



US ELECTIONS 2016

ISSUE 7 | FEBRUARY 2016

An ORF Monthly Monitor

EDITORIAL NOTE

As we enter 2016, the United States swings into election mode, ORF has begun to closely monitor the developments. We bring news updates; commentaries; opinion polls as well as statements, speeches and interviews by the Presidential candidates. We also look at role of the Indian Diaspora and its positions on various issues and explore the potential implications of the elections for India. We welcome your feedback and comments.

ANALYSES

The United States Presidential Elections and the Imminent Chinese Showdown **Monika Chansoria**

Though foreign policy issues might not be the eventual deciding factor during presidential campaigns, the case of China continues to remain exceptional interwoven with the fate of the US economy.

The Tr[i]um[phant] Nativism and the US Elections **Monish Tourangbam**

Rising and ebbing waves of patriotism narrowly identified with the protestant “natives”, and concentrated hatred of the other immigrants, has often created an “us vs them” scenario, highly magnified during election seasons.

THE FIELD

A look at the Republican and Democrat candidates who are running for their party’s nomination

THE POLLS

Analysis of the popularity ratings of the presidential nominees conducted by various news agencies

STATEMENTS/INTERVIEWS

Official statements and interviews by the candidates

DIASPORA WATCH

News about the Indian American Diaspora in the elections

MEDIA REVIEW

What the media is reporting on the issues

FURTHER READING

A list of readings based on commentaries, journal articles and reports on the elections

The United States Presidential Elections and the Imminent Chinese Showdown

Monika Chansoria

As the US Presidential campaign gathers momentum, the debate between the candidates on vital foreign policy issues among others, are stemming out with a jagged edge. The initial round of the Democratic debate was fixated as expectedly on two primary issues: American economy and jobs and healthcare. This was reminiscent of the previous Presidential campaign debates where the US was grappling with retaining and creating more jobs – a situation that visibly hasn't changed that much. An equal, if not more crucial subject for debate is foreign policy and the related question pertaining to the future and changing connotations of 'American supremacy'. Foreign policy of any nation is the [resultant of varied forces](#) including the economic conditions, commercial rivalries, dynastic ambitions, and special issues arising from time to time, which determine a nation's attitude toward other states. Though foreign policy issues might not be the eventual deciding factor during presidential campaigns, the case of China continues to remain exceptional – being interwoven with the fate of the US economy – more so the slowdown in Chinese GDP growth, dampening American recovery.

While ISIS and global terrorism, the increasingly confrontation Russia under Putin (as the US advocates it to be) and the Iranian nuclear deal for sure top the agenda, independent candidate and former Senator from Virginia, Jim Webb points out "... the [greatest strategic threat](#)... right now is resolving our relationship with China". [Aaron Friedberg](#), a former White House national security aide to Vice President Dick Cheney argues, "It's not that ISIS, Iran and Russia aren't problems, but in the long run, the bigger potential challenge is China." The forthcoming debates between the Republicans and Democrats through this year will surely witness increasing exchange of jobs over their respective and proposed "China policy".

A substantive part of the debates till now have entirely been dedicated to trade issues amongst others, including, cyber security and regional security. Cyber issues will cut across [many different sectors](#) from the theft of intellectual property to concerns about cyber spying and

the ability to disrupt technology or commerce," says Kenneth Lieberthal, at the John L. Thornton China Center at the Brookings Institution. He further added, "US capital stock in China is receding every year while Chinese investment in the US is increasing rapidly."

