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### 1NC

#### Harris is beating Trump now; multiple national polls prove

**Pengelly, Politics Reporter for The Guardian, 8-6**-24

(Martin, “Polls show Kamala Harris moving ahead of Donald Trump in 2024 US election,” The Guardian, accessed 8-7-24, <https://www.theguardian.com/us-news/article/2024/aug/06/trump-harris-election-polls>) JFN

As Kamala Harris named Tim Walz, the Minnesota governor, as her running mate, **recent polls showed the vice-president moving ahead of** Donald **Trump in the race for the White House**.

**Among recent national head-to-head polls, SurveyUSA put Harris up three points ahead of Trump**, 48%-45%; **Morning Consult put her up four points**, 48%-44%; **YouGov and CBS News made it a one-point Harris lead**, 50%-49%; and **University of Massachusetts Amherst put Harris up three**, 46%-43%. Those results were mostly within the margin of error. But Tatishe **Nteta,** provost **professor of political science at UMass Amherst and director of its poll, pointed to a key finding: a seven-point swing to the Democrat since January**, when Trump led Joe Biden by four. “For weeks after the first presidential debate in June,” Nteta said, “Democratic donors, prominent Democratic elected officials and members of the news media made the case that President Joe Biden faced long odds to defeat former President Donald Trump and called for Biden to step down. **“In the aftermath of Biden’s** historic **decision to forgo his re-election campaign**, it seems as if Biden’s critics were indeed correct as his replacement, Vice-President Kamala **Harris, has emerged as the frontrunner in the race for the White House.**

#### Decarbonization policies are unpopular with the public and torpedo’s Harris chances of winning

**Rutledge, senior lecturer in Economics at The Open University**, 7-10-**24**

(Emilie, “Oil economics could sway the US election,” accessed 8-8-24, <https://asiatimes.com/2024/07/oil-economics-could-sway-the-us-election/>) JFN

**Oil continues to influence** global economics and **politics like no other** finite natural resource. **In the 2024 US presidential election, the** strategic **commodity will be an important domestic issue**.

**As the biggest producer and consumer of oil on the planet, the US has a particularly strong relationship with the black stuff**. And the candidates know it. Donald Trump has promised to “drill, drill, drill” and reportedly courted the financial backing of industry giants. Those giants have responded by donating US$7.3 million to Trump’s campaign – three times more than for his 2020 run.

Meanwhile, Joe **Biden has attempted to reduce dependence on fossil fuels with his green energy policy** and other legislation. Yet **at the same time, he has overseen an increase in domestic oil production** and promised motorists he will keep petrol prices low. **It’s an important promise in the US**, a country whose love affair with cars is well known. Out-of-town shopping malls, long highways and a lack of government investment in public transportation have fuelled car dependency, with many cities being designed around huge road systems. So it is perhaps unsurprising that pump prices are a significant factor influencing voters. Research has even shown that gasoline prices have an “outsized effect” on inflation expectations and consumer sentiment. As fuel prices go up, confidence in the economy goes down. And while many European and Asian countries have shifted towards alternative energy sources, the US has not reduced its dependence on fossil fuels when it comes to transport. Electric models make up only 8% of vehicles sold in the US, compared to 21% in Europe and 29% in China. Any rise in gasoline prices ahead of the US summer “driving season” – when holidays and better weather encourage more road travel and gasoline consumption is estimated to be 400,000 barrels per day higher than other times – would be a serious concern for the Democratic party. Yet it’s also true that whoever is in the White House actually has limited ability to influence gasoline prices. Around 50% of the pump price is the cost of crude oil, the price of which is set by international markets. And despite producing enough oil domestically to cover its consumption, the US continues to trade its oil around the world. Back in 2015, Congress voted to lift restrictions on US crude oil exports that had been in place for four decades, allowing US companies to sell their oil to the highest international bidder. To complicate things further, some US refineries can only deal with a certain type of crude oil, which has to be imported. Neither international events or foreign production decisions are under the control of a US president. Indeed, **oil price spikes** caused by political crises in other oil-producing regions illustrate how continued dependence on oil itself, whether domestically produced or imported, leaves the US exposed to global market shocks which **could in turn influence electoral outcomes**. After Russia’s full-scale invasion of Ukraine in 2022 and production cuts from countries such as Saudi Arabia in 2023, the Republican party used a rise in gasoline prices to attack Biden’s environmental policies which had reduced domestic oil drilling and ended drilling leases in the Arctic. Big oil, little oil So while the US president has little say over the price of fuel that voters pay, domestic oil and gas regulations have a role to play, as **oil producers make up a significant body of influence in the US.** Aside from the big firms backing Trump, the structure of the US oil industry is unique among oil-producing states in that **it is dominated by a very large number of small independent producers who earn money from the extraction and sale of oil from their land.** In most oil-producing countries, subsurface oil is owned by the state. But in the US, the mineral rights are owned by the private landowner who can earn royalties by allowing oil companies to drill on their land. In 2019, there were 12.5 million royalty owners in the US. Operating alongside them are some 9,000 independent fossil fuel companies which produce around 83% of the country’s oil and account for 3% of GDP and 4 million jobs. Those companies drilling on state-owned land pay a royalty rate to the government, which up until recently was as low as 12.5% of the subsequent sales revenue. Biden’s decision to raise the rate to 16.67% did not go down well with oil producers. **Despite** that rise and **Biden’s pledge to forge ahead with the US energy transition, the domestic oil and gas industry expansion has continued under his watch**. **In 2023, US oil production grew to unprecedented levels**, averaging 12.9 million barrels per day and forecasters predict a 2% production increase in 2024. **Surging US oil production may help with the Democrats’ re-election bid**, but rising gasoline prices will not – even though their levels depend on much more than Biden’s energy policies. Instead, it may be that the international economics of oil markets drive voters’ decisions – and determine who wins and who loses in November 2024.

#### Harris victory is vital to strengthen US/India relations

**Swain, professor of peace and conflict research at Uppsala University**, Sweden, 8-2-**24**

(Ashok, “What would a Kamala Harris presidency mean for India?,” accessed 8-8-24, <https://scroll.in/article/1071532/what-would-a-kamala-harris-presidency-mean-for-india>) JFN

As Kamala **Harris** stands poised to potentially become the first female President of the United States, **her presidency offers a significant opportunity to redefine and strengthen the US-India relationship. Harris’s unique background, political philosophy and deep personal ties to India position her as a transformative figure in bilateral relations**. Her approach is expected to be distinct, focusing on enhancing the strategic partnership while emphasizing the importance of India maintaining its secular and democratic character. **Harris is likely to continue the Biden administration’s firm stance against Russian aggression in Ukraine and efforts to curb Chinese influence in Asia. These policies** are essential for maintaining global stability and **resonate with India’s strategic interests**. Harris’s balanced approach towards Israel, advocating for its right to self-defense while urging the protection of Palestinian civilians, indicates a nuanced foreign policy that would extend to her dealings with India. This balance is crucial as it ensures continued US support for key allies while promoting humanitarian values and maintaining a liberal world order.

#### Strong US/India relations are key to combating multiple existential threats

**Latham, Professor of Political Science at Macalester College**, 4-16-**24**

(Andrew, “India’s Growing Global Importance,” accessed 8-8-24, https://inkstickmedia.com/indias-growing-global-importance/) JFN

**By supporting India’s economic and military development, the United States can cultivate a vital strategic partner that shares its vision for a free and open Indo-Pacific region**. India’s democratic traditions and long-standing ties with the West create a natural foundation for alignment with US values and interests. **A strong India acts as a counterweight to China’s growing assertiveness**, ensuring a multipolar Asia where no single power dictates the regional narrative. **This strategic partnership** transcends immediate security concerns; it **opens doors for robust economic cooperation** between the two democracies. Imagine **a future where India’s** burgeoning **tech sector and skilled workforce collaborate with American ingenuity to drive innovation**. Imagine **joint efforts addressing global challenges like climate change, pandemics, and cyber threats**. Second, India’s rise is organic and driven by internal factors like a growing population and a mushrooming middle class. This stands in stark contrast to China’s state-driven economic model, one that for some time now has been shaped as much by the concept of “comprehensive national security” as any idea of open markets and free trade. A stronger India, integrated into the global economy, will be a natural trading partner for the US and a force for stability in the region. Finally, New Delhi’s strategic anxieties perfectly align with those of Washington. China’s growing assertiveness in the South China Sea and along the Himalayas directly threatens India’s security, just as they threaten the United States’ interests across — and beyond — the Indo-Pacific region. **A US-India partnership can present a united front against these challenges, deterring Chinese aggression and promoting a peaceful resolution of regional disputes.** The opportunity to cultivate a powerful ally in India not only adds an additional strategic arrow to Washington’s grand strategic quiver. **It’s a chance to build a more just, prosperous, and secure international order for all**. By embracing India’s rise, the United States can shape the 21st century alongside a partner that shares many of its grand strategic anxieties and that is committed to the same broad vision of the Indo-Pacific region.

