# TOC16 – Politics

# Elections

## 1NC

### Uniqueness

#### Hillary wins the election against trump – but there’s cause for concern.

Heer 4/27: (Jeet Heer, senior editor at the New Republic who has published in a wide array of journals including The New Yorker, The Paris Review, and VQR, “Why Hillary Clinton Should Fear Donald Trump.” New Republic. April 27, 2016//FT)

With Hillary Clinton’s strong performance on Tuesday night, the Democratic primaries are effectively over. Barring an unforeseen catastrophe, Clinton will be the Democratic nominee. And it’s increasingly likely that her opponent will be Donald Trump, who won a clean sweep of five states on Tuesday and only seems to be getting stronger. Both parties must now gear themselves for a Clinton-Trump match-up in the fall. Clinton indicated as much in her victory speech last night. As in earlier speeches, she made a play of Trump’s name and his penchant for racism, declaring, “Love trumps hate.” This slogan is an early clue as to how Clinton will frame the election, presenting herself as an inclusive advocate of national unity and Trump as an avatar of prejudice and divisiveness. Yet such an election poses unique problems that go beyond normal politics, and Clinton’s team may not yet appreciate how difficult this fight will be. If winning the presidential election were all that mattered, Trump would be Clinton’s dream opponent. The Democratic front-runner struggles with poor approval ratings—55.6 percent unfavorable, according to Huffington Post’s aggregation of the polls—which means she needs to compete against someone who is even less popular than her. Trump fits that bill handsomely, standing at 63.6 percent unfavorability. Furthermore, Trump’s racism and misogyny are likely to motivate the very voters that Clinton most needs to attract: people of color, single women, and young people. And not surprisingly, in head-to-head polls, Clinton enjoys a hefty lead over Trump, even as she trails behind the less-polarizing John Kasich and enjoys a significantly smaller lead (of roughly 5 percentage points) over Ted Cruz.

### Links

#### The AFF is political suicide – a gun costs her the presidency

Scher 15: (Bill Scher. “Will Any Presidential Candidate Support Banning Handguns?” CommonDreams. October 03, 2015.)

Politicians generally avoid proposing handgun bans because the position doesn’t fit into the frame of exempting “responsible gun owners” from new regulations. No one needs an assault rifle to hunt or to protect themselves. But plenty of Americans keep handguns thinking that it will protect them from harm. Politicians are loathe to advocate that the government “take their guns away.” However, the reality is, as physicist David Robert Grimes put it, “actually owning and using a firearm hugely increases the risk of being shot.” Of course, this is a political impossibility for the foreseeable future. The current Republican Congress won’t even pass an expansion of background checks, and a previous Republican Congress allowed the Clinton-era assault weapons ban to expire. A handgun ban also could run afoul of the Supreme Court, as it is currently constituted. But will any presidential candidate be willing to push the envelope, shake up the debate, and put a handgun ban on the table? It’s unlikely to be Sen. Bernie Sanders. Gun control is pretty much the only area where Sanders, long-time representative of rural hunting state, could be classified as a moderate. He opposed background checks in 1993, though supported them in 2013. He once supported a law protecting gun manufacturers from lawsuits, but he also voted for the assault weapons ban and supports closing the so-called gun show loophole. His rhetoric on the subject involves a bit of triangulation, “I think that urban America has got to respect what rural America is about, where 99 percent of the people in my state who hunt are law abiding people.” It’s unlikely to be Hillary Clinton. While she is stressing gun control in her campaign — a rare opportunity for her to get to Bernie’s left — she is a pragmatist at heart. Democrats for years have been careful to avoid sounding like “gun grabbers,” skirting the gun control issue so they can be competitive in states with high gun ownership like Colorado, Iowa and Nevada. In fact, if Democrats had not pursued this strategy, arguably Barack Obama never would have become president. For Clinton to push the issue now is shift left from where Obama was rhetorically in 2008 and 2012. But what’s on the table are provisions like “universal background checks, cracking down on illegal gun traffickers, and keeping guns out of the hands of domestic abusers and stalkers.” A handgun ban is not in the cards. But what about former Gov. Martin O’Malley? He too is pushing gun control hard, laying out a multi-pronged strategy to reduce gun violence, including universal background checks and a national gun registry. (An O’Malley Super PAC even ran a negative ad against Sanders regarding guns.) Yet he hasn’t gone as far as banning handguns. O’Malley, languishing near zero percent in the polls, is a candidate in need of a breakout issue, one that would animate base voters and distinguish himself from the pack. Merely proposing a handgun ban certainly wouldn’t make it become law anytime soon. But it would refocus the debate on the actual source of most of our senseless gun deaths.

#### Consistent with path trends with Gun Control.

Antle 12/3 (W. James, staff @ Washington Examiner, “Democrats aren't afraid to be anti-gun anymore”, http://www.washingtonexaminer.com/democrats-arent-afraid-to-be-anti-gun-anymore/article/2577508)

Democrats reacted swiftly and angrily to the mass shooting in San Bernardino, Calif. All three Democratic presidential candidates weighed in, as did most of the party's congressional leadership. Anger is an understandable reaction to learning that innocents have been gunned down. So is fear. But Democrats from President Obama and Hillary Clinton to Nancy Pelosi and Harry Reid weren't afraid of renewing calls for gun control when they renewed those calls on Wednesday. That wouldn't always have been the case. No, the debate over guns never ended and liberal Democrats were always more likely to call for stricter laws in safe Democratic districts in blueish areas with relatively few gun owners. Some Democratic leaders believed that gun control measures like the assault weapons ban, signed into law by President Bill Clinton, helped Republicans gain control of Congress. When the ban expired a decade later, Democrats tried to extend it didn't fight as hard as one might expect. It lapsed. Many Democrats also thought the primary campaign against Bill Bradley pushed 2000 presidential nominee Al Gore too far to the left on guns. The stance cost Gore Arkansas, West Virginia and his home state of Tennessee. If he had carried any one of those states, he would have won the presidency even without Florida's hanging chads. Former Gore national spokesman Doug Hattaway went so far as to say "there's not a potent pro-gun control constituency in national elections." The top progressive candidate for the 2004 Democratic presidential nomination was Howard Dean, who had tended to oppose gun control as governor of gun-friendly Vermont. Dean's campaign for the White House faltered, but he did become chairman of the Democratic National Committee. When Reid became the Senate Democratic leader, he was still regarded as a sometime ally of gun rights activists. The National Rifle Association reportedly contemplated a Reid endorsement as late as 2010. None of this stopped Reid from becoming the top Democrat in the Senate. In 2006 and 2008, even gun-control liberals like Chuck Schumer and Rahm Emanuel recruited pro-gun Democrats to run for Congress in districts where gun regulations were a political loser. Jim Webb, a relatively pro-gun Democrat, was the darling of the liberal netroots when he ran for Senate in Virginia. Democrats still prefer euphemisms like "commonsense gun safety laws" to the phrase "gun control," and like vague calls to "end gun violence" even better. Nevertheless, with each mass shooting event during the Obama administration, the party's politicians grow more assertive in their calls for firearms restrictions. Bernie Sanders hasn't gotten the same Vermont benefit of the doubt on guns as Dean. His occasional votes against gun control and brief alliance with the NRA during his first successful congressional race are significant barriers to his efforts to consolidate liberal support. Martin O'Malley appears to be running against the NRA more than Clinton. And Clinton has led the charge against guns. The new Democratic consensus appears to be that Republicans and the gun lobby are the only obstacles to a respite from tragedies like Sandy Hook and San Bernardino. Obama frequently describes theses shootings as a policy choice. The specific proposals Democrats generally endorse tend to be modest, but the repeated contentions that America's high rate of private gun ownership is what distinguishes it from other less violent industrialized democracies suggests more radical solutions. Countries like Australia that have passed more sweeping gun bans are often held up as examples the United States could or should follow. Gun control is the near-universal Democratic response to high-profile shootings. It is also likely to play a big role in the Democrats' response to an uptick in homicides in some cities. The debate is only partly about firearms policy. It's also a culture war issue. Obama was recorded talking about bitter people who cling to guns and religion. Liberals appear to hope that disarming largely law-abiding red-state gun owners (along with Sanders' progressive gun-toting constituents) will reduce the supply of guns in high-crime blue cities like Chicago, which already have tough gun laws on the books. For Democrats, the obvious political risk is that gun owners will mobilize and vote heavily Republican in the 2016 elections. This could produce an outcome in the presidential race similar to Gore's defeat. It could also hurt Democrats in down-ballot races, where they are already struggling.

### Impact – Trump bad

#### Trumps a catastrophic risk

Lippman 3/16: (DANIEL LIPPMAN, “The Economist rates Trump presidency among its top 10 global risks.” Politico. 03/16/16//FT)

A Donald Trump presidency poses a top-10 risk event that could disrupt the world economy, lead to political chaos in the U.S. and heighten security risks for the United States, according to the Economist Intelligence Unit. Electing Trump could also start a trade war, hurt trade with Mexico and be a godsend to terrorist recruiters in the Middle East, according to the latest EIU forecasts. The well-respected global economic and geopolitical analysis firm put a possible Trump presidency in its top 10 global risks this month, released Wednesday. Other risks include a sharp slowdown in the Chinese economy, a fracture of the Eurozone, and Britain's possible departure from the European Union. Trump’s controversial remarks on Muslims would be a gift to “potential recruiters who have long been trying to paint the U.S. as an anti-Muslim country. His rhetoric will certainly help that recruiting effort,” said Robert Powell, global risk briefing manager at EIU. Until Trump, the firm had never rated a pending election of a candidate to be a geopolitical risk to the U.S. and the world. The firm has no plans to include Hillary Clinton, Ted Cruz or John Kasich on future risk lists. “It’s highly unusual, and I don’t think we ever have done it where we’ve had a single politician be the center of our risk items,” Powell said in an interview, but noted that the firm has once included the transition at the top of the Chinese Communist Party as a top-ten risk as well. “Innate hostility within the Republican hierarchy towards Mr. Trump, combined with the inevitable virulent Democratic opposition, will see many of his more radical policies blocked in Congress,” wrote EIU. But “such internal bickering will also undermine the coherence of domestic and foreign policymaking.” And there are also serious risks to the global economy if Trump is elected, warned EIU, a sister company to The Economist. “The prospects for a trade war are quite high,” said Powell. “Why is a guy who has many of his goods made in China wanting to start a trade war in China?” One difficulty in assessing Trump’s policy positions is that “he does tend to shift his opinions like the weather,” Powell said. Powell also remarked upon Trump's calls for a more aggressive campaign against the Islamic State terrorist group, also known as ISIL or ISIS. “One of [Trump’s] extreme positions has been to invade Syria to wipe out ISIS,” he said, citing estimates finding that a year-long excursion in Syria of 20,000-30,000 U.S. troops could cost $25 billion. Trump has vowed to seize Syria's oil fields and refineries, which help keep ISIS afloat, and then sell the oil to pay for a U.S. military campaign. But Powell said that at current oil prices, if the U.S. actually stole the oil, it would only net about $500 million, at most.