As far as the progressive Democrat voters are concerned, ambivalence on taking a firm position on/against China has put Democrat presidential nomination hopeful, and former Secretary of State, Hillary Clinton, under the scanner. Topping the list is the question whether the Obama administration should have fast-tracked trading authority for the Trans-Pacific Partnership – an issue which clearly has caused a rift within the Democrats with President Obama pursuing the TPP persistently, while Democrats in the House of Representatives [voting against a key part of the legislation](#), amid strong concerns regarding losing jobs and growing income inequality. Hillary Clinton's has come under fire for [her shifting views on the Trans-Pacific Partnership](#) as an issue about jobs, not foreign policy. In the summer of 2015, Clinton dodged the issue in Iowa and advised the President "... should listen to and work with his allies in Congress, starting with (House Minority Leader) Nancy Pelosi, who have expressed their concerns about the impact that a weak agreement would have on our workers, to make sure we get the best, strongest deal possible. And if we don't get it, there should be no deal." This however, failed to cut any ice with the Democrat vote bank primarily since it is well known that she was a leading proponent and driver of the TPP during her stint as Secretary of State, with as many as 45 instances when she approvingly invoked the trade bill.

Clinton's take and relations with China, for that matter, can best be described as twitchy and complex dating two decades back to 1995 when she spoke at the World Conference on Women in Beijing, panning China's one-child policy, and castigating the Chinese government for censoring the broadcast. A key architect of the Obama administration's Asian pivot/rebalance strategy, which Beijing perceives as a measure to 'contain China', Clinton writes in her book *Hard Choices*, "It's not a secret that [the centre of the anti-democratic movement in Asia is China](#)". Not surprisingly, the memoir was effectively banned in China less than a month after its launch. Clinton further stated, "The jury's still out. China has some hard choices to make, and so do we. We should follow a time-tested strategy: Work for the best outcome, but plan for something less".

Moreover, China is chary of the long-held Republican view of labelling China as a currency manipulator. Recall the 2012 US presidential election, when Republican challenger Mitt Romney took a hard line on China and accused [Beijing](#) of manipulating its currency and taking advantage of unfair trade practices, and criticised President Barack [Obama](#) for being too soft on the rising Asian power. Obama fired right back by saying his administration had filed twice as many trade cases against China as his predecessor, George W. Bush.

This time round, front-running Republican candidature hopeful and former Governor of Florida, Jeb Bush, appears to have adopted a more conventional approach towards China, articulating like a conformist at the [Chicago Council on Global Affairs](#), “It’s the most complex -- going forward -- perhaps the most complex, important relationship that the United States has”. However, Bush’s Florida challenger, Senator Marco Rubio is seen to be providing the [first hints of a tough China policy](#). Commenting on China’s hacking, another Republican, and perhaps amongst the strongest contenders challenging Jeb Bush, [Carly Fiorina](#) has been positioning to take an extremely confrontational posture against China, accusing it for attempting to make up for its own liabilities. “I have been doing business in China for decades ...they’re not entrepreneurial, they don’t innovate. That is why they are stealing our intellectual property,” she alleged. Similarly, Wisconsin Governor Scott Walker, another top tier candidate for the Republicans, has adopted a hard-line policy toward China, and [accused Beijing](#) of mounting a “serious challenge to American interests.” Walker advocated that Washington needed to beef-up US military capabilities in East Asia, strengthen its alliances with Beijing’s neighbours, and develop a robust cyber capability “that punishes China for its hacking.”

According to various Chinese publications including *Jiefang Daily*, ‘China-bashing’ during the final stages of the US presidential campaign has customarily become the trump card for candidates to demonstrate their resolve to safeguard US’ national interests. Chinese publications contend that in contrast to the Democrats, who have been implementing the policy of labour protection against China amid a host of other issues requiring China to improve unfair trade practises, the Republicans’ approach seem more hands-on.

When the new American President takes the oath of office on January 20, 2017, a key question with reference to future Sino-US ties would be whether either a Republican or Democrat President would risk America’s economic symbiosis with Beijing(though heavily lop-sided

in China’s favour) and adopt an overtly confrontationalist approach? Washington’s management of the China challenge is likely to continue by walking a tightrope of treating the economic agenda whilst simultaneously making efforts to maintain strategic supremacy both within Asia and beyond. This can also be interpreted as confronting the complex task of positioning the US’ domestic fiscal house in order and ensuring long-term economic growth. The stakes on the geopolitical and geostrategic challenge posed by China, as is the case in every US election, shall resurface this time around as well.