# \*\*\*UNIQUENESS\*\*\*

### EXTENSION BLOCK

#### Harris is winning now; national polling averages prove

**Kilgore, Political Columnist for New York Magazine, 8-8**-24

(Ed, “Harris vs. Trump Polls: Kamala’s Gains Are Now a Trend, Not Just a Bounce,” accessed 8-8-24, <https://nymag.com/intelligencer/article/harris-vs-trump-polls-kamalas-gains-are-now-a-trend.html>) JFN

It has now been over two weeks since Joe Biden withdrew from the 2024 presidential race and endorsed Kamala Harris as his presumptive replacement as Democratic nominee. Unsurprisingly, **Harris got a quick bounce in the polls as the new, younger, and fresher rival to** Donald **Trump**. But **now it’s becoming clear this is a trend**, not just a momentary bounce. **According to the FiveThirtyEight national polling averages, Harris is leading Trump by 2.2 percent** (45.5 to 43.4 percent), with Robert F. Kennedy Jr. at 5.3 percent. When Biden dropped out, he was trailing in the same averages by 3.2 percent. **In a contest as static as the 2024 presidential race had been, that’s a big swing**, though it should be noted that Harris’s lead is about the same as the popular vote margin Hillary Clinton achieved in her losing effort against Trump in 2016. **The trend lines in national polls also reflect a pro-Democratic shift**. YouGov-Economist tested Harris against Trump back on July 16, showing Trump leading by 5 percent (44 to 39 percent). Then, on July 23, after Biden’s withdrawal, the same pollster had Trump leading Harris by 3 percent (44 to 41 percent). On July 30 and again on August 6 YouGov-Economist showed Harris leading Trump by 2 percent (46 to 44 percent on the earlier date and 45 to 43 percent later). Similarly, RMG Research had Trump leading Harris by two points (48 to 46 percent) on July 23, with Harris leading Trump by five points (47 to 42 percent) on July 31. Morning Consult’s tracking poll showed Trump leading Harris by two points ( 47 - 45 percent) on July 22 but then Harris leading Trump by four points (48 - 44 percent) on August 4. A CBS poll of likely voters conducted by YouGov shows a three-point Trump lead (51 to 48 percent) on July 18 turning into a one-point Harris lead (50 to 49 percent) on August 2.

#### Harris is leading now

**McHardy, Reporter for Newsweek, 8-8**-24

(Martha, “Kamala Harris Takes Eight-Point Lead Over Donald Trump in New Poll,” accessed 8-8-24, <https://www.newsweek.com/kamala-harris-eight-point-lead-donald-trump-new-poll-presidential-election-1936246>) JFN

Kamala **Harris has taken an 8 percentage point lead over** Donald **Trump, according to a new poll**. The survey, **conducted by Marquette Law School** between July 24 and August 1, **shows that when third party candidates are included, Harris leads among likely voters with 50 percent of the vote to Trump's 42 percent.** The surge by Harris has improved the Democrats' position since May, when Trump was leading with 44 percent of the vote to Joe Biden's 41 percent. **Harris is also leading among registered voters, with 47 percent of the vote to Trump's 41 percent**. In Marquette Law School's last poll in May, Trump was three points ahead of Biden among registered voters, securing 40 percent of the vote to the president's 37 percent. **Harris is also leading her opponent in a head-to-head matchup with the support of 52 percent of registered voters,** **while Trump is the choice for 48 percent**. **Among likely voters, Harris received 53 percent and Trump 47 percent**. The results include voters who initially did not choose Harris or Trump but who were then asked whom they would vote for if they had to choose.

#### Harris has the momentum in key swing states now

**Gans, Reporter for The Hill, 8-8**-24

(Jared, “Cook Political Report shifts Arizona, Georgia, Nevada toward Harris,” accessed 8-8-24, <https://thehill.com/homenews/campaign/4818198-cook-political-report-arizona-georgia-nevada-tossups/>) JFN

**The election handicapper Cook Political Report shifted its ratings for Arizona, Georgia and Nevada toward** Vice President **Harris** as she continues to close the polling gap with former President Trump. **All three states had been considered “lean Republican” in early July**, while President Biden was still in the race and falling further behind Trump both on the national level and in the key battleground states. But with polls showing Harris getting back within the margin of error of Trump, or in some cases slightly ahead, the three swing states have been moved to be a “toss Up.” **“For the first time in a long time, Democrats are united and energized, while Republicans are on their heels**. **Unforced errors from** both **Trump** and his vice presidential nominee J.D. Vance **have shifted the media spotlight from Biden’s age to Trump’s liabilities**,” Cook Editor-in-Chief Amy Walter wrote in a post explaining the decision.

# \*\*\*LINKS\*\*\*

### EXTENSION BLOCK

#### Plan allows Republicans to use the perception of higher electricity prices as a successful wedge issue against Harris

**Dabbs and Tomich, Reporters for Energy & Environment News**, 7-17-**24**

(Brian and Jeffrey, “Electricity prices get political in Trump’s world,” accessed 8-7-24, <https://www.eenews.net/articles/electricity-prices-get-political-in-trumps-world/>) JFN

Donald **Trump is trying to turn** high **electricity prices into an edge at the ballot box**. On campaign stops, in the blazing summer heat, the former president has blamed Democrats for the rising cost of keeping the lights on and the air conditioners humming. “By the end of my term, America will have the No. 1 lowest cost of energy and electricity,” Trump said in West Palm Beach, Florida, last month. “We’re going to get energy prices reduced within the first year to less than half of what they are right now, and that’s going to bring down inflation.” **At the Republican National Convention** in Milwaukee this week, **convention speakers blasted** President Joe **Biden for** gasoline prices and **the cost of electricity**, **driving at energy costs as a culprit for inflation across the economy**. All of it highlights an uncomfortable reality for Democrats ahead of the November election. Electricity prices have risen by roughly 20 percent since late 2020, according to the U.S. Energy Information Administration, and show few signs of falling. From April 2023 to April 2024**, average retail electricity prices went up in the main battleground states**, with Nevada and Wisconsin the exceptions. **Conservatives have seized on power** and gas **prices to push back against climate policies** in some states; in Washington state, a reliably Democratic stronghold, GOP megadonor and hedge fund executive Brian Heywood is bankrolling a ballot initiative to repeal the state’s cap-and-trade market for carbon emissions. Trump is championing tax cuts for fossil fuel producers. And he’s pledging to leave the Paris climate agreement and to cut federal programs that support clean energy technology. Trump and his surrogates are vowing to cut electricity prices with a familiar slogan: “Drill, baby, drill.” **Perceptions and realities of rising energy prices fit neatly into a** triple-barreled **Republican critique of economic, energy and climate policies under Biden**. Democratic spending is driving up the cost of living, from energy to groceries, GOP candidates are telling voters: “Inflation is killing our country. It is absolutely killing us,” Trump said during the June 27 presidential debate.

**Republicans** gathering in Wisconsin **are making electricity** — the pricing of which is arcane by any standard — **a wedge issue against Democratic support for the nation’s transition from burning fossil fuels to carbon-free energy in the fight against climate change.**

#### Majority of Americans oppose decarbonization policies

**PEW Research Center**, 6-28-**23**

(“1. What Americans think about an energy transition from fossil fuels to renewables,” accessed 8-1-24, <https://www.pewresearch.org/science/2023/06/28/what-americans-think-about-an-energy-transition-from-fossil-fuels-to-renewables/#majority-of-americans-continue-to-oppose-phasing-out-gasoline-cars-and-trucks-by-2035>) JFN

While the public prioritizes renewable energy development, **just 31% say they are ready to phase out the use of oil, coal and natural gas completely**. A much larger share (**68%) say the U.S. should continue to use fossil fuels, alongside renewables, as part of the mix of energy sources the country relies on**. The roughly two-thirds of Americans who support using a mix of renewables and fossil fuels are closely divided over whether the U.S. should ever stop using oil, coal and natural gas: 32% of Americans favor a mix of sources now but think the U.S. should eventually stop using fossil fuel energy sources, while **35% favor using a mix of sources now and say the U.S. should never stop using oil, coal and natural gas.**

#### Most Americans support an “all of the above strategy” for domestic energy production

**Lohr, IPSOS US Director of Public Affairs,** 2-27-**24**

(Annaleise Azevedo, “American voters are unhappy with the federal government’s energy policy,” accessed 6-3-24, <https://www.ipsos.com/en-us/american-voters-are-unhappy-federal-governments-energy-policy>) JFN

6. Four in five registered voters **(82%) say the U.S. should use an “all-of-the-above strategy” that includes oil and natural gas as well as renewable energy sources**, compared to 16% who say the U.S. should end the use of oil and natural gas and switch exclusively to renewable energy sources. More than nine in ten Republicans (95%), **four in five independents (83%), and seven in ten Democrats** (70%) **say the U.S. should use an “all-of-the-above energy strategy”.**

#### Americans support increasing domestic production of oil and natural gas

**Lohr, IPSOS US Director of Public Affairs,** 2-27-**24**

(Annaleise Azevedo, “American voters are unhappy with the federal government’s energy policy,” accessed 6-3-24, <https://www.ipsos.com/en-us/american-voters-are-unhappy-federal-governments-energy-policy>) JFN

2. More than four in five registered voters **(87%) support the U.S. increasing its own domestic sources of oil and natural gas rather than relying on other regions in the world, including a majority of registered voters who strongly support this (52%).** **This includes** 94% of Republicans, **87% of independents**, and 85% of Democrats. Republicans are most likely to say they strongly support this (73%) compared to 53% of independents and 34% of Democrats.

### Carbon Tax

#### Majority of Americans oppose even modest carbon taxes

**EPIC,** 6-4-**24**

(Energy Policy Institute @ the Univ. of Chicago, “Public Opinion on Energy & Climate,” accessed 6-12-24, <https://epic.uchicago.edu/area-of-focus/public-opinion-on-energy-climate-change/#:~:text=Americans'%20Views%20on%20Climate%20and%20Energy%20Policy&text=Most%20are%20unwilling%20to%20pay,responsibility%20to%20address%20climate%20change>.) JFN

While many **Americans** are willing to pay a monthly carbon fee on their energy use, **more than half are still unwilling to pay anything**. **Forty-five percent of Americans would support a monthly carbon fee of $1**, and 25% would support a $75 or $100 monthly fee. Democrats are more willing than Republicans and independents to pay a monthly carbon fee, regardless of the amount.

“Americans’ reported willingness to pay a carbon fee reveals the complicated politics of carbon pricing. **Less than half of Americans would pay even $1 per month**, but the average willingness to pay across the entire adult population is about $36 per month, up from $31 last year,” says Michael Greenstone, director of EPIC and the Milton Friedman Distinguished Service Professor in Economics at the University of Chicago. “The average is driven by the quarter of respondents who are willing to pay $100 or more per month. Still, **Americans’ willingness to pay for climate policy is far below the US EPA’s recent announcement that the costs of climate change have quadrupled**, based on EPIC’s Climate Impact Lab.”

