



US ELECTIONS 2016

ISSUE 2 | SEPTEMBER 2015

An ORF Monthly Monitor

EDITORIAL NOTE

As 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

A Short History of Campaign Slogans

Monish Tourangbam

Campaign slogans reflect the fundamental ambition of the candidate and the context in which the campaign is being run. They are simple but not generic.

The GOP's Foreign Policy—Waiting for Grand Strategy

Sanjay Pulipaka and Payal Ghosh

Instead of issue-oriented responses, articulation of a 'grand-strategy, might find greater resonance with American voters.

The First Republican Debate: Key Takeaways

Sylvia Mishra

In spite of the incredibly minimalistic intellectual heft that Trump induced in the debate, he could not be cornered by his rivals.

The Debate on Immigration

Uma Purushothaman

Irrespective of where they stand on immigration, it seems that winning Hispanic votes is a lost cause for the Republicans.

ORF EVENT

Report based on a talk by Professor Stephen Tankel, Associate Professor at American University and non-resident Senior Fellow at the Center for a New American Security on 'Transnational Threats, Islamic Militancy, and U.S. Foreign Policy'.

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

A Short History of Campaign Slogans

Monish Tourangbam

The flurry of activities in the Democratic and the Republican camps during the run-up to the US presidential elections produces some memorable and some not so memorable political slogans. Some of these campaign slogans fighting for voters' attention might sound like tongue twisters and some, cheap advertising gimmicks. However, some of the most successful slogans have clearly captured their times and the imagination of the American voters. Producing campaign slogans is a serious business, and over the years, slogans have become an inevitable part of presidential campaigns. In fact, no campaign is complete without a catchy and timely slogan that is brief and reflects the overwhelming mood of the time, often anti-incumbent but optimistic as well.

The Obama campaign in 2008 astutely managed to capture the feelings of the American people who wanted a change from the wars that America had fought under the Bush administration. Obama's slogans like "Change we can believe in" and "Yes we can" used the unpopularity of the Bush administration and rallied the people for a change. Obama became a personification of that change who besides being the first African American president, also promised to end the costly wars America was fighting. In his re-election campaign, when Obama had to campaign against the backdrop of a rather chequered four years behind him, he successfully relied on a one word campaign call "Forward." It signified the message that he had set the country on the path to economic recovery, and that he should be given four more years to take it forward.

During re-election campaigns, voters are usually reminded of the achievement of the candidate's presidency and also of how the country would fare better under his stewardship. More than any other president, Franklin D. Roosevelt's four terms at the Oval Office has been a matter of recurring debate in the history of modern American presidency. From the New Deal to victory at World War II, he rode like a colossus on the scene, finally leading to the 22nd amendment of the US constitution that forbade anyone from running for the office after serving two terms. While running for his third term in

1940, Roosevelt used the slogan "[Better a third term than a third-rater.](#)" Another slogan that tried to bring home the importance of having reliable leaders at the helm of affairs, especially during trying times, was Abraham Lincoln's popular Civil War era slogan "[Don't swap horses in midstream](#)" during his second term campaign in 1864. Using a phrase that might have sounded problematic in other times, Civil War hero of the Union Army Ulysses S. Grant told voters to "[Vote as You Shot](#)" in 1868.

Before America's direct involvement in World War I, Woodrow Wilson had campaigned for his re-election bid in 1916 with "He Kept Us Out of War" and his successor Warren Harding after the horrors of the war, rallied voters with "Return to Normalcy". Herbert Hoover in 1928 attracted voters with the catchy "[A chicken in every pot and a car in every garage](#)". But when the Great Depression struck, Americans began discovering that the chicken had no meat and the car had to be sold so they could eat. Hence, in 1932, Americans found hope for better times in Roosevelt's promising catchphrase "[Happy Days Are Here Again.](#)" One of the more memorable slogans in the history of US presidential campaigns remains "[We Polked you in '44, we shall Pierce you in '52.](#)" In 1852, it helped catapult a lesser known candidate Franklin Pierce using the legacy of another little known candidate who went on to become a popular president James K. Polk.

No campaign can ignore the importance of a catchy and relevant slogan, something that in simple layman's language reflects the mood of the times, mostly portraying a candidate as the man of the times, as the problem solver. The slogan should be inclusive, appeal to the hearts and minds of voters. Perhaps, in an eerie foretelling of the times to come when Facebook's 'Like' campaigns would be significant in virtual popularity, Dwight D. Eisenhower's campaign in 1952, cashing on the war-hero image of the candidate, used the now legendary campaign line "[I like Ike](#)" (Eisenhower was popularly known as Ike).

One of the most memorable campaign lines was the one used by Ronald Reagan in 1980, against the backdrop of a not-so-admirable presidency of Jimmy Carter and the bad economic conditions in the country. Reagan, invoking the mood of the voters, had [said](#), "I think when you make that decision, it might be well if you would ask yourself, are you better off than you were four years ago?" Since then,

these simple but evocative lines have been recurrent in many election cycles in the United States. In other words, campaign slogans reflect the fundamental ambition of the candidate and the context in which the campaign is being run. They are simple but not generic. They need to have a personality and help voters identify their candidates more easily. They help in branding candidates. Bill Clinton's now famous lines "It's the economy, stupid" that emerged during his 1992 campaign clearly conveyed the priority for the United States, and the candidate: to rejuvenate the US economy.

