



US ELECTIONS 2016

ISSUE 8 | MARCH 2016

An ORF Monthly Monitor

EDITORIAL NOTE

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

ANALYSES

US Nuclear Policy and 2016 Presidential Candidates **Sylvia Mishra**

One of the most important issues that America faces is determining a policy on nuclear weapons. What then are the US presidential candidates' views on nuclear weapons and nuclear security?

The issue has divided the polity between those who

Swing States and US Presidential Elections **Monish Tourangbam**

Maybe it's unfair but some states in the United States, when it comes to electoral politics, matter more than others. Voters in a particular state are seen as undecided means - their votes are up for grabs and the numbers in those states can swing the results.

Senator Bernie Sanders: The 'Other' Democrat **Stuti Banerjee**

Even if Sen. Sanders is not the final nominee for the democratic candidate, his campaign has infused new ideas for the next generation of democrats and their supporters.

THE FIELD

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

THE POLLS

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

STATEMENTS/INTERVIEWS

Official statements and interviews by the candidates

DIASPORA WATCH

News about the Indian American Diaspora in the elections

MEDIA REVIEW

What the media is reporting on the issues

FURTHER READING

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

The Future of US Nuclear Policy and 2016 Presidential Candidates

Sylvia Mishra

On March 31-April 1, 2016, President Obama is hosting the fourth and final nuclear security summit at the Walter E. Washington Convention Center in Washington, DC. The three previous summits held in Washington (2010), Seoul (2012) and The Hague (2014) highlighted international efforts to help prevent nuclear terrorism. President Obama during his [electoral campaign](#) in 2008 had stressed the ultimate goal of removing nuclear weapons from the planet. During President Obama's [speech in Prague in 2009](#), he identified nuclear terrorism as the 'most immediate and extreme threat to global security'. While the Obama administration accelerated efforts to '[secure all vulnerable nuclear material around the world within four years](#)', the initiative has registered scanty success. One can argue that the potential for the acquisition of nuclear materials by terrorist groups has been greatly reduced. However, there are still impending dangers of terrorist groups pursuing nuclear and radiological weapons highlighting the need for more work and global cooperation to secure vulnerable nuclear materials, break up black markets and detect and intercept illicitly trafficked materials.

Under the aegis of the Obama administration, the March Summit will continue discussion on the evolving threats and highlight steps that can be taken together to minimize the use of highly-enriched uranium, secure vulnerable materials, counter nuclear smuggling and deter, detect, and disrupt attempts at nuclear terrorism. As the 2016 US Presidential election season is underway, one of the most important political issues that America faces is determining a policy on nuclear weapons. What then are the US presidential candidates' views on nuclear weapons and nuclear security? How do the US presidential candidates wish to address gaps in the field of nuclear security and strengthen the global nuclear security system?

Broadly, the US presidential candidates have expressed their views on two aspects of nuclear related issues – nuclear power and nuclear non-proliferation. However, issues related to nuclear security has been relatively absent from the presidential debates. When it comes to nuclear power, most candidates are in [favour of incorporating it into the energy basket](#), but there remain variances about its safety, efficiency and the way of treating nuclear waste. There are also differences where Democrats and Republicans stand when it comes to nuclear proliferation. The Democrats have [stressed the need](#) for the US to consider its obligations under the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty (NPT).

Former Secretary of State and democratic front-runner Hillary Clinton is rarely seen discussing nuclear issues as she claims to be ["agnostic about nuclear power"](#). Clinton during the first 2016 Democratic Party debate briefly [stated](#) that the proliferation of nuclear weapons and the potential of nuclear material falling into wrong hands was the greatest threat to national security. On her website, she has sounded her [policy](#) of never allowing Iran to acquire nuclear weapon. Her policy further states that America and its allies – especially Israel will be safer if nuclear agreement with Iran is vigorously enforced and implemented. On non-proliferation, Clinton [said](#) that she was skeptical about Obama's estimated \$1 trillion nuclear arms upgrade. She was also asked in Iowa if she would prefer more reductions between the U.S. and Russia to 1,000 nuclear weapons apiece to which [Secretary Clinton responded](#) by saying, *"Absolutely. I mean that's why I worked so hard on what's called the New START Treaty. We gotta do more."* It is surprising that Clinton has not spoken on more substantial policy specifics on nuclear non-proliferation issues given her extensive experience with President Obama's [New START](#) treaty that reduces nuclear missiles and has substantial spending cuts on the United States' nuclear arsenal.

