



ENQUIRY

A publication of the AHI Undergraduate Fellows

Free thought and discourse

VOL. II No. 27 | CLINTON, NY. MONDAY, MAY 4, 2015

① Two Very Different Fields of Candidates

② Revisit Nuclear Energy

③ Royal Family Mania

Two Very Different Fields of Candidates

By **WILL SWETT**
STAFF WRITER

By March of 2011, the battle for the GOP presidential nomination was in full swing. A front-runner had not yet appeared and the race was still split between Mike Huckabee, with 18 percent Republican support, and Sarah Palin and Mitt Romney, both with 16 percent. Voters were undecided because the weak Republican field failed to impress the party base. The candidates failed to capitalize on Obama's weaknesses and suffered negative public opinion from congressional gridlock, lingering memories of Bush, and tactless statements both in public and private. The split field was atypical of past Republican nomination contests, because, according to Gallup, since 1952 the GOP races always featured a clear front-runner in that stage of the campaign who, with two exceptions, ultimately won the nomination.

Now, at about the same stage of the 2016 Republican nomination campaign this abnormality is even more exaggerated. According to polling data by Real Clear Politics, six key players in the Republican election are within 7 points of Jeb Bush, who leads with 15 percent support. Jeb is followed closely behind by Walker and Rubio, both around 12 percent.

Just like in 2011, the Republican nomination contest is crowded with candidates, and no clear front-runner has emerged yet.

Paul and Cruz are behind them with about 9.3 and 9 percent, respectively, and Huckabee brings up the rear with 8.3 percent. Possible dark horse candidates like Chris Christie, Ben Carson, Rick Perry, and Rick Santorum are still mulling over candidacy. Just like in 2011, the Republican nomination contest is crowded with candidates, and no clear front-runner has emerged yet. In 2015, however, the multitude of candidates

entering the race demonstrates the GOP's strength. The diverse field of contenders may seem like chaos within the party, but the number of nominees, some invariably stronger than others, evinces the intellectual diversity and future promise of many articulate young Republicans.

Florida Senator Marco Rubio, for example, is only 43 but introduced serious legislation proposals on the floor of a gridlocked Congress that reformed immigration and simplified the path to citizenship. Rubio likely knew that by proposing the bill, which was likely to fail anyway in the highly partisan senate, he risked alienating himself from the party base. By introducing reform counter to the platform of most party members, Rubio has demonstrated his commitment to legislate outside of partisan politics and his potential to appeal to voters outside the typical Republican base. Despite his youth and his bold legislative history, Rubio is one of the GOP's most promising candidates and will likely pose a significant challenge to Jeb in 2016.

While the GOP race is rife with strong candidates and future leaders of the party, the

continued on back page

Revisit Nuclear Energy

By **SARAH LARSON**
STAFF WRITER

Today, Americans get about 40% of their energy from coal, 27% from natural gas, 19% from nuclear power plants, and the rest from a mix of hydropower (6%), petroleum (1%), biomass (1.7%), geothermal (0.4%), solar (0.4%), and wind (4.4%) energy. That means that the majority of fuel we consume emits an immense amount of carbon dioxide, an amount that every Hamilton student knows is unsustainable and bad for the environment.

Although the alternative energy movement has lost some zeal in recent years, the problem it seeks to solve is no less urgent. That is why it is important for environmentalist and investors to revisit nuclear energy. Despite some of its bad connotations,

nuclear energy provides a great alternative to fossil fuels. As most already know, nuclear energy is carbon free. Nuclear energy plants, while initially expensive to build (upfront construction costs range from \$6-9 billion), have low operation and maintenance costs. In the long term, it costs less to generate nuclear electricity from any other source, notably coal and natural gas.

Ultimately, nuclear energy has the potential to beat out fossil fuels and end the energy crisis.

Another reason to pursue nuclear energy is that nuclear power plants can produce far more energy than wind or solar power plants. Furthermore, unlike fossil

REVISIT NUCLEAR ENERGY cont.