As the election season heats up, more campaign slogans will fill the airwaves. Some of them would be used by the candidates themselves and their official campaigns, others may come from supporters, which will either remain or fade away depending on their popularity. Some of the more quality slogans one gets to hear in the current campaign trail are Mike Huckabee's "From Hope to Higher Ground". It has a religious swing to it, that might have some good recall value for conservative voters and it offers something beyond Obama's "hope", as in "a higher ground". Other slogans like Rand Paul's "Defeat the Washington Machine. Unleash the American Dream" and Bernie Sander's "A Political Revolution is Coming" reflects the personalities of the candidates and their political priorities.

Eric Swartz, president of Tagline Guru that recently released its survey of the best and the worst slogans of the current crop of presidential contenders of both parties [said](#), "Political slogans still have marquee value on the national stage and can shape our perceptions of the candidates.... To be memorable, a slogan has to be catchy. To be politically effective, however, it needs to be authentic....Slogans that ranked highly were acknowledged for being clear, positive, believable, and aspirational. On the other hand, slogans that fared poorly were criticized for their lack of originality and genuine feeling, their appeal to fear rather than hope, and their inability to express an exciting idea."

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

The GOP and Foreign Policy— Waiting for Grand Strategy **Sanjay Pulipaka and Payal Ghosh**

This year, foreign policy issues have not been at the centre-stage of the US presidential election campaigns. While the Iran nuclear deal did grab headlines, domestic political matters such as race relations, responses to economic inequity, the US Supreme Court judgments on same-sex marriage and health care reform seem to be engaging the voters.

More than a dozen candidates have announced their plan to be the Grand Old Party's (GOP)/Republican Party's candidate in the US Presidential elections. In spite of the numbers, there seems to be very little diversity in their foreign policy positions. Many of them have been calling for an aggressive foreign policy posture, which is routine during an election campaign. It is assumed that for an effective political communication, nuance needs to be discarded and muscular foreign policy posture tends to attract the voters. It should be noted that the GOP candidates are calling for interventionist policies, even when the memory of US engagement in Iraq and Afghanistan is still fresh in the minds of the many. There could be two reasons for this: first, the GOP candidates think that there is a sizeable constituency which is calling for a proactive foreign policy; and second, at least some components of the hawkish rhetoric are in consonance with the candidates' world views.

For many GOP candidates, US-centered unipolarity defines the structure of the international politics and in spite of less than successful interventions in the recent past, the US continues to possess capabilities to shape the political events happening across the world. [Jeb Bush](#) succinctly summed up this understanding when he said, "the United States has an undiminished ability to shape events and build alliances of free people....We can project power and enforce peaceful stability in far-off areas of the globe." To enhance the US capacity to project power, [Chris Christie](#) has been calling for increased military spending.

The GOP candidates are of the opinion that President Obama is undermining the alliance/friendship networks built over the decades. As [Ben Carson](#) opined, Ukraine gave up its nuclear weapons with an understanding that the US would back them and therefore, it becomes imperative for the US to help Ukraine with all that is

necessary to maintain its sovereignty. The Obama administration, according to Ben Carson, has fallen short on its commitments to its friends. Similarly, [Carly Fiorina](#) referring to Arab allies, Jordan, Egypt, and Turkey stated: “there are a whole set of things we’ve been asked to do by our allies who know this is their fight, and we’re not doing any of them.”

According to the GOP candidates, the US response to the Ukraine crisis and the recent Iran nuclear deal demonstrate that the Obama administration is not standing up for American allies. The GOP candidates feel that the collapse of trust between the US and its allies will undermine US capacity to project power in various parts of the world. However, there are challenges with an unqualified support to the allies and arming various groups to fight the adversaries. There is a possibility of getting entrapped in conflicts that are in the interests of allies but not in the interests of the US. There is no certainty that the weapons distributed to friends/allies will not fall into wrong hands. For instance, [Rick Perry](#) also expressed his dismay at the Islamic State of Iraq and al-Sham (ISIS) using the American tanks. Similarly, [Rand Paul](#) noted, “ISIS exists and grew stronger because of the hawks in our party, who gave arms indiscriminately, and most of those arms were snatched up by ISIS.”

Reports of China’s cyber espionage activities have agitated many GOP candidates. Terming cyber attacks as akin to a military attack on US military installations, [Mike Huckabee](#) called for immediate retaliatory cyber strikes on cell phones and bank accounts of Chinese officials. Referring to Chinese activities in the South China Sea, [Donald Trump](#) indulged in his usual sensationalist rhetoric by stating, “you have a problem with the ISIS, you have a bigger problem with China.” For [Marco Rubio](#), promotion of human rights in China is an equally important task and therefore, it becomes imperative to demand that ‘China allow true freedom for its 1.3 billion people.’

Incidentally, Marco Rubio terms India, the world’s largest democracy, as a key partner of the US in the coming decades. In an [op-ed](#) written last year, Rubio identified three areas to strengthen India-US relations viz., deepening security cooperation; encouraging greater Indian involvement in Afghanistan, the Middle East and East Asia; and upgrading the economic relations through Bilateral Investment Treaty. As the campaigns gain momentum, it is distinctly possible that the other GOP

candidates will occasionally articulate similar sentiments, though India has rarely been an election issue.

Among the Democratic Party’s candidates, Hillary Clinton, because of her stint as a Secretary of State, comes with robust foreign policy credentials. On the other hand, the GOP candidates have some catching up to do. Overall, it appears that the GOP candidates are approaching various foreign policy issues as though they can be dealt with in water-tight compartments. As a consequence, their foreign policy statements tend to give the impression that there is a need for simultaneous aggressive actions to cripple the ISIS, contain Russia, respond to the rise of China, promote human rights and completely destroy Iran’s nuclear infrastructure. However, many of these issues are inter-related, and a grand strategy to address these questions simultaneously needs to be articulated. Instead of issue-oriented responses, articulation of a ‘grand-strategy’ might find greater resonance with American voters.