On the other hand, Bernie Sanders has displayed much skepticism about nuclear energy. He [believes](#) that non-conventional energy – solar, wind, geothermal power – are more cost-effective and energy efficient than nuclear plants. While questioning the federal government's investment of billions into federal subsidies for the nuclear industry, Sanders has [maintained](#) that the toxic

waste byproducts of nuclear plants are not worth the risks of the technology's benefit. Both Bernie Sanders and Hillary Clinton have ambitious plans to [shift the nation's economy away from fossil fuels](#) to clean energy to combat the global warming caused by their burning. However, the two candidates differ on where they stand when it comes to the use of nuclear energy. Sander's staunch views against the use of nuclear power is opposed to Clinton's [view](#) of preserving existing nuclear power plants and including new advanced reactors to help reduce carbon emissions.

The 2016 Republican Presidential candidates have avoided significant discussion of the issues of nuclear power and security. Lack of substantive discussion from the Republican candidates on this vital aspect of national security is alarming to say the least. Mostly, the GOP candidates have ignored the fact that the U.S. is already modernizing its nuclear arsenal and plans to replace all three legs of the nuclear triad of delivery systems and new nuclear bombs. In reality, the U.S. is spending a total of about [\\$35 billion per year](#) on the nuclear arsenal. While Donald Trump [during a debate](#) was ignorant of what nuclear triad implied, Ohio Governor John Kasich had a muted positive response to Obama's plan to modernize the nuclear triad. During October 2015, in a town hall meeting in Goffstown, NH, Governor John Kasich's response to Obama's \$1 trillion plan was that America needs to be prepared and modernize nuclear fleet because nuclear weapons offer deterrence. Trump's response so far on nuclear security has been, ["With nuclear, the power, the devastation is very important to me."](#) Trump's wildly inconsistent and unmoored vision for American influence and power in the world is well known. However, the [open letter](#) on Donald Trump from the GOP national security leaders failed to reflect on the abject lack of significant debate on nuclear security. Unfortunately, a [poll](#) in late October revealed that 34% of the Americans trust Donald Trump with the nuclear launch codes.

Trailing behind Donald Trump in polls – Ted Cruz believes in [strengthening nuclear arsenal](#). He states that all the three legs of the triad are critically important however, the submarine aspect of the triad is the most important part of America's nuclear arsenal. He places special emphasis on improving the submarines as they are the most important for projecting power and are the hardest to take out. [On the campaign trail in New Hampshire](#), Ted Cruz added that the first obligation of the Commander-in-

Chief is to keep the country safe with new major investments in missile defense. While the GOP candidates have in an inconsistent manner highlighted the need for nuclear weapons, quite disturbingly, hardly anyone has focused on the security and proliferation aspects. As the Nuclear Security Summit is underway, it would be interesting to note whether nuclear weapons and security appear more prominently on candidates' radar as the subject so far has received dismal attention. American and global citizens deserve to know more about what candidates are thinking about the future of US nuclear policy.

(Sylvia Mishra is a Junior Fellow at ORF.)

Swing States and US Presidential Elections

Monish Tourangbam

Maybe it's unfair but some states in the United States, when it comes to electoral politics, matter more than others. They matter more, not because they have more Electoral College votes but because they are undecided in their alignment towards either the Republican Party or the Democratic Party. Hence, they are called swing states and candidates are more interested in wooing the voters in these states, than in states that are already certain in favoring either of the two parties. These states are neither completely red (as in favoring the Republican Party) or blue (as in favoring the Democratic Party) and thus are also called purple states. Candidates do not feel the need to spend time and money campaigning in states where either their win or loss is guaranteed.

As the candidates and the parties go through the grind of campaigning towards the November national elections, they like to increase their attention and make their presence felt in states which are regular swing states or that are predicted to turn into swing states. The fact that voters in a particular state are seen as undecided means that their votes are up for grabs and the numbers in those states can swing the results. It also matters that, during the national elections, all states in the US electoral system except Maine and Nebraska follow the winner-take-all system where the winning candidate takes all the votes, no matter how narrowly he/she wins. As the election season progresses, candidates start engaging in localized campaigns tailored to the political environment and voter peculiarity of swing states.