#### Plan is unpopular because the public perceives decarbonization policies as the cause for grid failures

#### Dolsak and Prakash, Univ. of Washington Professors, 1-30-24

(Nives and Aseem, “Managing Public Views Of Decarbonization, Cold Waves, And Blackouts,” accessed 7-31-24, <https://www.forbes.com/sites/prakashdolsak/2024/01/30/managing-public-views-of--decarbonization-cold-waves-and-blackouts/>) JFN

**Public backlash to climate transition typically comes from** two sources: loss of jobs in climate-exposed sectors such as coal, and the rise in energy costs due to carbon pricing. Along with these structural sources of backlash, there is an episodic backlash driver as well: **public perceptions about the failure of the decarbonized electricity grid to meet surging energy demands during extreme weather events** such as cold waves. Although grids malfunction even when electricity is generated predominantly from natural gas (take the cases of Texas and Alberta), **climate critics attribute grid failure to climate transition.** We term this **the “I told you so” criticism**. **For climate policies to build** sustained **public support, policymakers need to assure the public that switching to renewables is not undermining grid resilience**. Electrification of the transportation sector makes this communication challenge even more important (apart from the problems electric cars face during cold waves). Utilities and grid operators deal with demand variation daily. The grid meets demand surges (typically in the evening) beyond the baseload by using “peaker plants,” importing electricity from other grids, or instituting demand-side measures for residential and industrial customers. Peakers pose an important challenge to climate policy because they tend to run predominantly on gas, but also oil, and coal. **When the grid is decarbonized** and coal/gas plants decommissioned, **citizens** might **wonder how their energy needs will be met during demand surges**. Policymakers are aware of the issue and have plans to address this. For example, the Washington Utilities and Transportation Commission and the Washington Department of Commerce closely monitor the adequacy of state electricity resources and provide annual reports and recommendations to the Governor. The political challenge is communicating this technical information to the public promptly. Absent effective communication, **“I told you so” narrative gains traction**, which was on display during the recent cold wave in the state of Washington.

#### Plan is unpopular because the public perceives decarbonization policies as the cause of grid failures

**Dolsak and Prakash, Univ. of Washington Professors**, 1-30-**24**

(Nives and Aseem, “Managing Public Views Of Decarbonization, Cold Waves, And Blackouts,” accessed 7-31-24, <https://www.forbes.com/sites/prakashdolsak/2024/01/30/managing-public-views-of--decarbonization-cold-waves-and-blackouts/>) JFN

**Policy failures, real or constructed, can shape public discourse**. The poor handling of the 2009 snowstorm contributed to the defeat the Seattle’s Mayor Greg Nickels. As an environmental champion, he instructed the city to follow “no salt” policy to clear roadways during snowstorms. But as the snowstorm disrupted the road network, and spreading sand on roads did not work, there was a public uproar. By some accounts, snowstorm failures contributed to Chicago Mayor Michael Bilandic’s defeat in 1979 and Denver Mayor Bill McNichols’s defeat in 1982. To conclude, policy makers and grid operators have developed technical solutions to improve resource adequacy and ensure grid resilience. What is lacking is proactive communication to assure the public that energy transition will not disrupt their lives. “**I told you so” narrative takes hold as the public begins to equate energy transition with rolling blackouts**. The political challenge is to identify the sources of public anxiety and develop proactive communication strategies to control the narrative.

#### Carbon taxes are always unpopular with the public; the design and implementation doesn’t matter

**Gleckman, Tax Policy Center**, 8-15-**19**

(Howard, “Why Carbon Taxes Are So Hard To Pass,” accessed 7-29-24, <https://www.taxpolicycenter.org/taxvox/why-carbon-taxes-are-so-hard-pass#:~:text=The%20authors%20not%20only%20found,would%20back%20the%20green%20version>.) JFN

What’s going on? **Why is a carbon tax**, an effective tool to combat climate change **that appears popular in public opinion surveys, such a political loser?** In a new paper published in July by the National Bureau of Economic Research (NBER), three researchers attempt to answer the question. And they have drawn some important lessons for those interested in the political viability of carbon pricing. The authors, economists Soren Anderson at Michigan State University and Ioana Marinescu at the University of Pennsylvania and NBER, and political scientist Boris Shor at the University of Houston found that: Political ideology is the biggest driver of voter attitudes towards a carbon tax. Resistance to personally paying more taxes matters too, but not as much. **Voters give little weight to the benefits of a carbon tax, including promised tax rebates**. **Well-organized**, well-funded **opposition to a carbon tax can sharply erode support for the levy**. Based on projections from the Washington State experience, no voters currently would approve any state-based carbon tax initiative, though some contests would be close. The researchers looked at Washington’s 2016 and 2018 voter initiatives. They studied precinct-level voting data and matched those results with a national public opinion survey on attitudes towards a carbon tax. Both Washington initiatives would have imposed a tax starting at $15 per ton of CO2 and gradually rising. The 2016 proposal would have rebated the revenue by lowering the sales tax rate and increasing the state Earned Income Tax Credit. The 2018 version would have spent the revenue on renewable energy and other “green” initiatives. Both were rejected—the 2016 version got 40.8 percent of the vote while the 2018 version received 43.4 percent. The study found that **perceived personal tax burdens do matter. People who faced higher taxes because they commuted to work by car or lived in a big house were less likely to support the carbon levy** than those who got to work other ways or lived in a smaller home. But ideology was by far the biggest factor in explaining how people voted on the carbon tax. For instance, voters who favored unrelated liberal causes such as gun control were more likely to back a carbon tax, a result that seems consistent with patterns throughout the US electorate these days. **Did the design of the tax matter?** Economists have worked hard to structure a carbon tax that is both effective and politically palatable. And the question of whether, and how, to rebate the tax revenue is important to them. But **this study found that voters didn’t care much** at all. The green spending version did a bit better than the rebate model, but neither passed. One reason may have been that **voters simply did not believe political promises of how the money would be spent**. Perhaps the authors’ most powerful result was the effect of the campaigns themselves. Opponents of the 2018 version outspent supporters by 2-1 and successfully reframed the measure from the “fee” used in the ballot language to a tax. In the end, **Washington voters were 20 percentage points less likely to support a carbon tax than survey respondents in other states**—even though there was little difference in their support for 11 other environmental initiatives. Why? **Because Washington voters were exposed to a real campaign for an actual carbon tax**. They confronted immediate costs in return for uncertain future benefits. **While those in other states were asked merely about a theoretical plan, Washington voters heard powerful criticism of a specific idea.** They also may also have been affected by a common bias against change. The authors not only found that a carbon tax was a tough sell in Washington State, they concluded it would fail in every other state with a ballot initiative. In some states 45 percent or more of voters would back the green version. A Washington-like carbon tax initiative would win a bare public majority in Vermont—except the Green Mountain State does not have voter initiatives. Some carbon tax experts fear that analysts may have “overlearned” from the Washington experience. My **Tax Policy Center colleague** Adele **Morris says that a national carbon tax might fare better than a state version**. Among the reasons: **Since a federal tax would replace clean air regulations, it more likely would win business support; in addition, a major national initiative would be a more credible weapon against climate change than a tax in a single, relatively small state.**

#### Voters don’t calculate the benefits of carbon taxes

**Marinescu, University of Pennsylvania Assistant Professor in Public Policy**, 5-26-**20**

(Ioana, “Why Americans Want a Carbon Tax, But Won’t Support One at the Polls.” Accessed 7-30-24, <https://kleinmanenergy.upenn.edu/podcast/why-americans-want-a-carbon-tax-but-wont-support-one-at-the-polls/>) JFN

Marinescu: We think that that’s probably an important factor. In our study we’re able to look at **the median voters**, so the person who might have tipped that over. What we find is that this person seems to feel about the carbon tax as in, “Hey, this carbon tax is going to increase my cost”—we estimate about $266 per year—“I don’t like it, that’s it.” They weren’t factoring in any of the other benefits, including that money was going to come back to them in the form of lower sales taxes or any environmental benefits. **For the person** smack **in the middle of the political spectrum, all they were seeing is this $200**-and-something-**more cost of energy** for me, **I don’t like this**, that’s it. **I’m done, I’m not voting for this**. As such **it’s consistent with people just not seeing beyond the cost and not factoring in the benefit, including the direct financial benefit**, in this case **from a reduction in the sales tax**. That’s an important obstacle also today for people who are thinking about the carbon tax and dividend, or carbon fee and dividend, because this dividend, you have to have people believe that it’s there and they’re going to get it and it’s going to make a difference.

#### Voters don’t believe in the positive benefits of carbon taxes

**Marinescu, University of Pennsylvania Assistant Professor in Public Policy**, 5-26-**20**

(Ioana, “Why Americans Want a Carbon Tax, But Won’t Support One at the Polls.” Accessed 7-30-24, <https://kleinmanenergy.upenn.edu/podcast/why-americans-want-a-carbon-tax-but-wont-support-one-at-the-polls/>) JFN

Marinescu: It’s very hard to change those beliefs. In the case of France, this may or may not apply to the US, but what they saw is that trying to provide people with objective information about the likely impact on themselves and telling them, “Hey, you’re probably going to come out ahead because what you’re getting in a dividend would be more than what you’d be losing for the cost of higher energy,” **people weren’t very impressed by that argument, and didn’t change their beliefs** very much. **If they started out thinking that the carbon tax is bad, they barely changed their mind after they were told that,** “Hey, **we scientists think that personally you would gain financially**,” they just basically, **many people just didn’t really buy it.** This illustrates the stickiness of beliefs, and that in many cases **it can be quite difficult to convince people who are concerned about the cost of the carbon tax** and the impact on their purchasing power. It can be quite hard to persuade them otherwise. I think this is interesting because study was done by economists, so they weren’t a political actor. They just said, “We are economists, here’s what we think is going to happen. Do you want to support this?” **People were not very much moved by economists showing them they would gain financially with the dividend**. It can be heightened in the context of partisanship. If maybe the other party, not your party, proposes this and is trying to persuade you that you’re actually going to gain financially, maybe you don’t want to believe it, because on top of that you might not trust the source.