(Sanjay Pulipaka is a Consultant and Payal Ghosh is an Intern at ICRIER, New Delhi. The views expressed here are authors’ personal views.)

The First Republican Debate: Key Takeaways

Sylvia Mishra

The excitement surrounding the [first Republican debate](#) on 6 August managed to live up to the buzz and hype, generating some powerful performances from a few GOP candidates. Ten leading Republican presidential front-runner candidates participated in the first primary debate in Cleveland, Ohio. The debate was hosted by Fox News moderators in conjunction with Facebook. The line-up of participants included a vibrant mix of incumbent and former governors — Jeb Bush, Chris Christie, Mike Huckabee, Scott Walker and John Kasick; real-estate mogul Donald Trump; Senators Marco Rubio, Ted Cruz, Rand Paul and retired neuro-surgeon Ben Carson. These top ten participants were chosen on the basis of an average of leading five opinion polls. The primary idea of the candidates participating in the debate was to woo voters and acquaint them with their positions on issues.

What was evident from the two-hours of compelling debate was a renewed conviction that the 2016 Republican field, although crowded, is impressive and

offers a difficult choice for voters to choose from— Governor Bush’s impressive economic record, Marco Rubio’s rigorous foreign policy adeptness, Rand Paul’s self-casting as “a different type of Republican”, Trump’s brash, unapologetic and supreme confidence to ‘Make America Great’ among others. In spite of a good debate, the lack of specific solutions to problems, especially on foreign policy from front-runner candidates, particularly Jeb Bush and Trump was disappointing.

Before the debate commenced, there was speculation that the face-off would entail a critical spotlight on the exchanges between the Republican front-runner candidates Jeb Bush and Donald Trump. Contrary to popular expectations, Trump and Jeb Bush did not engage in a heated debate. Instead, Trump with his bombastic rhetoric and taste for hurling insults left his rivals struggling. Living up to his populist appeal, Trump at the outset of the debate catapulted himself to the limelight mentioning that he would not hesitate to contest independently for President if he fails to get the Republican Party’s nomination. On the other hand, Jeb Bush maintained a low key position on issues and stated that even though the barrier for nomination is higher for him, he would run hard with his heart to earn the nomination. The candidates debated on sensitive issues such as abortion, gay-marriage rights and immigration, exposing the party’s fault-lines and deep divides among the candidates. In spite of the differences, a majority of the candidates seemed to agree on the subject of revitalizing America’s military standing in the world and called for deeper foreign policy engagement.

On the question of illegal immigration, Donald Trump proposed building a wall to prevent large-scale immigration from Mexico. On the other hand, Governor Kasich bounced the idea that each candidate has different approach to resolving the problem of illegal immigration. Senator Rubio instead explained that people coming across the border illegally are not only from Mexico, but the majority is from Guatemala, El Salvador and Honduras. Agreeing that the US needs a fence, Rubio added that there is also an urgent need for e-verify and have entry-exit tracking systems at the borders. In spite of agreement among the candidates that illegal immigration needed to be urgently prevented, there was an abject lack of specifics except from Senator Rubio. Similarly, the major thrust of the candidates’ position on Middle East strategy was that the present administration under the leadership of President Obama abandoned Iraq, creating a

vacuum for the ISIS to grow. Bush also mentioned that the Iran agreement needs to be stopped.

What was interesting to note was that no candidate was able to offer a strong alternative in place of the present policies outlined by the Obama administration aside from reposing faith in strengthening America’s military presence across the globe. This again brought the burning ideological question to the fore of the debate—would American foreign policy be about restoring self-interest or would it carry with itself the ideological burden of advocating liberal values and spreading freedom?

Boosted by a hometown crowd, John Kasich offered a more uplifting vision than most of his rivals. He skillfully defended both his attendance at a gay wedding and his decision to expand Medicaid while offering a just explanation of Donald Trump’s appeal. Marco Rubio piqued the interest of voters with his focused answer on curriculum reforms in education policy. On the other hand, for Trump, the debate served just another platform to inculcate the politics of doom and fear of America’s decline. As analysts struggle to explain his rising popularity, Trump’s persistent return to language which is highly divisive and mean-spirited without offering policy positions has become his hallmark. After the debate, Jeb Bush’s popularity ratings have been abysmally poor. This could be due to his poor performance during which he appeared to be low-spirited, hesitant and weak. In place of Jeb Bush, Marco Rubio and Scott Walker have gained highly.

The first Republican debate has set the momentum and the pace for future debates. American voters more or less now have a broad overview of the positions undertaken by the candidates. Some of the candidates like Marco Rubio, John Kasich and Scott Walker were able maximize their gains from the debate platform as they shone through the debate, maintaining composure and responding to questions in a focused manner. Candidates like Mike Huckabee, Ted Cruz, Chris Christie, Ben Carson and Rand Paul were seen struggling to clarify their positions, often highlighting a lack of preparation in their ideas. The debate served as reminder for Jeb Bush that while dynastic politics may help with massive funds, it cannot compensate for a charismatic leadership. The highlight of the debate was Donald Trump. In spite of the incredibly minimalistic intellectual heft that Trump induced in the debate, he could not be cornered by his rivals.

The Debate on Immigration

Uma Purushothaman

If the first Republican presidential debate held in August is any pointer, immigration is likely to be one of the leading issues in the forthcoming US elections.