So, how are these swing states known? It seems there are [no clear strategies](#) although public opinion polls, previous election results and registration in political parties might give a fair sense of where the wind is blowing, or more precisely, that the wind is not necessarily blowing in one direction. Efforts by parties to entice unaffiliated voters to come out could include greater person-to-person contact and political ads targeting local issues that matter to them. In recent times, politics in the United States has been getting increasingly polarized with decreasing number of politicians who are able to bridge the divide between the two parties and bring more bipartisanship. Continued gerrymandering has led to increasingly partisan congressional districts, with fewer numbers of states that are considered unsafe by either of the two parties.

There is decreasing competition in many of the states and the margins of wins or losses are wider. Compared to earlier elections, [number of undecided and hence competitive states has decreased](#) with only 12 states decided by five points or less in 2000. The figure went down to only four states in 2012. In 2016, seven states are being predicted as the real swing states or toss-ups, i.e., Colorado, Florida, Nevada, Ohio, Virginia, Iowa and New Hampshire. Some also push the number of [swing states up for grabs](#) to 11, including Pennsylvania, Wisconsin, Michigan and North Carolina into the mix. Reports show that most of the [campaign spending](#) towards television ads, grassroots voters' registration and get-out-the-votes drives get concentrated in a few battleground states and the campaign is activated and personalized, to get every vote that counts. Majority of the candidates' field offices are usually located in these few states as November approaches.

A new study has found that changing demographics in these 11 battleground states might majorly impact the voting patterns with significant consequences for the national results. The growing racial diversity and the aging white population in these swing states have been the subject of a [new study](#). A few points here and there, either through increasing minority voters, or declining white voters can shift results in these states, and hence significantly help in determining who comes to the White House. Choosing between persuading eligible voters aligned to another party, and expanding the electorate by increasing the minority and newly eligible unaligned young voters, campaigners have often found the latter to

be more cost-effective. In this context, the Democratic Party seems to have [a mathematical edge](#) over the Republican Party in terms of winning the swing states, owing to popularity among the rising minorities and aging white voters' base denting Republican prospects to some extent. Hence, Republicans need to find the message and the strategy to not only keep its base voters, but also to eat into the Democratic voting base of non-whites.

The non-whites are still far from becoming a majority in the US population, but the electoral implications are already being seen as significant enough to tilt votes one way or the other, more so in the swing states. In states like Pennsylvania, which is seen as being less significant than states like Florida and Ohio in the proportion of non-white voters, the [share of non-white voters](#) will see a rise from 17 per cent of the electorate in 2012 to 19.2 per cent in 2016. This is enough to make a difference in a very close race. Hispanics make up the largest minority group in the United States, numbering to about 17 per cent of the US population. Gabriel Sanchez, a political science professor at the University of New Mexico [reflected](#), "Every 30 seconds, a Latino citizen turns 18 and becomes eligible to vote... That's 66,000 each month. That's a powerful number." But, how Hispanics turn out this November might be crucial for both the parties in the swing states because this group also carries a historical record of being bad turnouts on Election Day. The other side of the story is that the lesser number of voters among Hispanics who have not registered give some leeway to both the parties to attract eligible but unregistered voters.

Analyzing [Obama's past wins make it clear](#) that changing demography apart, getting the minority voters enthusiastic and involved enough in the election to actually come out and vote was as important. It has to be seen as to what extent the Democratic candidate is able to excite minority voters in the swing states, and to what extent the Republican counterpart is able to make a dent in the Democratic support among minority voters. In other words, as both parties vie for voters in the swing states, the Democratic Party cannot take minority voters for granted and the Republican Party cannot hope to have a future without catering to minority voters.

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

Senator Bernie Sanders: The 'Other Democrat'

Stuti Banerjee

When Ms. Hilary Clinton announced that she would be running to get the Democratic nomination for President, she was the clear favourite to win the ticket, by both the party and the polls. She came with experience of politics from being a senator and former first lady; she understood US foreign policy due to her term as Secretary of States; and her resolve and strengthen before the Congressional committee investigating the Benghazi attacks, were seen as qualities essential to bear the pressures of being the Commander in Chief, of one of the most powerful and advanced military forces in the world. Yet, from being the clear choice, Ms. Clinton's campaign is trying to reach out to voters and donors alike to win them away from her fellow party candidate-Senator Bernie Sanders.

Sen. Sanders, a long standing representative of the state of Vermont in the US Congress, has slowly gained prominence in this race. He won the New Hampshire primary by a handsome majority. In the Iowa Caucus, Ms. Clinton won but the margin of 'victory' was dismal. (Ms. Clinton won close to 49.9 percent votes, against Sen. Sanders 49.6 percent votes). The Nevada Caucus, (won by Ms. Clinton) also witnessed stiff competition between the two. Sen. Sanders's close fight has ensured that the Democratic Party contest remains open, at least for the moment.