#### AFF’s pro carbon tax polls don’t reflect political realities and opposition arguments

**Marinescu, University of Pennsylvania Assistant Professor in Public Policy**, 5-26-**20**

(Ioana, “Why Americans Want a Carbon Tax, But Won’t Support One at the Polls.” Accessed 7-30-24, <https://kleinmanenergy.upenn.edu/podcast/why-americans-want-a-carbon-tax-but-wont-support-one-at-the-polls/>) JFN

**If you look at polls** nationally, **you see that more than two-thirds of people say they want the carbon tax**, and **then you see Washington State, who’s among the more liberal states, and it failed to pass it twice. What gives?** We show that **what gives is the “campaign effect.” It’s different when you ask about a policy in the abstract**—“Do you like carbon tax?” “Oh yeah, great, I love the environment, I want to do something.” And **then when it’s a real question**, it’s put to you, “**Do you want the carbon tax?”, and you’re also hearing the counter-arguments from the no campaign, that could have quite a different outcome and a negative outcome for the carbon tax**. It’s not that bringing it to the referendum is doomed, but it’s more you have to think about your communication strategy. We showed that it should be easier in more liberal states, places like Massachusetts. Maybe there, we have a good campaign, they have a chance, even with the adverse campaign of the adversaries, because Massachusetts is quite liberal, has policy preferences that are aligned with liking the carbon tax, they might be able to do it. A key lesson is **you cannot take surveys at face value**. They are useful, but **there is a distinction between what people will say in a survey before they are subject to a whole campaign, and what they say at the polling booth** or in their mail-in ballot, **after they heard all the pro and against arguments**.

#### Public opposes taxes specifically designed to protect the environment

**Gleckman, Tax Policy Center**, 12-27-**18**

(Howard, “Economists Love Carbon Taxes. Voters Don't.,” accessed 7-30-24, <https://www.taxpolicycenter.org/taxvox/economists-love-carbon-taxes-voters-dont>) JFN

But it is important to distinguish those gas taxes from taxes aimed at mitigating climate change. **While many US voters seem willing to pay higher taxes that are framed as user fees, taxpayers here**, and perhaps elsewhere in the world, **are not so enthusiastic about levies that are promoted as an environmental initiative**. And until that changes, or unless they can find another, more politically attractive use for the revenue, supporters of carbon taxes face a long uphill battle.

### Carbon Tax: Revenue Neutral

#### Voters don’t trust revenue neutral carbon taxes

**Marinescu, University of Pennsylvania Assistant Professor in Public Policy**, 5-26-**20**

(Ioana, “Why Americans Want a Carbon Tax, But Won’t Support One at the Polls.” Accessed 7-30-24, <https://kleinmanenergy.upenn.edu/podcast/why-americans-want-a-carbon-tax-but-wont-support-one-at-the-polls/>) JFN

This shows one of the complications of getting a carbon tax passed, including **a revenue-neutral carbon tax** where the money is given back to the people. One of the issues is, **do people actually believe that this money is going to come to them and make them whole**, basically compensate for the higher cost of energy. Simulations show that with the carbon fee and dividend, which again is not what Washington State did but many are proposing this, where everyone gets the same amount, simulations show that about 70% of the population would gain. The majority would gain financially. Therefore this seems like a no-brainer, something that should pass. I think it’s part of why it hasn’t passed yet is because **it is** somewhat **difficult to convince people that that’s really what’s going to happen**, that they’re going to benefit financially, and that people have sticky beliefs, and they also have—we can talk about this—they have partisan, ideological views about how they see a policy that’s also above and beyond the direct impact on themselves. They also have views about what policy they like that isn’t just related to pocketbook concerns, like how much it’s going to cost me. It’s related to how they like this policy in general for other ideological reasons.

# \*\*\*INTERNAL LINKS\*\*\*

### Generic

#### Close election means ANYTHING could matter

**Washington Post**, 5-31-**24**

(“Playbook: Teflon Don to Felon Don,” accessed 5-31-24, <https://www.politico.com/newsletters/playbook/2024/05/31/teflon-don-to-felon-don-00160948?cid=hptb_primary_0>) JFN

HOW TO READ THE POLLS: There are two takeaways from the many pieces about the polls out today: (1) Don’t trust the polls that ask voters what they might do if Trump is convicted. “People are very bad at putting themselves into an alternative reality and predicting how they’re going to respond to some set of facts in an alternative reality,” MARK MELLMAN told us recently. “They have a hard enough time predicting what they are going to have for dinner tonight, let alone how they’re going to react to some new situation.” (2) **In a closely divided election that could, like 2016 and 2020, be decided by just tens of thousands of votes** — **basically a football stadium** — of course a felony conviction could matter. **Anything could matter**.

### ELECTRICITY PRICES

#### Electricity prices is a key election issue

**Dabbs and Tomich, Reporters for Energy & Environment News**, 7-17-**24**

(Brian and Jeffrey, “Electricity prices get political in Trump’s world,” accessed 8-7-24, <https://www.eenews.net/articles/electricity-prices-get-political-in-trumps-world/>) JFN

To whatever degree Biden and Trump spar over energy inflation, the cost of turning the lights and AC on, or fueling up a car that runs on a battery, go far beyond today’s “price at the pump.” **The often-ignored commodity known as electricity could see its prominence as an election issue rise in future years.** “Right now, **in an extremely hot summer, if you’re adding 20-30 percent more electricity use because it’s so hot** and it doesn’t cool off, **that’s going to show up in a month’s time**,” **said** Barry **Rabe, a professor of public and environmental policy at** the Gerald R. Ford School of Public Policy at **the University of Michigan**. **“Awareness of** the sources of electricity [and] **the reliability of electricity, which is a huge issue in my part of the Midwest, is likely to become greater.”**

### Climate Change

#### Climate change is a key issue and determines election outcomes

**Burgess,** 3-23-**24**

(Matt, “Climate change could be a deciding factor in 2024 election, CU analysis finds,” accessed 8-2-24, <https://coloradosun.com/2024/03/23/climate-change-2024-election-colorado-analysis/>) JFN

Despite this, **research** that I conducted with my colleagues **suggests that concern about climate change has had a significant effect on voters’ choices in the past two presidential elections**. **Climate change** opinions **may** even **have had a large enough effect to change the 2020 election outcome in** President Joe **Biden’s favor**. This was the conclusion of an analysis of polling data that we published on Jan. 17, through the University of Colorado’s Center for Social and Environmental Futures. What explains these results, and what effect might climate change have on the 2024 election? We used 2016 and 2020 survey data from the nonpartisan organization Voter Study Group to analyze the relationships between thousands of voters’ presidential picks in the past two elections with their demographics and their opinions on 22 issues, including climate change. The survey asked voters to rate climate change’s importance with four options: “unimportant,” “not very important,” “somewhat important” or “very important.” **In 2020, 67% of voters rated climate change as “somewhat important” or “very important,”** up from 62% in 2016. **Of these voters rating climate change as important, 77% supported Biden in 2020,** up from 69% who supported Hillary Clinton in 2016. **This suggests that climate change opinion has been providing the Democrats with a growing electoral advantage**. **Using two statistical models, we estimated that climate change opinion could have shifted the 2020 national popular vote margin** (Democratic vote share minus Republican vote share**) by 3% or more toward Biden. Using an Electoral College model, we estimated that a 3% shift would have been large enough to change the election outcome in his favor**. These patterns echo the results of a November 2023 poll. This poll found that more voters trust the Democrats’ approach to climate change, compared to Republicans’ approach to the issue.

#### Climate change is a key issue for voters

**Ranevska, 7-30**-24

(Sasha, “New Survey By Deep Sky Shows Climate Change As Key Factor In US Presidential Choices,” accessed 8-1-24, <https://carbonherald.com/new-survey-by-deep-sky-shows-climate-change-as-key-factor-in-us-presidential-choices/>) JFN

The findings indicate that **climate change incidents are a source of concern for survey participants in their daily lives, resulting in health problems** (18% of surveyees), **disruptions to their usual schedule** (27%), **and damage to their property** (24%). The most concerning events for participants are heatwaves, tornadoes, droughts, and wildfires. Citizens in the United States are also experiencing the impacts of climate change on their emotional well-being. Over 26% of individuals admitted that concerns about the climate have had a detrimental effect on their mental health, with Generation Z individuals being 46% more likely than the average respondent to report such feelings. According to the survey, 25% of respondents have reported feeling “climate despair,” while 44% of voters believe that climate change is a situation without hope. **These issues all play a part in voters becoming more mindful of the importance of climate action, ultimately influencing the decisions they make at the polls.** The survey results showed that 65% of voters think that the 2024 election could hinder the country’s decarbonization objectives; 58% are concerned about the election’s impact on the climate; and nearly half (**49%) of voters consider climate change to be a key factor in deciding on a presidential candidate**.

### Energy Prices

#### Energy prices is a key election issue

**Eberhart,** 4-15-**24**

(Dan, “Biden Unprepared For Energy Inflation As Election Approaches,” accessed 5-24-24, <https://www.forbes.com/sites/daneberhart/2024/04/15/biden-unprepared-for-energy-inflation-as-election-approaches/?sh=6c3bfc103010>) JFN

The situation in energy markets threatens to reignite inflation and challenge any move by the U.S. Federal Reserve to lower interest rates, which many investors – and consumers – have been banking on this year. Upward pressure on gasoline, diesel, and other petroleum products like jet fuel could pass through to other products and services and create fresh inflationary pressures. That's a nightmare for Biden since, **according to a recent Gallup poll,** inflation, the economy, and **the availability of affordable energy continue to be voters' top concerns**. Conversely, **tackling climate change**—a Biden priority in his energy agenda—**doesn't make the list of voters' top concerns**. Several recent public opinion polls show Biden trailing Trump, the presumptive Republican presidential nominee, in a head-to-head contest, particularly in critical swing states that will determine the November election. Trump and fellow Republicans have been on the attack, vowing to undo most of the president's renewable energy agenda and further "unleash" American oil and gas production.