### Impact – Climate (1)

#### The impact is climate change

Clifton 8/17 (Allen Clifton is from the Dallas-Fort Worth area and has a degree in Political Science. He is a co-founder of Forward Progressives, author of the popular Right Off A Cliff column, and an unapologetic Hillary Clinton supporter. He is also the founder of the Right Off A Cliff facebook page, on which he routinely voices his opinions and stirs the pot for the Progressive movement. Follow Allen on Twitter as well, @Allen\_Clifton. (<http://www.forwardprogressives.com/6-truly-awful-things-will-happen-republicans-win-white-house-2016/>)

Initially I believed the 2016 presidential election was all but a lock for Democrats. Hillary Clinton was crushing pretty much any potential Republican rival they pitted her up against, and the GOP really didn’t have anyone who could even come close to challenging her. Well, things have changed. First, whoever is running Clinton’s campaign could use some pointers. Even as one of her supporters, sometimes I feel like walking into her office and screaming, “What the hell is wrong with all of you?! Get your asses out there and campaign like you want to win not just like you’re all hoping not to lose.” Couple that with Bernie Sanders entering the race and the continued irrational behavior of many of his followers as it relates to his actual chances of becoming president, and all that’s ultimately happening is Democrats are increasing the likelihood that Republicans win the White House next year. The odds are that Hillary is still going to be the Democratic nominee and I’ve already seen a good number of Sanders supporters claim that they just flat-out won’t vote for her. And I’ll say here what I’ve said to every single one of those people I’ve encountered: If Republicans win in 2016, these irrational Sanders supporters are going to be the people to blame. If you like Sanders, that’s great – I like him too. If he wins the nomination, I’ll gladly support him and vote for him. But if he doesn’t, those backing him now need to put their full weight behind Clinton. There’s simply too much at stake in 2016 to let Republicans win back the White House. So, to put into perspective what liberals should expect to happen if Republicans win next year, I thought I’d list six things that will most definitely take place at the hands of GOP leadership. Obviously there are more than 6 terrible things that would happen, but I just felt like these should be emphasized a bit. 1. Kiss the Affordable Care Act goodbye: Either through sabotage, or a flat-out repeal, health care reform will be a thing of the past. Not only that, but you can rest assured that Republicans will do everything they can to pass some sort of legislation that makes it nearly impossible to pass any future reforms to help the millions of Americans who won’t have access to affordable health care. 2. They’re going to try to rig elections: If you think these state-level restrictive voter ID laws that target Democratic voters are bad, wait until you see what Republicans can do to rig elections once they have full control on a national level. 3. They’ll set gay rights back years: While they can’t overrule the Supreme Court’s ruling on same-sex marriage, nor will they have the votes to pass a Constitutional Amendment banning gay marriage, they’ll still have enough power to find plenty of loopholes that infringe or flat-out restrict the rights of gay Americans. While they might not be able to roll the clock back to the days when homosexuals couldn’t marry or serve in the military, we’re likely looking at eight years (because incumbents almost always win re-election) where gay rights in the U.S. are either stuck in neutral or, more likely, set back quite a bit. 4. Women’s rights are going to be trampled on even worse than they already have been: Maybe you’ve been sleeping under a rock lately, but women’s rights are under attack by Republicans right now. Most recently using these heavily edited Planned Parenthood videos, Republicans are waging an all-out war on women and their Constitutional rights. It’s a “war” that will only get worse if they win the presidency. 5. Progress on climate change will be set back decades: I hope you like the idea of drilling for oil in our national parks, because that’s probably going to become a reality if Republicans win back the White House. Not only that, but you can rest assured that they’ll do everything they can to roll back the green energy initiatives that President Obama has enacted, and pass laws that make it much more difficult for any future administration that might actually have a desire to save the planet. 6. The Supreme Court will be overwhelmingly controlled by conservative justices for the next 20+ years: This is probably the most important issue of the 2016 election. With four Supreme Court Justices most likely set to retire over the next 2-10 years, our next president is likely going to select who replaces them. I don’t know about all of you, but I damn sure don’t want a Republican picking replacements for those four justices. I could keep going on and on. I didn’t even mention the almost certain war with Iran that they would start, or the laws they’ll pass that I’m positive will be based upon extreme religious beliefs. If a Republican wins next November, it’s literally going to set this nation back decades. As I’ve said repeatedly, I don’t really care if you’re a Clinton fan or Sanders supporter, our number one goal in 2016 needs to be to make sure no matter who the Democratic nominee for president is, they win. Because if they don’t, the alternative is going to be a complete disaster for this country. I can promise everyone reading this that no matter what issues you might have with Hillary Clinton or Bernie Sanders, they pale in comparison to what you’ll deal with if a Republican becomes president.

#### Extinction

Dyer ‘12 (London-based independent journalist, PhD from King's College London, citing UC Berkeley scientists (Gwynne, "Tick, tock to mass extinction date," The Press, 6-19-12, l/n, accessed 8-15-12, mss)

Meanwhile, a team of respected scientists warn that life on Earth may be on the way to an irreversible "**tipping point"**. Sure. Heard that one before, too. Last month one of the world's two leading scientific journals, Nature, published a paper, "Approaching a state shift in Earth's biosphere," pointing out that more than 40 per cent of the Earth's land is already used for human needs. With the human population set to grow by a further two billion by 2050, that figure could soon exceed 50 per cent. "It really will be a new world, biologically, at that point," said the paper's lead author, Professor Anthony Barnofsky of the University of California, Berkeley. But Barnofsky doesn't go into the details of what kind of new world it might be. Scientists hardly ever do in public, for fear of being seen as panic-mongers. Besides, it's a relatively new hypothesis, but it's a pretty convincing one, and it should be more widely understood. Here's how bad it could get. The scientific consensus is that we are still on track for 3 degrees C of warming by 2100, but that's just warming caused by human greenhouse- gas emissions. The problem is that +3 degrees is well past the point where the major feedbacks kick in: natural phenomena triggered by our warming, like melting permafrost and the loss of Arctic sea-ice cover, that will add to the heating and that we cannot turn off. The trigger is actually around 2C (3.5 degrees F) higher average global temperature. After that we lose control of the process: ending our own carbon- dioxide emissions would no longer be enough to stop the warming. We may end up trapped on an escalator heading up to +6C (+10.5F), with no way of getting off. And +6C gives you the **mass extinction**. There have been five mass extinctions in the past 500 million years, when 50 per cent or more of the species then existing on the Earth vanished, but until recently the only people taking any interest in this were paleontologists, not climate scientists. They did wonder what had caused the extinctions, but the best answer they could come up was "climate change". It wasn't a very good answer. Why would a warmer or colder planet kill off all those species? The warming was caused by massive volcanic eruptions dumping huge quantities of carbon dioxide in the atmosphere for tens of thousands of years. But it was very gradual and the animals and plants had plenty of time to migrate to climatic zones that still suited them. (That's exactly what happened more recently in the Ice Age, as the glaciers repeatedly covered whole continents and then retreated again.) There had to be a more convincing kill mechanism than that. The paleontologists found one when they discovered that a giant asteroid struck the planet 65 million years ago, just at the time when the dinosaurs died out in the most recent of the great extinctions. So they went looking for evidence of huge asteroid strikes at the time of the other extinction events. They found none. What they discovered was that there was indeed major warming at the time of all the other extinctions - and that the warming had radically changed the oceans. The currents that carry oxygen- rich cold water down to the depths shifted so that they were bringing down oxygen- poor warm water instead, and gradually the depths of the oceans became anoxic: the deep waters no longer had any oxygen. When that happens, the sulfur bacteria that normally live in the silt (because oxygen is poison to them) come out of hiding and begin to multiply. Eventually they rise all the way to the surface over the whole ocean, killing all the oxygen-breathing life. The ocean also starts emitting enormous amounts of lethal hydrogen sulfide gas that destroy the ozone layer and directly poison land- dwelling species. This has happened many times in the Earth's history.

### Impact – Warming

#### GOP win causes extinction from warming.

Ferner 1-25 --Cites Noam Chomsky, MIT professor emeritus of linguistics Matt Ferner (national reporter). “Noam Chomsky Says GOP Is 'Literally A Serious Danger To Human Survival’.” Huffington Post. January 25th, 2016. http://www.huffingtonpost.com/entry/noam-chomsky-gop\_us\_56a66febe4b0d8cc109aec78

Noam Chomsky, the noted radical and MIT professor emeritus, said the Republican Party has become so extreme in its rhetoric and policies that it poses a “serious danger to human survival.” “Today, the Republican Party has drifted off the rails,” Chomsky, a frequent critic of both parties, said in an interview Monday with The Huffington Post. “It’s become what the respected conservative political analysts Thomas Mann and Norman Ornstein call ‘a radical insurgency’ that has pretty much abandoned parliamentary politics.” Chomsky cited a 2013 article by Mann and Ornstein published in Daedalus, the journal of the American Academy of Arts and Sciences, analyzing the polarization of the parties. The authors write that the GOP has become “ideologically extreme, scornful of facts and compromise, and dismissive of the legitimacy of its political opposition.” Chomsky said the GOP and its presidential candidates are “literally a serious danger to decent human survival” and cited Republicans' rejection of measures to deal with climate change, which he called a “looming environmental catastrophe.” All of the top Republican presidential candidates are either outright deniers, doubt its seriousness or insist no action should be taken -- “dooming our grandchildren,” Chomsky said. "I am not a believer," Donald Trump, the Republican presidential front-runner, said recently. "Unless somebody can prove something to me, I believe there’s weather." Trump isn’t alone. Although 97 percent of climate scientists insist climate change is real and caused by human actions, more than half of Republicans in Congress deny mankind has anything to do with global warming. "What they are saying is, let's destroy the world. Is that worth voting against? Yeah," Chomsky said in a recent interview with Mehdi Hasan on Al Jazeera English's "UpFront." The policies that the GOP presidential candidates and its representatives in Congress support, Chomsky argued, are in “abject service to private wealth and power,” despite “rhetorical posturing” of some, including House Speaker Paul Ryan (R-Wis.). GOP proposals would effectively raise taxes on lower-income Americans and reduce them for the wealthy. Chomsky advised 2016 voters to cast their ballots strategically. He said the U.S. is essentially “one-party” system -- a business party with factions called Republicans and Democrats. But, he said, there are small differences between the factions that can make a “huge difference in systems of enormous power” -- like that afforded to the president. “I’ve always counseled strategic voting, Chomsky said. "Meaning, in a swing state, or swing congressional district, or swing school board, if there is a significant enough difference to matter, vote for the better candidate -- or sometimes the least bad.” Chomsky said if he lived in a swing state, he’d vote for Democratic front-runner Hillary Clinton. By no means should this be viewed as an endorsement of Clinton. Chomsky has been a vocal Clinton critic, saying her presidency would resemble that of President Barack Obama, who Chomsky has condemned for using drone strikes to kill individuals the president deems worthy of execution. In an ideal world, Chomsky might vote for Sen. Bernie Sanders (I-Vt.), who Chomsky has called an "honest and committed New Dealer" who has “the best policies,” despite some criticisms. Regardless of who wins the Democratic nomination, Chomsky told Al Jazeera he'd cast his general election vote "against the Republican candidate” because there may be dire consequences to a GOP victory. “The likely candidates are, in my opinion, extremely dangerous, at least if they mean anything like what they are saying,” Chomsky said. “I think it makes good sense to keep them far away from levers of power.”