Sen. Sanders has gained his support base among the younger democrats. This is interesting as he is the socialist democrat who looking to change the US in some very fundamental issues. [Polls show that he has been able to gather support among the 18-30 age group voters, and evidence of this is available on the social media, where his campaign has ensure that he is engaged with the young Americans. In Iowa, where Sen. Sanders came just a few delegates short of the supposed front-runner, Ms. Clinton, he won a staggering 84 percent of the voters under 30. Just as important, he got them to vote—they made up an unusually large 18 percent of the electorate.](#) The reason for this change is an adjustment in the thinking of the young Americans, who are facing the recession, paying of education debts and yet have no economic security. For them socialism is not a political ideology which is against the established capitalist

system, but an idea for a more equitable American society.

They want income and wealth equality, a major campaign issue for Sen. Sanders. He has called for the minimum wage to be increased from current US \$7.5 to US \$15. Wages are an important issue for the voters. While economists have put a question mark on the long term effects of this hike it is also true that wage revision is needed. The American economy has been growing in recent years with people going back to work nonetheless; wages have not increased to factor in rising inflation. [Cash money isn't the only way workers are compensated; they negotiate for health insurance, retirement-account contributions, and other benefits as part of their package. But wages and salaries are the biggest \(about 70%, according to the Bureau of Labor Statistics\) and most visible component of employee compensation.](#) For most workers, minimum wages is the only package they receive. These are largely the minimally educated who come from poor family, forming the large part of the blue collar workforce of America. The low wages have a domino effect on the quality of education and healthcare they can afford, as also the saving they can generate for post retirement plans. Sen. Sanders has plans to address these concerns by; Making tuition free at public colleges and universities throughout America to ensure that everyone in this country is able to go to college regardless of income. Sign the Paycheck Fairness Act into law to make sure that women earn the same as men in all jobs. And expand Social Security by lifting the cap on taxable income above \$250,000 to make sure that senior Americans retire with substantial savings. These ideas are finding favor with the young Americans, both those who joined the work force as the economy struggled under the recession.

The prominent feature of campaign is his views on how to bring about healthcare reform. Sen. Sanders has gone a step beyond the Affordable Care Act or ObamaCare and proposed what he calls the Single Player Health Care Plan. [The idea behind this plan is to ensure that all American are covered and this coverage is independent of their work. It would separate health insurance from employment. People would be able to start new businesses, stay home with their children or leave jobs they don't like knowing that they would still have health care coverage for themselves and their families. Basically it means putting almost all the \\$3.2 trillion-a-year U.S. health care system in the hands of the federal government, with states acting as administrative](#)

[subcontractors](#). Again, economists have pointed to the costs of not just repealing the Affordable Care Act but also of replacing it with a new policy. Despite the questions on its feasibility, it has found support among black Americans and the Hispanic communities, two groups that are largely unable to afford healthcare. While both these groups strongly support Ms. Clinton, they are open to the idea of hearing more about Sen. Sander's plans. Even if Sen. Sanders is not the final nominee for the democratic candidate, his campaign has infused new ideas for the next generation of democrats and their supporters.

(Stuti Banerjee is a Research Fellow at ICWA)

Republican Party

THE FIELD

Democratic Party

Hillary Clinton

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

Bernie Sanders

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

Ted Cruz

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

John Kasich

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

Donald Trump

Profession: Businessman
Official site: <https://www.donaldjtrump.com/>
Facebook: <https://www.facebook.com/DonaldTrump>
Twitter: <https://twitter.com/realdonaldtrump>

