

## 2016 U.S. Elections: Social Stability & Domestic Terrorism, National Security & Foreign Policy

The U.S. has a long, proud history of social movements, including many which have opposed the government in public. In most cases, a permit 许可证 is only required if the demonstration will affect traffic. Most would agree that social stability is not as high a government priority as it is in the contemporary PRC. Peaceful protest is legally protected in the Bill of Rights 《人权法案》 under the “Freedom of Assembly 集会自由,” but the line between a protest and a riot has always been thin and disputed. A protest becomes a riot when there is widespread (not isolated 孤立的) violence 大规模暴乱, either between protestors and police or among demonstrators themselves. Liberal Democracy can be very noisy and messy, and breakouts of violence are not uncommon. However, protestors generally try very hard to remain peaceful and keep violence from spreading. Political party conventions and speeches by candidates have a history of violent confrontation 对抗 between supporters and opponents. When does the freedom to gather in public go too far and begin to threaten national security?

African-Americans in recent years have highlighted “institutional racism 制度性种族歧视” in U.S. police departments, which manifests itself in a disproportionate number of black men being interrogated 质问, arrested, jailed, shot and killed by police officers. Studies show that minorities in America do not use drugs or commit other crimes at higher rates than white Americans, yet they are consistently arrested more often and given harsher punishment than whites. Meanwhile, candidates like Trump enjoy very strong support among less-educated white men who feel that the U.S. government has left them behind, as evidenced in the highest suicide rates in the U.S. being among middle-aged men. What do you think can be done to reduce racial tensions 种族间紧张关系, or is it too late? Do you think the U.S. is heading toward a split along racial lines?

Since 9/11, terrorism has largely been thought of as a threat emanating from 发源 foreign countries, but a growing number of perpetrators 犯错者 are U.S. citizens. In recent cases such as the Boston Marathon bombing, an attack on a black church in South Carolina, as well as shootings in San Bernardino, CA, and Miami, FL, *domestic* terrorism is a growing concern. Such attacks, with apparent political motivations to be categorized as terrorism, have been carried out by “lone wolves” (sing. “lone wolf” 独狼恐怖分子) who have few or no links to terrorist groups. The difficulty of preventing “radicalization 激进化” of individuals is under debate in the U.S., and candidates like Trump have proposed extreme “vetting” or even banning immigrants—even refugees 难民—based on their religion. Such a policy would appear to be unconstitutional 违反宪法的 and highly controversial. What do you think can be done to reduce the threat of “homegrown terrorism” without violating the rights of citizens or going against the constitution?

**Vocabulary:** ·(declare) allegiance to Sth. (i.e. The Islamic State) ·“Black Lives Matter” Movement 黑人的生命也要珍惜 黑人的命也是命 ·civil rights 公民权 ·criminal justice reform 刑事审判改革 VS. being “tough on crime” 严厉打击犯罪 ·crowd control 人群控制 ·“disturbing the peace” 扰乱治安 ·“If you see something, say something.” ·law & order 治安; 法律和秩序 ·(declare) martial law 戒严法 ·mass incident 群体性事件 ·mass (social) movement 大量移动 ·non-violent offender 非暴力罪犯 ·PAP (People’s Armed Police) 人民武装警察 ·racial profiling 歧视性种族评判 ·riot gear 防爆装备 ·segregation (i.e. by race) 种族隔离 VS. integration ·“stop & frisk” 盘查 policy ·(terrorist) watch-list / no-fly list

### **Statements & Policy Positions, by Candidate**

Hillary Clinton – Favors criminal justice reform to reduce the prison population of non-violent offenders. Hillary has the support of hawks and neoconservatives of the George W. Bush administration (those responsible for invading Iraq), with some reservations. Other than a harder line on China and more intervention in Syria, her policies would largely continue the status quo of the Obama Administration, whose first term she served as U.S. Secretary of State.

Donald Trump – Runs as a “law & order candidate” who will enforce the law as it is written. Endorsed 赞同的 by many border control agencies, police stations, and some military personnel. Criticizes the Obama administration for refusal to use the term “radical Islam.” Trump has called for major reform in how NATO and other military alliances are funded, expecting other countries to pay the U.S. much more. He advocates nuclear proliferation, explicitly to Japan and South Korea. His priority is to eliminate ISIS, but he does not want to intervene in Syria or cross Putin's Russia generally.

Gary Johnson – Favors extreme criminal justice reform to reduce the prison population and criminal records of individuals. From website: “[W]e have too many unnecessary laws.” “We should not use our military strength to try to solve the world’s problems. Doing

so creates new enemies and perpetual war.” Opposes “nation-building” abroad as a waste of trillions of tax dollars, calls U.S. foreign policy of being “the world’s policeman” “imperialistic” and a recruitment tool for terrorists. Johnson has embarrassed himself on national television by not knowing what Aleppo (, Syria) was and being unable to name a foreign leader he admired.

Jill Stein – Treat climate change as the #1 national security threat. “Establish a foreign policy based on diplomacy, international law, human rights, and nonviolent support for democratic movements around the world.” **End** U.S. arms sales, support to regimes which abuse human rights, assassination (by drone strikes and other means) as a foreign policy instrument, economic & military intervention, support for Israeli policies which mistreat Palestinians, wars (& military support) in Iraq & Afghanistan, nuclear weapons research. Sign land-mine ban. Make the National Guard “the centerpiece of our defense.” Freeze the bank accounts of countries funding terrorism, including the Saudi royal family. Much more domestic policy at <http://www.jill2016.com/platform>

**Military Spending** – Maintain or Increase = Clinton                      Decrease, but make allies pay more for U.S. protection = Trump  
Decrease = Johnson              Decrease by “at least 50%” = Stein

**Military Activity** – Increase # & Level of Interventions = Clinton              Unknown = Trump                      **Greatly** Decrease = Johnson & Stein