democrat on the list, [Sen. Amy Klobuchar](http://maplight.org/us-congress/interest/L1400) (D-Minnesota), has received at least $20,000 from national police and firefighter interests since 2012 (and [at least $10,000](http://maplight.org/us-congress/contributions?s=1&office_party=all&election=all&politician=724&business_id=L1400&start=04%2F01%2F2009&end=03%2F31%2F2015) from the national FOP), and [introduced a bill in 2014](http://www.startribune.com/klobuchar-bill-would-extend-police-hiring/255735711/) proposing a $900 million extension of the COPS program that would have paid for 2,600 additional cops in cities across the United States, and kept the COPS program going for another six years. (The bill was not enacted.) Sen. Martin Heinrich (D-New Mexico) has received $18,500 from police and firefighter union interests during the last six years. While he has [called for full funding](http://www.heinrich.senate.gov/press-releases/heinrich-urges-full-funding-for-police-body-camera-program) of a US Department of Justice program that assists police departments in outfitting officers with body-worn cameras, [he also announced in June](http://www.heinrich.senate.gov/press-releases/nm-counties-to-receive-345-million-in-pilt-funding-for-schools-roads-local-police) that he secured more than $34.5 million in funding for counties throughout New Mexico through the payment in lieu of taxes program, which would, in part, provide additional funding for hiring police officers. According to the [MapLight data](http://maplight.org/us-congress/interest/L1400), from April 1, 2013 to March 31, 2015, the top 10 House recipients of police and firefighter union and law enforcement lobbying contributions for the previous two years were also all Democrats. [Rep. Steny Hoyer](http://maplight.org/us-congress/interest/L1400) (D-Maryland) has received more than $20,000 from police and firefighter interests since 2013, with [at least $10,000](http://maplight.org/us-congress/contributions?s=1&office_party=all&election=all&politician=293&business_id=L1400&start=04%2F01%2F2013&end=03%2F31%2F2015) from the FOP in 2014. He[called for increased investment](http://hoyer.house.gov/press-releases/hoyer-announces-release-of-police-hiring-funds-for-prince-georges-county/) in the COPS hiring recovery program when he announced the release of $11,782,760 in COPS grants for the hiring of 55 officers in Prince George's County in 2009. [Rep. Julia Brownley](http://maplight.org/us-congress/interest/L1400) (D-California), who has received $16,200 from police and firefighter interests in the last two years, [has advocated](https://juliabrownley.house.gov/media-center/press-releases/brownley-announces-cops-hiring-grant-for-santa-paula-police-department) for the House Appropriations Committee to increase funding of the COPS program. Law Enforcement's Lobbying Agenda According to MapLight's data, the national FOP has spent nearly $1.6 million since 2008 to lobby US lawmakers. Each year, the organization has spent about $220,000 on lobbying. The National Association of Police Organizations has spent at least $1.16 million since 2008 to lobby US lawmakers, [according to MapLight](http://maplight.org/us-congress/lobbying?client=Police). Among other police unions and groups that are [top lobbying spenders](http://maplight.org/us-congress/lobbying?client=Police) are the Bossier Parish Police Jury, spending $835,000; the International Association of Chiefs of Police, spending $760,000; and the International Union of Police Associations, spending $580,000. The Ohio Police and Fire Pension Fund is among the top spenders, spending $280,000 on lobbying since 2011. According to Hampton, Ohio has always been a stronghold for police unions, especially the FOP, where one of its national offices is located in Columbus. Former FOP president Dewey R. Stokes, who headed the organization from 1987 to 1995, came out of the Columbus, Ohio, police department. Again, another president, Steve Young, who led the FOP from 2001 to 2003, came from Marion, Ohio's department. Recently, two investigations in the shooting death of 12-year-old Tamir Rice in Cleveland, Ohio, [concluded](http://www.nytimes.com/2015/10/11/us/2-outside-reviews-say-cleveland-officer-acted-reasonably-in-shooting-tamir-rice-12.html?_r=0) that the officer who shot the boy last year, Timothy Loehmann, acted "reasonably" after he confronted Rice, who was carrying a toy gun. The Cleveland Police Patrolman's Association [has been criticized](http://www.nytimes.com/2015/10/12/us/tamir-rice-outside-reviews-cleveland-police-charges.html) for encouraging Loehmann and his partner, Frank Garmback, to maintain silence about the incident before investigators. Two Texas-based groups - the Dallas Police & Fire Pension System, spending $265,000, and the Texas Municipal Police Association, spending $205,000 - also neared the top of the national list. Dallas resident Collette Flanagan, who lost her son Clinton Allen, a 25-year-old who was unarmed, to a Dallas officer, Clark Staller, in March 2013, isn't surprised that these Texas associations were among the top lobbying spenders. "[Police interests] spend the money so that they don't have to be held accountable," Flanagan told Truthout. "They enjoy their immunity and impunity, and in their mind, because of the corrupt way of policing that has become the norm in the culture, they don't want to change." Flanagan founded [Mothers Against Police Brutality](http://www.mothersagainstpolicebrutality.com/) to be a voice for the families of police shooting victims who have been isolated by the criminal legal system. She described her recent experience testifying in Austin for changes to a Texas Senate bill authorizing grants for body-worn cameras to certain law enforcement agencies. She testified in support of requirements for how the cameras can be used. Flanagan told Truthout, however, that the capitol was packed with police union representatives from nearly every major city in the state who "got exactly what they wanted." The bill has since languished in the House. Exactly how much money law enforcement agencies spend on lobbying - largely to resist all manner of police reforms - remains difficult to surmise because of state-to-state differences in the types of reporting requirements for lobbyists working for public-sector unions compared to other kinds of lobbying groups. The actual totals are likely much, much higher than they seem on paper. According to the [latest Bureau of Justice Statistics census data](http://www.bjs.gov/content/pub/pdf/csllea08.pdf), there are more than 12,501 local police departments, 3,063 sheriffs' offices, 50 primary state police agencies and 1,733 special jurisdiction law enforcement agencies, among other agencies - some of which lobby, or hire lobbyists, operating under different standards than public-sector unions. "Most traditional unions have always been pro-people and pro-human rights and pro-civil rights, except for police unions." The law enforcement lobby [worked hard in 2014 to kill a bill](http://www.huffingtonpost.com/2014/04/02/sentencing-reform-opposition_n_5065403.html) that would roll back tough mandatory sentences for people convicted of federal drug offenses. This year, the lobby may have partially succeeded in influencing the recently unveiled