THE POLLS

Table 1

Florida Democratic Presidential Primary

| Florida Democratic Presidential Primary – March 15 (214 Delegates) | | | | | | |
|--|-------------|--------|-----|---------|---------|---------------|
| Poll | Date | Sample | MoE | Clinton | Sanders | Spread |
| Final Results | -- | -- | -- | 64.5 | 33.3 | Clinton +31.2 |
| RCP Average | 3/7 - 3/13 | -- | -- | 60.7 | 31.8 | Clinton +28.9 |
| Quinnipiac | 3/8 - 3/13 | 519 LV | 4.3 | 60 | 34 | Clinton +26 |
| ARG | 3/11 - 3/13 | 400 LV | 5.0 | 58 | 37 | Clinton +21 |
| PPP (D)* | 3/11 - 3/12 | 627 LV | 3.9 | 57 | 32 | Clinton +25 |
| CBS News/YouGov | 3/9 - 3/11 | 796 LV | 4.5 | 62 | 34 | Clinton +28 |
| Florida Atlantic University | 3/8 - 3/11 | 414 LV | 5.0 | 59 | 31 | Clinton +28 |
| WTSP/Mason-Dixon | 3/7 - 3/9 | 500 LV | 4.5 | 68 | 23 | Clinton +45 |
| All Florida Democratic Presidential Primary Polling Data | | | | | | |

Table 1 shows poll results for Florida Democratic Presidential Primary for the Democrats. Bernie Sanders trailed behind at 31 percent while Hillary Clinton took a lead at 60 percent.

Source: www.realclearpolitics.com, 21 March, 2015

Table 2

Florida Republican Presidential Primary

| Florida Republican Presidential Primary – March 15 (99 Delegates) | | | | | | | | |
|---|-------------|---------|-----|-------|-------|------|--------|-------------|
| Poll | Date | Sample | MoE | Trump | Rubio | Cruz | Kasich | Spread |
| Final Results | -- | -- | -- | 45.8 | 27.0 | 17.1 | 6.8 | Trump +18.8 |
| RCP Average | 3/7 - 3/13 | -- | -- | 43.0 | 24.7 | 18.4 | 9.1 | Trump +18.3 |
| Florida Times-Union | 3/13 - 3/13 | 787 LV | 3.5 | 44 | 26 | 18 | 10 | Trump +18 |
| Trafalgar Group (R) | 3/12 - 3/13 | 1500 LV | 2.6 | 44 | 24 | 20 | 9 | Trump +20 |
| ARG | 3/11 - 3/13 | 400 LV | 5.0 | 49 | 24 | 16 | 8 | Trump +25 |
| Monmouth | 3/11 - 3/13 | 405 LV | 4.9 | 44 | 27 | 17 | 9 | Trump +17 |
| Quinnipiac | 3/8 - 3/13 | 615 LV | 4.0 | 46 | 22 | 14 | 10 | Trump +24 |
| CBS News/YouGov | 3/9 - 3/11 | 873 LV | 4.8 | 44 | 21 | 24 | 9 | Trump +20 |
| Florida Atlantic University | 3/8 - 3/11 | 852 LV | 3.0 | 44 | 21 | 21 | 9 | Trump +23 |
| WTSP/Mason-Dixon | 3/7 - 3/9 | 700 LV | 3.8 | 36 | 30 | 17 | 8 | Trump +6 |
| Suffolk University | 3/7 - 3/9 | 500 LV | 4.4 | 36 | 27 | 19 | 10 | Trump +9 |
| All Florida Republican Presidential Primary Polling Data | | | | | | | | |

Table 2 indicates the results of the Florida Republican Presidential Primary. The poll results reveal that Donald Trump keeps his lead in winner-take-all Florida, at 44 percent over Ted Cruz's 18 percent and Marco Rubio's 24 percent. Marco Rubio drops out of the presidential race after trailing behind in Florida.

Source: www.realclearpolitics.com, 21 March, 2015

Hillary Clinton's Speech to AIPAC

Democratic presidential candidate Hillary Clinton spoke to the American Israel Public Affairs Committee about the relationship between the United States and Israel.

It is wonderful to be here and see so many friends. I've spoken at a lot of AIPAC conferences in the past, but this has to be one of the biggest yet, and there are so many young people here, thousands of college students. You will keep the U.S.-Israel relationship going strong. You know, as a senator from New York and secretary of State, I've had the privilege of working closely with AIPAC members to strengthen and deepen America's ties with Israel. Now, we may not have always agreed on every detail, but we've always shared an unwavering, unshakable commitment to our alliance and to Israel's future as a secure and democratic homeland for the Jewish people.

And your support helped us expand security and intelligence cooperation, developed the Iron Dome missile defense system, build a global coalition to impose the toughest sanctions in history on Iran and so much more. Since my first visit to Israel 35 years ago, I have returned many times and made many friends. I have worked with and learned from some of Israel's great leaders.