There are two aspects to the debate over immigration in the US. The first is how to stop illegal immigrants from entering the US. The second is about what to do about the 11.4 million (according to Department of Homeland Security figures from 2013) illegal immigrants currently living in the US. While many Americans oppose immigration because of fear of losing jobs, there is also the fact that the healthcare industry, restaurants and hotels industries are dependent on low skilled workers who are willing to work for lower wages for longer hours. President Obama has tried in both his terms to have immigration reform laws passed but has failed because of partisanship on the Hill.

Democrats and the Republicans have vastly different positions on the issue. The Democrats broadly favour policies which would stop illegal immigration while allowing some categories of illegal immigrants some paths to citizenship. Republicans, on the other hand, support stronger border security and oppose amnesty for illegal aliens. Of course, within both parties, candidates might have liberal or conservative views depending on which wing of the party they belong to.

Democratic frontrunner Hillary Clinton has adopted an aggressive pro-immigration stance. As Senator, in 2006 she had voted in support of the Secure Fence Act to build a fence along the US-Mexico border. But now she supports President Obama's attempt to reform immigration and has even indicated support for giving [drivers' licenses](#) to undocumented immigrants. She supports a path to citizenship and has promised to fight for immigration reform, to [defend and expand](#) on executive actions if Republicans continue to block a permanent legislative solution and also to revisit the Obama Administration's controversial family detention practices.

While Bernie Sanders advocates immigration reform, he is against temporary guest worker programmes, which are part of comprehensive immigration reform. His concern about the guest worker programme is that at a time when unemployment is high in the US and Americans are [working longer for lower wages](#), it does not make sense to have a programme which will allow corporations to import workers from abroad at lower wages as this will only depress wages in the country.

Martin O'Malley also supports immigration reform. As Governor of Maryland, he brought a law which created a [temporary system](#) for undocumented residents of the state to obtain licenses. Another law he passed has been described as Maryland's version of the DREAM Act as it allows children of illegal immigrants to get in-state tuitions. During the child migrant refugee crisis in 2014, O'Malley spoke out against their deportation and asked lawyers to represent these children. This led to a rift between him and the White House. He favours a path to citizenship for illegal immigrants and is also against the detention of undocumented migrants. He has promised to push for immigration reform within the first hundred days of his Presidency.

Lincoln Chafee supports comprehensive immigration reform and a path to citizenship. He voted against the Secure Fence Act in 2006. He was one of the fourteen governors who in 2013 wrote to John Boehner and Nancy Pelosi requesting them to create a [bipartisan immigration solution](#).

Donald Trump, the surprise Republican frontrunner, has already grabbed eyeballs with his statements against illegal immigrants. During his [announcement speech](#), Trump said that "immigrants from Mexico are "people that have lots of problems, and they're bringing those problems with us. They're bringing drugs. They're bringing crime. They're rapists". He wants to build a border wall, "[detain undocumented immigrants](#) and only release them to their country of origin, defund sanctuary cities, enhance penalties for overstaying a visa, end birthright citizenship, require companies to hire American workers first and apply stricter standards for refugee status". He has spoken out against paths to citizenship, even saying that children born in the US to undocumented mothers (the so-called "anchor babies") should not be automatically given citizenship. He has mocked Jeb Bush about his wife, who is of Mexican origin.

Jeb Bush, a fluent Spanish speaker, who represents the mainstream Republican Party, has spoken out against ending birthright citizenship saying it is a constitutionally protected right. However, he says that if the provision is abused and if there is “birth tourism”, there should be greater enforcement. Bush wants more [forward-operating bases](#) closer to the border, advanced counter-surveillance technology and improved border infrastructure with road construction and maintenance to deal with border security issues. For [interior enforcement](#), Bush wants electronic verification of employment eligibility, adequate tracking and deportation of immigrants overstaying their visas, and withholding federal funding for sanctuary cities. He has also supported a path to legal status for those who are already illegally in the country.

Ben Carson wants to revoke birthright citizenship for children of illegal immigrants. He controversially has even supported using [drones to secure the border](#). He believes that deporting immigrants and building a wall would be unrealistic and expensive. For immigrants who are already in the US, he wants a guest worker programme. But they would have to pay [back tax penalty](#), taxes moving forward and go through the process of getting citizenship like everyone else.

Marco Rubio, who is himself of Hispanic origin, has supported a path to citizenship. He wants to secure the border as well as to reform immigration, which he incidentally supported in the Senate. He feels that the US needs to reform immigration to attract the best talent from abroad.

Scott Walker is also against birthright citizenship and considers border security to be a matter of national security. He has spoken out against amnesty for immigrants.

Thus, politicians from both sides are appealing to their constituencies through their positions on Immigration. Immigration is an emotive and divisive issue among voters. [39% of Americans](#) want lower immigration, while only 7% want higher immigration, according to a recent Gallup survey. While the Democrats are courting the Hispanic votes, the largest ethnic minority in the country constituting 17 percent of the population, most of the Republicans are trying to court the traditional Republican

voters who do not welcome immigrants as they feel that they take away their jobs and decrease wages. However, some like Jeb Bush and Marco Rubio are trying to appeal to a wider constituency, including Hispanics.

Hispanics incidentally have traditionally voted for Democrats and played a huge role in President Obama’s two victories. But even now, [polls](#) show Hillary Clinton as being more popular among Hispanics than both Bush and Rubio. So, irrespective of where they stand on immigration, it seems that winning Hispanic votes is a lost cause for the Republicans. In any case, given how divisive the issue has become, it is unlikely that even during the next Presidency, immigration reform will be passed.