Sentencing Reform and Corrections Act of 2015. Although the bill has been widely celebrated as a bipartisan achievement, many activists say it does not go far enough to reform existing mandatory minimum sentences - and also creates new mandatory minimums. In California and Minnesota, law enforcement lobbying [has worked to pressure lawmakers](http://www.mintpressnews.com/the-law-enforcement-lobbys-heavy-hand-in-american-policy/191557/) to once again prohibit medical marijuana and water down other kinds of medical marijuana legislation. The lobby is widely pushing back against the scaling back of drug war policies that have proved to be a cash cow for local police departments. The law enforcement lobby has also been [pushing back against increased transparency measures](https://www.aclu.org/blog/law-enforcements-lobbying-priority-states-fighting-transparency) like reporting and notice requirements, as well as legal protections regarding the police's use of location-tracking technologies, domestic drones, automatic license plate readers and access to electronic communications. Hampton witnessed several police unions testify in Washington, DC, in front of the President's Task Force on 21st Century Policing, telling Truthout that several union representatives, including those of the national FOP and the National Sheriffs' Association, testified that Michael Brown, Eric Garner and other victims of police killings essentially brought their deaths upon themselves. They even went so far as to claim their representatives should have a position on the President's Task Force on 21st Century Policing, he said. Hampton watched the national FOP and other police unions lobby strongly against affirmative action policies throughout the 1980s and challenge the NBPA as it brought affirmative action challenges on behalf of Black police officers. "They put their money where their mouth was," he said. "They invested in a great deal of litigation and legislation that opposed affirmative action." Flint Taylor, a founding partner of the People's Law Office in Chicago, has litigated many police brutality cases over the years as a civil rights defense attorney, including representing victims who were tortured under the watch of former Chicago Police Commander Jon Burge. In an [In These Times article](http://inthesetimes.com/working/entry/17520/police_unions_racist) earlier this year, Taylor outlined a history of police unions' role in thwarting and watering down efforts at police reform over the years. He traced the draconian criminal legal laws, including mandatory minimum drug sentencing, passed under Ronald Reagan's war on drugs to the rise of the law enforcement lobby's power nationally. "**That lobby hasn't gone away, and we see it as a counterforce now with 'Blue Lives Matter,**'" Taylor told Truthout. "**The cops are seizing on a counterattack politically." That reactionary counterattack has involved entrenched opposition and resistance to almost every kind of police reform effort that grassroots activists involved in the movement for Black lives have brought to the fore in the past year.** This law enforcement lobbying agenda has even caused tension within the labor movement over the role police unions play in the larger struggle for workers' rights. Graduate student employees in the University of California system and union members of the United Auto Workers Local 2865 [formed the Black Interests Coordinating Committee](http://www.truth-out.org/op-ed/item/32342-black-labor-organizers-urge-afl-cio-to-reexamine-its-ties-to-the-police) in an effort to pressure the AFL-CIO to end its the relationship with the International Union of Police Associations. "I have never ever in my career seen a police union in a traditional union light. Most traditional unions have always been pro-people and pro-human rights and pro-civil rights, except for police unions," Hampton said. He never joined a police union during his time as an officer in Washington, DC, because of his views about what the police unions represent. In fact, he even sued the Washington, DC, FOP over a dispute relating to his testimony opposing the death penalty for a Texas death row prisoner who had killed a police officer. Hampton says his refusal to join the union created tension with some of the other officers he worked with. "They wanted everybody to be 'blue,' but I'm not 'blue,' I'm Black," he said. In Taylor's view, the unions' efforts to thwart reforms and influence politicians would be stronger if not for the sustained pressure on elected representatives from a powerful grassroots movement. "It's very important and crucial that movements continue the pressure and the demands that they've been making, and that they don't let the Democratic or Republican or progressive politicians off the hook on this," Taylor said. The Local Impacts of the Law Enforcement Lobby Taylor said that **police unions like the FOP can have an even stronger impact at the local level,** citing Chicago [Judge Nicholas Ford's strong ties](http://www.chicagoreader.com/chicago/blind-justices/Content?oid=923777) to the FOP, which he says contributed to his campaign. In dealing with a case involving a Jon Burge torture victim, Taylor argued that a judge be recused from a case because of the judge's background in law enforcement and ties to the FOP. "There are too many judges who were former cops or state's attorneys, who had a law enforcement background, and once you have that law enforcement background, you normally also have either a direct or indirect connection to the union, the FOP," Taylor told Truthout. "**The FOP has a real impact on politics** at the local level in Chicago, which is Democratic politics." Taylor believes the influence of police unions during Jesus "Chuy" Garcia's campaign against Chicago Mayor Rahm Emanuel [partially led to Garcia's hesitancy](http://inthesetimes.com/article/17706/why_chuy_garcia_needs_to_condemn_rahms_secret_interrogation_site) in speaking out against the Homan Square black site that was revealed by the Guardian this spring. "The feeling was that Garcia had to pay some kind of deference to the FOP," Taylor said. "I think Chuy was trying to keep the FOP at bay." Flanagan cited similar problems in Dallas at the local level: Police unions often contribute to district attorney and judges' campaigns. She said that with police interests financing these local campaigns, the cops basically "own their seats." Flanagan went on to call for a federal mandate that would prohibit district attorneys and judges from accepting money from any police unions. "**You can't get [cops] indicted because the district attorneys and the judges are in bed with the police**," Flanagan said. Hampton says **the power that police unions have** on the local level is **why activists and advocates for police reform must support alternative, community-controlled oversight board structures for police agencies that would decrease the unions' local influence**. "[The unions] go straight for the jugular, in other words, they go straight for the politicians," Hampton said. "**They've got the money to invest. They've got the money to spend hours and days and weeks up on Capitol Hill, whether it's national or locally, because they also have the hand in the local legislation in this country**."