#### Warming causes extinction – need to act now

McCoy ’14: (Dr. David McCoy et al., MD, Centre for International Health and Development, University College London, “Climate Change and Human Survival,” BRITISH MEDICAL JOURNAL v. 348, 4—2—14, doi: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1136/bmj.g2510>, )

The Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) has just published its report on the impacts of global warming. Building on its recent update of the physical science of global warming [1], the IPCC’s new report should leave the world in no doubt about the scale and immediacy of the threat to human survival, health, and well-being. The IPCC has already concluded that it is “virtually certain that human influence has warmed the global climate system” and that it is “extremely likely that more than half of the observed increase in global average surface temperature from 1951 to 2010” is anthropogenic [1]. Its new report outlines the future threats of further global warming: increased scarcity of food and fresh water; extreme weather events; rise in sea level; loss of biodiversity; areas becoming uninhabitable; and mass human migration, conflict and violence. Leaked drafts talk of hundreds of millions displaced in a little over 80 years. This month, the American Association for the Advancement of Science (AAAS) added its voice: “the well being of people of all nations [is] at risk.” [2] Such comments reaffirm the conclusions of the Lancet/UCL Commission: that climate change is “the greatest threat to human health of the 21st century.” [3] The changes seen so far—massive arctic ice loss and extreme weather events, for example—have resulted from an estimated average temperature rise of 0.89°C since 1901. Further changes will depend on how much we continue to heat the planet. The release of just another 275 gigatonnes of carbon dioxide would probably commit us to a temperature rise of at least 2°C—an amount that could be emitted in less than eight years. [4] “Business as usual” will increase carbon dioxide concentrations from the current level of 400 parts per million (ppm), which is a 40% increase from 280 ppm 150 years ago, to 936 ppm by 2100, with a 50:50 chance that this will deliver global mean temperature rises of more than 4°C. It is now widely understood that such a rise is “incompatible with an organised global community.” [5]. The IPCC warns of “tipping points” in the Earth’s system, which, if crossed, could lead to a catastrophic collapse of interlinked human and natural systems. The AAAS concludes that there is now a “real chance of abrupt, unpredictable and potentially irreversible changes with highly damaging impacts on people around the globe.” [2] And this week a report from the World Meteorological Office (WMO) confirmed that extreme weather events are accelerating. WMO secretary general Michel Jarraud said, “There is no standstill in global warming . . . The laws of physics are non-negotiable.” [6]

#### Climate change disproportionately affects people of color and causes extinction.

Pellow ‘12: (David Naguib Pellow 12, Ph.D. Professor, Don Martindale Endowed Chair – University of Minnesota, “Climate Disruption in the Global South and in African American Communities: Key Issues, Frameworks, and Possibilities for Climate Justice,” February 2012, <http://www.jointcenter.org/sites/default/files/upload/research/files/White_Paper_Climate_Disruption_final.pdf>)

It is now known unequivocally that significant warming of the atmosphere is occurring, coinciding with increasing levels of atmospheric CO2. Dr. John Holdren, Director of the White House Office of Science and Technology Policy, prefers the term “global climate disruption” to “climate change” because it more fully captures the harm being done to the planet (Holdren 2007). The term “climate change” infers a naturally occurring process rather than a disruption created by specific human activity. Moreover, the terms “global warming” and “climate change” might be construed as occurring in a uniform, even, gradual, and benign fashion, none of which is true. One solid indicator of Holdren’s point is the fact that climate disruptions affect communities, nations, and regions of the globe in vastly different ways. While contributing the least of anyone to the causes of climate disruption, people of color, women, indigenous communities, and global South nations often bear the brunt of climate disruption in terms of ecological, economic, and health burdens—thereby giving rise to the concept of climate injustice (Roberts and Parks 2007). These communities are among the first to experience the effects of climate disruption, which can include “natural” disasters, rising levels of respiratory illness and infectious disease, heat-related morbidity and mortality, and large increases in energy costs. They also bear the burdens created by ill-conceived policies designed to prevent climate disruption. The effects of climate injustice have been evident for years. Flooding from severe storms, rising sea levels and melting glaciers affect millions in Asia and Latin America, while sub-Saharan Africa is experiencing sustained droughts. Consider that nearly 75 percent the world’s annual CO2 emissions come from the global North, where only 15 percent of the global population resides. If historic responsibility for climate change is taken into account, global North nations have consumed more than three times their share of the atmosphere (in terms of the amount of emissions that we can safely put into the atmosphere) while the poorest 10 percent of the world’s population has contributed less than 1 percent of carbon emissions. Thus the struggle for racial, gender, and economic justice is inseparable from any effort to combat climate disruption. Climate justice is a vision aimed at dissolving and alleviating the unequal burdens created by climate change. The topic of climate justice is a major point of tension in both U.S. and international policy efforts to address climate disruption because it would require wealthy nations that have contributed the most to the problem to take on greater responsibilities for solutions. For many observers, the path is clear: for humanity’s survival, for justice, and for sustainability, they maintain that we must reduce our emissions and consumption here at home in the global North.

### --- Warming turns Race

#### Climate change disproportionately affects low-income families and people of color in America

Frosch et al [Rachel Morello-Frosch, Ph.D., MPH | Manuel Pastor, Ph.D. | James Sadd, Ph.D. | Seth B. Shonkoff, MPH. The Climate Gap: inequalities in How Climate Change Hurts americans & How to Close the Gap. Published by the USC Dornsife School, May 20009. https://dornsife.usc.edu/assets/sites/242/docs/The\_Climate\_Gap\_Full\_Report\_FINAL.pdf]

What we used to think was tomorrow’s climate crisis is here today. Heat waves, wildfires and floods are making headlines more often. What hasn’t made headlines—yet—is the climate gap: the disproportionate and unequal impact the climate crisis has on people of color and the poor. Unless something is done, the consequences of America’s climate crisis will harm all Americans—especially those who are least able to anticipate, cope with, resist and recover from the worst consequences. This analysis is of California, which in many ways is a microcosm of the entire United States. Climate change is an issue of great importance for human rights, public health, and social fairness because of its profound consequences overall and the very real danger that poor neighborhoods and people of color will suffer even worse harms and hazards than the rest of Americans. This “climate gap” is of special concern for California, home to one of the most ethnically and economically diverse populations in the country. The climate gap means that communities of color and the poor will suffer more during extreme heat waves. For instance, African Americans in Los Angeles are nearly twice as likely to die from a heat wave than other Los Angeles residents, and families living below the poverty line are unlikely to have access to air conditioning or cars that allow them to escape the heat. The climate gap means that communities of color and the poor will breathe even dirtier air. For example, five of the smoggiest cities in California also have the highest densities of people of color and low-income residents. These communities are projected to suffer from the largest increase in smog associated with climate change. The climate gap means that communities of color and the poor will pay more for basic necessities. Low-income and minority families already spend as much as 25 percent of their entire income on just food, electricity and water—much more than most Americans. The climate gap is likely to mean fewer job opportunities for communities of color and the poor. The climate crisis may dramatically reduce or shift job opportunities in sectors such as agriculture and tourism, which predominantly employ low-income Americans and people of color. This report—an analysis and synthesis of available data—explores disparities in the impacts of climate change and the abilities of different groups to adapt to it. It also offers concrete recommendations for closing the climate gap, starting with insuring that climate solutions don’t leave anyone behind.

### Impact – Militarism

#### GOP president would increase massive institutionalized militarism – turns case.

Illing ’15: (Sean Illing, "The GOP’s pathological militarism: These dangerous neocons belong nowhere near the White House," Salon, November 11, 2015)

A lot of attention is paid to the regressive social policies of the Republican Party. And that’s certainly justified: The GOP continues to wage a pointless culture war that was lost decades ago. Whether it’s same-sex marriage or equal pay or drug laws or the right of women to control their own bodies, Republicans are out of step with most of the country. But what doesn’t get discussed enough is their pathological militarism and their historical amnesia. In debate after debate, Republican presidential candidates speak as though the last fifteen years never happened. We’re still mired in two quagmires in the Middle East, one of which is largely responsible for creating the menace that is ISIS, and none of them, with the exception of Rand Paul, appears to have learned anything from our mistakes. At the last Republican presidential debate in Milwaukee, you heard almost everyone on stage competing to out-hawk one another. Trump bragged about how “militaristic” he is. (Although, to Trump’s credit, he acknowledged our foolhardiness in waging war in Iraq.) Carson wants more troops in Syria and Iraq and so we can “take their energy field” and “all of that land from them.” Jeb Bush thinks the “lesson of history” is that America has to “exercise leadership” (read: intervene) in the Middle East in order to preserve world order, which means arming “moderates” in Syria and enforcing no fly zones over sovereign countries even though that’s impossible to do without risking full-scale war. Jeb also argued that when we fail to intervene in foreign countries, we create a dangerous power vacuum. And yet creating a power vacuum, which was filled by Iran and ISIS, is precisely what our failed experiment in Iraq accomplished. But in Jeb’s world, none of this happened. ISIS only exists because we didn’t stay in Iraq long enough, because we didn’t occupy the country interminably. Carly Fiorina, arguably the most enthusiastic warmonger in the Republican field, gave a rehearsed speech about our need to “rebuild the Sixth Fleet” and “the missile defense program in Poland” and to “conduct very aggressive military exercises in the Baltic States.” She also wants “put in a few more thousand troops in Germany, not to start a war, but to make sure that Putin understands that the United States of America” means business. Marco Rubio wants to cut spending across the board except, of course, on defense, where the budget is the most bloated and where we spend more than the next seven countries combined. And he sees no connection whatsoever between our military misadventures in the Middle East and the pervasive anti-American sentiment in the region. “They hate us because of our values,” Rubio said. “They hate us because our girls go to school. They hate us because women drive in the United States.” This is a stupid, Manichean ideology that reduces the world into the simplest terms possible. It’s also a convenient way to avoid acknowledging our own follies, which is necessary if we’re to learn anything from them. The Democratic Party was also complicit in our Iraq blunder. The difference is that the Democratic candidates all accept this. There’s no historical revisionism or blustering talk about doubling down on failed policies. For the GOP candidates, however, history starts in 2008, when Obama was elected. It’s Obama’s economy, Obama’s wars and Obama’s blunders. They simply refuse to see what went wrong before 2008 and how those errors shaped the political realities today. There are plenty of reasons to not elect a Republican in the next presidential election, but foreign policy is as significant as any. These candidates aren’t interested in diplomacy and they won’t even acknowledge historical facts. They praise the troops in the abstract, but are all too eager to send them abroad to police the world and to wage wars of choice – this is astonishing given what’s happened in the last fifteen years. America can’t afford another neoconservative in the White House, and that’s the interventionist ideology espoused by most of the Republican candidates. We’ve paid too high a price for this already. We’ve spent trillions of dollars and thousands of lives and the world is no safer for it. Obama spent eight years trying to clean up the mess left by the last Republican president, and he’s barely scratched the surface. There are real threats out there, and total isolationism is as unrealistic as it is dangerous. But we have to be careful about when and where we intervene, and about how we allocate resources. The warmongering and the nationalist chest-beating during last night’s debate is a reminder that the Republican Party doesn’t understand this.

