



US ELECTIONS 2016

ISSUE 3 | OCTOBER 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

Explaining Donald Trump's Popularity

Sylvia Mishra

What explains the 'Trump' phenomenon in America's electoral politics? Why does Donald Trump, with his lack of real policy proposals, continue to dominate the political discourse?

Farewell Mr. Speaker

Kimberley Anne Nazareth

Why would John Boehner, who has few scandals to his name, leave his post at such a critical time?

Do Demographics Foretell a Democrat Victory?

Uma Purushothaman

It seems that demographics favour the Democrats in the forthcoming elections, especially if they are able to make sure there is a huge turnout among the youth and people of colour.

Politics of Fear in Presidential Campaigns

Monish Tourangbam

Instilling fears about the other candidate into the minds of American voters has emerged an important feature of election campaigns.

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

Analyses

Explaining Donald Trump's Popularity

Sylvia Mishra

Donald Trump has become the most familiar face in the lineup of GOP Presidential hopefuls. Despite his lackluster performance during the second Republican debate at the Ronald Reagan Presidential Library in California, he is leading the [latest NBC News/Wall Street Journal polls](#). Donald Trump's remarks on social, domestic and foreign policy issues appear strange and sometimes misogynistic. His policies are exceedingly light on intellectual credibility and his rhetoric high on populism, xenophobia, nationalism and ideals of protectionism. Yet he continues to dominate the opinion polls, approval ratings and magazine covers and analysts are unable to write-off his political adventure. What explains the 'Trump' phenomenon in America's electoral politics? Why does Donald Trump with his lack of real policy proposals continue to dominate the political discourse? Simplistic assertions of Trump's popularity being consistent with early-cycle flirtations by base voters are fast losing currency as poll numbers continue to favour him.

The 2016 Republican presidential race is being touted as the outsiders' game – where candidates outside the political establishment are currently leading the race for the nomination. The [National polls of Republican voters](#) show that Donald Trump, Ben Carson and Carly Fiorina are gaining more popularity as opposed to candidates with storied political resumes such as former Florida Governor Jeb Bush, Wisconsin Governor Scott Walker, New Jersey Governor Chris Christie and Kentucky Senator Rand Paul. Assertions like anti-establishment candidates are leading the GOP nomination horserace capture the reasoning of Trump's soaring popularity only to an extent. A [Bloomberg report](#) graph covering the second Republican debate showed that Trump dominated all the different categories on which the candidates were evaluated –Words Spoken; Questions Received; Rebuttals Made; Successful Interruptions; and Mentions by Other Candidates. Trump's campaign success is largely based on the force of his personality. Despite his ['fact-free'](#) self-branding and malignant form of politics, Trump receives disproportionate public support and media coverage only due to his ability to read sinews of the common man. His

three official position papers arrest the attention of voters' base with a populist agenda on key issues such as tax, immigration and gun laws.

Trump's latest [tax plan](#) proposes to eliminate income tax for millions of Americans while simultaneously maintaining that wealthy Americans and businesses would also pay less tax under his plan. This plan is expected to simplify the tax code and provide major tax relief for middle income families as tax is eliminated for people earning less than \$25,000 and married couples jointly earning less than \$50,000. Edward Kleinbard, a law professor and tax expert at the University of Southern California's Gould School of Law, [states](#) that Trump's tax plan is not completely irrational. He adds, *"Trump wants to tax profits that companies earn abroad at the time they are earned, just like domestic profits. That would help end the practice of American companies parking their profits overseas because they are now taxed only upon repatriation."* While the proposal to tax American companies on the profits they make abroad would generate enthusiasm among the vast majority of middle-class Americans, such a populist agenda serves a bitter blow to the Republican establishment's consensus on issues which are fundamental to the GOP such as taxation.

[Reagan's Three-Legged Stool](#) – a coalition of fiscal, social and national security conservatives has dominated the Republican Party since 1980. Any attempt to potentially destabilize the three-legged stool consensus would receive stiff opposition from the GOP's base. Trump's charisma lies in his ability to strike a fine balance between propagating a populist agenda which undercuts GOP's consensus on one hand while wooing the party's base with conservative racism against Hispanic immigrants on the other. This ability to keep the American people near and the GOP conservative base nearer by oscillating between center-right to extreme right on the political spectrum has contributed to his authoritative lead in the early polls. The challenge for Trump vis-à-vis other candidates who are running more traditional and substantive campaigns (Jeb Bush and Marco Rubio) is that soon pollsters who support Trump would want to know more details of his roadmap such as how he wishes to debar 11 million undocumented immigrants out of the country without generating a backlash. Trump's continued success would depend on his ability to spell out specifics in policy proposals and take

advantage of American people's expectation to rally behind a candidate who cannot be bought.