#### Republican majority kills climate change reform --- uniqueness and internal link. BAGLEY ’16:

BY KATHERINE BAGLEY, INSIDECLIMATE NEWS JAN 6, 2016 2016: The Politics of Climate Unlikely to Change

Environmental leaders said they will use advertising campaigns to emphasize how high the stakes are. The 12 remaining Republican presidential contenders either deny the scientific evidence for global warming or question humans' role in it. Businessman and TV personality Donald Trump, the leading GOP candidate, told CNN in September that he is "not a believer in climate change." In 2012, Trump posted on Twitter that global warming is a "concept...created by and for the Chinese in order to make U.S. manufacturing non-competitive." Mostof President Obama'sclimate action has been done through executive order, or through federal regulation, including the Clean Power Plan to cut carbon emissions from power plants. That means they are reversible by whoever wins the White House next. The international climate treaty signed in December did not require approval by Congress, but compliance is also voluntary. Congress has been one of the biggest roadblocks to climate action in the U.S., but with more than one-third of the Senate up for reelection along with the entire House, that could shift after Nov. 8. The same goes for the state level. Eight of the 12 open gubernatorial seats are considered winnable by either party, though some are more of a toss up then others.

#### \*Insert desired impact for warming\*

### Warming – Heavy util

#### Global warming causes extinction through new weapons, diseases, terrorism, and nuclear wars and also magnifies the risk of every potential impact – comparative risk analysis means my impacts outweighs because any reason to think their impact is important just means climate change exacerbates that and is more important – default to ev that directly compares impact risk cause my authors crunched the numbers on your impacts already – also the newest ev and newest studies, TORRES 16:

“Climate Change Is the Most Urgent Existential Risk” July 22, 2016 Phil Torres Phil Torres is an author, Affiliate Scholar at the Institute for Ethics and Emerging Technologies, and founder of the X-Risks Institute. He has published widely on emerging technologies, terrorism, and existential risks, with articles appearing in the Bulletin of the Atomic Scientists. LHP SG