### Impact - Russia

#### GOP president will antagonize Russia and ramp up lethal aid to Ukraine—Clinton will continue Obama’s diplomatic approach

Menyhert 8-31-15 – Columnist of Free Russia Foundation Kyle, U.S. – RUSSIA RELATIONS AFTER 2016: ISOLATION, ENGAGEMENT OR CONFRONTATION?, Free Russia Foundation - nonprofit, nonpartisan, nongovernmental U.S.-based organization, led by Russians abroad that seeks to be a voice for those who can’t speak under the repression of the current Russian leadership, http://www.4freerussia.org/u-s-russia-relations-after-2016-isolation-engagement-or-confrontation/

Considerable consensus is evident among the other Republican Party candidates in regards to the Ukraine crisis.¶ Former Florida Governor Jeb Bush supports supplying Kyiv with lethal aid and an increased presence of American troops in the Baltic states of Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania. His Floridian counterpart, Senator Marco Rubio, has been vocal in his support for supplying Kyiv with weapons, as well as the possibility of letting Ukraine join NATO, an ambition that Ukrainian President Petro Poroshenko has expressed interest in holding a nationwide referendum for. Rubio called President Putin a “gangster”, referencing the assassinations of Aleksandr Litvinenko and Boris Nemtsov in recent remarks: “He [Putin] is basically an organized crime figure who controls a government and a large territory. … This is a person who kills people because they’re his political enemies. If you’re a political adversary of Vladimir Putin, you wind up with plutonium in your drink or shot in the street.”¶ Republican Senator Lindsey Graham is also very supportive of both arming Ukraine and bringing both Ukraine and Georgia into NATO, as well as rebuilding missile defense systems that were dismantled under the Obama Administration and is in agreement with Governor Bush in regards to an increased troop presence in the Baltic states.¶ Governor Scott Walker of Wisconsin did well to explicitly mention the conflict in Ukraine during the first major GOP debate. “I would send weapons to Ukraine,” Walker said. “I would put forces on the eastern border of Poland and the Baltic nations, and I would re-instate, put back in place the missile-defense system in the Czech Republic.” Indeed, an American military convoy recently a made a public trip through the Czech Republic. The convoy saw hundreds of Czechs waving the Stars and Stripes and cheering the passing American troops.¶ Senator Ted Cruz of Texas also is supportive of sending Ukraine lethal aid, as is Ben Carson. Carson, however, was previously and publicly unaware that the Baltic states were members of NATO, raising some American political pundits’ eyebrows.¶ Governor John Kasich of Ohio has been vigorously supportive of supplying lethal aid to the Ukrainians as well. He is on record as saying “For the life of me, I cannot understand why we are not giving the Ukrainians [the ability] to defend themselves against Putin and the Russians.”¶ Despite the consensus coming across among many Republican candidates, some differences exist among the candidates specifically around Mike Huckabee and Rand Paul. While Senator Paul supports “isolating” Russia because of its aggression in Ukraine, he seems more reluctant to directly engage or supply Ukraine with aid. Mike Huckabee, once the Governor of Arkansas, is also quite wary of military escalation, instead opting to focus on economic isolation.¶ On the other side of the aisle, Hillary Clinton, the Democratic frontrunner and President Obama’s Secretary of State for many years, seems to employ more hawkish ideals than her boss. Clinton, like many of the Republican candidates, has alluded to providing greater financial and military assistance to Kyiv, but whether Clinton would sign a bill as president directly arming Ukraine is unclear. Clinton has made strong remarks about Putin, though, comparing him to Nazi dictator Adolf Hitler. She has also spoken highly of the Ukrainian government and armed forces. “I think the Ukrainian army and the Ukrainian civilians who’ve been fighting against the separatists have proven that they’re worthy of some greater support.” After many years of directly working with the president, though, it’s questionable that a Clinton Administration would do much different than the Obama Administration. Hillary may also face opposition from those who lean farther left within her own party if she becomes president.¶ If Vice President Joe Biden runs and wins the White House, the United States will have someone at the helm who is a seasoned and experienced character who has visited and met with leaders in the Baltic states and both Ukraine’s President and Prime Minister. Biden, however, probably will not waver far from Obama’s current policies, which, while they have thrown the Russian economy into considerable instability, have not visibly convinced the Kremlin to change course. Biden has also displayed more caution in regards to the War in the Donbas than Secretary Clinton or even President Obama. Farther to the left, Independent-turned-Democratic Senator Bernie Sanders has expressed interest in economic isolation but has been, like Senator Paul, very wary of military action.¶ There are over twenty candidates running for President in the United States. However, there are probably only about three courses to choose from when you boil it down regarding Ukraine and Russia. Americans can choose the status quo with Clinton (or Biden if he runs), stronger action against Putin with most of the Republicans, restrained action with Senator Paul or Senator Sanders, or uncharted isolation with Donald Trump.

#### Causes Putin to escalate with ramped up troop deployments—risks nuclear escalation

Mayer 2-5-15 – CBCNews.ca feature writer Andre, Ukraine conflict: Why U.S. arms could lead to 'serious trouble', CBC News, http://www.cbc.ca/news/world/ukraine-conflict-why-u-s-arms-could-lead-to-serious-trouble-1.2946581

But there's a strong possibility that by arming Ukraine, the U.S. could spur Russia to unpredictable action, says John Mearsheimer, co-director of the Program on International Security Policy at the University of Chicago.¶ "People who are advocating that we up the ante by sending lethal aid to Ukraine are betting that this will cause Putin to throw up his hands and surrender," says Mearsheimer. "This is not going to happen."¶ U.S. Air Force Gen. Philip Breedlove, the top NATO commander, echoed this view on Thursday, saying that arming Ukraine "could trigger a more strident reaction from Russia."¶ German Chancellor Angela Merkel, for one, is opposed to arming Ukraine. She and French President Francois Hollande have drafted a new peace initiative that they are presenting in Ukraine's capital, Kyiv, on Thursday, and to Putin in Moscow on Friday.¶ Intensified fighting¶ Talk of a more concerted response from the U.S. and other NATO members comes after days of intensified fighting between Ukrainian troops and Russia-backed separatists in eastern Ukraine.¶ According to the United Nations, more than 200 people have died there in the past three weeks. It is estimated that 5,000 people have died in the conflict to date.¶ On Wednesday, heavy shelling in the rebel stronghold of Donetsk killed at least five people and damaged a hospital and several schools, according to local officials.¶ It's been almost a year since Russia annexed Crimea and Russian-backed separatists started making incursions in eastern Ukraine, and a number of western commentators say it's time for the U.S. to help Ukraine, which is no match militarily for the Russian army on its own.¶ Editorials in media outlets such as USA Today and the Washington Post say giving Ukraine lethal weapons is the only solution to this conflict.¶ Russian Foreign Ministry spokesman Alexander Lukashevich said Thursday a U.S. decision to arm Ukraine would not only escalate the situation but "threatens the security of the Russian Federation."¶ U.S. Secretary of State John Kerry has said he is committed to finding a diplomatic solution, but he has also expressed concern about the increased presence of Russian tanks and artillery in rebel-held areas of Ukraine. Russia continues to deny any involvement in the conflict.¶ Stephen Blank says that up until now, all the Russian operations "have been conducted at a scale small enough so that they can pretend that they're not there," which is why NATO has been reluctant about getting involved.¶ "My belief is that if we let this go and not do what is necessary, we will face future challenges from Putin or others inspired by him," says Blank. "This has to be stopped sooner rather than later."¶ Testing Russian resolve¶ Any direct military aid from the U.S. would likely include armaments, intelligence information and "counter-battery radar," a mobile radar system that detects artillery projectiles, says William Courtney, a senior analyst at the Rand Corporation, a U.S. think tank.¶ Taras Kuzio, a senior researcher at the Canadian Institute for Ukrainian Studies, believes that if Ukraine, with the help of U.S. armaments, begins to defeat rebels on the ground, Russia would be compelled to send more of its own troops.¶ Then, Russia would no longer be in a situation of "essentially lying" about its presence on the ground, says Kuzio, because it would have to commit 50,000 to 100,000 troops.¶ He says that in this scenario, the U.S. would hope that a strengthened Ukraine army and significant casualties on the Russian side would break Putin's resolve.¶ "The American viewpoint is a bit like the 1980s, where the only way to get the Russians out of Afghanistan was to make them pay so much in terms of bodybags that eventually they say enough and they pull out, which they did," says Kuzio.¶ "We have to make the price sufficiently high for the Russians that eventually they recalculate their policies."¶ But Mearsheimer doesn't believe we will see a similar outcome in the current conflict.¶ He says Putin has already shown that economic hardships at home – such as depressed oil prices, a plunging ruble, western sanctions and the threat of a recession — are no obstacle to Russian military involvement.¶ And pressuring Putin on the battlefield will only rile him more, says Mearsheimer.¶ "Any time a great power armed with thousands of nuclear weapons is backed into a corner, you are asking for really serious trouble."

#### Aggression in Ukraine causes extinction—comparatively the biggest impact

Baum 14 - Executive Director @ Global Catastrophic Risk Institute [Seth Baum (Ph.D. in Geography @Pennsylvania State University and a Post-Doctoral Fellowship @ Columbia University Center for Research on Environmental Decisions), “Best And Worst Case Scenarios for Ukraine Crisis: World Peace And Nuclear War,” *Huffington Post*, May 7, 2014, http://tinyurl.com/lxx49og]

Here's the short version: The best case scenario has the Ukraine crisis being resolved diplomatically through increased Russia-Europe cooperation, which would be a big step towards world peace. The worst case scenario has the crisis escalating into nuclear war between the United States and Russia, causing human extinction.¶ Let's start with the worst case scenario, nuclear war involving the American and Russian arsenals. How bad would that be? Put it this way: Recent analysis finds that a "limited" India-Pakistan nuclear war could kill two billion people via agricultural declines from nuclear winter. This "limited" war involves just 100 nuclear weapons. The U.S. and Russia combine to possess about 16,700 nuclear weapons. Humanity may not survive the aftermath of a U.S.-Russia nuclear war.¶ It seems rather unlikely that the U.S. and Russia would end up in nuclear war over Ukraine. Sure, they have opposing positions, but neither side has anywhere near enough at stake to justify such extraordinary measures. Instead, it seems a lot more likely that the whole crisis will get resolved with a minimum of deaths. However, the story has already taken some surprising plot twists. We cannot rule out the possibility of it ending in direct nuclear war.¶ A nuclear war could also occur inadvertently, i.e. when a false alarm is misinterpreted as real, and nuclear weapons are launched in what is believed to be a counterattack. There have been several alarmingly close calls of inadvertent U.S.-Russia nuclear war over the years. Perhaps the most relevant is the 1995 Norwegian rocket incident. A rocket carrying scientific equipment was launched off northern Norway. Russia detected the rocket on its radar and interpreted it as a nuclear attack. Its own nuclear forces were put on alert and Boris Yeltsin was presented the question of whether to launch Russia's nuclear weapons in response. Fortunately, Yeltsin and the Russian General Staff apparently sensed it was a false alarm and declined to launch. Still, the disturbing lesson from this incident is that nuclear war could begin even during periods of calm.

## 2NR

### A2: Dems Can’t help

### Climate – More specific

#### Next President can make or break climate policy – Ex can change fuel-economy standards, Clean Power Plan, and EPA strength