(Sylvia Mishra is a Junior Fellow at ORF)

Farewell Mr. Speaker
Kimberley Anne Nazareth

John Boehner has just announced his resignation not only as Speaker of the US House of Representatives, but also from the House itself. Why would a politician who has few scandals to his name leave his post at such a critical time?

Boehner is one of the rare breed of politicians who has never set his eye on the White House and who has always felt his time would be better served in the House instead. He was elected in 1991 to the US House of Representatives where he managed to gain credibility and influence among the 435 representatives. Boehner was a Newt Gingrich protégé, which means employing the 'Gingrich Treatment' to get deals done and force a President into submission. But Boehner also learnt from Gingrich's mistakes, especially 'never to mess with a popular' president. For all his personal and professional flaws, Bill Clinton was and is one of the most popular presidents in American history. Gingrich's major error was not so much the head-to-head policy battles with Clinton but the personal attack on the then president. Boehner has in that sense conducted himself more professionally, and has avoided personal attacks on Obama.

The Boehner–Obama connection has always been a conundrum. At one point, Boehner was willing to negotiate with the President and at others willing to go beyond the Constitution to flex the power and muscle of the Congress. Obama for his many failings accepted the fact that Congress will play a role in the Iran deal. This was especially true after much pressure from Republicans led by Boehner. However, grandstanding is part of the Gingrich way. The *Contract with America* was like the War Powers Resolution that came before it, a firm idea to resurrect Congress's Constitutional powers and portray it as an important branch of the Government, no matter what the President thought. Through this lens, those in Congress upset by the nuclear deal with Iran led by Boehner made a decision to resurrect the powers of Congress and flex its muscle. Republicans showed unanimity and unity in their

decision, especially when they invited Benjamin Netanyahu to speak before a joint session of Congress. They also took it a step further in true Gingrich style: Republicans led by Boehner wrote a letter to the legislators in the Iranian Majlis, stating that the Republican-controlled Congress would have an important say on the deal.

Thus, like in the past and very much in tune with Boehner's mentor, grandstanding once again became part of another Republican Congress. This grandstanding also manifested itself in the government shutdown, which did nothing for Republican credibility.

John Boehner has been a watered down version of his mentor but has employed some of the same techniques. When Republicans took over the House in 2011, they managed under his leadership to stay in power and act as a thorn in the side of the President till date. At every juncture, irrespective of whether they had the votes or not, they did what a partisan Congress is supposed to do: create a deadlock.

However, in spite of the tug of war between the Speaker and the President, there is a subtle kind of friendship going on. This was true of certain deals such as reaching a 'grand bargain' over the Budget. On the other hand, the Iran Deal has sparked a fierce fight between the Speaker and the President. This is an absolute conundrum: on the one hand he was trying to make deals with the President and on the other partisanship got the better of him.

What does Boehner's resignation mean for Congress and for his party? The repercussions on Congress and on the party are one and the same as the Republicans control Congress. Boehner had a tough time rallying conservatives and therefore looked to Democrats for support.

Boehner's exit leaves the Republicans in the hands of the conservative 'crackpots'. The stipulated reason for his resignation is primarily the infighting that has been going on within the Republican Party over Planned Parenthood, the budget, and the Iran Deal. Since Boehner had found it difficult to rally his troops, the conservatives threatened to get rid of him.

From the time he entered the Office of the Speaker in 2011, Boehner has had to deal with rallying his own factious party and dealing with the age-old problems that accompany divided government. He has been pushed and

pulled by the conservatives on spending cuts, on threats of government shut downs and so on. This would have definitely continued and it was Boehner's duty to "Protect the Institution from irreparable harm."

With him out of the picture, the floor has been thrown open to whoever wants the job. Republicans have already started to look for his replacement. Among Republicans jockeying for the position are the Majority Leader Kevin McCarthy and Paul Ryan could very well be a strong contender though he has made it clear he does not want to get involved in leadership battles. The Conservatives too are looking to fill the seat with a person more to their liking. If they succeed, Obama will have a tough year ahead. It also means that the party will reach new levels of conservatism. Then what will happen to the Iran Deal that has been tabled for January 2016 is an open question.