Why? Because these ongoing catastrophes in slow-motion will frame our existential predicament on Earth not just for the rest of this century, but [for literally thousands of years](http://www.climate.unibe.ch/~stocker/papers/clark16natcc.pdf) to come. As such, they have the capacity to raise or lower the probability of other risks scenarios unfolding. Ask yourself the following: are wars [are] more or less likely in a world marked by extreme weather events, megadroughts, food supply disruptions, and sea-level rise? Are terrorist attacks more or less likely in a world beset by [the collapse of global ecosystems](http://www.nature.com/nature/journal/v486/n7401/full/nature11018.html%253Fa_aid%253D3598aabf?message-global=remove&a_aid=3598aabf%2523auth-1), agricultural failures, [and] economic uncertainty, and political instability? Both government officials and scientists agree that the answer is “more likely.” For example, the current Director of the CIA, John Brennan, recently [identified](http://www.cnsnews.com/news/article/cnsnewscom-staff/cia-director-cites-impact-climate-change-deeper-cause-global) “the impact of climate change” as one of the “deeper causes of this rising instability” in countries like Syria, Iraq, Yemen, Libya, and Ukraine. Similarly, the former Secretary of Defense, Chuck Hagel, has [described](https://www.scribd.com/doc/242845848/Read-DoD-report-2014-Climate-Change-Adaptation-Roadmap) climate change as a “threat multiplier” with “the potential to exacerbate[s] many of the challenges we are dealing with today — from infectious disease to terrorism.” The Department of Defense has also affirmed a connection. In [a 2015 report](http://www.defense.gov/news-article-view/article/612710), it states, “Global climate change will aggravate problems such as poverty, social tensions, environmental degradation, ineffectual leadership and weak political institutions that threaten stability in a number of countries.” Scientific studies have further shown a connection between the environmental crisis and [to] violent conflicts. For example, [a 2015 paper](http://www.pnas.org/content/112/11/3241.abstract) in the Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences argues that climate change was a causal factor behind the record-breaking 2007-2010 drought in Syria. This drought led to a mass migration of farmers into urban centers, which fueled the 2011 Syrian civil war. Some observers, including myself, have suggested that this struggle could be [the beginning of World War III](http://www.salon.com/2015/12/20/is_this_how_world_war_iii_begins_religion_end_times_terror_and_the_frightening_new_middle_east_tinderbox/), given the complex tangle of international involvement and overlapping interests. The study’s conclusion is also significant because the Syrian civil war was the Petri dish in which the Islamic State consolidated its forces, later emerging as the largest and most powerful terrorist organization in human history. The point is that climate change and biodiversity loss could very easily push societies to the brink of collapse. This will exacerbate existing geopolitical tensions and introduce entirely new power struggles between state and nonstate actors. At the same time, advanced technologies will very likely become increasingly powerful and accessible. As [I’ve written elsewhere](http://media.wix.com/ugd/d9aaad_a2bb594c8ead4ce5bbfc8e8a54534b50.pdf), the malicious agents of the future will have bulldozers rather than shovels to dig mass graves for their enemies. The result is a perfect storm of more conflicts in the world along with unprecedentedly dangerous weapons. If the conversation were to end here, we’d have ample reason for placing climate change and biodiversity loss at the top of our priority lists. But there are other reasons they ought to be considered urgent threats. I would argue that they could make humanity more vulnerable to a catastrophe involving superintelligence and even asteroids. The basic reasoning is the same for both cases. Consider superintelligence first. Programming a superintelligence whose values align with ours is a formidable task even in stable circumstances. As Nick Bostrom argues in [his 2014 book](https://www.amazon.com/Superintelligence-Dangers-Strategies-Nick-Bostrom/dp/0198739834/ref=sr_1_1?ie=UTF8&qid=1468887102&sr=8-1&keywords=superintelligence+bostrom), we should recognize the “default outcome” of superintelligence to be “doom.” Now imagine trying to solve these problems amidst a rising tide of interstate wars, civil unrest, terrorist attacks, and other tragedies? The societal stress caused by climate change and biodiversity loss will almost certainly compromise important conditions for creating friendly AI, such as sufficient funding, academic programs to train new scientists, conferences on AI, peer-reviewed journal publications, and communication/collaboration between experts of different fields, such as computer science and ethics. It could even make an “AI arms race” more likely, thereby raising the probability of a [malevolent superintelligence being created either on purpose or by mistake](http://studylib.net/doc/13908183/taxonomy-of-pathways-to-dangerous-artificial-intelligence...). Similarly, imagine that astronomers discover a behemoth asteroid barreling toward Earth. Will designing, building, and launching a spacecraft to divert the assassin past our planet be easier or more difficult in a world preoccupied with other survival issues? In a relatively peaceful world, one could imagine an asteroid actually bringing humanity together by directing our attention toward a common threat. But if the “conflict multipliers” of climate change and biodiversity loss have already catapulted civilization into chaos and turmoil, I strongly suspect that humanity will become more, rather than less, susceptible to dangers of this sort. We can describe the dual threats of climate change and biodiversity loss as “context risks.” Neither is likely to directly cause the extinction of our species. But both will define the context in which civilization confronts all the other threats before us. In this way, they could indirectly contribute to the overall danger of annihilation — and this worrisome effect could be significant. For example, according to the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change, the effects of climate change will be “severe,” “pervasive,” and “irreversible.” Or, as [a 2016 study](http://www.climate.unibe.ch/~stocker/papers/clark16natcc.pdf) published in Nature and authored by over twenty scientists puts it, the consequences of climate change “will extend longer than the entire history of human civilization thus far.” Furthermore, [a recent article](http://advances.sciencemag.org/content/1/5/e1400253.full?con=&dom=pscau&src=syndication) in Science Advances confirms that humanity has already escorted the biosphere into the sixth mass extinction event in life’s 3.8 billion year history on Earth. Yet [another study](http://www.nature.com/nature/journal/v486/n7401/full/nature11018.html) suggests that we could be approaching a sudden, irreversible, catastrophic collapse of the global ecosystem. If this were to occur, it could result in “widespread social unrest, economic instability and loss of human life.” Given the potential for environmental degradation to elevate the likelihood of nuclear wars, nuclear terrorism, engineered pandemics, a superintelligence takeover, and perhaps even an impact winter, it ought to take precedence over all other risk concerns — at least in the near-term. Let’s make sure we get our priorities straight.