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

Okay, now let's assume it's 2017. There's a new president, and Congress is still totally gridlocked on climate change. What happens next? The next president likely won't be able to dismantle Obama's climate policies entirely — not on his or her own. After all, the Supreme Court has effectively ordered the EPA to regulate greenhouse gases so long as there's evidence that they cause harm, and that evidence is quite solid. Only Congress could undo everything Obama's done, by revising the Clean Air Act. Still, whoever occupies the White House and EPA will have a lot of say in how to implement Obama's climate rules. That sounds boring, but it's actually a key step. There's tons of leeway to strengthen or weaken these rules. Here are a few ways this could play out: 1) Fuel-economy standards could be tightened (or weakened) in 2017. Remember, the EPA's fuel-economy standards for new cars and light trucks are on pace to rise from their current 35 miles per gallon to 54.5 miles per gallon by 2025. Yet those numbers aren't set in stone. These CAFE (corporate average fuel economy) rules are scheduled to come up for a midterm review in 2017. At that point, automakers may lobby to allow the standards to rise more slowly — particularly if sales of fuel-efficient vehicles have been sluggish due to low oil prices. Green groups, meanwhile, could push to make the standards stricter, or to have them keep increasing past 2025, to push vehicle emissions down even further. So the next administration will have to decide. Leave the vehicle standards alone? Make them stricter? Weaker? The one twist here is that due to a longstanding quirk of the Clean Air Act, California can threaten to create its own stricter standards if it's not happy with what the federal government is doing (and other states can join). Automakers really hate the idea of multiple sets of vehicle standards around the country, so they may prefer not to weaken the federal rules too much and risk having California go it alone. 2) The Clean Power Plan will live or die based on implementation. The EPA will finalize its rules for reducing carbon dioxide from existing power plants in the summer of 2015. It's a core component of Obama's climate policy — power plants are responsible for 40 percent of the nation's greenhouse gas emissions. But the next president will have enormous influence over how this plan actually works. Assuming the rule holds up in court, it could prove difficult for the next president to simply hit the kill switch on the plan and start all over. But he or she will get to decide how to implement it — and that's arguably just as significant. After the rule is finalized, states will have another 14 months to submit plans for cutting emissions, though some will request extensions. That process could drag on until 2017 or 2018. At that point, the EPA will review each state's plans for reducing emissions from its power plants and decide whether the plans are acceptable. An administration that really wants to tackle climate change can make sure states are doing as much as is feasible. By contrast, a president who was less concerned about global warming could allow states that wanted to, like Texas, to submit less-aggressive plans. "There’s a lot of latitude in the review process," says Stanford's Michael Wara. "The history of the Clean Air Act shows this. If you have a president who doesn’t like climate policy, they could basically signal to the states that they’re going to give a lot of compliance flexibility and allow states to make assumptions in their plan that reduce their costs." This would likely involve seemingly arcane tweaks to models and baselines that would be harder for green groups to challenge in court. Meanwhile, some states may outright refuse to submit any plans for reducing emissions. (Sen. Mitch McConnell, R-KY, is already urging states to do exactly this.) If that happens, the EPA has the authority to impose its own federal plan on the states. The agency will unveil the details of this federal plan in 2015, though, again, implementation would be left to the next president. Meanwhile, industry groups are almost certain to challenge aspects of the rule in court. Adele Morris, the policy director for the Climate and Energy Economics Project at the Brookings Institution, points out that an administration hostile to Obama's EPA rule could defend it weakly in court. And if any parts of the rule get struck down, the next administration will get to decide how to redo it. It all comes down to preference. "If you have an administration that's friendly to [Obama's] policy, then you'd have continuity in implementation," says David Doniger, director of the Natural Resources Defense Council's climate and clear air program. "But if you had an administration that wasn't as friendly, they could try to drag their feet or change the rules." 3) The next president will decide whether to regulate other sectors — like refineries. The Clean Air Act doesn't just cover vehicles and power plants. Technically the EPA has the authority to regulate carbon dioxide from other sources, as well. Oil refineries. Cement plants. Trucks. Airplanes. The agency is regulating methane leaks from new oil and gas wells, but it hasn't touched existing wells. And so on. These sources all add up. The Obama administration is leaving most of the decisions about what to do with these sectors to the next president. If Hillary Clinton comes in and wants to expand the EPA's authority here, she can. If Marco Rubio comes in and doesn't, he may have to fend off lawsuits, but he can likely hold off on doing this for a long time.

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

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

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

### A2 Warming Inevitble

#### Yes, we can’t give you an exact year when the tipping point will be reached – but it’s not irreversible yet – err on the side of caution because warming will be abrupt and irreversible once tipped.

**Lenton and Ciscar 13** (Timothy – Chair in and Professor of Climate Change/Earth Systems Science at University of Exeter, Ph.D. Oceanic/Atmospheric Studies, and Juan-Carlos – Ph.D. Economics, “Integrating tipping points into climate impact assessments”, pg. 587, SpringerLink, Climatic Changel 2013 117:585–597, RSpec)

Several ‘tipping elements’ in the climate system have been identified that could pass a tipping point this century, leading to a qualitative change in their future state (Lenton et al. 2008; Schellnhuber 2009). Leading candidates are: abrupt loss of Arctic summer sea-ice, irreversible meltdown of the Greenland ice sheet (GIS), disintegration of the West Antarctic ice sheet (WAIS), reorganisation of the Atlantic thermohaline circulation (THC), increased amplitude of the El Niño Southern Oscillation (ENSO), disruption of the Indian summer monsoon (ISM), collapse of the West African monsoon (WAM), dieback of the Amazon rainforest, and dieback of boreal forests. Abrupt changes in Antarctic bottom water formation, tundra, permafrost, marine methane hydrates, ocean anoxia and Arctic ozone have also been considered, but either lacked evidence for a large-scale threshold or were deemed to have a threshold that is inaccessible this century (Lenton et al. 2008). Subsequent work has identified the Yedoma region of permafrost and the North Atlantic sub-polar gyre as potential tipping elements, and has considered several other candidates, including aridification of southwest North America (Lenton 2012; Lenton et al. 2009; Levermann et al. 2012). A new class of tipping point dependent only on the rate of climate change has also been suggested, with the example of self-sustaining breakdown of soils rich in carbon (Wieczorek et al. 2011).The existence of a threshold is uncertain for some of these systems (see Supplementary Information), but the salient point here is not whether all of these systems exhibit tipping points—but rather that the list of potential tipping points is a long one! Even if further research eliminates some of the candidates, it seems unlikely that the list will reduce to a single large-scale discontinuity. Thus, we should consider the possibility of multiple tipping points in the climate system, which are unlikely to all occur at the same time or level of e.g. global temperature rise.

#### Even if they win it’s irreversible, we can adapt and stop the impact.

**Skuce 14** – retired geophysical consultant, BSc in geology from Sheffield University, MSc in geophysics from the University of Leeds. (Andrew, “Global Warming: Not Reversible, But Stoppable,” Skeptical Science, 2014, http://www.skepticalscience.com/global-warming-not-reversible-but-stoppable.html)

Global warming is not reversible but it is stoppable. Many people incorrectly assume that once we stop making greenhouse gas emissions, the CO2 will be drawn out of the air, the old equilibrium will be re-established and the climate of the planet will go back to the way it used to be; just like the way the acid rain problem was solved once scrubbers were put on smoke stacks, or the way lead pollution disappeared once we changed to unleaded gasoline. This misinterpretation can lead to complacency about the need to act now. In fact, global warming is, on human timescales, here forever. The truth is that the damage we have done—and continue to do—to the climate system cannot be undone. The second question reveals a different kind of misunderstanding: many mistakenly believe that the climate system is going to send more warming our way no matter what we choose to do. Taken to an extreme, that viewpoint can lead to a fatalistic approach, in which efforts to mitigate climate change by cutting emissions are seen as futile: we should instead begin planning for adaptation or, worse, start deliberately intervening through geoengineering. But this is wrong. The inertia is not in the physics of the climate system, but rather in the human economy. This is explained in a recent paper in Science Magazine (2013, paywalled but freely accessible here, scroll down to "Publications, 2013") by Damon Matthews and Susan Solomon: Irreversible Does Not Mean Unavoidable. Since the Industrial Revolution, CO2 from our burning of fossil fuels has been building up in the atmosphere. The concentration of CO2 is now approaching 400 parts per million (ppm), up from 280 ppm prior to 1800. If we were to stop all emissions immediately, the CO2 concentration would also start to decline immediately, with some of the gas continuing to be absorbed into the oceans and smaller amounts being taken up by carbon sinks on land. According to the models of the carbon cycle, the level of CO2 (the red line in Figure 1A) would have dropped to about 340 ppm by 2300, approximately the same level as it was in 1980. In the next 300 years, therefore, nature will have recouped the last 30 years of our emissions. So, does this mean that some of the climate change we have experienced so far would go into reverse, allowing, for example, the Arctic sea ice to freeze over again? Unfortunately, no. Today, because of the greenhouse gas build-up, there is more solar energy being trapped, which is warming the oceans, atmosphere, land and ice, a process that has been referred to as the Earth's energy imbalance. The energy flow will continue to be out of balance until the Earth warms up enough so that the amount of energy leaving the Earth matches the amount coming in. It takes time for the Earth to heat up, particularly the oceans, where approximately 90% of the thermal energy ends up. It just so happens that the delayed heating from this thermal inertia balances almost exactly with the drop in CO2 concentrations, meaning the temperature of the Earth would stay approximately constant from the minute we stopped adding more CO2, as shown in Figure 1C. There is bad news and good news in this. The bad news is that, once we have caused some warming, we can’t go back, at least not without huge and probably unaffordable efforts to put the CO2 back into the ground, or by making risky interventions by scattering tons of sulphate particles into the upper atmosphere, to shade us from the Sun. The good news is that, once we stop emissions, further warming will immediately cease; we are not on an unstoppable path to oblivion. The future is not out of our hands. Global warming is stoppable, even if it is not reversible

### Hillary win

#### Best electoral projections show Hillary wins the Electoral College.

**Smith ’16:** [Allan Smith, “A new electoral-map model finds Hillary Clinton crushing Donald Trump and Ted Cruz”, Business Insider, Apr. 13, 2016.//vm]

An Electoral College projection released Wednesday [from Morning Consult](https://morningconsult.com/presidential-election-2016-electoral-college-projection/) found that Hillary Clinton would secure massive victories in the general election against either Donald Trump or Ted Cruz, the two most likely Republican presidential nominees. But the analysis also showed that Clinton, the former secretary of state and Democratic frontrunner, would suffer a defeat at the hands of John Kasich, the Ohio governor. The study, which surveyed more than [44,000 registered voters across all 50 states](https://morningconsult.com/wp-content/uploads/2016/04/MRP_whitepaper-5-1.pdf), showed that Clinton would have the advantage in nearly every Midwestern swing state against Trump, the GOP frontrunner, and Cruz, the Texas senator nipping at his heels. But the analysis suggested that Kasich had the potential to flip the script in those states. The study showed Kasich holding leads in Pennsylvania, Ohio, Michigan, Wisconsin, and Minnesota, all states his fellow remaining Republicans were projected to lose. The map was nearly identical for both Trump and Cruz, with Trump picking up an additional four votes for winning Maine. (Maine, however, has voted reliably for Democratic candidates in every presidential election since 1988.) Morning Consult, a polling, consulting, and technology firm, surveyed the more than 44,000 voters in all 50 states over a four-month period. The company combined those results with other factors like voter demographics and economic data to forecast an overall outcome in each state. Clinton would edge out Trump and Cruz by more than 100 electoral votes, the analysis found. A candidate needs to secure 270 electoral votes to win the presidency. Of note, roughly 18% of total respondents were still undecided.