With the Democrat and Republican National Conventions scheduled in July 2016, China’s shadow shall loom large with the most pressing question – the direction and scope in which China is putting to use, its economic and military weight, triggers a debate, yet again, whether Beijing essentially would be content at remaining a status quo power or is the world witnessing its gradual, yet steady shift, towards being a revisionist one?

Branding the US presidential election a ‘noisy cacophony of democracy’ Chinese writers and political thinkers often fail to comprehend that this cacophony is far more welcome as compared to the eerie and frozen silence of brutal authoritarian political arrangements, where the irony is that though there are a billion plus people, they cannot speak, express, be heard, or be represented, politically.

(Dr. Monika Chansoria is a Senior Fellow heading the China-study programme at the Centre for Land Warfare Studies, New Delhi)

Tr[i]ump[hant] Nativism and the US Election Campaign Monish Tourangbam

Elections are essentially about winning the hearts and minds of the electorate and in the United States, election campaigns sometimes revolve around separating the White Anglo Saxon Protestants (WASP) from other immigrants. The fear of new immigrants into the United States tend to be directly proportional, often, to rise in perceived threats to the “American way of life” owing to migrant influx from different parts of the world at different periods in American history. Rising and ebbing waves of patriotism narrowly identified with the protestant “natives”, and concentrated hatred of the other immigrants, has often created an “us vs them” scenario, highly magnified during election seasons.

Politicians have often played on hyperbolic fears of an imminent demise of White America, and the dilution of

what is perceived American culture. As early as 1850s, nativism emerged in the political scene of America with the emergence of the '[Know Nothing Movement](#)' (also later referred to as the American Party) that primarily saw surge of anti-immigrant feelings directed against Roman Catholics. The movement has been [reflected in popular culture](#) as well, seen in the Hollywood production *Gangs of New York*, with Daniel Day Lewis essaying the role of a real life Know Nothing movement leader William Poole aka Bill the Butcher.

During his campaign, President John F Kennedy (the only Catholic elected US president) had to passionately emphasize his American-ness to a group of protestant ministers at the Greater Houston Ministerial Association on 12 September 1960. Kennedy emphatically [said](#), "...contrary to common newspaper usage, I am not the Catholic candidate for president. I am the Democratic Party's candidate for president, who happens also to be a Catholic." Jewish immigrants have also been the subject of much [ridicule and prejudice](#) in the United States. Fear mongering [saw them as](#) swarming America's elite institutions or undermining America's small town simplicity. Threats have also been perceived from influx of immigrants from East Asia as well. The internment of Japanese Americans in the aftermath of the Pearl Harbor attacks continues to be questionable measure of the Franklin D. Roosevelt administration.

In more recent times, such politics of fear have been directed against illegal immigrants from Mexico, Muslims in general and Syrian refugees in particular in the midst of the rising threats of the Islamic State (IS). Besides the fear of cultural dilution, the fear of immigrants and the associated political rhetoric is often seen to be directly proportional to rising concerns of national security, as seen through rising incidences of crime and terrorist violence. Election campaigns often reflect this politics of fear trumpeted and project oneself as that candidate who could more than anyone else, preserve life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness at the face of all odds.

The Republican candidate Donald Trump's nativist views has been the subject of much debate in the campaign season and his no holds barred comments on immigrants has fueled concerns around the world. Trump has often talked of erecting a wall to stop Mexicans crossing over, [who according to him](#), bring drugs, crime and are rapists. A Washington Post/ABC News poll [pointed out that](#) Trump's supporters were largely voters with no college degree and voters who say that immigrants weaken America. Trump's campaign has been serving a politics of alienation, fed on the threats perceived to the White

Americans, both in the cultural and economic sense. There has been a prevailing sense of decreasing economic opportunities among the [blue-collar and rural Americans](#) who have also been moving towards the Republican Party. In addition, recent terrorist attacks as seen in Paris and San Bernardino have accentuated the threat to national and personal security.