The future direction of the GOP will be determined by the presidential election and the twists and turns it takes. The presidential hopefuls have shown no or not much interest in the decision of who would replace the Speaker. The Conservatives no doubt are joyous and are going to take full credit for the displacement of the Speaker. There is a feeling among Republicans in Congress that they need new leadership. But what kind of leadership do they mean and what kind of leadership

do they seek? Is it a kind of leadership that will at every possible stage create a legislative gridlock and refuse to compromise and bargain with the President or his party thus making even a little splash of bipartisanship a remote possibility? If this were to happen, Congress would definitely be 'the Broken Branch'. Boehner's departure has thus raised valid questions about the future of the GOP.

(Kimberley Anne Nazareth is a Research Scholar at JNU)

Do Demographics Foretell a Democrat Victory?

Uma Purushothaman

It is often said that demography is destiny. This is certainly true of US elections where demographic changes are poised to have a telling impact on the US elections in 2016. Demographics in the US could be anything, from sex, race, income levels, people supporting LGBT rights, etc. One can often predict which way the elections will go based on how different demographics are voting.

[Statistics](#) showing how different groups voted in 2012 are useful in this context. 52% of men voted for Mitt Romney as opposed to 45% for Obama. Among women, 55% voted for Obama while 44% voted for Romney. Only 39% of Whites voted for Obama, with 59% voting for Romney. African American (93%), Hispanics (71%) and Asians (73%) voted overwhelmingly for Obama. If one were to examine voting by age, young voters voted for Obama while older people voted for Romney. There was a difference in how rich and poor people voted as well. People with less than \$50,000 annual income voted for Obama while those with higher incomes voted for Romney. People with college degrees have usually voted for Democrats as opposed to those with lower levels of education who vote Republican. While these statistics need not necessarily be repeated in 2016, there is no doubt that they do point to the broader voting trends.

The demographic group which will have the most impact on the elections are likely to be people of colour. It is projected that [by 2043](#), the majority of Americans will be people of colour. Therefore, winning over this demographic will be crucial for any party wanting to win the presidency and the Congress. The archetypal White Anglo Saxon Protestant (WASP) is becoming a shrinking part of what is becoming a more diverse American electorate. In 2012, for instance, [whites were 72%](#) of the electorate, 13% were African Americans, Latinos were 11% and Asians and others were 6%. It is [estimated that in 2016](#), the electorate will be 70 percent white, 13 percent African-American, 11 percent Latino, and six percent Asian/Other. This change in demographics is not only because of more relaxed immigration laws, but also because some groups like the Hispanics who came to the US in the 1990s are going through their own version of the baby boom. This is a demographic group which has in recent times voted for the Democrats. The GOP will have to work really hard to draw them away from the Democrats in 2016.

Women are another major demographic group. The likelihood of women voting for Republicans has [consistently declined since 2006](#). This trend is unlikely to change in 2016 as a [majority of women](#) are now pro-choice with the GOP still stuck in its pro-life stance. The section of the population which supports LGBT rights has also grown. In 2003, 47 percent of the American population supported equal rights for LGBT people as compared to [57 percent](#) in 2013. Given the GOP's positions on same sex marriage,

those supporting LGBTs rights will likely vote Democrat in 2016.

The Republican voter base still consists of white, rich and older voters. Further, [the group with which the GOP does best](#)—whites without college degrees— is the only one poised to shrink in 2016. The Republican Party's inability to broaden its support base by reaching out to minorities, for instance, will be a significant impediment to its electoral success. While in the 1990s, the GOP lost the Hispanic votes to the Democrats, in 2000 and 2004, George W Bush [rebounded](#), winning 35% and 44% of the Hispanic vote. His ability to speak Spanish and his roots in Texas, a Spanish speaking state might have been factors in this. Similarly, the Republicans do have a chance at splitting the Hispanic vote if they nominate a Marco Rubio who is of Hispanic origin or Spanish-speaking Jeb Bush who has a Mexican-American wife or someone less aggressive about illegal immigration. Similarly, some African Americans could vote for the Republicans if Ben Carson is on the GOP ticket. The good news for the GOP is that a group they have won consistently i.e. older voters are increasing in the electorate as the US is aging. This is also a section which [is more likely to vote](#) than youngsters. But this alone might not be enough to tilt the scales towards the GOP.

Though demographics favour the Democrats, whether this will turn into an electoral advantage for the party would depend on how much support the eventual

Presidential candidate is likely to whip up among these demographic groups. Also, sometimes [changes in the non white population](#) alone might not be enough for Democrats to win Electoral College votes. Hispanic votes are overrepresented in some safe states like California and Texas and are underrepresented in swing states.