### Warming – Generic

#### Extinction – the disadvantaged lose first, Snow and Hannam 14’

Climate change could make humans extinct, warns health expert March 31, 2014 Deborah Snow, Peter Hannam

The Earth is warming so rapidly that unless humans can arrest the trend, we risk becoming ''extinct'' as a species, a leading Australian health academic has warned. Helen Berry, associate dean in the faculty of health at the University of Canberra, said while the Earth has been warmer and colder at different points in the planet's history, the rate of change has never been as fast as it is today. ''What is remarkable, and alarming, is the speed of the change since the 1970s, when we started burning a lot of fossil fuels in a massive way,'' she said. ''We can't possibly evolve to match this rate [of warming] and, unless we get control of it, it will mean our extinction eventually.'' Professor Berry is one of three leading academics who have contributed to the health chapter of a Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) report due on Monday. She and co-authors Tony McMichael, of the Australian National University, and Colin Butler, of the University of Canberra, have outlined the health risks of rapid global warming in a companion piece for The Conversation, also published on Monday. The three warn that the adverse effects on population health and social stability have been ''missing from the discussion'' on climate change. ''Human-driven climate change poses a great threat, unprecedented in type and scale, to wellbeing, health and perhaps even to human survival,'' they write. They predict that the greatest challenges will come from undernutrition and impaired child development from reduced food yields; hospitalisations and deaths due to intense heatwaves, fires and other weather-related disasters; and the spread of infectious diseases. They warn the ''largest impacts'' will be on poorer and vulnerable populations, winding back recent hard-won gains of social development programs.

## Warming 2N Frontline

### A2 Ice Age

### ---Warming now

#### Even if there’s ice age in isolated incidents, warming is the overall global trend. BLITZ 10/29:

[Blitz, Bethany. “CLIMATE CHANGE PANEL TALKS FEARS, CHANGES, OPTIONS.” Hagadone News Network. October 29, 2016. LHP MK]

COEUR d’ALENE — A black, 5.7 pound brick sat on a table at the back of a conference room in North Idaho College’s student union building. Four panel **members from around Coeur d’Alene sat in front of the room, ready to talk about climate change**, its implications and how people can fight it locally. Under the brick was a description: “This is the approximate amount of carbon that is put into the atmosphere when one gallon of gasoline is burned in a conventional automobile engine.” Once the carbon combines with atmospheric oxygen, the description continued, it creates about 19 pounds of atmospheric pressure. **Fear was one of many concepts brought up at the climate panel discussion** hosted by Climate Action Coeur d’Alene, a group within Kootenai, “Fear of reality can be a really good motivator short term; it causes you to react quickly,” said Brian Henning, one of the panel members and a philosophy and environmental studies professor at Gonzaga University. “But I’m not convinced fear is something that can motivate people for 100 years, even if it’s true.” **The discussion turned to how to motivate people in the community to care about climate change**. Panel members Kiira Siitari, a staff biologist with the Idaho Department of Fish and Game, and Caj Matheson, the cultural resources protection manager of the Coeur d’Alene Tribe, both agreed that experiencing nature and the world around us can easily convince someone to take care of it. “The biggest conservation minded people are the ones out there using the resources, hunting and fishing,” Siitari said. “We were part of a society that flourished as part of this area,” Matheson added. “We have a relationship with the land, and that implies a give and take.” Matheson also said that by giving animals pronouns usually associated with people, such as “he” or “she” instead of “it,” the Tribe has a closer relationship and respect for animals in the area. A member of the audience asked panel members whether the statistic that Earth’s temperature has risen 2 degrees celsius is correct and “how quickly can we expect catastrophic climate change?” Jamie Esler, an environmental studies teacher at Lake City High School, responded that there is more to data points than might meet the eye. He said **Earth’s global temperature is based on the running average from 1980 to 2000 and any spikes or decreases are reported off that average temperature.** He also said predicting what’s going to happen is very hard. Some of the best scientists in the world have been working to figure out potential outcomes of different fluctuations in the earth’s temperature. “We don’t know how much water there really is on earth, and water can absorb huge amounts of energy,” he said. “That then affects many other systems because of how **heat moves throughout the planet**.” Hennig, the philosophy professor from Gonzaga, touched on the argument that Earth has seen varying temperature in its history. “We’ve had these changes in the past,” he said. “Usually they take thousands of years to have a 6 degree difference. This change is going to happen in a century. The challenge is speed. Things can adapt if they have 10- or 20,000 years.” The night ended with the question, “what can we do individually and as a community?” Siitari said people first have to think about why they are attached to a place. “**We’re going to have to be flexible on what our world looks like,** on what Coeur d’Alene looks like,” she said. “But that doesn’t mean we have to give up our values.” Matheson agreed people need to be more attached “emotionally and practically to our land.” Esler said **people need to understand that climate change and global warming is happening now. “Once we accept that we are living with it on a day to day basis, people are more likely to react**,” he said. Hennig said political involvement can help a lot. “When that legislation is in front of you, vote for it,” he said. “Even if it’s not perfect, it’s better than its absence.”