[Many white nationalist groups](#) who tend to see immigrants in a negative light, robbing the WASP identity of its essence, are coming out in support of the Trump campaign. They see him as someone who has the guts and bravado to speak their minds and stand up for the "natives" as opposed to those politicians who appease immigrants for political mileage. They support an uncompromising stand against any form of illegal immigration and vouch for their deportation. The Daily Stormer, America's most popular neo-Nazi news site, endorsed Trump for President. Jared Taylor, the editor of American Renaissance, a white-nationalist magazine and Web site based in Oakton, Virginia, said in regard to Trump: "I'm sure he would repudiate any association with people like me, but his support comes from people who are more like me than he might like to admit."

Trump's campaign has liberally [employed ethnocentric views](#), looking at issues from the prism of whether it favors one group over others. Moreover, he has not stopped from using abusive languages in propagating his racially biased arguments. More than any other, he has used the issue of immigration to emphasize this fear of the others to the "American dream". There is a widespread feeling of dissatisfaction among the American people that both the parties are not providing economic solutions. Trump has been filling this gap with [vitriolic comments against](#) immigrants, trade, Wall Street and Washington elites. In the wake of terrorist threats, his [proposal to temporarily ban Muslims](#) from entering the United States has generated much distaste within the United States and abroad. However, it was not surprising that he found takers among his supporters.

It might indeed be hard to strike the balance between national security measures and maintaining the liberty of all Americans regardless of their ethnicity. However, any crude attempt to find populist solutions and the sort of anti-immigrant rhetoric that Trump has employed during the campaign hardly does justice to complex socio-economic and cultural issues that a diverse country like the United States has to grapple with.

(The author is Assistant Professor at the Department of Geopolitics and International Relations, Manipal University (Karnataka))

THE FIELD

Democratic Party

Hillary Clinton

Former Office: US Secretary of State; Senator, New York
Campaign Site: HillaryClinton.com
PAC Site: [Priorities USA Action PAC](http://PrioritiesUSAActionPAC.com)
Independent PAC Site: ReadyForHillary.com
Twitter: www.twitter.com/HillaryClinton

Bernie Sanders

In office: Senator, Vermont
Campaign Site: <https://berniesanders.com>
Government Site: [Office of US Senator Bernie Sanders](http://OfficeofUSSenatorBernieSanders.com)
Facebook
(Campaign): www.facebook.com/FriendsOfBernie
Facebook (Official): www.facebook.com/SenatorSanders
Twitter: www.twitter.com/SenSanders

Republican Party

Jeb Bush

Former Office: Governor, Florida
Official Site: <https://jeb2016.com>
Facebook: www.facebook.com/JebBush
Twitter: www.twitter.com/JebBush

Facebook: <https://www.facebook.com/DonaldTrump>
Twitter: <https://twitter.com/realdonaldtrump>

Ben Carson

Profession: Neurosurgeon
Official Site: RealBenCarson.com
PAC Site: [American Legacy PAC](http://AmericanLegacyPAC.com)
Facebook: www.facebook.com/DrBenjaminCarson
Twitter: www.twitter.com/RealBenCarson

Ted Cruz

In Office: Senator, Texas
Official Site: www.cruz.senate.gov
Government Site: [Office of US Senator Ted Cruz](http://OfficeofUSSenatorTedCruz.com)
Facebook: www.facebook.com/TedCruzPage
Twitter: www.twitter.com/TedCruz

John Kasich

In Office: Governor, Ohio
Official Site: <https://johnk Kasich.com/>
Twitter: <https://twitter.com/JohnKasich>
Facebook: <https://www.facebook.com/JohnKasich>

Marco Rubio

In Office: Senator from Florida
Official site: <http://www.rubio.senate.gov/public/>
Facebook: <https://www.facebook.com/MarcoRubio>
Twitter: <https://twitter.com/marcorubio>