Also, demographic changes are occurring at different paces in different states. While some states do have more non white populations, sometimes this does not change the nature of the electorate. This is because oftentimes many people are illegal immigrants who do not have the right to vote. Traditionally, Hispanic and African American voters have had [low voter turnout](#) rates. Another factor to be kept in mind is that demographics are often fluid. For instance, an African American male who would normally be considered a Democrat voter might vote for the Republicans if he has strong views opposing LGBT rights.

But a [simulation study](#) by the Center for American Progress shows that by 2016, given the rising share of

people of colour in the electorate, if Democrats are able to maintain support among voters of colour at the same levels they achieved in 2012, then they will more easily win states that were only narrowly won in 2012.

Thus, it seems that demographics favour the Democrats in the forthcoming elections, especially if they are able to make sure there is a huge turnout among the youth and people of colour. But one must also remember that the Democrat nominee will in a sense have to run against historical patterns: the same party rarely wins the White House after keeping it for two consecutive terms. But the shift in demographic patterns could just change this mould.

(Uma Purushothaman is a Research Fellow at ORF)

Politics of Fear in US Presidential Campaigns Monish Tourangbam

Fear is the foundation of most governments-John Adams

The story of election campaigns is a curious mix of optimism and pessimism, a mirror of past follies, a vision of a better future and furious duel between “us” and “them” first within parties, then between parties. The attack campaigns feature a host of fear predictions, reflecting (with rhetorical flourishes) primary issues of the time, and often real or perceived failures of the incumbent to resolve them. Many of these fears may not be totally unfounded, but what comes forth most starkly is the scare tactics that candidates employ to entice voters to come out and vote.

As clearly amplified in the notorious Daisy ad, Lyndon B. Johnson's campaign reflected the horrors of a nuclear holocaust and impressed upon Americans to vote for Johnson, [saying](#), “. . . the stakes are too high for you to stay home.” Ronald Reagan used the metaphorical “[bear in the woods](#)” as a campaign ad during his re-election bid to remind the American voters why they needed a more prepared President to fend off the uncertain strong bear (read the Soviet Union). If fear of communism had dictated the language of electoral campaigns during the Cold War era, another constant cycle of fear most propagated during elections is the fear of both weak as well as powerful executives. Since federalism and anti-federalism is an enduring theme in American politics, a president is either besieged for being too weak to make bold decisions for the security of America, or he is criticized for being too intrusive.

The philosophy of a government that governs the least has often guided political debates within the United States. However, when crisis strikes as during the Great Depression or the 9/11 attacks, a powerful executive is often tolerated and people rally around him to take firm decisions. As with the launch of the global war on terrorism, threat to western democracy and American way of life became a major narrative of all election campaigns. Another fear that often features in US election campaigns, both [presidential](#) and [congressional](#), is the fear of losing American jobs to foreigners a la the fear of offshoring and outsourcing, with emerging economies like India and China being targets. Rhetoric on outsourcing and offshoring, and the promise of bringing jobs back to America are liberally used, and more effectively in states hit by economic downturn. In election seasons, it is most commonplace to see both parties attack each other for packing off American job overseas. Negative attacks rise to such extent that fear of the other party coming to power is often the overwhelming story than the hope of either coming to the White House.

Come election season, [doom and gloom](#) dominates the airwaves with majority of candidates trying to show off how they are going to be tougher than the incumbent on issues of national security. Often American voters are reminded how afraid they should be of the world around them, and why exactly they need a particular person to be at the White House, and not someone else. In 2008, Hillary Clinton ran the [3 am phone call ad](#) propagating her credentials and experience as someone who could answer the call to security threats in a “dangerous world.” The same advertisement has come under attack from Republican candidates like Rand Paul in recent times, [alleging](#) that Hillary Clinton as Secretary of State had failed to answer that “3 am phone call” when it mattered, referring to the terrorist attacks in 2012 at the US diplomatic compound in Benghazi, Libya where casualties included the US Ambassador Christopher Stevens.

However, a government going overboard on matters of national security also becomes a matter of concern with the American public. Government surveillance over American citizens and its limitations have often been hotly debated among the candidates in the post 9/11 era. Democratic candidate Bernie Sanders has been speaking against excessive government surveillance. Writing for *Time Ideas* in May this year, he [contended](#), “. . . We must do everything we can to protect our country from the

serious potential of another terrorist attack. We can and must do so, however, in a way that also protects the constitutional rights of the American people and maintains our free society.” Republican candidate Chris Christie stands at the opposite end of this debate. Speaking at Portsmouth, New Hampshire the same month, Chris Christie defended the government’s anti-terror and surveillance laws. Vehemently refuting the fears of government encroaching upon civil liberties in the name of national security, he [argued](#), “. . . Let’s be clear, all these fears are exaggerated and ridiculous. When it comes to fighting terrorism, our government is not the enemy.”