#### Trump wins the primaries – but loses the elections

CBS 3/28: (Larry Light. “The money is on Hillary Clinton to bury Donald Trump.” CBS Money Watch. March 28, 2016//FT)

Prediction one: Donald Trump and Hillary Clinton will win their parties' nominations. Prediction two: Clinton will take the White House handily. At least, that's what political wagering websites say. These operations, which distill the wisdom of crowds, turn out to be surprisingly solid when it comes to predicting presidential races. Their record for accuracy outdoes that of opinion polls. Most Web-based political investment markets -- they don't like to call themselves betting pools, not wanting to run up against online gambling bans -- are structured to run much like commodity futures exchanges. According to the oldest such election bourse, the Iowa Electronic Markets, which has been operating since 1988, Trump has 85 percent odds of capturing the Republican nomination this year; Clinton has a 90 percent chance of gaining the Democratic prize. And the Democrats' candidate in the fall is the favorite, by 67-33 percent. (The Iowa market, run by the University of Iowa, doesn't put a person's name at the head of the ticket before the party's nominating convention.) That's a slightly better result for Clinton than the Bloomberg poll finds: 54 percent for her and 36 percent for Trump. Another prominent exchange that trafficks in the presidential contest is Predictit, a two-year-old organization run by Victoria University in New Zealand, with a Washington, D.C., office. Both the Iowa exchange and Predictit received OKs from the Commodity Futures Trading Commission to operate. The two organizations view themselves as more of an academic experiment than a business. Then there are the storied British betting houses, Ladbrokes and Betfair Group. The two U.K. firms accept actual bets, chiefly on sports and casino games, but also have lively gambling action on how elections will fare. By law, however, U.S. dwellers can't deal with these outfits, which have similar American election prognostication numbers as the Iowa exchange and Predictit. How accurate are these predictions? For nationwide races, as opposed to state presidential primaries and caucuses, they have been quite reliable, and more so closer to an election. Iowa professors did a study of their exchange's results through 2008, its 20-year anniversary. They found it was accurate 74 percent of the time 100 days from an election, defining "accuracy" as being more precise than the polls. Opinion polls tend to be more exact right before a balloting, as voters focus with greater intensity on the candidates. So, five days prior to an election, the exchange was better than the polls 68 percent of the time. Predictit says it has an 84 percent accuracy rate, as measured against actual voting outcomes. The task is tougher for primaries and caucuses. Predictit nailed the most recent contests, in Arizona, Utah and Idaho. But for Super Tuesday on March 1, it mistakenly projected that Vermont Sen. Bernie Sanders would lose to Clinton in Minnesota and Oklahoma. Instead, he won those two states by convincing margins. The reason likely is that when traders from around the nation predict a specific state's outcome, they're not always clued into its particular situation. Brandi Travis, a spokeswoman for Predictit, said its Iowa-resident traders were more accurate for that's state's Feb. 1 caucus results than were non-Iowa ones. For the next big contest, April 5 in Wisconsin, Predictit says Texas Sen. Ted Cruz will sweep to victory with 60 percent of the vote, versus 40 percent for Trump. For the Democrats, the exchange's traders believe, Sanders will outpace Clinton, 54-48 percent. Why are they often so prescient? Various studies conclude that it's the nature of the people who participate in the electoral exchanges: mainly those who are highly informed about politics. Plus, they have a monetary stake in their election picks, which makes them take the endeavor more seriously than someone selected at random by pollsters for a phone survey. "Polls are a static, one-time prediction," said Joyce Berg, a University of Iowa accounting professor who's the exchange's director. But traders on the exchange, she added, are continuously drinking in new information about the political state of play, and thus are more in tune with changing dynamics.

### Link –

The aff is unpopular – they link but the cp doesn’t

Swift 15, Art, Americans' Desire for Stricter Gun Laws Up Sharply, http://www.gallup.com/poll/186236/americans-desire-stricter-gun-laws-sharply.aspx

The percentage of Americans who favor a law providing that only authorized persons (including the police) would be allowed to possess handguns has remained low since the 1990s. This year, 27% -- near the record low -- say there should be this type of ban. This trend has been generally declining since Gallup began asking this question in 1959, when 60% said such a law should exist. In 2007, the year of the Virginia Tech massacre, the percentage of Americans who favored stricter laws on gun sales dropped to a bare majority (51%) for the first time in several years. Since then, support for stricter laws had stayed under 50%, except in the wake of the Sandy Hook school shootings in Newtown, Connecticut, in December 2012. At that point, 58% of Americans said they were in favor of stricter laws on gun sales. Although support for stricter laws receded after those shootings, in which a young man fatally shot 20 children and six adults, it has yet to return to the 44% level it was at before that tragedy. Americans' Views on Gun-Sales Laws The latest increase, from the Gallup Crime poll conducted Oct. 7-11, came in the days after the most recent high-profile mass shooting, at a community college in Oregon. However, that event seems to have mainly affected Americans' views about laws on gun sales, but not other topics relating to guns. Independents, Democrats Fueling Trend for Stricter Gun Laws The rise in the proportion of Americans who want stricter laws on firearm sales can be attributed partly to an increase among certain demographic groups. Support rose among Democrats and especially independents from 2014, and among those who do not personally own a gun. However, support increased even among those who say they own a handgun, from 30% in 2014 to 36% this year. Views on Laws Regarding Gun Sales, by Selected Demographic Group Civilian Handgun Possession Should Not Be Banned, Americans Say The percentage of Americans who favor a law providing that only authorized persons (including the police) would be allowed to possess handguns has remained low since the 1990s. This year, 27% -- near the record low -- say there should be this type of ban. This trend has been generally declining since Gallup began asking this question in 1959, when 60% said such a law should exist.

### Link – Hillary affected

#### That wrecks Clinton’s chances in 2016

Dueck 15 – PhD, Professor of Policy, Government and International Affairs @ GMU (Colin, “The Obama Doctrine,” p. 193-194)

Presidential elections are among other things a referendum on the previous four years.58 If the existing president is unpopular, then a nominee from the same party cannot altogether escape the association with an unpopular incumbent, John McCain was a very different person from George W, Bush in 2008, just as Hubert Humphrey was a very different person from Lyndon Johnson in 1968, but when an incumbent is unpopular it envelops and drags down his would be successor. President Obama's overall approval ratings have hovered around since the summer of 2013—not as low as Bush's by the end of his second term, but still not at all good. If a majority of Americans continue to disapprove of Obama by 2016, and to feel the country is on the wrong track, then voters will hold the Democratic Party's 2016 presidential nominee responsible for Obama's performance, regardless of candidate messaging. This includes voter evaluation of incumbent performance on foreign policy issues. A party's presidential nominee can try to distance him or herself from a weak incumbent, but if voters disapprove of a president's foreign policy, inevitably this hurts any would-be successor from the very same party. To be sure, presidential nominees from the party out of power must develop credible and constructive policy alternatives. But asking voters to reflect on the failure or success of an existing president’s foreign policy record is quite rightly a major part of what opposing nominees can and should do.

#### It’s shaky

Bloomberg 3/24: (Sahil Kapur, “Donald Trump’s Tough But Plausible Path to Winning the White House.” Bloomberg Politics, March 24, 2016//FT)

There are some wildcards that could alter Clinton's advantage in the electoral college. A large body of political science research finds that an economic downturn or low presidential approval typically helps the party out of power in an election. In addition, an unforeseen event, such as a major terrorist attack, could complicate the fundamentals of the election in unpredictable ways. “We tend to always look at politics and particularly presidential campaigns through the prism of events that have already occurred—what happened last week. But the events that will shape the outcome between now and November are unwritten,” Steve Schmidt, chief strategist for John McCain's 2008 campaign, said Tuesday on MSNBC. “Donald Trump is something we haven't seen in the country in a long time from that message construct. He is an American nationalist.” Political analysts and strategists in both parties agree that Clinton would start off as the front-runner as she enjoys significant demographic advantages throughout the country. The fastest-growing coalitions—racial minorities, unmarried women, and millennials—all lean Democrat. (Greenberg projects that they will rise from comprising 48 percent of electorate in 2012 to 54 percentage of the electorate in 2016.) Trump is counting on his populist messages to overcome that. “There's no doubt that trade is a powerful new issue,” Greenberg said. “Powerful in the sense that globalization and trade have been uncontested because the elites, to some degree, have conspired not really to discuss it. And Republicans have been part of that,” he said, adding that immigration was also a key issue. “Democrats and their elites have been divided [on the issue of trade] and he's kinda the skunk at the garden party.” Trump and Clinton are both very unpopular. Trump is viewed unfavorably by 68 percent of Americans, while 53 percent felt the same way about Clinton, according to the new Bloomberg Politics national poll of 1,000 adults that was conducted March 19-22 by Selzer & Co. of West Des Moines, Iowa. A survey released Monday by the New York Times and CBS found that Trump and Clinton have the highest unfavorable ratings among prospective nominees since the poll began asking that question in 1984. “It’s going to be a very nasty campaign,” Rollins said. “Probably as close to nuclear war as you can have in American politics.”

#### Gun control is a major issue for the 2016 election—its unpopularity will get pinned to Democrats and cause GOP victory.

Tani 15 Max Tani (staff writer). “The dark reason why guns are virtually guaranteed to be a major issue of the 2016 campaign.” Business Insider. July 29th, 2015. http://www.businessinsider.com/gun-control-in-2016-election-2015-7

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

#### Spills over to congress as wel

Owens ’15: (Bob Owens, “Democrats Will Lose The White House In 2016 Over Guns. Here’s Why.” Bearing Arms. October 13, 2015//FT)

We’re always careful to note that firearms ownership has no age, faith, color, religious, or political boundaries. What we do know is that firearms ownership, long strong among rural white males, has been seeing incredible growth among young, urban and female voters… traditional Democrat constituencies. They are also among the most rabid Second amendment supporters on the planet, and most see little or no room to compromise and given up their rights for more gun control laws. Many, in fact, are chomping at the bit to repeal numerous existing gun laws for being ineffective and punitive in design. Grossly inaccurate perceptions of gun ownership and gun owners by party leaders is going to force many Democrats and independents to cross over and vote for the Republican candidate in 2016, or else convince them to stay home. Hillary and Bernie are salting the earth beneath their feet, and setting the stage for the republicans not only winning the White House, but extending their power in the House and Senate. I don’t know who is driving their political calculus, but it appears obvious that they’ve been attempting it with Common Core math.

#### Their vote matters.

Herring ’08: (Hal Herring. “Why we all need the Democrats to abandon gun control.” High Country News. Oct. 27, 2008//FT)

At this year's annual Gun Rights Policy Conference in September, National Rifle Association President Sandy Froman endorsed Arizona Sen. John McCain in the upcoming presidential election. This came as no surprise; the Democrats have long been denounced by the NRA as the anti-Second Amendment party — Nanny-State know-it-alls, Big-Government gun-controllers out of touch with the majority of Americans, yearning to impose their vision on a population that wants none of it. In this election, however, it's not that simple. The U.S. is facing a host of challenges, most of them brought on by the antics of a Republican administration that governed as a team of mendacious plunderers, with no regard for the future, or even for the beliefs that their own party once espoused. The Constitution — the very document that guarantees the right to keep and bear arms — has been treated with scorn. The economy, manipulated by the kind of "crony capitalism" we once despised in less-enlightened nations, is a shambles, at least for the middle class, and our energy policies are the laughingstock of the developed world. Today's Republicans are not just the party of the Second Amendment; they are also the party of the big energy companies. Is it possible, then, that gun-rights advocates might consider voting for someone who is not a Republican? It's unlikely, unless the Democrats start acknowledging the gun vote and respecting the views of Second Amendment proponents. Gun owners represent at least 4 million of the nation's most dedicated voters. Election after election, they help change the outcome, sometimes electing politicians who are inept, corrupt or unabashed lackeys of corporate interests — people whose only appeal to gun owners is that they promise to leave the Second Amendment alone. Now, however, the Second Amendment is more resistant to those politicians who might want to mess with it. The Supreme Court's recent Heller decision just declared Washington, D.C.'s restrictive firearms laws unconstitutional, thus weakening the power of state and local politicians to control guns or limit gun ownership. Given that — and given what is at stake in the U.S. today — it may be time for Democratic and independent voters to simply give up on gun control. We have so many more pressing issues to deal with. For two decades, many liberals have thrived on despising the NRA and its members. Those who believe in gun control often hold enormous prejudice against those who don't. But there are already reams of laws pertaining to the use, abuse, purchase and sale of firearms. What new regulations would the gun-controllers create, and how would they work to address the problem of gun violence? Do they want to prohibit private ownership of firearms altogether? Many would like to ban handguns, without considering just what this would entail, what inequities of power would result, and what new, potentially dangerous, powers would have to be awarded to government to accomplish it. Like activists who want to ban pit bulls, the gun-control advocates remain relentlessly unspecific about what they hope to achieve. It has become clear, too, that these advocates hold a double standard regarding the U.S. Constitution: The First Amendment is vital to the health of a free nation, as is the Fourth, but the Second is respected only by the un-evolved and the violent. Only the parts of the Constitution that their side respects are valid, in this view. According to Dave Workman, the senior editor of GunWeek, a publication of the Bellevue, Wash.-based Second Amendment Foundation, "The Clinton-era 'assault weapons ban' was more symbolic than anything else. The reason it was so overwhelmingly supported by the gun control movement was because it represented a federal ban on firearms based on cosmetic circumstances — what they looked like — not on their lethality. It was to condition the public to accept a piecemeal destruction of the Second Amendment." Workman believes there was much to learn from the Clinton election. "When George H. W. Bush took the gun vote for granted in 1992, most of the gun owners voted for Ross Perot, or else they sat it out," he says. The election of Clinton, though, and what followed, cemented the gun voters' dislike of the Democratic Party. The Brady Law went into effect in 1993, and the "assault weapons ban" passed a year later. That was enough, says Workman, for the gun voters to see "how this was all going. They mobilized and threw out many of the Democrats, costing them control of Congress (in 1994)." The National Rifle Association first endorsed a presidential candidate — Ronald Reagan — in 1980, but gun politics as we know them today were born in 1994. Since then, the gun vote has gone to the Republicans, and that is not expected to change anytime soon, even with pro-gun Democrats like Montana's Gov. Brian Schweitzer or Sen. Jon Tester gaining prominence. "It is not that the gun vote will not cross party lines," Workman said. "We know that there are a lot of pro-gun Democrats now, and we are not the one-mind, one-thought Neanderthals that many liberals believe us to be. But the Republican party remains the party of the gun owners, because the most entrenched Democrats are the old-left, dust-gathering anti-gun, anti-liberty politicians, and when the Democrats have a majority, it puts those people in charge." Tom Gresham, host of the radio show Gun Talk, recognizes that there are dire problems with the Republican Party. Still, he refuses to vote for a Democrat. "I am proud to be a single-issue voter, and I will not cast a vote to strengthen the party of Nancy Pelosi. Let's look at what it means when any politician says that it is okay to take away any of the gun rights of a law-abiding citizen. It means that they truly believe that we are too childlike to be trusted with those rights, and it means that their attitude of government is that it will protect us from any and every peril. Tangentially, it also means that they want all the power."