Donald Trump

Profession: Businessman
Official site: <https://www.donaldjtrump.com/>

THE POLLS

Table 1

New Hampshire Democratic Presidential Primary

Polling Data						
Poll	Date	Sample	MoE	Sanders	Clinton	Spread
Final Results	--	--	--	60.4	38.0	Sanders +22.4
RCP Average	2/2 - 2/8	--	--	54.5	41.2	Sanders +13.3
ARG	2/7 - 2/8	409 LV	5.0	53	44	Sanders +9
UMass Lowell/7News	2/5 - 2/7	407 LV	5.5	56	40	Sanders +16
CNN/WMUR	2/4 - 2/8	363 LV	5.1	61	35	Sanders +26
Emerson	2/4 - 2/7	783 LV	3.7	54	42	Sanders +12
Monmouth	2/4 - 2/6	502 LV	4.4	52	42	Sanders +10
Boston Herald/FPU	2/2 - 2/6	407 LV	4.9	51	44	Sanders +7
All New Hampshire 2016 Democratic Primary Polling Data						

Table 1 shows poll results for New Hampshire for the Democrats. Bernie Sanders swept to a thumping outsiders victory in New Hampshire primary, seizing the support of the grass-roots workers. On the Republican side Donald Trump emerged victorious followed by Ohio Gov. John Kasich, whose aspirational conservative message surged him to a surprise second place in the GOP race.

Source: www.realclearpolitics.com, 9 February, 2015

Table 2

Iowa Republican Presidential Caucus

Polling Data															
Poll	Date	Sample	Trump	Cruz	Rubio	Carson	Paul	Bush	Huckabee	Kasich	Fiorina	Christie	Santorum	Spread	
Final Results	--	--	24.3	27.6	23.1	9.3	4.5	2.8	1.8	1.9	1.9	1.8	1.0	Cruz +3.3	
RCP Average	1/24 - 1/31	--	28.6	23.9	16.9	7.7	4.1	4.1	3.1	2.9	2.6	2.4	1.1	Trump +4.7	
Emerson	1/29 - 1/31	298 LV	27	26	22	3	3	4	5	4	2	3	1	Trump +1	
Opinion Savvy	1/29 - 1/30	887 LV	20	19	19	9	9	5	4	4	4	3	2	Trump +1	
Quinnipiac	1/25 - 1/31	890 LV	31	24	17	8	4	4	3	2	2	1	1	Trump +7	
DM Register/Bloomberg	1/26 - 1/29	602 LV	28	23	15	10	5	2	2	2	2	3	2	Trump +5	
PPP (D)	1/26 - 1/27	780 LV	31	23	14	9	4	4	4	2	3	2	1	Trump +8	
Gravis	1/26 - 1/27	724 LV	31	27	13	7	2	6	2	4	3	3	1	Trump +4	
NBC/WSJ/Marist	1/24 - 1/26	450 LV	32	25	18	8	2	4	2	2	2	2	0	Trump +7	
All Iowa Republican Presidential Caucus Polling Data															

Table 2 indicates the results of the Iowa Republican Presidential Caucus. The poll results reveal that Ted Cruz has a lead cumulatively over Donald Trump, Marco Rubio, Jeb Bush and Ben Carson. On the Democratic side, Hillary Clinton and Bernie Sanders fought to a near-draw in Iowa.

Source: www.realclearpolitics.com, 1 February 2015

Triumphant Donald Trump: "I can change the game"

Texas Senator Ted Cruz was in Daphn for a rally as part of his '12 cities in 12 days' campaign event. Before he took the stage, he sat down for an exclusive interview with News 5.

Just hours after winning New Hampshire's Republican primary with 35 percent of the vote, front-runner Donald Trump weighed in on the current state of the GOP field in an interview with "CBS This Morning".

Trump said "The people of New Hampshire were amazing," Trump said, adding that "I thought I'd do well there." He weighed in on other Republican rivals, including former Florida Gov. Jeb Bush as a candidate who "just doesn't have it" and New Jersey Gov. Chris Christie who he called a "friend."

When asked if he believed it was time for his New Jersey opponent to quit the presidential race, Trump responded: "I don't know... I'd like to see a lot of people to drop out."