One of the best examples of scare tactics during campaigns came out of the Bush-Cheney re-election campaign in 2004, called the [Wolves](#) ad. It used [wolves as a metaphor for lurking terrorists](#) in the post 9/11 era ready to harm America, and criticized the democratic opponent John Kerry and liberals in the Congress for voting to slash America’s intelligence operations budget, putting the country in harm’s way. [According to Ken Goldstein](#), an expert on campaign advertising and a political scientist at the University of San Francisco, regardless of general perceptions of negative advertising, political strategists swear by them as turnout tools. Goldstein emphasized that “people are more likely to take into account fear than hope in casting a ballot.”

Instilling fears about the other candidate into the minds of American voters has emerged an important feature of election campaigns. The fear mongering, through campaign rhetoric and negative ads is distributed many times over by the power of new media technologies. As the election season heats up, the language of fear and name calling is rampant within parties and between parties. Alarm bells are being sounded for threats of all hues and designs against the “American” way of life. Those threats might come from terrorists, rogue states, sexual orientations, abortion, illegal immigrants, socialism or a leader who was incompetent and betraying the “American dream.” President Franklin D. Roosevelt [famously said](#), “. . . the only thing we have to fear is fear itself.” However, the politics of fear continues to be liberally employed in the greatest act of liberal democracies—“free and fair” elections.

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

The Field

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.donaldtrump.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/scottwalker>

THE POLLS

Table 1

2016 Democratic Presidential Nomination

Polling Data									
Poll	Date	Sample	Clinton	Sanders	Biden	Webb	O'Malley	Chafee	Spread
RCP Average	9/17 - 9/24	--	40.8	27.6	20.0	0.8	0.8	0.0	Clinton +13.2
NBC/WSJ	9/20 - 9/24	256 RV	42	35	17	1	0	0	Clinton +7
FOX News	9/20 - 9/22	381 LV	44	30	18	1	2	0	Clinton +14
Bloomberg	9/18 - 9/21	375 RV	33	24	25	2	1	0	Clinton +8
Quinnipiac	9/17 - 9/21	587 RV	43	25	18	0	0	0	Clinton +18
CNN/ORC	9/17 - 9/19	392 RV	42	24	22	0	1	0	Clinton +18
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, NBC/WSJ, Bloomberg, CNN/ORC and Quinnipiac, Hillary Clinton is leading. The polling data reveals that Clinton is followed by Bernie Sanders although there is a gap between Sanders and the far-and-away front runner, Hillary Clinton. This trend has remained stable in the last few months. There is speculation that Vice President Joe Biden might announce his candidature. These polls show that even before announcing his candidature, he is already quite popular and is ahead of O'Malley, Webb and Chaffe. If Biden does announce his bid, the polls could change.

Source: www.realclearpolitics.com, 30 September 2015

Table 2**2016 Republican Presidential Nomination**

Polling Data																	
Poll	Date	Trump	Carson	Fiorina	Rubio	Bush	Cruz	Kasich	Christie	Huckabee	Paul	Santorum	Walker	Pataki	Jindal	Graham	Spread
RCP Average	9/17 - 9/24	23.4	17.0	11.6	9.6	9.2	6.2	3.6	3.4	3.2	2.4	0.6	0.5	0.4	0.4	0.0	Trump +6.4
NBC/WSJ	9/20 - 9/24	21	20	11	11	7	5	6	3	2	3	1	--	0	1	0	Trump +1
FOX News	9/20 - 9/22	26	18	9	9	7	8	4	5	3	2	0	--	1	0	0	Trump +8
Bloomberg	9/18 - 9/21	21	16	11	8	13	5	4	4	3	2	1	1	0	1	0	Trump +5
Quinnipiac	9/17 - 9/21	25	17	12	9	10	7	2	2	2	1	0	--	1	0	0	Trump +8
CNN/ORC	9/17 - 9/19	24	14	15	11	9	6	2	3	6	4	1	0	0	0	0	Trump +9
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, NBC/WSJ, CNN/ORC, Bloomberg and Quinnipiac. Ben Carson is the second most popular candidate, leading over Carly Fiorina and Marco Rubio who, thanks to strong performances in the second GOP debate, are surging in popularity. The surprise has been Jeb Bush, whose ratings are falling.