### ---Warming -> Ice Age

**Turn — Warming shuts down the ocean conveyor triggering the next ice age. Hartmann[[1]](#footnote-1)**

While **global warming** is being officially ignored by the political arm of the Bush administration, and Al Gore's recent conference on the topic during one of the coldest days of recent years provided joke fodder for conservative talk show hosts, the citizens of Europe and the Pentagon are taking a new look at the greatest danger such climate **change could produce** for the northern hemisphere - a sudden shift into **a new ice age**. What they're finding is not at all comforting. In quick summary, **if enough** cold, fresh **water** coming **from** the **melting** polar **ice caps and** the melting **glaciers** of Greenland **flows into the northern Atlantic, it will shut down the Gulf Stream**, which keeps Europe and northeastern North America warm. The worst-case scenario would be a full-blown return of the last ice age - in a period as short as 2 to 3 years from its onset - and the mid-case scenario would be a period like the "little ice age" of a few centuries ago that disrupted worldwide weather patterns leading to extremely harsh winters, droughts, worldwide desertification, crop failures, and wars around the world. Here's how it works. If you look at a globe, you'll see that the latitude of much of Europe and Scandinavia is the same as that of Alaska and permafrost-locked parts of northern Canada and central Siberia. Yet Europe has a climate more similar to that of the United States than northern Canada or Siberia. Why? It turns out that our warmth is the result of ocean currents that bring warm surface water up from the equator into northern regions that would otherwise be so cold that even in summer they'd be covered with ice. The current of greatest concern is often referred to as "The Great Conveyor Belt," which includes what we call the Gulf Stream. The Great Conveyor Belt, while shaped by the Coriolis effect of the Earth's rotation, is mostly driven by the greater force created by differences in water temperatures and salinity. The North Atlantic Ocean is saltier and colder than the Pacific, the result of it being so much smaller and locked into place by the Northern and Southern American Hemispheres on the west and Europe and Africa on the east. As a result, the warm water of the Great Conveyor Belt evaporates out of the North Atlantic leaving behind saltier waters, and the cold continental winds off the northern parts of North America cool the waters. Salty, cool waters settle to the bottom of the sea, most at a point a few hundred kilometers south of the southern tip of Greenland, producing a whirlpool of falling water that's 5 to 10 miles across. While the whirlpool rarely breaks the surface, during certain times of year it does produce an indentation and current in the ocean that can tilt ships and be seen from space (and may be what we see on the maps of ancient mariners). This falling column of cold, salt-laden water pours itself to the bottom of the Atlantic, where it forms an undersea river forty times larger than all the rivers on land combined, flowing south down to and around the southern tip of Africa, where it finally reaches the Pacific. Amazingly, the water is so deep and so dense (because of its cold and salinity) that it often doesn't surface in the Pacific for as much as a thousand years after it first sank in the North Atlantic off the coast of Greenland. The out-flowing undersea river of cold, salty water makes the level of the Atlantic slightly lower than that of the Pacific, drawing in a strong surface current of warm, fresher water from the Pacific to replace the outflow of the undersea river. This warmer, fresher water slides up through the South Atlantic, loops around North America where it's known as the Gulf Stream, and ends up off the coast of Europe. By the time it arrives near Greenland, it's cooled off and evaporated enough water to become cold and salty and sink to the ocean floor, providing a continuous feed for that deep-sea river flowing to the Pacific. These two flows - warm, fresher water in from the Pacific, which then grows salty and cools and sinks to form an exiting deep sea river - are known as the Great Conveyor Belt. Amazingly, the Great Conveyor Belt is only thing between comfortable summers and a permanent ice age for Europe and the eastern coast of North America. Much of this science was unknown as recently as twenty years ago. Then an international group of **scientists** went to Greenland and used newly developed **drilling** and sensing equipment to drill into some of the world's most ancient accessible glaciers. Their instruments were so sensitive that when they analyzed the **ice core samples** they brought up, they **were able to** look at individual years of snow. The results were shocking. Prior to the last decades, it was thought that the periods between glaciations and warmer times in North America, Europe, and North Asia were gradual. We knew from the fossil record that the Great Ice Age period began a few million years ago, and during those years there were times where for hundreds or thousands of years North America, Europe, and Siberia were covered with thick sheets of ice year-round. In between these icy times, there were periods when the glaciers thawed, bare land was exposed, forests grew, and land animals (including early humans) moved into these northern regions. Most scientists figured the transition time from icy to warm was gradual, lasting dozens to hundreds of years, and nobody was sure exactly what had caused it. (Variations in solar radiation were suspected, as were volcanic activity, along with early theories about the Great Conveyor Belt, which, until recently, was a poorly understood phenomenon.) Looking at the ice cores, however, scientists were shocked