I know that all of you understand what's at stake in this election. Our next president will walk into the Oval Office next January and immediately face a world of both perils we must meet with strength and skill, and opportunities we must seize and build on. The next president will sit down at that desk and start making decisions that will affect both the lives and livelihoods of every American, and the security of our friends around the world. So we have to get this right. As AIPAC members, you understand that while the turmoil of the Middle East presents enormous challenge and complexity, walking away is not an option.

Candidates for president who think the United States can outsource Middle East security to dictators or that America no longer has vital national interests at stake in this region are dangerously wrong. It would be a serious mistake for the United States to abandon our responsibilities, or cede the mantle of leadership for global peace and security to anyone else. As we gather here, three evolving threats — Iran's continued aggression, a rising tide of extremism across a wide arc of instability, and the growing effort to de-legitimize Israel on the world stage — are converging to make the U.S.-Israel alliance more indispensable than ever.

We have to combat all these trends with even more intense security and diplomatic cooperation. The United States and Israel must be closer than ever, stronger than ever and more determined than ever to prevail against our common adversaries and to advance our shared values. This is especially true at a time when Israel faces brutal terrorist stabbings, shootings and vehicle attacks at home. Parents worry about letting their children walk down the street. Families live in fear. Just a few weeks ago, a young American veteran and West Point graduate named Taylor Force was murdered by a Palestinian terrorist near the Jaffa Port. These attacks must end immediately. And Palestinian leaders need to stop inciting violence, stop celebrating terrorists as martyrs and stop paying rewards to their families.

Because we understand the threat Israel faces we know we can never take for granted the strength of our alliance or the success of our efforts. Today, Americans and Israelis face momentous choices that will shape the future of our relationship and of both our nations. The first choice is this: are we prepared to take the U.S./Israel alliance to the next level? We will never allow Israel's adversaries to think a wedge can be driven between us.

That's why I believe we must take our alliance to the next level. I hope a new 10-year defense memorandum of understanding is concluded as soon as possible to meet Israel's security needs far into the future. That will also send a clear message to Israel's enemies that the United States and Israel stand together united. It's also why, as president, I will make a firm commitment to

ensure Israel maintains its qualitative military edge. The United States should provide Israel with the most sophisticated defense technology so it can deter and stop any threats. That includes bolstering Israeli missile defenses with new systems like the Arrow Three and David's Sling. And we should work together to develop better tunnel detection, technology to prevent armed smuggling, kidnapping and terrorist attacks.

There is much Americans can learn from Israel, from cyber security to energy security to water security and just on an everyday people- to-people level. And it's especially important to continue fostering relationships between American and Israeli young people who may not always remember our shared past. They are the future of our relationship and we have to do more to promote that.

Many of the young people here today are on the front lines of the battle to oppose the alarming boycott, divestment and sanctions movement known as BDS.

If we look at the broader regional context, converging interests between Israel and key Arab states could make it possible to promote progress on the Israeli-Palestinian issue. Israelis and Palestinians could contribute toward greater cooperation between Israel and Arabs. I know how hard all of this is. I remember what it took just to convene Prime Minister Netanyahu and President Abbas for the three sessions of direct face-to-face talks in 2010 that I presided over. But Israelis and Palestinians cannot give up on the hope of peace. That will only make it harder later.

Let us do the hard work necessary to keep building our friendship and reach out to the next generation of Americans and Israelis so the bonds between our nations grow even deeper and stronger. We are stronger together, and if we face the future side by side, I know for both Israel and America, our best days are still ahead.

Source: For the complete transcript, see <http://time.com/4265947/hillary-clinton-aipac-speech-transcript/>

DIASPORA WATCH

Citing India Interview, Bernie Sanders Challenges Hillary Clinton's View on Outsourcing

Democratic presidential aspirant Bernie Sanders has challenged his party's front-runner Hillary Clinton's view on outsourcing by digging out her four-year-old interview to an Indian TV news channel in which she is seeing saying that "outsourcing" is part of India-U.S. economic ties. "Well, you know, it's been going on for many years now and its part of our economic relationship with India," Clinton told the Indian news channel on May 7, 2012. The interview video along with the relevant transcripts was distributed to media Mar. 4 by the Sanders campaign. "This new video shows Secretary Clinton says different things to different audiences about outsourcing," said Jeff Weaver, Bernie 2016 campaign manager. "In the U.S. she condemns it but when she's in India she says it has benefitted many parts of our country. Secretary Clinton should explain to the people of Michigan how they have benefited from the outsourcing of their manufacturing jobs," Weaver said. Asserting that the former Secretary of State is the only candidate in this race with a comprehensive agenda to create jobs, the Clinton campaign said Sanders should tell voters how he will create manufacturing jobs and grow the economy.