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 September 2015

STATEMENTS/INTERVIEWS

Trump's Interview on '60 Minutes' with Scott Pelley

Scott Pelley: Revolution is easy, governing is hard and what I'd like to get to is how you intend to govern the country if you are elected president. What's your tax plan?

Donald Trump: It's a substantial reduction for the middle-income people. Because our middle class, Scott, is being absolutely decimated. It will be a corporate also reduction, I think it'll be a great incentive for corporations.

Scott Pelley: Who are you going to raise taxes on?

Donald Trump: If you look at actual raise, some very wealthy are going to be raised. Some people that are getting unfair deductions are going to be raised. But, overall, it's going to be a tremendous incentive to grow the economy and we're going to take in the same or more money. And I think we're going to have something that's going to be spectacular.

Scott Pelley: But Republicans don't raise taxes.

Donald Trump: Well, we're not raising taxes.

Scott Pelley: What kind of Republican are you?

Donald Trump: I mean the only, well, I'm a pretty good Republican. But, I will tell you this, I do have some differences. I don't want to have certain people on Wall Street get away with paying no tax.

Scott Pelley: Are you serious about deporting 12 million illegal immigrants?

Donald Trump: Well, nobody knows the number. But the answer is-- you just said it, they're illegal immigrants. They're here illegally.

Donald Trump: First of all, I have to start a little bit differently. We're going to build a wall and we're going to create a border. It's going to be a great wall and it's not going to be very expensive. And it's going to be peanuts compared to the kind of numbers, you know?

Scott Pelley: How are you going to build a wall?

Donald Trump: It's called management.

Scott Pelley: --that is cheap and impenetrable?

Donald Trump: It will be a real wall. It'll be a wall that works. It'll actually be a wall that will look good, believe it or not. 'Cause what they have now is a joke. They're-- they're ugly, little and don't work.

Scott Pelley: What is the role of the U.S. military in the world?

Donald Trump: I want to have a military that's so strong, so powerful, so modern, has the greatest equipment in the world and that everybody says, "We're not gonna mess with them." And we don't have that now.

Scott Pelley: When has the U.S. military been too small to accomplish its mission?

Donald Trump: It's not a question of too small.

Donald Trump: We don't have leadership.

Donald Trump: I would end ISIS forcefully. I think ISIS, what they did, was unbelievable what they did with James Foley and with the cutting off of heads of everybody, I mean these people are totally a disaster. Now, let me just say this, ISIS in Syria, Assad in Syria, Assad and ISIS are mortal enemies. We go in to fight ISIS. Why aren't we letting ISIS go and fight Assad and then we pick up the remnants? Why are we doing this? We're fighting ISIS and Assad has to be saying to himself, "They have the nicest or dumbest people that I've ever imagined."

Scott Pelley: Millions of people are wondering right now whether you are serious or whether this is a reality show. Yesterday you said, "if the presidency doesn't work out, I'll go back to my business."

Donald Trump: Well, that's true.

Scott Pelley: Do you intend --

Donald Trump: I mean, that's true. I can't guarantee that --

Scott Pelley: --to be president, or not?

Donald Trump: Totally. But that's true. I always like to have a downside. I love my business. I didn't want to do this. I just see our country as going to hell. And I felt I had to do it.

Source: CBS News. For full transcript of the interview, see <http://www.cbsnews.com/news/donald-trump-60-minutes-scott-pelley/>

Hillary Clinton Talks about Student Debt and the 'Cold Shoulder' with Lena Dunham

During her college years at Wellesley College presidential hopeful Hillary Clinton protested against a litany of injustices, among them the school's curfew policy that limited visiting hours between the sexes. The former Secretary of State revealed that and more in an interview with Lena Dunham. The light-hearted interview appears in the first issue of *Lenny*, a feminist newsletter published jointly by Lena Dunham and Jenni Konner, co-creators of the HBO series *Girls* and vocal Clinton supporters.

On her marriage to Bill Clinton

"I was terrified about losing my identity and getting lost in the wake of Bill's force-of-nature personality. I actually turned him down twice when he asked me to marry him."

On debt held by America's students

"We have \$1.2 trillion in student debt, and this is an enormous problem. I want to give everybody a chance to refinance their debt. Bring the interest rates down, because oftentimes in crowds, I will say, 'Who has student debt?' And so many hands go up."

On whether she considers herself a feminist

"Yes. Absolutely. I'm always a little bit puzzled when any woman, of whatever age but particularly a young woman, says something like, 'Well, I believe in equal rights, but I'm not a feminist.' Well, a feminist is by definition someone who believes in equal rights!"