"He's a friend of mine," Trump added. "I thought he was very effective. And I was surprised he didn't do better, frankly."

The GOP front-runner brushed aside comments that he has fundamentally changed American politics.

"I haven't done anything -- unless I win. And I mean, not the nomination. I mean win the whole thing. I haven't done anything," Trump said.

The businessman said he believes if you don't win in the end, "you're a failed candidate, even if you go to the final step."

He laid out his strategy after New Hampshire, mentioning his chances at winning some Democratic-leaning states.

"I have a chance of winning New York," he told "CBS This Morning" co-host Charlie Rose. "You know, you look at these politicians they always talk about the six states -- you've got to win this one, that one. You have to win Ohio, you have to win Florida.

"I can change the game because I really have a chance of New York, I'm going to win Virginia," Trump said. "I'm going to win Michigan, as an example."

Turning to foreign policy issues, when asked about the recent threat posed by North Korea after it launched a long-range rocket on Sunday, Trump suggested that he would force China to handle its neighbor.

"I would get China to make that guy disappear in one form or another very quickly," Trump said.

"How do you make him disappear?" host of "CBS This Morning" Norah O'Donnell asked. "Assassinate him?"

Trump shrugged, "Well, I've heard of worse things frankly."

"He's a bad dude, and don't underestimate him," he added. "China has control -- absolute control over North Korea...And they should make that problem disappear."

"China is sucking us dry. They're taking our money, they're taking our jobs. They're doing so much," Trump said. "I would force the Chinese to do it -- economically."

The GOP candidate also weighed in on other foreign rulers, including Russian president Vladimir Putin, who Trump has repeatedly said he had a "very good relationship" with.

"I love the fact that Russia is hitting ISIS," he said. "And as far as I'm concerned, they've got to continue to hit ISIS."

When asked if he would negotiate with Putin to pressure Syrian President Bashar al-Assad to step aside, Trump said, "I don't think it's that important" to get rid of Assad.

"Let's say you get rid of Assad, you knock out that government -- who's gonna take over?" he questioned. "The people that we're backing? And then you're gonna have, like, Libya?"

The real estate mogul warned, "Look what happened when we got rid of [Libyan President] Qaddafi."

"To me it was a total mistake," Trump said of ousting the Libyan leader. Pointing to [the 2011 terror attack on a U.S. diplomatic compound in Benghazi](#), he added that the North African country is now "a mess."

Trump also suggested that the U.S. should not have been involved in toppling Iraq President Saddam Hussein.

"Had we not done anything - had our politicians gone to the beach and enjoyed the sun, we would be in a lot better position than we are right now," he added. "Saddam Hussein -- no good guy but Saddam Hussein killed terrorists."

Source: For the complete transcript, see <http://www.cbsnews.com/news/donald-trump-lays-out-st-new-hampshire-strategy-foreign-policy-positions/>

DIASPORA WATCH

Indian American Group Backs Donald Trump For President

Calling Republican presidential frontrunner Donald Trump as the “best hope for America”, some Indian-Americans in the New York Tristate area have formed a Political Action Committee (PAC) to support and raise funds for him. Headed by Dr. AD Amar, a business professor with Seton Hall University in New Jersey, the ‘Indian-Americans for Trump 2016’ was registered as a PAC with the Federal Election Commission. Its sole goal is “to garner actively the support of all Americans, but particularly Indian-Americans, to have Donald J. Trump become the next President of the USA,” the PAC said in a press release. “On realizing that the agenda of Donald J Trump for President 2016 is focused on reviving the American economy, rightly bringing America on the world stage, defeating terrorism and establishing peace through strength, many Indian-Americans believe that he is the best hope for America and the right candidate to be the next president of the United States,” the PAC said in a statement.

