



# ENQUIRY

A publication of the AHI Undergraduate Fellows

Free thought and discourse

VOL. II .... No. 26 | CLINTON, NY. MONDAY, APRIL 27, 2015

- ① [The Other Woman Running for Pres.](#)
- ② [E-Cig Regulators Are a Drag](#)
- ③ [Money in Politics](#)

## The Other Woman Running for President

By **ALEX KLOSNER**  
STAFF WRITER

Could America see a woman in the White House in 2016? Hillary Clinton can rely on strong support from women voters next November. According to a recent Gallup poll, 56% of women hold a favorable view of Hillary, compared to only 44% of men. Female voters will provide Hillary with a crucial advantage against her Republican opponent. But what will happen if the Republicans also nominate a female candidate?

The GOP has yet to promote a female presidential candidate who appeals to the non-Tea Party faction of the Republican base, but that's about to change. Carly Fiorina, a rising star in the Republican Party, is set to launch her campaign next week. Unlike Sarah Palin or Michele Bachmann, Fiorina demonstrates intelligence and a powerful ability to articulate ideas appealing to the average Republican voter.

A Texas native, Fiorina attended Stanford University and worked her way up the corporate ladder to become the CEO of Hewlett-Packard from 1999 to 2005. Although many scrutinize her short-lived tenure as CEO, she helped the company endure the dot-com bubble and oversaw one of the largest tech mergers in history with HP's \$19 billion purchase of Compaq Computers. In 2001, *Forbes* magazine named Fiorina one of the thirty most powerful women in America.

After her tenure at HP, Fiorina entered the political world. During John McCain's 2008 campaign, Carly served as a top economic advisor and led the Republican National Committee's "Victory '08" team. Two years later, Fiorina launched her own campaign against California Senator Barbara Boxer. While Republicans face an uphill battle in California—which has consistently voted Democratic in presidential elections since 1992—Fiorina provided Boxer with a true challenge. Boxer, one of the most liberal members of the Senate, emerged victorious,

winning 52% to Fiorina's 42%. However, capturing 42% of the vote in a California while running a conservative platform is an impressive feat. Boxer described the election as "the toughest and roughest campaign of my life."

*Fiorina demonstrates intelligence and a powerful ability to articulate ideas appealing to the average Republican voter.*

When she announces her candidacy, Fiorina will enter a packed field of candidates from Wisconsin Governor Scott Walker to Florida Senator Marco Rubio. As a political "outsider" and the only woman GOP candidate, Fiorina will add an interesting dynamic to the primary. Michael Warren of *The Weekly Standard* writes that "Carly, as everyone knows her, is less Sarah Palin and more Ronald Reagan, a natural storyteller with a quick wit and an ear for emotional narratives." Her unapologetic conservative positions resonate with the Republican base and increase her competitiveness in the primary. Fiorina is pro-life, scrutinizes the fiscal mismanagement of

*continued on back page*

## E-Cig Regulators Are a Drag

By **WILL SWETT**  
STAFF WRITER

Few college-aged students have ever seen someone light up a cigarette indoors. The recent invention of e-cigarettes, however, has allowed smokers to once again enjoy the feeling of smoking a cigarette in bars, restaurants, offices, and residences without being forced outside. "Vaping" shouldn't be a problem as e-cigarettes emit harmless water-vapor that poses virtually no risk to anybody nearby. Nevertheless, anti-smoking advocacy groups have unsurprisingly taken issue with e-cigarettes simply because vaping *looks* like smoking.

Advocacy groups like the American Lung Association have succeeded in lobbying state and local legislatures to impose

cigarette and tobacco restrictions on e-cigarettes as well. Smoking was pushed outside because of the health risks of secondhand smoke. E-cigarettes are getting the same treatment, even though they emit no smoke at all.

*Why is there such a push to ban vaping in the name of maintaining a smoke-free environment?*

In March, the California legislature passed a bill restricting the use of e-cigarettes from bars, nightclubs, restaurants, and other public areas. State Senator Ellen Corbett, D-San Leandro said that the bill aimed to "treat them the same as other cigarettes." New York Governor Andrew Cuomo is also awaiting approval for his budget proposal, which would ban the use of e-cigarettes anywhere tobacco products are already prohibited. Treating e-cigarettes like their combustible counterparts is puzzling, considering that they are not tobacco products and do not generate smoke. Why is there such a push to ban vaping in the name of maintaining a smoke-free environment?