On race and law enforcement

"One of the areas where we have problems is the relationship between communities of color and the police forces who are to protect them. In those police forces now, we have many more police officers who are from different races, different backgrounds, so it's not only a

question of white versus black. It is a question of how force is used, how our law enforcement are trained, what kind of mind-set they have as they go about their daily jobs."

On a photo of her as First Lady wearing a favorite dress

"This is what's called a cold-shoulder dress. And I wore it for one of our first big events at the White House, in 1993. It was a design of my friend Donna Karan. And like everything I do, it turned out to be controversial. I'm hardly a fashion icon." "Donna always says that no matter your age, your size, your shoulders always look good."

Source: *Time*, 29 September 2015

DIASPORA WATCH

No holds barred: Ahead of 2016 US election, Bobby Jindal lays into 'carnival act' Donald Trump

Long shot Indian-American Republican presidential candidate Bobby Jindal declined to back Donald Trump if he wins the party nomination, calling him an "egomaniacal madman," only to be snubbed by the party frontrunner. A "non-serious carnival act", "entertaining narcissist," "full of foolishness and nonsense," a "power-hungry shark" who "eats whatever is in front of him" were some of the other epithets Jindal used for Trump in a string of attacks. Asking the real estate mogul to return to reality TV after a summer fling with politics, the Louisiana governor, who is languishing at the bottom of polls, said: "The Donald Trump act is great, and the idea of Donald Trump is great. But the reality of Donald Trump is absurd," he said suggesting Trump is not a true conservative. Jindal said it is "silly to argue policy" with Trump because "he has no idea what he's talking about, he makes it all up on the fly" and "lacks the intellectual curiosity to even learn." Asked if he would support Trump if he emerges as the Republican nominee as all party presidential contenders, including Trump, have pledged, Jindal declined to answer the "hypothetical"

question, saying he was working to prevent that.

Source: <http://www.firstpost.com/world/no-holds-barred-ahead-of-2016-us-election-bobby-jindal-lays-into-carnival-act-donald-trump-2429722.html>, 11 September 2015

MEDIA REVIEW

Donald Trump Unveils Plan to Slash Taxes for the Poor— and the Wealthy

Donald Trump's highly anticipated tax plan comes at a time when he is being pressed to provide more details about how his administration would govern. Trump said at a press conference at Trump Tower in New York as he unveiled his plan to revamp the tax code, "It will provide major tax relief for middle income and for most other Americans. There will be a major tax reduction. It'll simplify the tax code; it'll grow the American economy at a level that it hasn't seen for decades." One of the biggest beneficiaries of this plan appears to be families that draw the smallest pay checks. Individuals who make less than \$25,000 (and \$50,000 for married couples) would pay no income taxes under Trump's plan. However, many of those families already pay no federal taxes. Roughly 45% of American households will not owe any federal income taxes this year under the existing tax code, according to Tax Policy Center estimates. Trump said his plan will ensure a slightly larger share -- more than 50% of households -- pay no federal income tax.

Source: CNN, 29 September 2015

House Plans Special Committee to Probe Planned Parenthood

The House is considering a vote this week to create a special panel to investigate Planned Parenthood — the most direct move by congressional Republicans to probe allegations of improper fetal tissue sales by the group. The subcommittee would fall

under the jurisdiction of the influential Energy and Commerce Committee. It was announced over the weekend by Rep. Marsha Blackburn (R-Tenn.), who would serve as the panel's chairwoman. "What people want us to do is to get to the bottom of what has transpired with Planned Parenthood and the utilization of taxpayer funds. There is frustration from our constituents," Blackburn told. The committee is expected to investigate claims made in the videos to determine any wrongdoing by Planned Parenthood or its senior officials. A review of the videos and interviews with witnesses over the summer has yet to turn up a criminal case but the new committee would have subpoena power for documents and testimony. Republican staffers for the Energy and Commerce Committee say those interviews have prompted new questions, however, that the new select committee will investigate.