#### Energy policy is a key issue in the election

**EPIC,** 6-4-**24**

(Energy Policy Institute @ the Univ. of Chicago, “Public Opinion on Energy & Climate,” accessed 6-12-24, <https://epic.uchicago.edu/area-of-focus/public-opinion-on-energy-climate-change/#:~:text=Americans'%20Views%20on%20Climate%20and%20Energy%20Policy&text=Most%20are%20unwilling%20to%20pay,responsibility%20to%20address%20climate%20change>.) JFN

**Eighty-four percent of Democrats rank climate change policy as an important factor to their vote in the 2024 presidential election** compared with 43% of Republicans. **When it comes to energy policy, majorities of both parties say it is an important factor to their vote, including 78% of Democrats and 65% of Republicans.**

### Economy

#### Economy is the key issue

**Zandi**, 3-25-**24**

(Mark, “Why the Election Might Come Down to Pennsylvania’s Economy Moody’s chief economist Mark Zandi on why he’s optimistic about Biden’s reelection,” accessed 4-11-24, <https://nymag.com/intelligencer/article/the-economy-is-roaring-will-it-matter-for-biden.html>) JFN

At the top of your January report, you say that the election hinges on the strength of the economy between now and Election Day. Is this election more dependent on the economy than previous ones?

No. **The economy is always important**. There might be some exceptions when we get pandemics and wars, but for the most part, I think **the economy is topic number one for most people**. Right now**, voters are looking at the economy to their own financial position, and what they see determines in large part how they vote**.

### Small Issues

#### Election will be close; small issues on the margin can be the tipping point

**Zandi**, 3-25-**24**

(Mark, “Why the Election Might Come Down to Pennsylvania’s Economy Moody’s chief economist Mark Zandi on why he’s optimistic about Biden’s reelection,” accessed 4-11-24, <https://nymag.com/intelligencer/article/the-economy-is-roaring-will-it-matter-for-biden.html>) JFN

It would also come fairly late for the housing market. Yeah, exactly. If it came in July, as markets anticipate, by the time it showed up in sales, it would probably be beyond the point where it really mattered to most people. **It’s all about expectations**. If people see rates coming in, and markets are expecting rates to come down further, people could take that into consideration. **Trend lines matter to people, because they’re doing a forecast, and they’re going to be using what happened recently to do the forecast. It’s these little things on the margin that may actually decide who wins this thing. It’s going be that close.**

# \*\*\*IMPACTS\*\*\*

### EXTENSION BLOCK

#### Harris victory is key to strong US/India relations

**Rajagopalan, ASPI resident senior fellow**, 6-6-**24**

(Rajeswari Pillai, “What would a Harris presidency mean for US foreign policy and Australia?,”accessed 8-7-24, <https://www.aspistrategist.org.au/what-would-a-harris-presidency-mean-for-us-foreign-policy-and-australia/>) JFN

There are plenty of divisions within the US foreign policy establishment—such as on Gaza and Ukraine. But **on India, there is a general bipartisan support for closer relations, which is likely to continue in a Harris administration.** That said, **it is also likely to be a much more stable relationship than what we might see under the mercurial** Donald **Trump**. However, there is little indication to suggest that India would be a major focus of a Harris administration either. New Delhi itself appears to value its strategic autonomy more than closer relations with the US. There have been recent tensions related to alleged Indian covert operations targeting Sikh separatists in the US and other countries. The Indian foreign policy establishment is also somewhat wary of Harris’s possible focus on democracy and human rights in foreign policy, which has been another source of irritation in US-India relations. Nevertheless, **Harris can be expected to work through** these **issues with India because the relationship is important to both countries given their common worry about China’s growing power and behavior.**

### HARRIS GOOD/TRUMP BAD: CARBON EMISSIONS

#### Harris victory is key to continued progress on reducing carbon emissions; Trump victory ensures plan rollback and massive emissions increases

**Pahwa, Reporter for Slate**, 7-25-**24**

(Nitish, “Kamala Harris Could Be One of the Best Things to Ever Happen for the Environment,” accessed 8-7-24, <https://slate.com/technology/2024/07/kamala-harris-environment-climate-change-record-bp-exxonmobil.html>) JFN

That inauspicious timing reveals **the incredible stakes for the 2024 race**: for American democracy, **for the entire world’s climate and environment, and for the very hope of a habitable future**. **If Harris isn’t elected**, Donald **Trump has made very clear**, over and over again, **that he will work to scrap all of** President Joe **Biden’s** hard-fought (and **effective) clean-energy and pro-environmental initiatives, while granting fossil-fuel companies carte blanche to spew as many planet-heating gasses as they please**. **He’s already got a presidential record of ample regulatory rollbacks, international agreements canceled**, and oil-industry glad-handing to show for it. Harris is just a few days into her top-ticket candidacy. With Election Day coming up, activists on the left and strategists on the right are scrambling to figure out just how the veep will campaign on this issue, and how they can leverage it toward their respective ends. It’ll be tough to take much from the past few years. Yes, she is part of the presidential administration that has implemented the most ambitious climate agenda in United States history, and she cast the tie-breaking vote that allowed the imperfect yet much-needed Inflation Reduction Act to get through Congress. But she was never a central player in those processes like, say, Joe Manchin. (Who, in case you were wondering, is no longer running for president this year.) So to actually suss out Kamala Harris’ climate record and future ambitions, many have turned to her first presidential campaign in the 2019 Democratic primary as a hint to what more she could bring to the White House, climatewise. However, this is a mistake: That was a moment when she broadly aligned herself with the Green New Deal wing of Dem contenders and their resultant promises, and was soon rendered moot by Biden’s ultimate victory. When she joined Biden’s ticket the following year, she moderated accordingly.

As I noted at the time, Harris took a defensive tack against then–Vice President Mike Pence during their 2020 debate, “not mentioning the Green New Deal at all, vaguely citing investments in ‘clean’ and ‘renewable energy,’ and emphasizing over and over again that a Biden administration would not ban fracking, at one point looking toward the camera to make this point.” Republican opposition groups will be fine with focusing on that 2019 platform and ignoring the backtracks, but left-wing activist groups certainly won’t. Of course, the Biden-Harris administration has been the climate’s best presidential champion in history, but it’s a low, low bar. The long-overdue investments in electric vehicle manufacturing, car chargers, solar and wind and nuclear power, heat pumps, resiliency measures, public transit, and semiconductor production have been hefty and powerful—but they were included in legislative packages with plenty of poison pills, including funds for highway expansion and federal crutches for the waning fossil-fuel sector. Dirty energy has also enjoyed a post-pandemic boom period under Biden, with his administration approving a record number of drilling permits. In this regard, he’s even outflanked the Trump administration, which employed literal oil executives and lobbyists. And thanks to Biden’s lack of effective messaging around his accomplishments (in retrospect, likely a symptom of his aging), there was far more public knowledge of the bad than the good. n fairness, it’s not all Biden’s fault. He couldn’t have anticipated the energy shocks that resulted from the Russia-Ukraine war, or the lawlessness of a judicial system stacked with conservative ideologues that gutted everything from his pause to drilling on federal land to, well, the potency of the entire administrative state. Thankfully, the president’s still been able to place vast swaths of natural landscapes, wilderness habitats, and water bodies under federal protection. But—to bring things back around—even that’s all contingent on whether his chosen successor is elected to replace him. Still, **if Biden could be pressured into a more oil-friendly stance** thanks to inconvenient circumstances, **there’s little sign Harris will be similarly pliant**. To understand why, **you have to go back to Harris’ career pre–national spotlight**. Jacobin noted that **when she was San Francisco district attorney, she installed the city’s “first Environmental Justice Unit” and “went after cases involving illegal dumping and air pollution.”** Then, **as California’s attorney general, “she went after companies including BP, Chevron, Comcast, Cosco Busan, ExxonMobil, and South California Gas Company,** with Cosco Busan agreeing to the largest settlement of its kind for its 2007 spill in the San Francisco Bay.” The Chevron and BP cases ended with multimillion-dollar settlements from the oil giants, and her Exxon investigation paved the way for Cali’s current attorney general to sue the firm in a mammoth litigation for knowingly downplaying the impact of its fuels on atmospheric warming.

### HARRIS GOOD/TRUMP BAD: Existential Threats

#### Trump victory precludes progress on solving numerous existential problems and threats

**Frum, 24**

(David, “THE REVENGE PRESIDENCY,” The Atlantic, Jan/Feb 2024, accessed 3-6-24, p. EBSCOhost MasterFILE Premier) JFN

That grim negative ideal is the core ballot question in 2024. **If Trump is defeated, the United States can proceed in its** familiar **imperfect way to deal with the many big problems of our time: the wars in the Middle East and Ukraine, climate change,** educational standards and **equal opportunity, economic growth and individual living standards**, and so on. Stopping Trump would not represent progress on any of those agenda items. But **stopping Trump would preserve the possibility of progress, by keeping alive the constitutional-democratic structure of the United States**.

**A second Trump presidency**, however, **is the kind of shock that would overwhelm all other issues. It would mark the turn onto a dark path, one of these rips between "before" and "after" that a society can never reverse.** Even if the harm is contained, it can never be fully undone, as the harm of January 6, 2021, can never be undone. The long tradition of peaceful transitions of power was broken that day, and even though the attempt to stop the transition by violence was defeated, the violence itself was not expunged. The schemes and plots of a second Trump term may be defeated too. Yet every future would-be dictator will know: A president can attempt a coup and, if stopped, still return to office to try again.