Source:

<http://www.theindianpanorama.news/indians-abroad/indian-american-group-backs-donald-trump-for-president-57197/> 29 January 2016

MEDIA REVIEW

Make no mistake: Bernie Sanders’s win in New Hampshire was historically massive

The weird thing about the New Hampshire Democratic presidential primary is that Hillary Clinton did about as well this year as she did in 2008, percentage-wise. In the state's main counties, Clinton

performed on average only about two percentage points worse than she did eight years ago (according to vote totals) -- and in five of the 10 counties, she did as well or better. If you plot her 2008 results against her 2016 percentages, it's a neat little circle in the middle of the graph. About the same, across the board. Why did Clinton do less well in the western part of the state? Perhaps because that's the area that abuts Vermont, the home state of Sen. Bernie Sanders (Vt.). In Grafton, Cheshire and Sullivan counties -- which abut Vermont -- Clinton got 33.9 percent of the vote in 2008, vs. 30.6 percent this year. In the eastern counties of Carroll, Belknap, Stafford and Rockingham, she got 38.6 percent in 2008 to 37.4 percent on Tuesday. The difference between her win in 2008 and her loss in 2016 was that, in 2008, she could win those counties with lower percentages because she was running against two people, not one. If we drop the winning percentages in each county on to that first chart, it's obvious the extent to which Clinton wasn't even close to winning any of the counties in the state, despite seeing similar percentages of support.

Source: [Washington Post](http://www.washingtonpost.com), 10 February 2016

The gaping hole at the heart of Hillary Clinton’s campaign

There are many stories one could tell about Bernie Sanders’ defeat of Hillary Clinton in New Hampshire. One is that Sanders has captured the prevailing sentiment among Democrats, a fervent desire for political revolution to unmake a corrupt system, and he will ride this desire all the way to the nomination. Another is that yesterday’s result was a function of some idiosyncratic features of that primary, particularly New Hampshire’s demographic homogeneity and the fact that independents are allowed to vote in the party primary; now that the race moves to states that better represent the Democratic Party, Clinton’s strength among Latinos and African-Americans will move her back into command for good. Either of those stories might be true. But right now, the Clinton campaign has a much bigger problem than the story it wants to tell about New Hampshire. That problem is this: the campaign has no story to tell the voters about Hillary Clinton and why she should be president. Having a good story doesn’t guarantee you victory, but nobody becomes

president without one. The story has to contain three simple elements. First, it explains what the problem is. Second, it explains what the solution is. And third, it explains why this candidate, and only this candidate, is the person who can bring the country from where it is now to where it ought to be.

Source: [Washington Post](#), 10 February 2016

A Multifront Republican Battle in South Carolina

Donald J. Trump's rivals for the Republican presidential nomination dug in for a hard fight in the South Carolina primary, where Mr. Trump will seek to gain a clear upper hand in the 2016 race after his smashing victory in New Hampshire. But the effort to stop Mr. Trump was only one element of the hard-edged, multifront campaign shaping up here among five candidates, nearly all of whom are facing immense pressure to demonstrate strength. The Republican contest after New Hampshire has in some respects been clarified into two parallel battles: between Mr. Trump and Senator Ted Cruz, the anti-establishment duo, and among three establishment-friendly hopefuls. The contenders began exchanging fire in a way that illustrated the complexities of the race — and the unique calculations each candidate is making. Above all, there is a fight against Mr. Trump, which will be waged by both Mr. Cruz and the mainstream candidates. After largely avoiding a sustained ad assault in New Hampshire, Mr. Trump is likely to face far more attacks here, a state where campaigns can turn rough. Mr. Cruz wasted little time in signalling how he intended to run against the New York real estate mogul in the Bible Belt.

Source: [New York Times](#), February 10, 2016

Jeb Bush can't win Iowa. But he wants to make sure Marco Rubio doesn't come close.

Jeb Bush has virtually no chance of winning the Iowa caucuses — but his team wants to make sure Marco Rubio doesn't do too well there either. The Bush-allied Super PAC Right to Rise USA released a new negative ad attacking Rubio — and, according to the Des Moines Register's Jennifer Jacobs, the ad will air on Iowa television. The ad itself is a pretty misleading attack on Rubio for missing a Senate briefing on terrorism to fundraise (Rubio

actually attended a similar briefing days earlier, one that included classified information). What is interesting about the ad, though, is that Bush's team is airing this attack on Rubio in Iowa, a state Bush himself has basically already conceded, rather than just focusing on New Hampshire, a state Bush desperately hopes to win. But this move by Bush actually makes a lot of sense — because any good news for Rubio out of Iowa would be terrible for Jeb Bush.