Source: www.politico.com, 28 September 2015

There's a Reason Bernie Sanders Talks about Pope Francis so much

When Bernie Sanders stepped onto a makeshift soapbox at the Latino Heritage Festival, he immediately compared himself to Pope Francis. Sanders said "What Pope Francis is saying in so many words is that there is something wrong in this world, and I am saying in this country, when so few have so much and so many have so little." It would be easy to interpret Sanders's emphasis on Francis, who just wrapped up a US tour, as the fleeting fascination of a politician trying to capitalize on a zeitgeist. What Sanders is really doing is defter and more interesting — he's using the pope to put his unusual-for-America politics into a global context that makes them seem more mainstream to voters. Francis, who recently admonished world leaders to "seek a new economic model to help the poor and to shun policies that sacrifice human lives on the altar of money and profit," helps him do that. Surely it isn't hurting. Few took Sanders, an avowed socialist, seriously when he announced his candidacy. America just doesn't do socialism. But an NBC/Wall Street Journal poll released shows Sanders pulling

within 7 percentage points of frontrunner Hillary Clinton, at 42 percent to 35 percent, when Vice President Joe Biden is included in the list of choices.

Source: www.vox.com, 28 September 2015

How Citizens United Helps Trump and Sanders, and Other 2016 Twists

The Supreme Court's 2010 ruling in *Citizens United vs. FEC*, which allows corporate donations to be treated as free speech, has often been criticized for allowing money to dictate political outcomes. But interestingly, in these elections, the ruling has helped Donald Trump and Bernie Sanders. It has helped set them apart as being unlike the other contenders who depend on money from big donors. Trump has often criticized his rivals for the nomination for being dependent on big donors and has said that his wealth immunizes him to pleas from special interests. Trump's rhetoric has been giving him free media coverage. Bernie Sanders has been gaining on Hillary Clinton in Iowa according to some polls. Like Trump, Sanders can point to the big donors supporting Clinton and say that he will not be beholden to them unlike her.

Source: *The Wall Street Journal*, 1 September 2015

Liberal Feminists Ponder Friends, Foes and Carly Fiorina

Liberal feminists across the country have conflicted feelings about Carly Fiorina as her presidential campaign gains traction after her strong showing at the second GOP debate. While they feel proud of her for taking on Donald Trump forcefully, her statements on Planned Parenthood appall them. Fiorina opposes abortion, raising the minimum wage, federally mandated paid maternity leave and the Affordable Care Act, policies that disproportionately affect women. Thus, liberal feminists like her performances but not her policies. Ms Fiorina has been asking feminists to take her seriously and asking for support from women, saying that women are the majority of the nation. Left-leaning feminists

have not been so conflicted by other Republican candidates in recent years.

Source: *New York Times*, 28 September 2015

Rising Rubio Hits Back, Calls Trump "Insecure"

Trump has taken note of Marco Rubio's rising popularity and has made him his new target, criticizing him for being "sweaty," "overly ambitious," "financially unsuccessful", "absent from the U.S. Senate", and "a kid." Though Rubio has tried to stay out of Trump's way, opting instead to focus on fundraising and campaign activity and hoping to stay under the radar, he realises he cannot stay quiet anymore. So he has called Trump "a touchy and insecure guy". With Scott Walker suspending his campaign, some of his supporters have crossed over to Rubio, giving him more room to manoeuvre. His performances at the GOP debates have also helped Rubio. But the Senator remains wary of peaking too soon.

Source: www.realclearpolitics.com, 25 September 2015

FURTHER READING

David Smith, Ashley Townshend and James Brown, 'Foreign Policies of the 2016 US Presidential Candidates', Alliance 21 Report (United States Studies) Centre at the University of Sydney, September 2015), <http://alliance.ussc.edu.au/research/foreign-policies-of-the-2016-us-presidential-candidates/>

Harvey M. Sapolsky, 'Rand Paul: The Champion of American Leadership?', *National Interest*, September 29, 2015, <http://www.nationalinterest.org/feature/rand-paul-the-champion-american-leadership-13955>

Christopher J. Fettweis, 'Joe Biden, The Realist, For President? *National Interest*, 27 September 2015,

<http://www.nationalinterest.org/feature/joe-biden-the-realist-president-13947>

Elaine Kamarck, 'Why Speaker Boehner can't govern: Primaries, parties, privacy, and pork', 25 September 2015, <http://www.brookings.edu/blogs/fixgov/posts/2015/09/25-john-boehner-speaker-cant-govern-resigns-kamarck>

Ron Fournier, 'Hillary Clinton: Come Clean or Get Out', *National Journal*, 23 September 2015, <http://www.nationaljournal.com/s/73675/hillary-clinton-come-clean-get-out?mref=recommended>

Ed O'Keefe and Matea Gold, 'It's make or break time for Jeb Bush', *Washington Post*, 27 September 2015, http://www.washingtonpost.com/politics/its-make-or-break-time-for-jeb-bush/2015/09/27/73d5f6fa-63c0-11e5-b38e-06883aacba64_story.html

Editor: Uma Purushothaman

Associate Editor: Sylvia Mishra