### HARRIS GOOD/TRUMP BAD: Global Instability

#### Trump election unleashes global disorder and instability

**Brands**, 5-27-**24**

(Hal. “An “America First” World,” accessed 5-30-24, <https://www.foreignaffairs.com/united-states/america-first-world>) JFN

What would become of the world if the United States became a normal great power? This isn’t to ask what would happen if the United States retreated into outright isolationism. It’s simply to ask what would happen if the country behaved in the same narrowly self-interested, frequently exploitive way as many great powers throughout history—if it rejected the idea that it has a special responsibility to shape a liberal order that benefits the wider world. That would be an epic departure from 80 years of American strategy. But it’s not an outlandish prospect anymore. In 2016, Donald Trump won the presidency on an “America first” platform. He sought a United States that would be mighty but aloof, one that would maximize its advantages while minimizing its entanglements. Indeed, the defining feature of Trump’s worldview is his belief that the United States has no obligation to pursue anything larger than its own self-interest, narrowly construed. Today, **Trump is again vying for the presidency**, as his legion of foreign policy followers within the Republican Party grows. Meanwhile, fatigue with key aspects of American globalism has become a bipartisan affair. Sooner or later, **under Trump** or another president, **the world could face a superpower that consistently puts “America first.”** That version of the United States wouldn’t be a global dropout. On some issues, it might be more aggressive than before. But **it would also be far less concerned with defending global norms, providing public goods, and protecting distant allies**. Its foreign policy would become less principled, more zero-sum. Most broadly, this version of the United States would wield outsized power absent any outsized ethos of responsibility—so it would decline to bear unequal burdens in pursuit of the real but diffuse benefits the liberal order provides. **The results would not be pretty. A more normal U.S. foreign policy would produce a world that would** also **be** more normal—that is, **more vicious and chaotic**. **An “America first” world could be fatal for Ukraine and other states vulnerable to autocratic aggression. It would release the disorder U.S. hegemony has long contained**.

### HARRIS GOOD/TRUMP BAD: Economy

#### Trump victory crushes the US economy

**Sor**, 3-6-**24**

(Jennifer, “A Trump reelection is the biggest threat to the economy because it would make inflation, debt, and growth worse, 'Dr. Doom' Nouriel Roubini says,” accessed 3-9-24, <https://finance.yahoo.com/news/trump-reelection-biggest-threat-economy-225232085.html?guccounter=1&guce_referrer=aHR0cHM6Ly93d3cuZ29vZ2xlLmNvbS8&guce_referrer_sig=AQAAAJVv5kDIDhaYi3QgEuZV9VYhppoYSQi_ws-AACHJTZ50XWTh3qma6RbsDsGWntKPw04t52vZTbql2E4UnSv8N0vL2RzbMs8QP_pT6o9Od70KFy0efbs8_8ttgOB5GjaZWkYhYkO_OnMIQ1K0qyMD4HjW5o9DPK8NlUaYGnIGiKLF>) JFN

**Trump being reelected might be the biggest looming threat to the global economy**, **according to** "Dr. Doom" **economist** Nouriel **Roubini.** Roubini, known on Wall Street for his bombastic and persistently negative prognostications, warned in an op-ed for Project Syndicate that Trump winning a second term as President could cause the world economy to be "even further destabilized." That comes amid existing geopolitical tensions, with war raging in Ukraine and Gaza, and a potential cold war between the US and China breaking out later in the decade, Roubini predicted. **The biggest risk of destruction stems from Trump's economic policies**, Roubini said, which could open the door to a whole new set of problems. **Under Trump's presidency, US protectionist trade policies would** undoubtedly "**become more severe**," Roubini said. The former president has already said **he would hike taxes on US imports from 2% to 10%. That could spark a trade war between some of America's most important partners, leading to de-dollarization, more supply chain chaos**, and a host of other problems, he warned. "**A trade war would reduce growth and increase inflation**, making it the largest geopolitical risk that markets should consider in the months ahead," Roubini added. That spells trouble for the US in particular, where the economy is already on rocky footing. GDP growth eased to 3.2% over the fourth quarter, according to the Commerce Department's latest estimate. Meanwhile, inflation still remains above the Fed's 2% target, with consumer prices rising 3.1% in January. Roubini also argued that **Trump's presidency could bring stagflation risks**, a scenario where prices spiral out of control while growth remains weak. **That stems from Trump's "denialist attitude" on climate change, as well as the likelihood that he would replace Fed Chair Powell with a "more dovish, pliant figure," who could cut interest rates prematurely and allow inflation to surge higher**, Roubini suggested. **Trump's promised tax cuts also risk making the US debt mountain even worse**. At the current pace of spending, the US is tacking on another trillion in debt every 100 days, per an analysis from Bank of America. "With private and public debts high and rising, **that would introduce the specter of a financial crisis**," Roubini warned. "**Trump's** proposed **economic-policy agenda is now the greatest threat to economies and markets around the world."**

#### Econ decline causes nuclear wars

Dr. Mathew **Maavak 21**, PhD in Risk Foresight from the Universiti Teknologi Malaysia, External Researcher (PLATBIDAFO) at the Kazimieras Simonavicius University, Expert and Regular Commentator on Risk-Related Geostrategic Issues at the Russian International Affairs Council, “Horizon 2030: Will Emerging Risks Unravel Our Global Systems?”, Salus Journal – The Australian Journal for Law Enforcement, Security and Intelligence Professionals, Volume 9, Number 1, p. 2-8

