

Political Nuances

LEAD 807 Contemporary Issues in Leadership

Term III

Dr. Okeke

Billie Campbell

September 22, 2019

Introduction:

According to Knapp (2019) in US politics, nuance likely means a politician's ability to convey their position on an issue to one audience and the opposite position on the same issue to another audience while still being able to convince everyone they are not lying to one or both audiences. As an example, the writer states in 2004, Democratic presidential nominee John Kerry called his ever-shifting position on the war in Iraq nuanced as a way of explaining why he was for it before he was against it and why his recommendations for its future kept changing. Nuances in debates, politics, and public policy. Almost always like an excuse for either non-specificity on a current position or reverse collapsing from a past position.

Of all the words in the political word list, none makes for a brighter neon sign than not to trust nuance.

What is Political Nuance:

The writer goes on to state during his research that nuance has a subtle meaning, opinion, or attitude. Although it has an attractive characteristic in paintings, literature, music and other arts, in political philosophy and public policy, it is a cheat mechanism used to create unwarranted wiggle room without giving any clarity to what they mean. The advocate or candidate carrying out the nuance does not want to be understood clearly. That is the whole point of resorting to nuance during their political and policy discussions. In other words, they are trying to create a loophole through which they can escape his or her position when that position becomes inconvenient.

The writer further states that nuance is an excuse of civil libertarians who are all for free speech until someone says something they do not like; that hate speech is not free. It is like the talking point of the pro-gun-rights politician who announces that a 30-round magazine is too large and must be banned but that their views on guns have not changed or the plea from the formerly anti-war politician who votes to invade Iraq and then wants to be as the anti-war candidate.

Political Nuance is Not

What political nuance is not is a desirable quality in politics and public policy. From our political candidates, we deserve clear statements of principle and position, not nuanced attempts to avoid declaring any principles or positions at all which they might later hold accountable. If a politician changes his or her mind, the public deserves to know and to know why, rather than just being told they have not, and we do not get the nuance.

From our laws and proposals for laws, we deserve specificity if we are expected to abide by those laws. Instead of letting the bureaucrats who implement and enforce them, write post-passage nuances making up the law as they go and leaving the public at their nuanced mercy.

Regardless of one's position on any given issue, it is essential to define our terms and then either stick to them or admit that we have abandoned them. In politics and public policy, nuance is where the truth goes to die.

Political Nuance on Climate Change:

Currently, in the upcoming Democratic National Convention, there are Ten Democratic candidates Convention-sanctioned debate following the committee deadline. While there are several candidates with an array of viewpoints, the DNC is being critiqued by both the public and politicians for its handling of climate change and its shady debate requirements - particularly concerning how the committee approves polls. According to Jeffe (2018), Climate change has become one of the most highly polarized political problems, but it was not always this way. As recently as 2008, leading Republicans and Democrats agreed on the implications of global warming research. Then the United States moved from a bipartisan agreement on the need to address climate change to the current state of seemingly stubborn oppositions. Research from those who have worked with environmental non-profits, the writer posits that advocates need to disrupt the conventional wisdom on climate

change politics if they are to achieve lasting success. Tackling a problem like a climate change requires sustaining pollution- decreasing efforts over many decades, even as the political pendulum continues to swing. Because of that, environmentalists must embrace the goal of cultivating a working coalition regardless of who is in power. The political nuance seems to differentiate whenever the political leaders of different parties take office.

Matthews (2017) posits that President Donald Trump rejected the science on climate change, famously tweeting that it is a hoax created by and for the Chinese. The writer continues to state this administrations attitude marks a dramatic reversal from the prior Obama administration, by totally rejecting that the issue exists. However, more importantly, it caps a decade-long trend toward increased political divergence on the issue. As recently as 2008, leading Republicans and Democrats agreed on the implications of global warming research. At a presidential campaign event (McCain 2008) stated that research by credible scientists, that time was short, and the dangers were great. The most relevant question now is whether our government is equal to the challenge.

Moreover, whether the United States will move from bipartisan agreement on to addressing climate change, even if the federal government failed to act based on its current state of seeming nuances. While opponents fail to address climate, change a vicious and well-funded campaign is aimed at belittling the peer-reviewed science, that only tells part of the story. Activists for sound climate policies must consider how they can change their tactics and strategies. The writer goes on to state that environmentalists have struggled to navigate this complex and often contradictory political-cultural, lobbyist funded traditional political driven nuance. For example, no one claimed that a North Korean missile test might be a hoax perpetrated by their political adversaries for partisan gain. Therefore, the same vital, the core of agreement does not currently exist regarding global warming policy. Many advocates have tried to work around this

dilemma, focusing on issues indirectly connected to climate change, such as promoting energy efficiency.