## This Week's News in 140 Characters

### EDITORIAL REPORT



**Elizabeth Scalia** @TheAnchoress · 5h  
"Mistakes were made" couldn't help Nixon.

**The Daily Beast** @thedailybeast  
Clinton Foundation: 'We Made Mistakes' thebea.st/1btzLMc

← ↻ 21 ★ 17 ...



**Reihan Salam** @reihan · 8h  
Clinton Foundation raised \$500M+ 09-12. \$75M to charity vs. \$135M for compensation and travel. Rest: "other expenses" freebeacon.com/blog/everythin

← ↻ 126 ★ 61 ... [View summary](#)



**Nassim Nicholas Taleb** @nntaleb · Apr 24  
Remember next time you attend a university lecture that the same people who teach Socrates today would have voted to put him to death then.

← ↻ 553 ★ 577 ...



**David Frum** @davidfrum · Apr 23  
Be warned: bad as Clinton ethics are, Americans will stomach them if alternative is loss of their health coverage theatlantic.com/politics/archi...

← ↻ 33 ★ 28 ... [View summary](#)



**Razor** @hale\_razor · Apr 24  
When most people omit TENS OF MILLIONS OF DOLLARS from their tax returns, the result isn't an oopsy do-over, it's jail. #ClintonCash

← ↻ 553 ★ 286 ...

## Money in Politics

By **SARAH LARSON**  
STAFF WRITER

As we approach the 2016 presidential election, Americans will again bemoan the increasing amount of money spent on campaigns. Already, the Koch network plans to spend close to \$900 million on the 2016 campaign according to the *New York Times*, and Hillary Clinton is expected to raise over one billion dollars. According to Opensecrets.com, Barack Obama's and Mitt Romney's campaigns cost close to \$1.12 billion in 2012, and that number does not even include the immense amount of spending conducted by outside groups, other candidates, and other parties. OpenSecrets.com conservatively estimates that overall the 2012 presidential race cost more than \$2.6 billion. Based on data released by the FEC in April, the 2014 midterm elections cost the 58 democrats who ran \$285,218,602 total and the 137 Republicans who ran \$315,898,295 total.

For most Americans, these numbers are baffling and unnerving. Yet the problem seems insurmountable. As

the federal government, and opposes any path to citizenship for illegal immigrants. Fiorina has already capitalized on Hillary's lack of results as Secretary of State: "like Hillary Clinton, I too have traveled hundreds of thousands of miles around the globe, but unlike her, I've actually accomplished something."

Fiorina must overcome several pitfalls during the primary before worrying about Hillary Clinton. While she's been active in the political realm for a decade, she's never held political office. During her tenure as CEO, HP's stock lost over 60% of its value. According to *The Huffington Post's* pollster, she trails behind almost every other GOP candidate with only 1.2% of Republicans backing her. Fiorina will see her numbers increase after she makes her official announcement, but she must boost her name recognition. It's crucial that Republicans recognize her potential to become the first female President of the United States and regard her as a serious, legitimate candidate.

#### E-CIG REGULATORS ARE A DRAG *cont.*

There is no evidence that the water vapor emitted from e-cigarettes poses a significant threat to bystanders. Although some of the chemicals in tobacco smoke have been detected in e-cigarette vapor, studies show that the levels of potentially toxic compounds are substantially lower than those found in the smoke from cigarettes. Kimberly Amazeen, vice president for public policy and advocacy at the California chapter of the American Lung Association implicitly conceded the lack of evidence to support a vaping ban by saying that "there is currently no scientific evidence establishing the safety of e-cigarettes." The science on e-cigarettes is still new and requires further research, but research is not necessary to lawmakers because these bans are not about health.

E-cigs are being banned in areas where cigarettes are already prohibited because vaping looks like smoking. Nanny state dictators are worried that if nobody handcuffs e-cigarettes to conventional cigarettes, then Big Tobacco will come back and make smoking cool again. Even some e-cigarette flavors have been banned because they might attract teens. By restricting where e-cigarettes can be smoked, as if they carry with them the same harmful risks of cigarette smoke (i.e. cancer of the lungs, mouth, throat, pancreas, bladder, nose, etc.), these regulations work to attack a perceived "smoking

culture." Like a worried parent whose child has started listening to heavy metal, the nanny statesmen and stateswomen worry that vaping is a gateway to a culture they deem hazardous.