to **discover** that the **transitions from ice age-like weather to contemporary-type weather usually took only two or three years**. Something was flipping the weather of the planet back and forth with a rapidity that was startling. It turns out that the ice age versus temperate weather patterns weren't part of a smooth and linear process, like a dimmer slider for an overhead light bulb. They are part of a delicately balanced teeter-totter, which can exist in one state or the other, but transits through the middle stage almost overnight. They more resemble a light switch, which is off as you gradually and slowly lift it, until it hits a mid-point threshold or "breakover point" where suddenly the state is flipped from off to on and the light comes on. It appears that small (less that .1 percent) variations in solar energy happen in roughly 1500-year cycles. This cycle, for example, is what brought us the "Little Ice Age" that started around the year 1400 and dramatically cooled North America and Europe (we're now in the warming phase, recovering from that). When the ice in the Arctic Ocean is frozen solid and locked up, and the glaciers on Greenland are relatively stable, this variation warms and cools the Earth in a very small way, but doesn't affect the operation of the Great Conveyor Belt that brings moderating warm water into the North Atlantic. In millennia past, however, before the Arctic totally froze and locked up, and before some critical threshold amount of fresh water was locked up in the Greenland and other glaciers, these 1500-year variations in solar energy didn't just slightly warm up or cool down the weather for the landmasses bracketing the North Atlantic. They flipped on and off periods of total glaciation and periods of temperate weather. And these changes came suddenly. For early humans living in Europe 30,000 years ago - when the cave paintings in France were produced - the weather would be pretty much like it is today for well over a thousand years, giving people a chance to build culture to the point where they could produce art and reach across large territories. And then a particularly hard winter would hit. The spring would come late, and summer would never seem to really arrive, with the winter snows appearing as early as September. The next winter would be brutally cold, and the next spring didn't happen at all, with above-freezing temperatures only being reached for a few days during August and the snow never completely melting. After that, the summer never returned: for 1500 years the snow simply accumulated and accumulated, deeper and deeper, as the continent came to be covered with glaciers and humans either fled or died out. (Neanderthals, who dominated Europe until the end of these cycles, appear to have been better adapted to cold weather than Homo sapiens.) **What brought on this sudden "disappearance of summer" period was that the warm-water currents** of the Great Conveyor Belt had **shut down**. Once the Gulf Stream was no longer flowing, it only took a year or three for the last of the residual heat held in the North Atlantic Ocean to dissipate into the air over Europe, and then there was no more warmth to moderate the northern latitudes. When the summer stopped in the north, the rains stopped around the equator: At the same time Europe was plunged into an Ice Age, the Middle East and Africa were ravaged by drought and wind-driven firestorms. **If the** Great ConveyorBelt**,** which includes the Gulf Stream, **were to stop flowing** today, the result would be sudden and dramatic. **Winter would set in for** the eastern half of **North America and** all of **Europe** and Siberia, **and never go away.** Within three years, **those regions would become uninhabitable and** nearly two billion humans **would** starve, **freeze to death**, or have to relocate. **Civilization** as we know it probably **couldn't withstand the impact** of such a crushing blow. And, incredibly, the Great Conveyor Belt has hesitated a few times in the past decade. As William H. Calvin points out in one of the best books available on this topic ("A Brain For All Seasons: human evolution & abrupt climate change"): ".the abrupt cooling in the last warm period shows that a flip can occur in situations much like the present one. What could possibly halt the salt-conveyor belt that brings tropical heat so much farther north and limits the formation of ice sheets? Oceanographers are busy studying present-day failures of annual flushing, which give some perspective on the catastrophic failures of the past. "In the Labrador Sea, flushing failed during the 1970s, was strong again by 1990, and is now declining. In the Greenland Sea over the 1980s salt sinking declined by 80 percent. Obviously, local failures can occur without catastrophe - it's a question of how often and how widespread the failures are - but the present state of decline is not very reassuring." Most scientists involved in research on this topic agree that the culprit is global warming, melting the icebergs on Greenland and the Arctic icepack and thus flushing cold, fresh water down into the Greenland Sea from the north. When a critical threshold is reached, **the** climate will suddenly switch to **an ice age** that could last minimally 700 or so years, and maximally over 100,000 years. And when might that threshold be reached? Nobody knows - the action of the Great Conveyor Belt in defining ice ages was discovered only in the last decade. Preliminary computer models and scientists willing to speculate suggest the switch could flip as early as next year, or it may be generations from now. It may be wobbling right now, producing the extremes of weather we've seen in the past few years. What's almost certain is that **if nothing is done about global warming**, it **will happen sooner rather than later.**