Source:

<http://newamericamedia.org/2016/03/citing-india-interview-bernie-sanders-challenges-hillary-clintons-view-on-outsourcing.php> 14 March, 2016

MEDIA REVIEW

Why the Republican Establishment Doesn't Like John Kasich

Improbable as it seemed just two months ago, the one remaining "establishment" Republican presidential candidate in the race is [John Kasich](#), whose last name many voters still can't pronounce. After winning Ohio, Kasich has potentially denied Donald Trump the 1,237 delegates needed to clinch the nomination outright. And he goes into primaries (in Arizona and Utah) as an antagonist to Ted Cruz, whose quest to close the gap between him and

Trump is complicated by Kasich's continued presence. But the Ohio governor has amassed only 143 delegates — which means that even if Kasich somehow managed to win every single one of the remaining 1,049 delegates, he would still fall shy of the nomination threshold. Then again, neither Trump nor Cruz is likely to clear the bar, either. Should that prove to be the case, then at the G.O.P. convention in Cleveland this July, all delegates will be free to vote for whomever they wish after the first ballot. And although a convention rule precludes consideration of a candidate who, like Kasich, has failed to win eight states, this provision can possibly be changed. Why would they do so on behalf of a candidate who has finished well behind his two opponents? The case goes like this: Unlike Trump and Cruz, Kasich has more temperate stances on immigration and social issues, which are less likely to turn off moderates, independents, minorities and young voters.

Source: [NY Times](#), 22 March, 2016

Trump Questions Need for NATO, Outlines Noninterventionist Foreign Policy

Donald Trump outlined an unabashedly noninterventionist approach to world affairs Monday, telling The Washington Post's editorial board that he questions the need for the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, which has formed the backbone of Western security policies since the Cold War. The meeting at The Post covered a range of issues, including media libel laws, violence at his rallies, climate change, NATO and the U.S. presence in Asia. Speaking ahead of a major address on foreign policy later in front of the American Israel Public Affairs Committee, Trump said he advocates a light footprint in the world. In spite of unrest abroad, especially in the Middle East, Trump said the United States must look inward and steer its resources toward rebuilding domestic infrastructure. "I do think it's a different world today, and I don't think we should be nation-building anymore," Trump said. "I think it's proven not to work, and we have a different country than we did then. We have \$19 trillion in debt. We're sitting, probably, on a bubble. And it's a bubble that if it breaks, it's going to be very nasty. I just think we have to rebuild our country." He added: "I watched as we built schools in Iraq and they're blown up. We build another one, we get blown up. We rebuild it three

times and yet we can't build a school in Brooklyn. We have no money for education because we can't build in our own country. At what point do you say, 'Hey, we have to take care of ourselves?' So, I know the outer world exists and I'll be very cognizant of that. But at the same time, our country is disintegrating, large sections of it, especially the inner cities."

Source: [Washington Post](#), 22 March, 2016

Bernie Sanders Makes a Return Trip to Utah, Delivers Foreign Policy Address

Vermont Sen. Bernie Sanders made a return trip to Utah, making a foreign policy address and rallying thousands ahead of the caucus. "All right Salt Lake City, are you ready for a political revolution?" he shouted to cheers from a packed gymnasium at West High School. The Salt Lake City Fire Marshal estimated crowd turnout at about 3,500. Unlike his opponents in the presidential race, Sanders skipped powerful American-Israeli Public Affairs Committee (AIPAC) meeting in Washington, D.C., but declared that he is "probably the only candidate who has personal ties with Israel." Ahead of the rally, Sanders delivered his own foreign policy address to a select group of supporters where he called on Muslim countries to take the lead in the fight against ISIS (with U.S. support), backed the Iran nuclear deal, and weighed in on the Israeli-Palestinian conflict, urging both sides to work toward peace. "I firmly believe that the only prospect for peace is the successful negotiation of a two-state solution," Sanders said to applause from the room. Sanders' is polling ahead of Hillary Clinton in Utah's Democratic caucus. During his campaign rally, he urged his supporters to flood the caucus meetings to vote for him. His supporters, who consider themselves a wide demographic of progressives, said they intend to.