Various scholars and institutions regard **global social instability** as the **greatest threat** facing this decade. The catalyst has been postulated to be a **Second Great Depression** which, in turn, will have **profound implications** for **global security** and national integrity. This paper, written from a broad systems perspective, illustrates how emerging risks are getting more complex and **intertwined**; blurring boundaries between the economic, environmental, geopolitical, societal and technological taxonomy used by the World Economic Forum for its annual global risk forecasts. **Tight couplings in** our **global systems** have also **enabled risks** accrued **in one area to snowball into** a **full-blown crisis** **elsewhere**. The COVID-19 pandemic and its socioeconomic fallouts exemplify this systemic chain-reaction. Onceinexorable forces of globalization are rupturing as the current global system can no longer be sustained due to poor governance and runaway wealth fractionation. The coronavirus pandemic is also enabling Big Tech to expropriate the levers of governments and mass communications worldwide. This paper concludes by highlighting how this development poses a dilemma for security professionals. Key Words: Global Systems, Emergence, VUCA, COVID-9, Social Instability, Big Tech, Great Reset. INTRODUCTION. The new decade is witnessing rising volatility across global systems. Pick any random “system” today and chart out its trajectory: Are our education systems becoming more robust and affordable? What about food security? Are our healthcare systems improving? Are our pension systems sound? Wherever one looks, there are dark clouds gathering on a global horizon marked by volatility, uncertainty, complexity and ambiguity (VUCA). But what exactly is a global system? Our planet itself is an autonomous and selfsustaining mega-system, marked by periodic cycles and elemental vagaries. Human activities within however are not system isolates as our **banking**, utility, **farming, health**care **and retail** sectors etc. **are** increasingly **entwined**. Risks accrued in **one system** may **cascade** into an **unforeseen crisis** within and/or without (Choo, Smith & McCusker, 2007). Scholars call this phenomenon “emergence”; one where the behaviour of **intersecting systems** is determined by **complex** and largely **invisible interactions** at the **substratum** (Goldstein, 1999; Holland, 1998). The ongoing COVID-19 pandemic is a case in point. While experts remain divided over the source and morphology of the virus, the contagion has ramified into a global health crisis and supply chain nightmare. It is also tilting the geopolitical balance. China is the largest exporter of intermediate products, and had generated nearly 20% of global imports in 2015 alone (Cousin, 2020). The pharmaceutical sector is particularly vulnerable. Nearly “85% of medicines in the U.S. strategic national stockpile” sources components from China (Owens, 2020). An initial run on respiratory masks has now been eclipsed by rowdy queues at supermarkets and the bankruptcy of small businesses. The entire global population – save for major pockets such as Sweden, Belarus, Taiwan and Japan – have been subjected to cyclical lockdowns and quarantines. Never before in history have humans faced such a systemic, borderless calamity. COVID-19 represents a classic emergent crisis that necessitates real-time response and adaptivity in a real-time world, particularly since the global Just-in-Time (JIT) production and delivery system serves as both an enabler and vector for transboundary risks. From a systems thinking perspective, emerging risk management should therefore address a whole spectrum of activity across the economic, environmental, geopolitical, societal and technological (EEGST) taxonomy. Every emerging threat can be slotted into this taxonomy – a reason why it is used by the World Economic Forum (WEF) for its annual global risk exercises (Maavak, 2019a). As traditional forces of globalization unravel, security professionals should take cognizance of emerging threats through a systems thinking approach. METHODOLOGY. An EEGST sectional breakdown was adopted to illustrate a sampling of extreme risks facing the world for the 2020-2030 decade. The transcendental quality of emerging risks, as outlined on Figure 1, below, was primarily informed by the following pillars of systems thinking (Rickards, 2020): • Diminishing diversity (or increasing homogeneity) of actors in the global system (Boli & Thomas, 1997; Meyer, 2000; Young et al, 2006); • Interconnections in the global system (Homer-Dixon et al, 2015; Lee & Preston, 2012); • Interactions of actors, events and components in the global system (Buldyrev et al, 2010; Bashan et al, 2013; Homer-Dixon et al, 2015); and • Adaptive qualities in particular systems (Bodin & Norberg, 2005; Scheffer et al, 2012) Since scholastic material on this topic remains somewhat inchoate, this paper buttresses many of its contentions through secondary (i.e. news/institutional) sources. ECONOMY According to Professor Stanislaw Drozdz (2018) of the Polish Academy of Sciences, “a global financial crash of a previously unprecedented scale is highly probable” by the mid- 2020s. This will lead to a **trickle-down meltdown**, impacting **all areas** of human activity. The economist John Mauldin (2018) similarly warns that the “2020s might be the worst decade in US history” and may lead to a **Second Great Depression**. Other forecasts are equally alarming. According to the International Institute of Finance, global debt may have surpassed $255 trillion by 2020 (IIF, 2019). Yet another study revealed that global debts and liabilities amounted to a staggering $2.5 quadrillion (Ausman, 2018). The reader should note that these figures were tabulated before the COVID-19 outbreak. The IMF singles out widening income inequality as the trigger for the next Great Depression (Georgieva, 2020). The wealthiest 1% now own more than twice as much wealth as 6.9 billion people (Coffey et al, 2020) and this chasm is widening with each passing month. COVID-19 had, in fact, boosted global billionaire wealth to an unprecedented $10.2 trillion by July 2020 (UBS-PWC, 2020). Global GDP, worth $88 trillion in 2019, may have contracted by 5.2% in 2020 (World Bank, 2020). As the Greek historian Plutarch warned in the 1st century AD: “An imbalance between rich and poor is the oldest and most fatal ailment of all republics” (Mauldin, 2014). The stability of a society, as Aristotle argued even earlier, depends on a robust middle element or middle class. At the rate the global middle class is facing catastrophic debt and unemployment levels, widespread social disaffection may morph into outright anarchy (Maavak, 2012; DCDC, 2007). **Economic stressors**, in transcendent VUCA fashion, may also **induce** **radical geopolitical realignments**. Bullions now carry more weight than NATO’s **security guarantees** in **Eastern Europe**. After Poland repatriated 100 tons of gold from the Bank of England in 2019, Slovakia, Serbia and Hungary quickly followed suit. According to former Slovak Premier Robert Fico, this **erosion** in **regional trust** was based on historical precedents – in particular the 1938 Munich Agreement which ceded Czechoslovakia’s Sudetenland to Nazi Germany. As Fico reiterated (Dudik & Tomek, 2019): “You can hardly trust even the closest allies after the Munich Agreement… I guarantee that if something happens, we won’t see a single gram of this (offshore-held) gold. Let’s do it (repatriation) as quickly as possible.” (Parenthesis added by author). President Aleksandar Vucic of Serbia (a non-NATO nation) justified his central bank’s gold-repatriation program by hinting at economic headwinds ahead: “We see in which direction the crisis in the world is moving” (Dudik & Tomek, 2019). Indeed, **with** two global Titanics – the **U**nited **S**tates **and China** – set on a **collision course** with a quadrillions-denominated iceberg in the middle, and a viral outbreak on its tip, the **seismic ripples will be felt** **far**, **wide** and for a **considerable period**. A reality check is nonetheless needed here: Can additional bullions realistically circumvallate the economies of 80 million plus peoples in these Eastern European nations, worth a collective $1.8 trillion by purchasing power parity? Gold however is a potent psychological symbol as it represents national sovereignty and economic reassurance in a potentially hyperinflationary world. The portents are clear: The current global economic system will be weakened by rising nationalism and autarkic demands. Much uncertainty remains ahead. Mauldin (2018) proposes the introduction of Old Testament-style debt jubilees to facilitate gradual national recoveries. The World Economic Forum, on the other hand, has long proposed a “Great Reset” by 2030; a socialist utopia where “you’ll own nothing and you’ll be happy” (WEF, 2016). In the final analysis, COVID-19 is not the root cause of the current global economic turmoil; it is merely an accelerant to a burning house of cards that was left smouldering since the 2008 Great Recession (Maavak, 2020a). We also see how the four main pillars of systems thinking (diversity, interconnectivity, interactivity and “adaptivity”) form the mise en scene in a VUCA decade. ENVIRONMENTAL. **What happens to the environment when our economies implode? Think of** a **debt-laden workforce at** sensitive **nuclear** and **chemical plants**, along **with a** concomitant **surge in** **industrial accidents**? **Economic stressors**, workforce demoralization and rampant profiteering – rather than manmade climate change – arguably pose the **biggest threats** to the environment. In a WEF report, Buehler et al (2017) made the following pre-COVID-19 observation:vThe ILO estimates that the annual cost to the global economy from accidents and work-related diseases alone is a staggering $3 trillion. Moreover, a recent report suggests the world’s 3.2 billion workers are increasingly unwell, with the vast majority facing significant economic insecurity: 77% work in part-time, temporary, “vulnerable” or unpaid jobs. Shouldn’t this phenomenon be better categorized as a societal or economic risk rather than an environmental one? In line with the systems thinking approach, however, global risks can no longer be boxed into a **taxonomical silo**. Frazzled workforces may precipitate another Bhopal (1984), Chernobyl (1986), Deepwater Horizon (2010) or Flint water crisis (2014). These disasters were notably not the result of manmade climate change. Neither was the Fukushima nuclear disaster (2011) nor the Indian Ocean tsunami (2004). Indeed, the combustion of a long-overlooked cargo of 2,750 tonnes of ammonium nitrate had nearly levelled the city of Beirut, Lebanon, on Aug 4 2020. The explosion left 204 dead; 7,500 injured; US$15 billion in property damages; and an estimated 300,000 people homeless (Urbina, 2020). The environmental costs have yet to be adequately tabulated. Environmental disasters are more attributable to Black Swan events, systems breakdowns and corporate greed rather than to mundane human activity. Our JIT world aggravates the **cascading potential** of risks (Korowicz, 2012). Production and delivery delays, caused by the COVID-19 outbreak, will eventually require industrial **overcompensation**. This will further stress senior executives, workers, machines and a variety of computerized systems. The trickle-down effects will likely include substandard products, contaminated food and a general lowering in health and safety standards (Maavak, 2019a). Unpaid or demoralized sanitation workers may also resort to indiscriminate waste dumping. Many cities across the United States (and elsewhere in the world) are no longer recycling wastes due to prohibitive costs in the global corona-economy (Liacko, 2021). Even in good times, strict protocols on waste disposals were routinely ignored. While Sweden championed the global climate change narrative, its clothing flagship H&M was busy covering up toxic effluences disgorged by vendors along the Citarum River in Java, Indonesia. As a result, countless children among 14 million Indonesians straddling the “world’s most polluted river” began to suffer from dermatitis, intestinal problems, developmental disorders, renal failure, chronic bronchitis and cancer (DW, 2020). It is also in cauldrons like the Citarum River where pathogens may mutate with emergent ramifications. On an equally alarming note, depressed economic conditions have traditionally provided a waste disposal boon for organized crime elements. Throughout 1980s, the Calabriabased ‘Ndrangheta mafia – in collusion with governments in Europe and North America – began to dump radioactive wastes along the coast of Somalia. Reeling from pollution and revenue loss, Somali fisherman eventually resorted to mass piracy (Knaup, 2008). The coast of Somalia is now a maritime hotspot, and exemplifies an entwined form of economic-environmental-geopolitical-societal emergence. In a VUCA world, indiscriminate waste dumping can unexpectedly morph into a Black Hawk Down incident. The laws of unintended consequences are governed by actors, interconnections, interactions and adaptations in a system under study – as outlined in the methodology section. Environmentally-devastating industrial sabotages – whether by disgruntled workers, industrial competitors, ideological maniacs or terrorist groups – cannot be discounted in a VUCA world. Immiserated societies, in stark defiance of climate change diktats, may resort to dirty coal plants and wood stoves for survival. Interlinked ecosystems, particularly water resources, may be **hijacked** by nationalist sentiments. The **environmental fallouts** of critical infrastructure (CI) breakdowns loom like a **Sword of Damocles** over this decade. GEOPOLITICAL. The **primary catalyst behind WWII was** the **Great Depression**. Since **history** often **repeats itself**, expect **familiar bogeymen** to **reappear** in societies roiling with **impoverishment** and ideological clefts**. Anti-Semitism** – a societal risk on its own – **may** reach alarming proportions in the West (Reuters, 2019), possibly **forc**ing **Israel** to undertake **reprisal operations** inside allied nations. If that happens, how will **affected nations** react? Will security resources be reallocated to protect certain minorities (or the Top 1%) while larger segments of society are exposed to restive forces? **Balloon effects** like these present a classic VUCA problematic. Contemporary geopolitical risks **include** a possible **Iran-Israel war; US-China military confrontation over Taiwan or** the **S**outh **C**hina **S**ea; **North Korean proliferation** of **nuclear** and **missile technologies**; an **India-Pakistan nuclear war**; an **Iranian closure** of the Straits of **Hormuz**; **fundamentalist-driven implosion in the Islamic world**; or a **nuclear confrontation between NATO and Russia**. Fears that the Jan 3 2020 assassination of Iranian Maj. Gen. Qasem Soleimani might lead to WWIII were grossly overblown. From a systems perspective, the killing of Soleimani did not fundamentally change the actor-interconnection-interaction adaptivity equation in the Middle East. Soleimani was simply a cog who got replaced.

# \*\*\*ANSWERS TO\*\*\*

### No Link: Harris Won’t Get the Blame/Credit

#### Harris and Biden are tied at the hip

**Opoien and Andrea, Milwaukee Journal Sentinel Reporters**, 7-22-**24**

(Jessie and Lawrence, “'Patriotic thing to do': Tammy Baldwin praises Joe Biden dropping out of race, backs Kamala Harris for president,” accessed 8-9-24, <https://www.jsonline.com/story/news/politics/elections/2024/07/21/tammy-baldwin-praises-bidens-decision-to-exit-backs-kamala-harris/74491921007/>) JFN

**Republican Party of Wisconsin chairman** Brian **Schimming** accused Democrats of "subjecting the American people to chaos, uncertainty, and an incapacitated presidency." In an interview, Schimming **told the Journal Sentinel a shift from Biden to Harris would not dramatically change Republicans' approach** to the campaign **because** "Kamala **Harris and** Joe **Biden are tied at the hip."** "As far as I'm concerned, Kamala **Harris is** Joe **Biden: The Sequel**," **Schimming said**. "In addition to the fact that I can't wait for her to answer the question of when she finally realized that Joe Biden was not capable of being president, it really gets to the issue of, if he's not capable of being a candidate for president, and the rigors of that, how is he capable of being president?" **Harris has** "all the disadvantages of having **spent four years with** Joe **Biden** and none of the advantages of making decisions on her own," he said.