### Link – Trump can win

#### Trump will win the nomination

Bloomberg 3/24: (Sahil Kapur, “Donald Trump’s Tough But Plausible Path to Winning the White House.” Bloomberg Politics, March 24, 2016//FT)

Denial has been Trump's greatest ally. Republicans and commentators didn't believe he would run. They didn't believe he could be an attractive candidate to rational people, no matter how angry with "the establishment" voters said they were. They — which includes me — were wrong. The denial lasted longer for some than others. Long after many observers had come to the realization that Trump was the front-runner, Jeb Bush's super PAC, Right to Rise, believed Bush's real rival was Marco Rubio. It spent $35 million trying to destroy Rubio before it dropped its first $25,000 attacking Trump. Over the weekend, Republican National Committee Chairman Reince Priebus showed the first public signs of acceptance about what's in store for the party. He finally acknowledged that the Republican nominee was probably going to be determined on the convention floor in Cleveland.

#### Trump has momentum – while it would be tough it’s plausible

Bloomberg 3/24: (Sahil Kapur, “Donald Trump’s Tough But Plausible Path to Winning the White House.” Bloomberg Politics, March 24, 2016//FT)

But the glee has given way to some pangs of anxiety as the Republican candidate marches to the nomination. Trump's unexpected success in the primary has revealed his uncanny ability to appeal to the fears of working-class Americans, which some Democratic and Republican operatives say could scramble the electoral map by putting in play Midwestern states that have voted Democrat in recent elections. “He's unpredictable. He plays by his own rules. He's thrown conventional playbooks out the window,” said Tracy Sefl, a Democratic consultant who advised the now-defunct group Ready for Hillary. Sefl warns that Trump's idiosyncratic message of railing against trade deals and confronting countries where American jobs have migrated could have crossover appeal with blue-collar voters if Democrats don’t counter it effectively. Most Democrats continue to believe he'd be the underdog against Clinton, and a new Bloomberg Politics national poll finds her leading Trump in a hypothetical general-election match-up by 54 percent to 36 percent. But some in the party are bracing for a tougher battle than they once expected. “He could alter the map and make us fight in industrial Midwestern states we have not had to fight in for years,” said one prominent Democratic strategist involved in the 2016 race, who was granted anonymity to speak candidly. Trump’s likeliest path to the White House hinges on winning Rust Belt states with high concentrations of white working-class voters, according to strategists and pollsters. It's a herculean task as some of these states have voted Democrat for the past six elections, but the brash billionaire’s unique economic pitch could help. Trump could clinch the 270 electoral votes needed to become president if he holds the states Mitt Romney won in 2012 as well as Florida (29 electoral votes) and any three states between Ohio (18), Wisconsin (10), Michigan (16), and Pennsylvania (20). Two other states—Virginia (13) and Iowa (6)—are also plausible targets. “Pennsylvania could be in play. Michigan could be in play. Wisconsin—we’ve got a strong Republican governor,” said Ed Rollins, a GOP consultant who managed Ronald Reagan's re-election campaign in 1984. “There's obviously some disaffected Democrats in there. That hasn’t been our turf, but it can be. ... Trade has not been a cutting-edge issue because Republicans have been a pro-trade and pro-business party.” Trump's attacks on trade have the potential to win over voters. According to the Bloomberg Politics poll, 65 percent of Americans prefer more restrictions on imported goods to protect U.S. jobs, while 22 percent favor fewer restrictions. Forty-four percent said NAFTA, which took effect while Clinton's husband, former President Bill Clinton, was in office, has been bad for the economy. Twenty-nine percent said it's been good. Eighty-two percent indicated they're willing to pay a little more for products made in the U.S., while 13 percent said they'd prefer the lowest possible price. A strong majority of Americans said they'd prefer a U.S.-owned factory that employed 1,000 workers in their community to a Chinese-owned factory that created 2,000 jobs. “I don’t expect any of the states in the Republican camp for the last several cycles to go away. He sorta begins with North Carolina and Indiana,” Rollins said of Trump. “I don’t buy the premise that it’s a Goldwater year,” he added, referring to Republican Barry Goldwater's landslide defeat in 1964. “Democrats automatically begin with some advantage but I expect it to be a competitive race.” Democrats' margins in some states Trump needs to win were modest in 2012. President Barack Obama squeaked out Florida by a margin of less than 1 percentage point; he won Ohio by 2 points, Virginia by 4 points, Pennsylvania by 5 points, Wisconsin by 7 points, and Michigan by just under 10 points. Below are two conceivable scenarios for a Trump victory that require him to win Florida and flip three swing states Obama won by single digits in 2012. To be sure, carrying Midwestern states that have trended Democrat won't be easy. An analysis by demographer Ruy Teixeira found that unless Trump out-performs Romney among college-educated white voters, a victory would require improving on the GOP's 2012 margin with working-class whites by 18 points in Michigan, 12 points in Wisconsin, 13 points in Pennsylvania, and 6 points in Ohio. Yet some Republicans compare Trump's current general-election deficit to that of Reagan in 1980, who many Democrats initially thought would be an easy opponent. “Remember that when people tell you Trump is 8 points behind Hillary or something, Reagan was 25 points behind [Jimmy] Carter in March of 1980,” former House Speaker Newt Gingrich said. Reagan closed the gap and won the popular vote by 10 points in a 44-state landslide. In the Rust Belt, home to the once-vibrant U.S. manufacturing sector, there is evidence of Trump's appeal. A January study by the labor-linked group Working America found unusually high levels of support for Trump among white working-class voters in Ohio and Pennsylvania—even some Democrats took to his message. Labor leaders recently told the New York Times and Huffington Post that Trump's message about upending a system that's failing the working class appeals to their members. “If I win, Apple and all of these great companies will be making their product in the United States, not in China, Vietnam and all. And we're not going to be losing our companies. You know, our companies are leaving our country rapidly. Rapidly,” Trump said on March 15 after taking a leap toward the nomination. “Frankly I'm disgusted with it. And I'm tired of seeing it. And there's no reason for seeing it. It's just gross incompetence at the highest level. We should not allow it to happen.” Recent polling in Ohio ranks debt to China, jobs shipped overseas, and the decline in manufacturing among the top four concerns for voters. “We're already witnessing it. I don’t think it's a ‘what if’ scenario. There's a sense that, ‘I'm a Democrat, I vote Democrat, but boy I sure like this guy who says the stuff about how we gotta beat China.’ … Trump’s plain-spokenness, however perverse, rings true for people,” Sefl said. “But that's where it stops. Because what he's proposing is absurd at best and impossible in many cases.”

#### Mid-west states are a gun prevalent region.

Kiersz 15: (Andy Kiersz and Brett LoGiurato. “Here's where you're most likely to own a gun.” Business Insider. Jul. 3, 2015//FT)

The researchers conducted the survey of 4,000 adults in an attempt to answer the question of how many Americans own a firearm — and why — amid a lack of overall data and statistics on gun ownership. They found a broad regional variation in gun ownership — from as low as near 5% in some areas to as much as 66% in others. In individual states, this ranged from 5.2% ownership in Delaware to 61.7% in Alaska. The researchers discovered the variation was due to everything from local and state firearm laws to cultural and social norms. Those who reported the prevalence of a "social gun culture," in fact, were 2.25 times more likely to own a gun. "In many parts of the country, these social norms include participation in social activities around gun ownership. These social gun cultures have rarely been formally studied but may be important determinants of gun ownership," the study's authors wrote. In the Northeast, gun ownership was below the national average, ranging from 5.8% in Rhode Island to 28.8% in Vermont. In the Midwest and South, ownership ranged from 26.2% in Illinois to 57.9% in Arkansas. And in the West, just more than 20% of Californians own a gun, compared with about 57% in Idaho.

#### Dems win now, but it’s really close—if Obama’s approval rating drops, Dems will lose.

Needham 1-21 Vicki Needham (trade reporter). “Moody’s model gives Dem candidate advantage in 2016.” The Hill. January 21st, 2016. http://thehill.com/policy/finance/266668-moodys-model-gives-dem-candidate-advantage-in-2016

The Democratic presidential nominee will win the race for the presidency, but the election is shaping up as historically tight, according to a political model. Less than 11 months from Election Day, Moody’s Analytics is predicting that whomever lands the Democratic nomination will capture the White House with 326 electoral votes to the Republican nominee’s 212. Those results are heavily dependent on how swing states vote. The latest model from Moody’s reflects razor-thin margins in the five most important swing states — Florida, Ohio, Colorado, New Hampshire and Virginia. In each of those states, the Democratic advantage is less than 1 percentage point, well within the margin of error. The election model weighs political and economic strength in each state and determines the share of the vote that the incumbent party will win. The most important economic variable in the model is the growth in incomes in the two years leading up to the election. That factor captures the strength of the job market in each state, including job growth, hours worked, wage growth and the quality of the jobs being created. The model also factors in home and gasoline prices. So far, the strength of the economy has kept the model on track for the Democratic nominee. But the trajectory of the president’s approval rating also makes a difference in who could win the White House. If President Obama’s approval rating shifts only a little more than 4 percentage points, a bit more than the margin of error for many presidential opinion polls, the move could further cut into Democratic hopes to retain the White House. Growing concern about terrorism and other issues could dent Obama’s approval rating further. Usually, if the sitting president’s approval rating is improving in the year leading up the election, the incumbent party receives a boost. But in most elections, the president’s rating has declined in the lead-up to the election, favoring the challenger party.