Although it is a serious concern that the amount of teens who have tried vaporizers has tripled in the last year, one must recognize that since the popularization of e-cigarettes in 2009, teenage smoking in the United States has fallen by half to 9.2 percent. Underage vaping has increased by such a degree because it is only in the last year that most states began prohibiting the sale of e-cigarettes to minors. Even now, ten states have yet to legislate on them at all, allowing more than 16 million minors unrestricted access to the potentially harmful devices.

Although the growing amount of vaping by minors is troubling, legislatures should at least stop the sale to minors before considering anymore potentially unnecessary restrictions. Kids will always do stupid things. I think that we can all agree that kids should not have access to any nicotine products, but vaping is infinitely preferable to smoking.

Opponents of e-cigs claim that e-cigarettes open the door to other tobacco products, but banning e-cigarettes from smoke-free areas will actually keep more people smoking. Although the anti-smoking groups supporting these laws profess a desire rid the world of smoking cigarettes altogether, what they are doing is making it more difficult for people to quit. E-cigarettes have proven to be immensely helpful to people who want to quit cigarettes, but have found it impossible to do permanently. Vaping is more effective than nicotine patches, gum, or any other nicotine supplement that smokers who want to quit have employed. By forcing e-cigarette users back on the streets with the other smokers, these laws make it more difficult to choose vaping an e-cig over lighting up another cigarette. We should be supporting those who want to quit and not chastising them.

#### MONEY IN POLITICS *cont.*

Matea Gold of the Washington Post reported earlier this week, the *Citizens United* Supreme Court decision "helped set off a financial arms race." There is no doubt that campaign financing will continue to skyrocket.

It seems that many Americans agree that campaigns should not cost as much as they do and that spending a billion dollars or so getting elected is

wrong. Many Americans hold the notion that this kind of political spending undermines the nation's democratic values. The frequent public outrage seems justified. Yet nothing has changed. Year after year, politicians across the spectrum occasionally give lip service to the question of campaign spending, most notably President Obama who (ironically) was the best and most effective presidential fundraiser to date. Americans click on surveys to indicate they are 'upset.' These occasional speeches and articles in major newspapers will only continue until everyone realizes the root issue: politics in money.

The reason why campaigns cost so much is that there is a lot of money to gain or lose in an election. In particular, corporations can stand to make or lose a lot of money. Individuals too, can stand to gain or lose money in an election. Characteristic of donations to the Democratic Party on the whole, government employees donated \$736,722 to President Obama's 2012 campaign. Government employees were the fourth largest category of people to donate to his campaign. Their donations make sense. A change in power could cost them their job. Many financiers donated to Mitt Romney's campaign, probably because of his promise to undo the financial regulations set up after the 2008 crisis. Romney would have likely made changes that would have been great for their business.

A great example that reveals the reason why some people spend so much on politics was witnessed this last Friday. Comcast, a large cable provider, was deeply

involved with President Obama's campaign, executives not only donating millions of dollars but also hosting fundraisers, going on golf outings, and meeting with the President one-on-one. At the root, all of their efforts were for federal permission to merge with another large cable company, Time Warner. The deal would have been groundbreaking, vastly increasing the market share of Comcast. Last week regulators vetoed the deal, it seems all those donations were in vain this time around. But there is no doubt that companies like Comcast will continue to seek the attention of candidates, be they looking for a federal contract (like in the construction or military sector), a subsidy (like in agriculture), a new regulations (like in finance) or a bailout (like in the automobile industry). For major corporations, a few million dollars is a small price to pay for increased market share, permission to cut a billion dollar deal, or a billion dollar federal contract.

If we are serious about reducing the cost of elections, we need to reduce the size, scope, and economic leverage of the government. The less government there is, the less government can be bought.

#### CONTINUE THE CONVERSATION

- ① *The Other Woman Running for Pres.*  
#theotherwoman
- ② *E-Cig Regulators Are a Drag*  
#ecigregulators
- ③ *Money in Politics*  
#moneyinpolitics

vol. II

## ENQUIRY

Joe Simonson  
*Editor in Chief*

Mike Adamo  
*Senior Editor*

Michael Levy  
*Creative Director*

#### STAFF WRITERS

Taylor EliceGUI  
Alex Klosner  
Andrew Nachemson  
Will Swett

Amy Elinski  
Sarah Larson  
Phil Parkes

*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](mailto:jsimonson@hamilton.edu) and [madamo@hamilton.edu](mailto:madamo@hamilton.edu). Please be aware that we do not accept anonymous submissions.