(Uma Purushothaman is Research Fellow at the Observer Research Foundation)

ORF EVENT

Situating South Asia in the US Response to Transnational Threats and Islamic Militancy

The ‘strategic effect’ of the rise of the Islamic State (IS) is already being felt in South Asia, said Professor Stephen Tankel at a talk on ‘Transnational Threats, Islamic Militancy, and U.S. Foreign Policy’ organized by the Observer Research Foundation (ORF), Delhi on August 25, 2015. Professor Tankel is an associate professor at the School of International Service, American University and a non-resident senior fellow at the Center for a New American Security.

The talk was chaired by Mr. Vikram Sood, Advisor at ORF. Mr. Sood initiated the discussion by highlighting some of the key concerns surrounding the rise of the IS in West Asia, pointing towards the ambiguity that accompanies the speculation around the spread of its influence in the region. Is the IS threat restricted or is it reasonable to conclude that it is now moving closer to South Asia, particularly India? Mr. Sood also alluded to the subsequent shifts that have taken place in U.S. policy on counter-terrorism in the wake of these developments.

Professor Tankel highlighted two broad developments that have taken place in the issue area of counter-

terrorism since 9/11: first, that the majority of the countries such as Pakistan, Yemen, and Saudi Arabia that joined forces with the U.S. and extended their support to the American entry into Iraq were countries that had experienced revolutionary insurgencies provoked by groups like the Al Qaeda in their own territories. Second, since 9/11, the Al Qaeda has grown and the last decade has witnessed an increase in the number of affiliates which has given a more global focus to their activities. He pointed out that Pakistan is the only place in the region that has had pan-Islamic groups in operation after 9/11.

According to Professor Tankel, however, since the Arab uprisings of 2011, a number of shifts have taken place. The global focus on Islamic militant groups has reduced, and a more regional or local focus has emerged. In this context, the IS threat is markedly different from that of the Al Qaeda a decade ago, since the barriers to the entry of affiliates are not as pronounced. Two aspects were highlighted: the involvement of foreign fighters with the IS, and the robust use of social media by the group. Professor Tankel therefore concluded that the group is more than a terrorist organization; it is actively engaged in hybrid warfare that represents a departure from the ways of the Al Qaeda.

How do we situate South Asia in this? Professor Tankel was of the opinion that the rise of IS does pose a strategic threat to the region, although the influence might not be direct. Since the decline of the Al Qaeda senior leadership in Pakistan, the IS has emerged a source of new leadership. The flipside to this argument involves looking at whether the Al Qaeda leadership has the potential to re-emerge once the U.S. troop presence in Afghanistan recedes. A major threat to South Asian regional stability also comes from the risk of existing terror operatives such as the LeT or the Indian Mujahideen associating themselves with the IS. Professor Tankel said the IS is an alternative, a repository for disaffected individuals within these organizations who can easily come together and

challenge the influence of the Taliban, among others. Either way, the risk of violent terror attacks in South Asia, particularly targeted towards India is present, strategically motivated by the rise of the IS itself.

The U.S. perspective on these developments is interesting. According to Professor Tankel, the U.S. approach seeks to work from within, by engaging with local operatives. The use of drone strikes, and efforts to build partnership capacity with local actors in Yemen is a case in point. The focus of U.S. policy has subsequently been on intelligence sharing, threat finding, and the use of military force for political leverage as witnessed in Iraq and Afghanistan. Professor Tankel also emphasized that the involvement of the military is important for the success of leverage politics in combating Islamic militancy.

The U.S. focus on South Asia, in Professor Tankel's view, can therefore be analysed historically. While the focus of the U.S. has been on the Al Qaeda and the Haqqani network in Afghanistan and Pakistan, troop withdrawal has changed the nature of this focus. He emphasized the need for the U.S. to look closely at local groups in South Asia, especially in the wake of the enormous challenges in the Middle East and North Africa.

Professor Tankel concluded his talk by highlighting two important aspects of renewed American focus on South Asia: the risk of an India-Pakistan crisis, and the WMD threat in the region. The latter, in his opinion, appears to be a most likely scenario if the Al Qaeda or other groups infiltrate and deploy tactical nuclear weapons in the event of an India-Pakistan crisis.

The talk was attended by former diplomats, foreign diplomats, media persons and ORF faculty.

(This report is prepared by Shagun Gupta, Research Intern, Observer Research Foundation, Delhi.)

Democratic Party

Lincoln Chafee

Former Office: Governor, Rhode Island; Senator, Rhode Island
Campaign Site: www.chafee2016.com/
Government Site: Office of US Senator Bernie Sanders
Facebook (Campaign): www.facebook.com/FriendsOfBernie
Facebook (Official): www.facebook.com/SenatorSanders
Twitter: www.twitter.com/SenSanders

Hillary Clinton

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

Martin O'Malley

Former Office: Governor, Maryland
PAC Site: O'Say Can You See PAC
Facebook: www.facebook.com/MartinOMalley
Twitter: www.twitter.com/GovernorOMalley

Bernie Sanders

In office: Senator, Vermont
Campaign Site: <https://berniesanders.com>
Government Site: Office of US Senator Bernie Sanders
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

Ben Carson

Profession: Neurosurgeon
Official Site: RealBenCarson.com
PAC Site: American Legacy PAC
Facebook: www.facebook.com/DrBenjaminCarson
Twitter: www.twitter.com/RealBenCarson

Chris Christie

In Office: Governor, New Jersey
Official Site: <https://www.chrischristie.com/>
Government Site: Office of Governor Chris Christie
Facebook: www.facebook.com/GovChrisChristie
Twitter: www.twitter.com/GovChristie

Ted Cruz

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

Mike Huckabee

Former Office: Governor, Arkansas
Official Site: <https://www.mikehuckabee.com/>
Twitter: <https://twitter.com/GovMikeHuckabee>
Facebook: <https://www.facebook.com/mikehuckabee>