Source: [Fox News](#), 21 March, 2016

Ted Cruz's Stealth Delegate Hunt

Sen. Ted Cruz's campaign has been operating an under-the-radar effort to prepare for a contested Republican convention this summer, and those moves appear to be bearing fruit in places such as this Atlanta exurb. Though front-runner Donald Trump carried Georgia's Coweta County by 12 percentage

points three weeks ago, it was Cruz supporters who dominated an early stage of the arcane process of choosing the people who will serve as delegates at the Republican National Convention. The goal: If Mr. Trump doesn't win on the first ballot—freeing most delegates from voting for the candidate who won their state's primary or caucus—Cruz supporters would dominate the convention, paving the way for the Texas senator to win the nomination on a later vote. It is at events like the Coweta County Republican Convention last weekend where Mr. Cruz must prevail to have any reasonable chance of wresting the GOP nomination away from Mr. Trump. "We started preparing to get our folks to the convention in 2015," said Scott Johnson, a top Cruz organizer in Georgia.

Source: [Wall Street Journal](#), 21 March, 2016

Donald Trump Names Foreign Policy Advisers

Republican presidential candidate Donald Trump has revealed the first members of his foreign policy team. The advisers include academics and former military officers with expertise on the Middle East and energy issues. Mr Trump told the Washington Post that he would name more advisers in the coming days. Several of his advisers have served as experts for other Republican presidential candidates such as Mitt Romney and Ben Carson. Mr Trump named retired Lt Gen Keith Kellogg, Carter Page, George Papadopoulos, Walid Phares and retired Gen Joseph Schmitz. The team is led by Republican Senator Jeff Sessions of Alabama who has helped shape Mr Trump's policies, most notably on immigration. Mr Trump has come under criticism in recent days over his policy credentials. When cable news network MSNBC asked him who was advising him on policy, Mr Trump named himself. Donald Trump recently boasted he was his own top adviser on foreign policy matters, noting that he had a "good instinct for this stuff. After more than a month of hints and promises, however, the Republican presidential front-runner has announced who else has his ear on international affairs. The names are hardly a who's who in the Republican foreign policy firmament - which could be good or bad news depending on one's perspective. Mr Trump's positions on trade deals and military intervention put him decidedly outside the

Republican Party establishment, and this list of advisers will do little to change that perception.

Source: [BBC](#), 21 March, 2016

Open Letter on Donald Trump from GOP National Security Leaders

We the undersigned, members of the Republican national security community, represent a broad spectrum of opinion on America's role in the world and what is necessary to keep us safe and prosperous. We have disagreed with one another on many issues, including the Iraq war and intervention in Syria. But we are united in our opposition to a Donald Trump presidency. Recognizing as we do, the conditions in American politics that have contributed to his popularity, we nonetheless are obligated to state our core objections clearly: His vision of American influence and power in the world is wildly inconsistent and unmoored in principle. He swings from isolationism to military adventurism within the space of one sentence. His advocacy for aggressively waging trade wars is a recipe for economic disaster in a globally connected world. His embrace of the expansive use of torture is inexcusable.

Source: [War On The Rocks](#), 2 March, 2016

FURTHER READING

Nikhila Natarajan, 'Does America have enough angry white voters to fuel a #Trump presidency?' *Observer Research Foundation*, 22 March, 2016. <http://www.orfonline.org/expert-speaks/does-america-have-enough-angry-white-voters-to-fuel-a-trump-presidency/>

Daniel Twining, 'To the insurgents the spoils: America's unusual 2016 primary elections', *Observer Research Foundation*, 9 March, 2016, <http://www.orfonline.org/expert-speaks/to-the-insurgents-the-spoils-americas-unusual-2016-primary-elections/>

Daniella Leger, '2016 maybe the year of anti-establishment candidate, but don't lump Trump and Sanders together', *Observer Research Foundation*, 25 February, 2016, <http://www.orfonline.org/expert->

[speaks/2016-may-be-the-year-of-the-anti-establishment-candidate-but-dont-lump-trump-and-sanders-together/](#)

Goh Eng Yeow, 'For the Fed's next move, watch US elections', *Strait Times*, 22 March, 2016, <http://www.straitstimes.com/business/for-the-feds-next-move-watch-us-elections>

Rajeev Srinivasan, 'Impeccable credentials and experience: Why Hillary Clinton is India's favourite US presidential candidate', *First Post*, 21 December 2015, <http://www.firstpost.com/politics/impeccable-credentials-and-experience-why-hillary-clinton-is-indias-favourite-us-presidential-candidate-2685930.html>

Editor: Sylvia Mishra