### No Link: Plan is Placed at the Bottom of the Docket

#### Even if the plan is placed at the bottom of the docket the plan is announced now and that announcement to the public is immediately perceived and politicized. The DA link is immediately triggered when the plan is perceived by the public.

### No Link: No Swing Voters

#### Persuadable constituencies still exist in 2024

**Glueck**, 2-16-**24**

(Katie, “Are There Any Persuadable Voters Left?,” NYT, accessed 3-11-24, p. ProQuest) JFN

And yet, **even in** a likely **rematch, and at a moment of deep political tribalism, a few constituencies** — a slice of a slice of a slice of the electorate — **remain up for grabs**. You can be certain that both campaigns will be spending hundreds of millions of dollars to reach them. In interviews with pollsters and political strategists this week, some raised familiar questions about groups of voters who have been closely studied in the last several election cycles. **Can Republicans make inroads with the suburban women** who have pivoted sharply away from the party in the Trump era? **Can Democrats win back Latino men**, especially those without college degrees? **What do those Trump 2016-Biden 2020 voters do now?**

#### Non-ideological and persuadable voters still exist

**Glueck**, 2-16-**24**

(Katie, “Are There Any Persuadable Voters Left?,” NYT, accessed 3-11-24, p. ProQuest) JFN

But that’s not universal. **Murray** of Monmouth **said that there were still some voters whose identities were not closely tied to their politics — and they might be up for grabs. “Those are the persuadable voters,” he said**, “that don’t buy into kind of these doomsday scenarios that both parties are putting out if the other party wins.” It is difficult but not impossible to identify those voters by looking at the strength of their party identification “and the extent to which they accept the validity of the other party,” he said. But **they most certainly exist, and they could loom large in a closely fought election.** “It’s not about demographics, per se, or economic concerns or issue concerns,” he said, but rather the extent to which “they have translated their sense of self in society into a political identity.”

### No Link: Polls Are Inaccurate

#### Political polls are accurate; 2022 midterms and recent methodological improvements

**Klawans**, 1-21-**24**

(Justin, “How accurate are political polls?,” The Week, accessed 3-10-24, <https://theweek.com/politics/2024-election-polls-accuracy>) JFN

Nonetheless, polls can still be valuable and paint a widespread picture of Americans' feelings — and they are still sometimes on the money. **Polling during the 2022 midterms was "historically accurate," FiveThirtyEight reported. This is** partially **because pollsters began "increasingly weighting surveys based on whom respondents recall voting for in a previous election, in addition to adjusting for standard demographics such as race and age,"** the Times reported. **This method** has long been used to calculate polling in other countries, but **is only recently gaining widespread usage in the United States**. After the 2016 election, it was also found that pollsters underrepresented less-educated voters, which heavily skewed poll results. Since then, **pollsters have "adopted education as an additional survey weight, and a cycle of accurate polls in 2018 seemed to reflect a return to normalcy,"** the Times added.

### No Impact: Trump Will Be Checked/Constrained

#### No institutions will constrain a second term Trump

**Kagan**, 12-3-**23**

(Robert, “A Trump dictatorship is increasingly inevitable. We should stop pretending,” Washington Post, accessed 3-29-24, p. ProQuest) JFN

**If Trump does win the election**, **he will** immediately become the most powerful person ever to hold that office. Not only will he **wield the awesome powers of the American executive** - powers that, as conservatives used to complain, have grown over the decades - but he will do so **with the fewest constraints of any president, fewer even than in his own first term**. **What limits those powers?** The most obvious answer is **the institutions of justice** - **all of which Trump, by his very election, will have defied and revealed as impotent**. **A court system that could not control Trump as a private individual is not going to control him better when he is president of the United States and appointing his own attorney general and all the other top officials at the Justice Department**. Think of the power of a man who gets himself elected president despite indictments, courtroom appearances and perhaps even conviction? Would he even obey a directive of the Supreme Court? Or would he instead ask how many armored divisions the chief justice has? Will a future Congress stop him? Presidents can accomplish a lot these days without congressional approval, as even Barack Obama showed. The one check Congress has on a rogue president, namely, **impeachment and conviction, has already proved all but impossible** - even when Trump was out of office and wielded modest institutional power over his party. **Another traditional check on a president is the federal bureaucracy**, that vast apparatus of career government officials who execute the laws and carry on the operations of government under every president. They are generally in the business of limiting any president's options. As Harry S. Truman once put it, "Poor Ike. He'll say 'do this' and 'do that' and nothing at all will happen." That was a problem for Trump is his first term, partly because he had no government team of his own to fill the administration. This time, he will. Those who choose to serve in his second administration will not be taking office with the unstated intention of refusing to carry out his wishes. If the Heritage Foundation has its way, and there is no reason to believe it won't, **many of those career bureaucrats will be gone, replaced by people carefully "vetted" to ensure their loyalty to Trump.** What about the desire for reelection, a factor that constrains most presidents? Trump might not want or need a third term, but were he to decide he wanted one, as he has sometimes indicated, would the 22nd Amendment block him any more effectively from being president for life than the Supreme Court, if he refused to be blocked? Why should anyone think that amendment would be more sacrosanct than any other part of the Constitution for a man like Trump, or perhaps more importantly, for his devoted supporters? A final constraint on presidents has been their own desire for a glittering legacy, with success traditionally measured in terms that roughly equate to the well-being of the country. But is that the way Trump thinks? Yes, Trump might seek a great legacy, but **it is strictly his own glory that he craves**. As with Napoleon, who spoke of the glory of France but whose narrow ambitions for himself and his family brought France to ruin, **Trump's ambitions**, though he speaks of making America great again, **clearly begin and end with himself**. As for his followers, he doesn't have to achieve anything to retain their support - his failure to build the wall in his first term in no way damaged his standing with millions of his loyalists. They have never asked anything of him other than that he triumph over the forces they hate in American society. And that, we can be sure, will be Trump's primary mission as president.

#### Trump will ensure there’s no internal checks on him in a second term

**Coppins, 24**

(McKay, “LOYALISTS, LAPDOGS, AND CRONIES,” The Atlantic, Jan/Feb 2024, accessed 3-6-24, p. EBSCOhost MasterFILE Premier) JFN

Don't expect it to happen again. **The available supply of serious, qualified people willing to serve in a Trump administration has dwindled since 2017**. After all, **the so-called adults didn't fare so well in their respective rooms.** Some quit in frustration or disgrace; others were publicly fired by the president. Several have spent their post-White House lives fielding congressional subpoenas and getting indicted. And after seeing one Trump term up close, vanishingly few of them are interested in a sequel: This past summer, NBC News reported that just four of Trump's 44 Cabinet secretaries had endorsed his current bid. **Even if mainstream Republicans did want to work for him again, Trump is unlikely to want them. He's made little secret of the fact that he felt burned by many in his first Cabinet. This time around**, according to people in Trump's orbit, **he would prioritize obedience over credentials. "I think there's going to be a very concerted, calculated effort to ensure that the people he puts in his next administration—they don't have to share his worldview exactly, but they have to implement it**," Hogan Gidley, a former Trump White House spokesperson, told me.

### TURN: PLAN IS POPULAR

#### Combating climate change is not a high priority for voters

**Sarnoff**, 8-8-**24**

(Leah, “Do voters care about climate change? How going green divides this election,” accessed 8-8-24, <https://abcnews.go.com/Politics/voters-care-climate-change-green-divides-election/story?id=112586833>) JFN

**As voters prepare to head to the polls** in November, **inflation, foreign policy and reproductive rights have dominated the national conversation, with environmental policy failing to emerge as a major ballot issue.** But **with climate change fueling more damaging** and deadly **weather events, experts question if the effects of global warming have fallen victim to over-politicization on the national stage**. **"There's no innate reason that addressing climate change should be a partisan issue, but** unfortunately, **it has become one**," Gregory **Dotson,** former chief counsel of the Senate Environment and Public Works Committee and current **environmental law professor at the University of Oregon, told ABC News**. "This is an extremely consequential election with regard to climate change," Dotson added. **National polls from the Pew Research Center released in Feb. 2024, found that Americans on both sides of the political aisle rank climate change initiatives as a far lower policy priority than other ballot issues.**

#### Public doesn’t vote on pro climate policies even if public opinion polls say they support action

**Sarnoff**, 8-8-**24**

(Leah, “Do voters care about climate change? How going green divides this election,” accessed 8-8-24, <https://abcnews.go.com/Politics/voters-care-climate-change-green-divides-election/story?id=112586833>) JFN

Between party lines, however, Democrats are substantially more likely than Republicans to prioritize protecting the environment (63% vs. 23%) and dealing with climate change (59% vs. 12%), according to the survey. Still, these findings may underestimate the public's support for climate initiatives despite not being a top voting priority. **"The large majority of Americans would prefer government action on climate change, but that doesn't mean that they prioritize the issue when they're going into their polling place and voting,"** Nathaniel **Stinnett, executive director of the Environmental Voter Project, told ABC News**. **Stinnett referred to the general public's concern over environmental issues as "a mile wide and an inch deep,"** meaning there is general awareness, but it's not pushing the needle one way or the other politically.

#### Voters won’t give Democrats credit for the benefits of the AFF

**Collinson**, 4-29-**24**

(Stephen, “Biden is up against nostalgia for Trump’s first term,” accessed 4-30-24, <https://www.cnn.com/2024/04/28/politics/biden-trump-nostalgia/index.html>) JFN

**Biden has had a successful presidency by** many **traditional metrics**. **He has presided over a long period of historically low unemployment** following the pandemic-induced economic crisis. He has unified the West to support Ukraine, a democracy, under a ruthless and illegal assault from Russia. And earlier this month, he presided over a stunningly successful US operation to shield Israel from a volley of Iranian drones and cruise and ballistic missiles. **He’s passed as much or more major legislation as any of his recent predecessors**, including a bipartisan infrastructure law that Trump failed to enact. **Yet** whether it is because of high inflation or a prolonged feeling of economic insecurity still haunting Americans, **he’s not getting much credit from the voters**.