John Kasich

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

Rand Paul

Office: Senator, Kentucky
Official Site: <https://www.randpaul.com/>
Facebook: <https://www.facebook.com/RandPaul>
Twitter: <https://twitter.com/randpaul>

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

Scott Walker

In Office: Governor, Wisconsin
Official Site: <http://www.scottwalker.com/>
Twitter: <https://twitter.com/ScottWalker>
Facebook: <https://www.facebook.com/scottkwalker>

Table 1

2016 Democratic Presidential Nomination

Polling Data									
Poll	Date	Sample	Clinton	Sanders	Biden	O'Malley	Webb	Chafee	Spread
RCP Average	8/11 - 8/25	--	47.8	26.3	14.0	1.5	1.3	0.5	Clinton +21.5
Quinnipiac	8/20 - 8/25	647 RV	45	22	18	1	1	0	Clinton +23
Rasmussen Reports	8/23 - 8/24	536 LV	50	24	--	2	2	2	Clinton +26
CNN/ORC	8/13 - 8/16	358 RV	47	29	14	2	1	0	Clinton +18
FOX News	8/11 - 8/13	401 LV	49	30	10	1	1	0	Clinton +19

All 2016 Democratic Presidential Nomination Polling Data

Table 1 shows the leading candidates in the 2016 Democratic Presidential Nominations. In all the surveys conducted by Fox News, CNN/ORC, Rasmussen Reports and Quinnipiac, Hillary Clinton is leading by a wide margin. The polling data reveals that Clinton is followed by Bernie Sanders although there is a huge gap between Sanders and the far-and-away front runner, Hillary Clinton. This trend has remained stable in the last few months.

Source: www.realclearpolitics.com, 30 August 2015

Table 2

2016 Republican Presidential Nomination

Polling Data																	
Poll	Date	Trump	Carson	Bush	Rubio	Cruz	Walker	Fiorina	Kasich	Huckabee	Paul	Christie	Perry	Santorum	Jindal	Graham	Spread
RCP Average	8/9 - 8/25	23.5	10.3	9.8	7.3	7.3	7.3	6.0	4.5	4.0	3.8	3.5	1.3	1.0	0.5	0.3	Trump +13.2
Quinnipiac	8/20 - 8/25	28	12	7	7	7	6	5	5	3	2	4	1	1	0	0	Trump +16
CNN/ORC	8/13 - 8/16	24	9	13	8	5	8	5	5	4	6	3	2	1	0	0	Trump +11
FOX News	8/11 - 8/13	25	12	9	4	10	6	5	4	6	3	3	1	1	1	0	Trump +13
Rasmussen	8/9 - 8/10	17	8	10	10	7	9	9	4	3	4	4	1	1	1	1	Trump +7

All 2016 Republican Presidential Nomination Polling Data

Table 2 indicates the popularity of the 2016 Republican Presidential Nominees. The polling data reveals that on an average, Donald Trump has a lead cumulatively in surveys conducted by Fox News, CNN/ORC, Rasmussen and Quinnipiac. Surprisingly, Ben Carson leads over Jeb Bush who is followed by Marco Rubio, Ted Cruz and Scott Walker. The Republican field has been shaken by the surge in the popularity of Donald Trump, who has taken a lead over Jeb Bush, who had been the frontrunner so far.

The tables together show that both the Democrats and Republicans now have clear front-runners in Hillary Clinton and Donald Trump. Also, the Republican field is much more crowded than the Democrat field. However, a clear picture of the leading nominees will emerge only towards the end of the year.

Source: www.realclearpolitics.com, 30 August 2015

Excerpts from Senator Marco Rubio's Oped in the Wall Street Journal

How My Presidency Would Deal With China

Over the past week, we have been dealt a painful reminder of just how important U.S. policy toward China is in the 21st century. On Monday, due largely to a crash in China's stock market, U.S. markets suffered their worst day in four years. Insecurity and anxiety about the future—already high for American families—climbed even higher. It was a jarring illustration of how globalization is changing the U.S. economy.

China presents both opportunities and challenges. Trade with its growing middle class has opened American businesses to hundreds of millions of new customers. But Beijing's protectionist economic and trade policies increasingly endanger America's financial well-being. China is also a rising threat to U.S. national security. Earlier this year, it was behind the largest cyber-attack ever carried out against the United States.

President Obama has continued to appease China's leaders despite their mounting aggression. In addition to his insufficient responses to economic and national-security concerns, he has ignored the Chinese government's mass roundups of human-rights advocates, oppression of religious minorities, detention of political dissidents, ever-tightening controls on the Internet, and numerous other human-rights violations. He has hoped that being more friendly with China will make it more responsible. It hasn't worked.

The U.S. must continue to pursue cooperation with China when possible, but we can no longer succumb to the illusion that more rounds of cordial dialogue with its rulers will effect a change of heart.

... If elected U.S. president next fall, I will approach China on the basis of strength and example, not weakness and appeasement.

My first goal will be to restore America's strategic

advantage in the Pacific. China has increased its defense spending by 10% this year, continuing a 20-year trend. We cannot continue to allow our military readiness to atrophy while China's strengthens. My presidency will begin with an end to defense sequestration and a restoration of the Pentagon's budget to its appropriate level. This will allow us to neutralize China's rapidly growing capabilities in every strategic realm, including air, sea, ground, cyber space and even outer space.