### Link – A2 Plan Popular

#### Popularity of the plan among voters overall is irrelevant – Trump’s base is mostly very conservative whites who are certain to oppose any sort of gun ban no matter what

#### It’s a perception question – Hillary would get labeled as pro gun-ban generally. Especially true in this election – Trump is a master media manipulator, and the facts don’t matter, just the spin

### Internal Link

#### Link shapes uniqueness---the plan is an albatross that drastically changes the election narrative and prevents bounce-back--- Dueck—even if uncertain polling etc, you know for certain that the plan makes Clinton lose

#### Voter preferences are shaped early, but are not static

Jennings 15 – PhD, Senior Lecturer in Politics and International Relations at the University of Southampton

(William, “The Timeline of Elections:

A Comparative Perspective,” presented at the 2015 Meeting of the American Association for Public Opinion Research, Hollywood, Florida, and also at the University of Amsterdam, Ludwig Maximilian University of Munich, the University of Manchester, the University of Mannheim)

Discussion and Conclusion

Voter preferences evolve in a systematic way over the election timeline in a wide range of representative democracies. There is structure to preferences well in advance of elections, indeed, years before citizens actually vote. That is, very early polls predict the vote, at least to some extent. This largely reflects differences in the equilibrium support of parties and candidates. Polls do become increasingly informative over time, however, pointing to real evolution of preferences. That this pattern holds across countries is important and points towards 35 a general tendency in the formation of electoral preferences. But the pattern is not precisely the same in all countries. Political institutions structure the evolution of voters’ preferences.23 Government institutions are important. Preferences come into focus later in presidential elections than in parliamentary ones. A year out from Election Day, parliamentary elections are more predictable from the polls than are the outcomes of presidential races. This presumably reflects the greater uncertainties involved in the assessment of presidential candidates and also the time it takes for voters to directly factor in their dispositions toward the political parties (Erikson and Wlezien 2012). In parliamentary systems, by contrast, parties matter more early on. This is important because partisan dispositions, while not fixed, are more durable than those toward candidates. That preferences are in place much later in presidential systems thus comes as little surprise. That there is no real difference between legislative elections in presidential and parliamentary systems may surprise, however. It implies that parties do not matter consistently more to voters in the latter. Electoral institutions also are important. Preferences in legislative elections come into focus more quickly and completely in proportional systems. We find limited evidence of general differences across systems—that proportional representation per se is what matters. We find stronger evidence that the party-centricity of the systems matters most of all. Although closely related to proportionality, there is significant variation in party-centricity within both proportional and plurality systems, and this variation is of consequence for the formation of electoral preferences. The number of parties, meanwhile, appears to have little effect. We have only scratched the surface of the variation in context. To begin with, political institutions differ in ways that we have not considered. Perhaps more importantly, there are other differences in context that we have not even begun to explore. Some of the differences relate to countries themselves. For instance, following Converse (1969), there is reason to think that the age of democracy is important to the formation and evolution of preferences. Other differences relate not to political institutions or the countries themselves, but to characteristics of political parties. There are numerous possibilities here, most notable of which may be whether parties are in government or opposition, as is suggested by the literature on economic voting (e.g. Fiorina 1981; Duch and Stevenson 2008). Another is whether parties are catch-all or niche. The age and size of parties also could matter. Clearly, much research remains to be done, and our methodology can guide the way. That said, we have learned something about the general pattern relating preferences and the vote over the election timeline and the structuring influences of political institutions. We have shown that preferences are often in place far in advance of Election Day and that they evolve slowly over time. Indeed, the final outcome is fairly clear in the polls before the election campaign really begins. This is not to say that the campaign does not matter, as it does, particularly in 37 certain types of countries and elections where candidates are central. Even there, however, it is clear that the “long campaign” between elections matters most of all.

#### Actions now shape the conversation and resonate with the electorate---shapes voting patterns

York 15 - Chief Political Correspondent for the Washington Examiner

(Byron, “2016: Yes, it's early, but pay attention now,” http://www.washingtonexaminer.com/2016-yes-its-early-but-pay-attention-now/article/2563339)

It's conventional wisdom that the 2016 Republican presidential race is at such an early stage that the polls don't matter. They're just a measurement of name recognition at this point, some observers say, and the only people really paying attention to the campaign are reporters and hard-core party activists. Maybe that was true in earlier years. But it doesn't seem to be the case now. "One thing about this election — Republicans are paying attention," says a GOP pollster not affiliated with any campaign. "They are very concerned about who the nominee is going to be, and the idea that what a candidate says now doesn't matter could not be farther from the truth." Look at the new CNN/ORC poll, out Monday morning. First of all, it's a huge field, and no candidate dominates — Jeb Bush is in the lead with just 17 percent. But nearly all the respondents surveyed have picked a candidate to support; add together every candidate's little share of the vote and the total nears 100 percent, with few undecided. There's Bush's 17 percent, followed by Scott Walker with 12 percent; then Rand Paul and Marco Rubio with 11 percent each; Mike Huckabee with nine percent; Ted Cruz with seven percent; Ben Carson and Chris Christie with four percent each; Rick Perry and Rick Santorum with three percent each; and Carly Fiorina, Lindsey Graham, Bobby Jindal, and John Kasich with two percent each. Then there are five percent who say they support some other candidate. MORE FROM THE WASHINGTON EXAMINER What's behind Trump's collapsing Iowa poll numbers? Evangelicals prefer Carson By Daniel Allott • 10/26/15 6:20 PM Add it up, and that's 94 percent of Republicans who say they support a specific candidate now. The rest — a pretty tiny number of undecided — say they can't make a decision or have no opinion. Of course, that's just for now. Many will change their minds, but they are already taking the race seriously. At this point, many voters are likely making preliminary decisions based on very little information. They know Scott Walker fought unions in Wisconsin. They know Jeb Bush is George W. Bush's brother and George H.W. Bush's son. They know Ted Cruz was involved in the government shutdown. "That's why these announcements are important," says the pollster, "because it is the first time to associate more facts with each candidate. And you've seen each candidate get a little bump when they announced." Some analysts describe this period as the "pregame." The real game starts at some point in the future, perhaps in August when the first Republican debate takes place in Ohio. But the pregame, if that's what it is, matters too. Candidates are getting their only chance to make a first impression. In the 2012 campaign, the first Republican debate was held May 5, 2011, in Greenville, South Carolina. The participants were Ron Paul, Herman Cain, Rick Santorum, Tim Pawlenty, and Gary Johnson. (Don't remember Johnson? He's the former New Mexico governor who ended up running as a Libertarian.) The big question that night was whether Pawlenty could ascend to the top tier of candidates. (He couldn't.) But the real lesson of the evening, at least in retrospect, was that the GOP field was still remarkably unformed at that stage. This year's field seems much more stable at an earlier time. Yes, Kasich might enter the race — he certainly sounded that way last weekend in New Hampshire — and yes, perhaps another candidate will give it a try, too. But the basic structure of the Republican field seems nearly set. And strong, too. Back in 2011 and 2012, it was common to hear Republicans complain about the weakness of their field. Some complain today — some always do — but the fact is the 2016 GOP field is a pretty impressive group. Governors with solid records, senators who have made their mark in the Senate, plus intriguing figures who come from outside the world of politics. Not all of them will make it even to the Iowa caucuses. And they'll drop off like flies after that. The key thing for the winning candidate is to realize that he will have to be able to assemble a coalition of those voters who support other candidates in the current 14-candidate field. That's what it will take to win. One thing a candidate — or anyone else, for that matter — should not do is dismiss what is going on in the race now as meaningless because it is so early. Plenty can change, but it might be that when February 2016 comes around, and the voting begins, some themes (and frontrunners) in the race will look a lot like they look now.

#### Looking like a winner NOW is necessary because elections are determined by momentum---causes voter buy-in, increases campaign contributions and leads to positive media coverage

Holbrook 96 – Professor of Political Science @ UW-Milwaukee

(Thomas, “Do Campaigns Matter?,” p. 130-132)

Although they are different from primaries, it is expected that similar but perhaps less pronounced momentum effects exist in general election campaigns. Skalaban (1988) found that paying attention to poll results had a significant influence on voting behavior during the 1980 election. According to Skalaban, those voters who paid attention to the polls in September 1980, when Reagan was ahead in most polls, were more likely to vote for Reagan than those who did not pay attention to the polls. Nadeau, Niemi, and Amato (1994) also found that voter expectations about who would win had a significant influence on party support in British general elections. To date, however, there are no studies of the effect of momentum in U.S. presidential general election campaigns. One basis for expecting significant momentum effects is offered by Nadeau et al.: "... some voters respond to the implicit bonus of being on the winning side" (1994, 378). All else held equal, voting for a winning candidate appears to offer some value for some voters. As poll results are reported in the media, voters incorporate them as one more piece Of information when evaluating the relative merits of the candidates. This, of course, assumes that poll results or information about the likely winner is readily available to voters. Indeed, there is substantial circumstantial evidence to support this proposition. In 1992, for instance, in the period between the end of the conventions and election day, over 100 national trial-heat polls were con- ducted for major national print and television media outlets (The American Enterprise 1992, 100-101). This figure does not include the number of polls taken during the summer of 1992. In addition, during the general election campaign of 1992, 27% of all campaign stories on the ABC, CBS, and NBC evening news programs focused on the "horse race" aspect of the campaign (Stanley and Niemi 1994, 63). Clearly, there are many opportunities for voters to become aware of the competitive nature of the race. Another possible explanation for momentum effects lies not in the value voters place on supporting a winner but in the way political and media elites react to poll numbers. First, it is possible that potential campaign contributors will feel more comfortable if they think they are betting on a winner and be more forthcoming with contributions that might strengthen the campaign. Perhaps more important, however, is the way the media respond to poll results. There is some tendency for the media to treat candidates differently depending on their standing in the polls. Patterson (1989), for instance, found that the amount of favorable media coverage of Bush and Dukakis in 1988 was positively related to their relative standing in the polls during the general election campaign. Positive press coverage translates into positive information being conveyed to the voters, which should lead to more improvement in the polls. Good poll numbers, then, may influence voters directly or indirectly. Whatever the mechanism, it is expected that momentum plays a role in the dynamics Of general election campaigns. In this analysis the effect of mo- mentum is captured with a variable that measures the change in candidate support in public opinion polls over a relatively short period of time. Specifically, for every day in the analysis, the difference between the Republican estimated polling margin (see Appendix A) on the previous day and the Republican polling margin five days earlier is used to measure short-term change in candidate support. If this number is positive, indicating a Republican gain in support, it should translate into more support for the Republican candidate. If the change is negative, indicating a Republican loss in support, it should translate into a further decline in Republican support. One important point to bear in mind is that momentum does not occur in a vacuum. Public opinion changes in response to campaign events or changes in national conditions; momentum then exacerbates these changes.

#### Clinton is the favorite despite her flaws—prediction markets prove

King 1-4-16 - Wall Street Journal's global economics editor Neil King Jr., Election 2016 Predictions: Partisan Divide Deepens and Voters Remain Displeased, The Wall Street Journal, http://blogs.wsj.com/washwire/2016/01/04/election-2016-predictions-partisan-divide-deepens-and-voters-remain-displeased/

Succeeding an unpopular, two-term president from your own party isn’t easy, and polls already point to a palpable degree of wariness—and weariness—toward Mrs. Clinton. But the Republicans still face an uphill climb to win the White House, especially after a bitter nomination fight in which most of the candidates have swerved far to the right on numerous issues, such as guns and immigration, that play very differently in a general election setting, particularly in the handful of states—including Colorado, Virginia and Florida—that now determine who wins presidential campaigns.¶ The GOP’s own chairman, Reince Priebus, warned after the 2012 loss that the party would find it “increasingly difficult” to win future presidential contests unless it broadened its appeal to younger and minority voters. So far, the party’s drift has been in the opposite direction. All the various prediction markets now give the Democrats at least a 60% chance of keeping the White House in 2017.