This Week's News in 140 Characters

EDITORIAL REPORT



Salman Rushdie @SalmanRushdie · Apr 30

Twitter question to anti-CH writer: Have you even once flipped through Charlie Hebdo?
Keith Gessen: No. Nor would my French be up to it.
Wow.

162 183



David Burge @Iowahawkblog · May 1

In 1959, Detroit was the wealthiest city in America and Cuba was the wealthiest county in Latin America. #HappyMayDay

1.4K 717



TheClassyLife @AceofSpadesHQ · May 1

wow the @BBC, World Press, and UN are "totally" giving the civilian casualties of the Yemen fight every bit as much attention as with Israel

6 3



Eli Lake @EliLake · Apr 30

Nobody ever credits #Iran for compromising in these negotiations too. In 1979 they took 66 US hostages. Today they only have 4. #moderates

206 116



Allahpundit @allahpundit · Apr 29

Hillary's campaign feels increasingly like a lab experiment in how much corruption Dems will accept to maximize their WH odds

72 45



Jimmy @JimmyPrinceton · May 2

Everything in #Bridgetate case comes from e-mail and text message records. A reminder why Hillary destroying her e-mail records is damning.

157 72



andy levy @andylevy · 20h

somebody should tell mayweather he's supposed hug his wife and punch the guy in the ring not the other way around

8K 7.5K



AG @AG_Conservative · May 1

Kind of funny watching the same journalists/liberals that promote teachers unions act appalled by the behavior of police unions.

55 36

Royal Family Mania

By **AMY ELINSKI**
STAFF WRITER

It is odd to think that a nation founded to escape the British monarchy would be so fascinated by the royal family.

This past Sunday, as the royal family welcomed a new member, America's obsession reached a new peak. Union Jacks, recolored pink and bearing the phrase "IT'S A GIRL!" filled computer and television screens, celebrating the princess born to William and Kate. By Sunday afternoon there were already 677,000 tweets of #royalbaby. What exactly is the cause of this obsession?

One explanation for royal family mania is that admiration of royalty is so ingrained in our culture. From the time we are

Democrats, conversely, have put all their eggs in the Clinton basket. Clinton already has 62.2 percent support according to Real Clear Politics, and it doesn't look like there will be any other serious candidates to oppose her. Second to Hillary is Elizabeth Warren, currently polling at 12.7 percent, almost 50 points behind Hillary. Partisans of Warren have refused to listen what Warren has been telling the media for the past years: "I am not running for president."

Miles behind Hillary in the polls at 9.8 percent is Joe Biden, the walking punch-line of the Democratic Party. Forgetting his lecherous behavior and his history of plagiarism, presenting Joe Biden as a serious candidate, assuming he runs, would be a difficult task for the media, considering that nobody takes him seriously anyway.

The absence of any candidate to significantly challenge Hillary Clinton demonstrates how ideologically unhealthy the party has become. It's not as though Hillary is a particularly powerful politician. During her husband's presidency, Hillary's leadership during the 1993 Clinton Health Care Plan was an embarrassment to the administration. Her tenure as Secretary of State has also raised many legal and moral questions. Despite her poor handling of unending controversies, Hillary has, in true Clinton spirit, remained remarkably resilient in the face of scandal. Yet the question remains of whether she can maintain the support of her constituency, progressives and millennials, during the election. She couldn't do it last election when she also seemed preordained to win the nomination. What has changed between now and then, other than more scandal and a failed Democratic president?

REVISIT NUCLEAR ENERGY cont.

fuels, uranium and thorium are plentiful, and very little is needed to produce a lot of energy. The United States already has 99 nuclear power reactors in 30 states. Those power plants are operated by 30 different power companies, allowing for robust competition that does not exist in the oil and coal industries. Over the years, these plants have generated hundreds of billions of kilowatts per year. So why aren't there more of them?

The answer is complicated. Not only are gas prices decreasing, making it more difficult for new investors to see the long-term payout of investing in new plants, but the American people themselves

are halting nuclear progress.