Restoring America's strategic strength in Asia will also require reinforcing ties with allies in the region. Under my presidency, the U.S. will conduct joint freedom of navigation exercises with these nations to challenge any Chinese attempts to close off international waters or airspace. And if China continues to use military force to advance its illegitimate territorial claims, as it has in the South China Sea and elsewhere, I will not hesitate to take action. I will also promote collaboration among our allies, as America cannot and need not bear the full burden of counterbalancing China's power.

My second goal is protecting the U.S. economy. For years, China has subsidized exports, devalued its currency, restricted imports and stolen technology on a massive scale. As president, I would respond not through aggressive retaliation, which would hurt the U.S. as much as China, but by greater commitment and firmer insistence on free markets and free trade. This means immediately moving forward with the Trans-Pacific Partnership and other trade agreements.

I will also recognize that in the 21st century, national and economic security both depend on cybersecurity. No longer will China hack U.S. corporate or government servers with ease and without consequence.

The third goal concerns not just what Americans do, but who we are. Under my presidency, Beijing will not receive a free pass on human rights.

... Despite the challenges China poses to the U.S., we must never forget that the opportunities are even greater. The ability to trade, travel and innovate through cooperation and competition is greater than it has ever been.

But to achieve a new era of productive relations between our nations, America must stand on the side of the Chinese people rather than their autocratic rulers. Americans must elect a president willing to lead with strength and by example. A strong America—militarily, economically and morally—is the only path to lasting peace and partnership between the U.S. and China.

Source: The Wall Street Journal, 25 August 2015

Excerpts from Donald Trump's Interview to Time Magazine on 18 August

Q: I want to ask you about the immigration plan you put out over the weekend. You had said in 2012 that Mitt Romney's "self-deportation" comment was crazy and maniacal.

A: Well I thought it was stupid. Who's going to self deport? It wasn't that it was a bad plan from any other standpoint. But you tell people, oh, self deport. To me that just means what, you're just going to walk across the border and say okay. They asked me to go. That's not going to happen.

...Well what we're going to do—we have a plan, and I think it's a really good plan. And by the way, it's been very well received and some of the candidates, my opponents I guess you could call them, but some of the candidates have said that's really what you want.

...The first thing I need is a wall, and I will build a wall. ... And it will be done quickly and Mexico will pay for it.

...Don't forget in the meantime we have a real unemployment rate that's probably 21%. It's not 6. It's not 5.2 and 5.5. Our real unemployment rate—in fact, I saw a chart the other day, our real unemployment—because you have ninety million people that aren't working. Ninety-three million to be exact.

If you start adding it up, our real unemployment rate is 42%. We have a lot of room. We have a lot of people who want to work. But the good people I want them to come back. And I also want people of great talent to come to this country, to Silicon Valley for engineers. If you go to Harvard and you graduate

number one in your class, and you're from China, they send you home, you can't get back into the country.

So you end up working for companies in China and fighting us. And they're competitors of us. They're trained in our schools. I want people like that to come into this country. And if they want, I want that path to citizenship for these people. So they go to our best schools, they're fabulous students, they do well, they're going to be great and we throw them out of the country. It's ridiculous.

... We have to strengthen our border. We have to have people come in legally. And we will work out an expedited system where the really good people can come back legally.

Q: You've said that you can't tear up an Iran deal on Day One.

A: I'm a deal maker, when a person makes a deal ... But I've taken on some really bad deals and made the other side suffer.

Q: Do your rivals who say they'd tear up the deal understand how the world works?

A: They don't...It's a terrible deal. But I would enforce that deal like they never saw ... I'd demand to go — and the twenty-four day thing is ridiculous. And the fact that we didn't get the prisoners back is ridiculous.

There are so many things wrong with it...I'm a dealmaker...There are things in the deal that I'm sure Kerry doesn't even know about that I will find. And if they make a mistake they've got big problems.

For the full transcript of the interview, see <http://time.com/4003734/donald-trump-interview-transcript/>

DIASPORA WATCH

Mary Thomas Could Become the First Indian-American Woman in US Congress

Indian-American Mary Thomas, a government attorney in Florida, has announced that she will run for the US Congressional elections. She currently works as general counsel for the Florida Department of Elder Affairs. She has been a member of Governor Rick Scott's Administration since he was sworn into office. Born in Charleston, South Carolina, 37 year old Thomas is a Republican who will be pitted against incumbent Democrat Gwen Graham. She has already come out strongly against illegal immigration.

Source: <http://www.ndtv.com/diaspora/mary-thomas-could-become-the-first-indian-american-woman-in-us-congress-1201631>, 29 July 2015

Louisiana Gov. Bobby Jindal warns of immigrant 'invasion'

Indian-American Republican presidential aspirant Bobby Jindal, has said that immigrants who do not adopt American values represent an invasion. "Immigration without integration is not immigration; it's invasion," the Louisiana governor said. Describing the current immigration policy as "dumb", Jindal said that the US needs "to insist that folks who come here come here legally, learn English, adopt our values, roll up our sleeves and get to work".

Source: <http://www.washingtontimes.com/news/2015/aug/30/bobby-jindal-gop-presidential-candidate-warns-of-i/>, 30 August 2015

MEDIA REVIEW

As Biden Weighs a 2016 Campaign, Does He want to be the anti-Clinton?