Source: [Vox News](#), December 29, 2015

Bush and Rubio race to the bottom

New Hampshire was supposed to be the nail Marco Rubio would drive into Jeb Bush's coffin. Now, it might be the beginning of Rubio digging his own political grave. The two warring Floridians spent much of the New Hampshire campaign eyeing each other, with Bush blasting Rubio in millions of dollars in ads. But in the end, both of them ended up finishing behind Donald Trump, John Kasich, and, barring a last-second shift in the counting, Ted Cruz. Rubio took to the stage to address his supporters was surprisingly frank about his poor debate performance and its impact on his finish. New Hampshire's notoriously late-breaking voters veered away from Rubio after watching him get walloped by New Jersey Gov. Chris Christie for awkwardly repeating over-rehearsed lines and not taking questions from the press. The groundswell of "Marcomentum" coming out of Iowa flat-lined. "I know many people are disappointed. I'm disappointed with tonight," Rubio told supporters at the Radisson hotel in downtown Manchester. "I want you to understand something. Our disappointment tonight is not on you, it's on me. It's on me. I did not do well in the previous debate, so listen to this: That will never happen again."

Source: [Politico](#), 10 February, 2016

Chris Christie Drops Out of Race After New Hampshire Flop

Gov. Chris Christie of New Jersey, a once-commanding figure in the Republican Party who struggled to attract support for his presidential campaign but unsettled the race with his strident attacks on Senator

Marco Rubio of Florida, ended his run for the White House. The decision came a day after Mr. Christie came in sixth in the New Hampshire primary, an embarrassing result after he had focused the bulk of his campaign's efforts on the state. He was also facing the prospect of being left out of the group that will take the stage at the Republican debate because of his poor showings in the Iowa caucuses last week and in New Hampshire. "While running for president, I tried to reinforce what I have always believed: that speaking your mind matters, that experience matters, that competence matters and that it will always matter in leading our nation," Mr. Christie wrote on his Facebook page.

Source: [NY Times](#), 10 February 2016

FURTHER READING

'The US Presidential Nominating Process' *CFR Backgrounder*, 9 February 2016, <http://www.cfr.org/elections/us-presidential-nominating-process/p37522>

Dana Milbank, 'Jeb Bush Is Not Dead', *Washington Post*, 10 February 2016, https://www.washingtonpost.com/opinions/jeb-bush-is-not-dead/2016/02/10/0446d214-d03f-11e5-b2bc-988409ee911b_story.html

Jeffrey Frank, 'What Every Candidate Could Learn from JFK?', *The New Yorker*, <http://www.newyorker.com/news/daily-comment/what-every-candidate-could-learn-from-j-f-k>

Clare Malone, 'Carly Fiorina Peaked Early And Faded Fast', *FiveThirtyEight* 10 February, 2016, <http://fivethirtyeight.com/features/carly-fiorina-peaked-early-and-faded-fast/>

Kori Schake, 'The GOP IS Not Going To Win This Election On Foreign Policy', *Foreign Policy*, 21 December 2015, <http://foreignpolicy.com/2015/06/15/gop-republican-foreign-policy-hawkishness-will-not-win-presidential-election/>

Talia Lepson, 'Why Bernie Sanders, Not Hillary Clinton, IS Winning The Millennial Women', *The Globalist*, 11 February 2015, <http://www.theglobalist.com/bernie-sanders-election-politics/>

Lawrence Korb, 'Bernie Sanders Is More Serious On Foreign Policy Than You Think', 11 February 2016, <http://www.politico.com/magazine/story/2016/02/bernie-sanders-foreign-poicy-213619?cmpid=sf#ixzz3zuZGOyWH>

Editor: Sylvia Mishra