## Uniqueness 2N Block

### Iz close

**Democrats predicted to win, but its close. THORNTON 11/3:**

[David Thornton, 11-3-2016, "Democrats Poised To Win Control of Senate," No Publication, <http://theresurgent.com/democrats-poised-to-win-control-of-senate/>. LHP MK]

A month ago, the GOP seemed to be the odds-on favorite to [retain control of the Senate](http://theresurgent.com/gop-poised-to-retain-senate-with-smaller-majority/). With the tumultuous month of October behind us, the odds seem to have shifted slightly to favor the Democrats regaining control. The Democrats have a structural advantage due to the fact that they are defending only 10 seats while Republicans are defending 24. Only one Democratic seat, the Nevada seat of the retiring Harry Reid, was considered at risk. A total of eight Republican seats, many in blue or purple states, are threatened. Many of these at-risk seats were won in the Tea Party wave election of 2010. Wave elections often allow weak candidates to win who cannot retain their seat when political conditions return to normal. [FiveThirtyEight](http://fivethirtyeight.com/features/senate-update-pennsylvania-swings-left-indiana-and-wisconsin-right/) puts the chances that the Democrats will win the Senate at over 60 percent. A recent blog post noted that four of the eight most hotly contested races have seen major shifts. Three races have shifted toward the Republicans and one toward the Democrats. Indiana, New Hampshire and Wisconsin have moved slightly toward the Republicans while Pennsylvania now favors the Democratic challenger. Here are summaries on the battleground Senate races for Republican seats: In [Florida](http://www.realclearpolitics.com/epolls/2016/senate/fl/florida_senate_rubio_vs_murphy-5222.html), Sen. Marco Rubio’s lead over Democrat Patrick Murphy has tightened slightly, but Rubio is still the clear favorite. In [Illinois](http://www.realclearpolitics.com/epolls/2016/senate/il/illinois_senate_kirk_vs_duckworth-5432.html), Sen. Mark Kirk’s seat is all but lost. Rep. Tammy Duckworth’s lead has widened to 13 points in the Real Clear Politics average after Kirk made [an embarrassing comment](http://www.usatoday.com/story/news/politics/onpolitics/2016/10/28/mark-kirk-under-fire-comments-tammy-duckworths-thai-heritage/92879442/) about Duckworth’s heritage. In [Indiana](http://www.realclearpolitics.com/epolls/2016/senate/in/indiana_senate_young_vs_bayh-6003.html), a race previously considered a Democrat lock, Rep. Todd Young (R) was tied with former Senator Evan Bayh (D) in a recent poll. FiveThirtyEight’s models show Young’s chances of taking the seat surging from 30 percent to 45 percent. The seat is currently held by Republican Dan Coats, who is retiring. In [Missouri](http://www.realclearpolitics.com/epolls/2016/senate/mo/missouri_senate_blunt_vs_kander-5631.html), Sen. Roy Blunt is in a tossup race with Secretary of State Jason Kander. FiveThirtyEight gives the race as a 55 percent chance of going to the Democrats, a slight improvement for Blunt. In [New Hampshire](http://www.realclearpolitics.com/epolls/2016/senate/nh/new_hampshire_senate_ayotte_vs_hassan-3862.html), Sen. Kelly Ayotte seems to be maintaining a margin-of-error lead over Gov. Maggie Hassan. FiveThirtyEight has downgraded Hassan’s chances of winning the seat from 67 to 56 percent. The race is still a tossup, but with slightly better odds for Ayotte. In [North Carolina](http://www.realclearpolitics.com/epolls/2016/senate/nc/north_carolina_senate_burr_vs_d_ross-5693.html), Sen. Richard Burr’s race with state Rep. Deborah Ross is still a tossup. FiveThirtyEight puts Ross’s chances of taking the seat at 34 percent, down nine percent from two weeks ago. In [Ohio](http://www.realclearpolitics.com/epolls/2016/senate/oh/ohio_senate_portman_vs_strickland-5386.html), Sen. Rob Portman’s seat seems to be reliably Republican. Portman holds a double-digit advantage over Gov. Ted Strickland. In [Pennsylvania](http://www.realclearpolitics.com/epolls/2016/senate/pa/pennsylvania_senate_toomey_vs_mcginty-5074.html), Sen. Pat Toomey has trailed Katie McGinty in nine straight polls. The race is still close, with McGinty leading by an average of less than four points, but FiveThirtyEight has moved the race from a tossup to a 73 percent chance of a Democratic victory. In [Wisconsin](http://www.realclearpolitics.com/epolls/2016/senate/wi/wisconsin_senate_johnson_vs_feingold-3740.html), Sen. Ron Johnson’s chances are still not good. Former Democrat Sen. Russ Feingold has consistently led the race. FiveThirtyEight says that the race has moved slightly in Johnson’s favor, but Feingold still has a 90 percent chance of retaking the seat. The sole Democratic battleground seat is [Nevada](http://www.realclearpolitics.com/epolls/2016/senate/nv/nevada_senate_heck_vs_cortez_masto-5982.html). This race is a tossup between Rep. Joe Heck (R) and Attorney General Catherine Cortez Masto. Heck holds a slight advantage in the RCP average of polls, but FiveThirtyEight gives Cortez Masto almost a 60 percent chance of winning. The current balance of power in the Senate is 54 Republicans to 46 Democrats (including independents). The Democrats need a net pickup of four seats to split control of the Senate or five seats to take a majority. In the case of a 50-50 split among the two parties, the incoming vice president can cast the deciding vote. At this point, Democrats look likely to retain Harry Reid’s Nevada seat as well as pick up Republican seats in Illinois, Indiana, Pennsylvania and Wisconsin. These four seats would be enough to split the Senate evenly with the Republicans. The fifth seat, to give the majority to the Democrats, will likely come from either Missouri, New Hampshire or North Carolina. All three races are tossups and FiveThirtyEight gives Democrats the edge in both Missouri and New Hampshire. Regardless of whether Hillary Clinton or Donald Trump wins the presidency, it has been viewed as critical for Republicans to hold the Senate. The Senate has the role of confirming judges and Supreme Court justices as well as confirming treaties. Any bills from the House’s Republican majority, which is likely safe, must go through the Senate before they are signed into law by the president. The most recent round of polling gives little hope of preserving the Republican Senate majority. As Republican Senate hopes fade, so do hopes of everything from keeping liberal justices off of the Supreme Court to repealing and replacing Obamacare.

## Extensions

### Overview

**Democrats will decisively win the senate elections, but its close, lobbying could change the outcome of the election, that’s the Peterson ev. The police lobby is inherently opposed to police reform such as the aff, the aff makes them lash out and turn on democrats. There are many examples of how they go after democrats who propose police reform, that’s Tracey. The police lobby controls the election, they have a large amount of political power so they can screw over the democrats if they go after them, that’s Bernd. Republican senate kills climate change reform, they are ideologically opposed means that climate change will get substantially worse. Climate change causes extinction, ……**

1. **‘4**

   (Thomas, NYT Best-selling author, “How Global Warming May Cause the Next Ice Age...”, 1-30, <http://www.commondreams.org/views04/0130-11.htm>) [↑](#footnote-ref-1)