Vice President Joe Biden is reportedly considering a Presidential run. Biden has already unsuccessfully run for President twice. Biden has developed a reputation for decency, is well-liked and enjoys great goodwill. But he has not been a prodigious fundraiser. If he does run, he faces a tough challenge from Hillary Clinton who is likely to raise about \$100 million by Fall. The way ahead for Biden

is daunting. To put together all the pieces needed in an era of social media and digital communication and prodigious amounts of data and tens of thousands of volunteers is laborious and time-consuming. What would be Biden's reason for deciding to run at this point? He does not have obvious policy differences with Clinton and cannot claim to be the idol of the Progressive wing in the party, unlike Bernie Sanders. Many attribute speculation about Biden's run to worry among the Democrats that Clinton is vulnerable. A Biden campaign would quickly be cast as one that embodies a lack of confidence in Clinton, an anti-Hillary venture. But no one on the outside knows what Biden will decide.

Source: *The Washington Post*, 15 August 2015

Warren Allies Demand Answers from Clinton on Wall Street Ties

Eight liberal political groups continue to pressure Hillary Clinton over her Wall Street policies releasing a letter that asks whether she supports legislation to ban financial companies from giving workers large bonuses before they join the government. The letter specifically points to two of Clinton's State Department aides who came over from the banking world. "On behalf of our nine million supporters across the country, we are writing to request more information about your positions regarding the revolving door between Wall Street and the federal government," reads a statement backed by Democracy For America, Rootstrikers, CREDO Action, MoveOn.Org Political Action, the Center for Popular Democracy Action, The Other 98%, Friends of the Earth Action and American Family Voices. The missive, which comes as Clinton interrupts her Hamptons vacation to unveil her rural policy platform in Iowa, specifically notes that Clinton has yet to support or comment on Senator Tammy Baldwin's Financial Services Conflict of Interest Act. Progressive icon Senator Elizabeth Warren— who has ties to many of those who signed the letter—has encouraged all presidential candidates to back the legislation, as both Bernie Sanders and Martin O'Malley have done.

Source: *www.politico.com*, 26 August 2015

Jeb's Fundraising Juggernaut shows Signs of Slowing

There are signs that Jeb Bush's fundraising juggernaut is losing some momentum, after banking a stunning \$120 million for his campaign and super PAC in the first half of the year. A prominent Florida donor backing Bush said the former Sunshine State governor and his supporting super PAC have to work even harder to keep up the pace, as hard-money contributions have been harder to come by in recent weeks. "The debate performance scared a few people," said Brian Ballard, a Tallahassee lobbyist backing Bush. "But I think the campaign's trouble raising money right now is not because of his performance, but there's some donor fatigue after that \$100 million. I've been on some donor calls and it's a hard sell for hard money." With a little more than a month left in the year's third quarter and the second Republican debate weeks away, Bush is continuing a breakneck fundraising schedule.

Source: www.politico.com, 25 August 2015

Bernie Sanders Draws Big Crowds to His 'Political Revolution'

As 1,800 mad-as-hell supporters jumped out of their seats and pumped their fists, Senator Bernie Sanders of Vermont delivered the message they had come to hear. We will "give these guys an offer they can't refuse," he shouted in the jam-packed gym, vowing to bust up the banks, bring down the billionaire class and smash the political establishment. "So I welcome you all," he said, "to the political revolution of 2015." The presidential election is, of course, in 2016, but Mr. Sanders can be forgiven for living in the moment. By overtaking Hillary Rodham Clinton in New Hampshire in some polls and drawing tens of thousands of people to his events on the West Coast, as well as thousands in Iowa and Nevada, Mr. Sanders, 73, has recaptured the enthusiasm that fuelled the 2008 Obama campaign, with T-shirts that say "Feel the Bern" and show an image of floppy white hair and glasses replacing the famous image in the Obama "Hope" poster by Shepard Fairey.

Source: New York Times, 20 August 2015

Poll: Hillary losing Support of White Women

Adding to Hillary Clinton's woes is a poll showing that she is losing support among White women, a constituency most people thought she would have won over with ease given that she would be the first female President if she wins. 34 percent of white women viewed her favourably while 53 percent held an unfavorable view. This is a decline from June when 44 percent of white women held favourable views and 43 percent held unfavourable views. The decline in favourability comes amid continued scrutiny of Clinton's use of a private email account when she was Secretary of State. The poll showed that Clinton's unfavourability ratings also increased among independents, people ages 18–34, and African-Americans—all groups which Democrats are counting on in 2016. However, Clinton still polls strong among African-Americans, 66 percent of whom viewed her favorably in July compared to 81 percent in June. Her unfavourability among African-Americans increased from 3 percent to 15 percent.

Source: www.politico.com, 4 August 2015

FURTHER READING

Robert W. Merry, 'Donald Trump's Secret Weapon: The Silent Majority?', 27 August 2015, *National Interest*,
<http://www.nationalinterest.org/feature/donald-trumps-secret-weapon-the-silent-majority-13714>

Jacob Heilbrunn, 'Trump: The Media's 'Goose with the Golden Eggs'', 27 August 2015, *National Interest*,
<http://www.nationalinterest.org/feature/trump-the-medias-goose-the-golden-eggs-13715>

Ben Wofford, 'Meet the Liberals Who Think Trump's Good for Democracy', *Politico Magazine*, 25 August 2015,
<http://www.politico.com/magazine/story/2015/08/meet-the-liberals-who-love-trump-121733>

Thomas E. Mann, 'Election 2016: Dumbing down American politics, Lawrence Lessig, and the Presidency', 27 August 2015, <http://www.brookings.edu/blogs/fixgov/posts/2015/08/27-dumbing-down-american-politics-mann>

Brandon George Whitehill, 'A Quick Guide to the Foreign Policy Views of the Democratic Presidential Candidates', August 2015, Foreign Policy Research Institute, <http://www.fpri.org/articles/2015/08/quick-guide-foreign-policy-views-democratic-presidential-candidates>

Editor: Uma Purushothaman

Associate Editor: Sylvia Mishra