Despite all of its advantages, Americans remain skeptical of nuclear energy. Many regard it as unsafe. They irrationally believe that nuclear energy emits hazardous radiation, that it is merely disguised weaponry, that it produces dangerous waste and that it is incompetent to overtake the oil and coal industry. According to a Gallup poll conducted this March, "A slim majority of Americans (51%) now favor the use of nuclear energy for electricity in the U.S., while 43% opposed it."

The fears of those 43% are unfounded. Nuclear power plants are safer than any other power plant. Nuclear weapons are built in completely separate reactors or centrifuges. Nuclear energy does not mean nuclear war. The power plants themselves emit no radiation. In reality there is not really much waste, and any waste that does remain can be safely stored in rock tunnels like Yucca, salt caverns like New Mexico, or deep boreholes. Nuclear waste is far better taken care of than other EPA-registered hazardous waste, like mercury and PCBs, that is disposed of each year.

New reactor designs are further reducing the amount of waste, and many innovators are discovering ways to recycle it. One example, first brought to light by the Brookings Institute last year, promises 100% recyclability of nuclear waste. Leslie Dewan and Mark Massie, both students at MIT, figured that they could "chop up" the rods of nuclear waste and remove their metal cladding, and then use the product to power their molten salt reactor design. Similar innovations are happening all the time. But if no one is interested in funding nuclear energy, all those ideas will go to waste.

Ultimately, nuclear energy has the potential to beat out fossil fuels and end the energy crisis. Before writing off nuclear energy as a solution, Americans should reevaluate nuclear energy.

ROYAL FAMILY MANIA cont.

born, we are told stories of heroic princes and princesses, of noble kings and queens who protect their kingdoms from evil. From stories of Disney princesses or the tales of King Arthur and his knights of the round table, we come to admire these fantastical royal characters, and they become our childhood idols. We project that same sense of heroism onto the real life royal family. Certainly if the royal characters in our favorite childhood fables had this

incredible sense of honor and duty, the real life royal family must have the same sense of honor.

Another cause of the obsession is the royal family's constant media presence. Celebrities come in and out of fame as fads within the media ebb and flow, but the royal family is always there. The Queen of England has ruled since 1952, and the media has publicized much of her daily life. The media has followed the royal children and grandchildren for their entire lives, and their spouses have become instant celebrities and idols of the watching world.

Maybe the biggest reason for the royal family mania is that it is a break from bad news.

Even people who dislike or maintain indifference to the royal family know about them. Everyone knows the names of the royal family members. Everyone knows who is in line for succession.

The modern day fairytale of Prince William and Kate Middleton has most recently captured our attention. Many hold their marriage as affirmation that even in modern society, a few

lucky people can get their fairytale ending. Kate, a commoner, met Prince William while the two studied at the University of St. Andrews in Scotland in 2001, and the two married in 2010 in a highly publicized ceremony at Westminster Abbey. To many, their story is a reminder that there is still the tiny possibility that they may marry their very own prince (or princess) charming. This story is the modern ideal to many, and a reminder that fairytales can come true.

Maybe the biggest reason for the royal family mania is that it is a break from bad news. People want to see that somewhere in the world, good things are happening. People see a beautiful, happy-looking family, and they envy them. People want to be able to live a life that is as happy as the royal family's appears. The royal family is the perfect embodiment of the life people want, and we fill our minds with their happiness to take the edge off of the pain of today's bad news.

vol. II

ENQUIRY

Joe Simonson
Editor in Chief

Mike Adamo
Senior Editor

Michael Levy
Creative Director

STAFF WRITERS

Taylor Elicegui	Amy Elinski
Alex Klosner	Sarah Larson
Andrew Nachemson	Phil Parkes
Will Swett	

The opinions expressed in these articles are the views of their authors and do not represent the views of Enquiry or the Alexander Hamilton Institute.

Enquiry accepts articles of 500 to 800 words at jsimonson@hamilton.edu and madamo@hamilton.edu. Please be aware that we do not accept anonymous submissions.

FOLLOW US ON TWITTER

@ENQUIRY_AHI

ENQUIRY