According to Thomson & Arroyo, (2017) The American Council for an Energy-Efficient Economy has stressed that the United States can put itself on a path to decreasing energy use by 2050, that would save the nation billions of dollars in lower energy bills, create domestic jobs, and improve health by reducing pollution, while making homes and businesses more comfortable. Conspicuously absent in this call to action is any direct discussion of climate change. There is limited work-to to discuss or address the urgency and immediacy of the global warming problem. This unfortunate fact has presented existential challenges for advocates hoping to aggressively reduce greenhouse gas pollution on the scale necessary to mitigate the worst impacts of global warming and filibustering the acceptance in the most elementary aspects of peer-reviewed science, that a robust and clear-eyed solution to the climate crisis cannot possibly exist. The writer argues that the primary mission for environmental groups now must be to disrupt the conventional wisdom on climate change politics. By disruption, that means that environmentalists must choose to act in ways that break up the traditional cycle that has dominated climate change discourse for a quarter-century, with politically active environmental groups endorsing a Democratic candidate for office, while at the same time criticizing the Republican candidate for relying on campaign donations from big polluters. Then the Republican candidate attacks his or her Democratic opponent for being beholden to environmental extremists, while media outlets report on the tension as a choice between the economy or the environment, creating political nuance. To break out of this cycle, environmental groups must prioritize strategies that force other stakeholders such as elected officials, electric utilities, and chambers of commerce to alter their own, kneejerk responses.

Brief History of Why Such Nuance To Politics and Climate Change:

Clarke, Ling, Kothe, and Richardson (2017), posits the question how then is it possible that so many people deny the reality of climate change, and the negative impact it is having on the environment, and on our health as well as the imminent, potentially extinction-level of a threat we face together? There has been intensive research study on this denial of climate change even though there is scientific proof. The answer is on how political ideology influences attitudes about climate change, and reports based on their survey of US participants of whom are identified as liberal, or conservative, and the rest in the middle politically. The writers go on to state among other colleagues that the relationship among various dimensions of political belief and motivations are the reason for denying climate change, noting that prior research has demonstrated a significant correlation between right-wing philosophy and climate change denial. Besides hypothesizing various components of political belief that correlated with climate change denial, which predicted a climate change mitigation threat causing a negatively impact on the socioeconomic status quo bringing about a significant additional factor in climate change denial. In other words, then people who deny climate change would at least be partially motivated to do so to avoid adverse effects on social and economic factors, remade despite being presented with the clear and present danger posed by climate change. Furthermore, to test their hypotheses, they recruited subjects to participate in a survey of political belief-related factors and climate change denial related factors. Administering the following scales:

1. The Right-Wing Authoritarianism (RWA) scale, measuring a) authoritarian aggression, b) authoritarian submission, and c) conventionalism;
2. The Social Dominance Orientation (SDO) scale, measuring the "tendency to prefer group-based hierarchy and inequality";
3. The Ideological orientation measure, asking individuals where they fall politically, ranging from "extremely liberal" to "extremely conservative";

4. The Climate Change Mitigation Threat (CCMT) scale, measuring anxiety-related the possible effects on socioeconomic stability due to proposed changes such as higher costs for higher carbon emission, caps on emissions, and the impact on conventional fuel industries from alternative energy sources;
5. The Climate Change Denial scale, measuring four types of climate change denial including a) denial of the existence of climate change, b) denial of human cause, c) impact denial and d) climate science denial. This has created continued nuances among the politicians and the people.

Fershee, (2019) posits a brief history of climate change politics and policy, summarizing both the development of the science of global warming and the increasingly polarized politics that have grown up with it. The writer states how climate policy has become so polarized by merely focusing on three, distinct theories of political culture moralistic, traditionalist, and individualistic. To appreciate just how polarized and hostile today's debate on climate policy has become, it is helpful first to trace the history of the scientific basis on climate change, and the political debate that accompanied this history. The writer starts with climate science research in the 1960s and 1970s and traces the beginnings of political divergence on climate change, with a focus on the presidential elections of 1992 Bush v. Clinton and of course 2008 McCain v. Obama. This brought about consistency and longstanding opportunity for bipartisan solutions over many decades, which shows the recent political polarization, which has become an insurmountable impediment to legislative action on the issue. Contrary to conventional wisdom, our understanding of global warming is not new. The researcher states for a half-century or more, the brightest minds in climate science have been warning us of the problem. A 1965 report of the President's Science Advisory Committee cautioned the world of the marked changes in climate due to the increased carbon dioxide pollution. That led President Lyndon B. Johnson to insert a mention of the issue in a speech to

Congress on Conservation and Restoration of Natural Beauty. Air pollution was no longer confined to isolated places. Because of the generation altered composition of the atmosphere through radioactive materials and a steady increase in carbon dioxide from the burning of fossil fuels.

Hornblower (1977) posits a decade assessed what has been widely known and identified in scientific circles as the global carbon dioxide problem.

The principal conclusion of this study is that the primary limiting factor on energy production from fossil fuels over the next few centuries would turn out to be the climatic effects of the release of carbon dioxide and the potential for catastrophic effects on agriculture, fishing, and sea-level rise. Cementing and strengthened earlier conclusions of incontrovertible evidence that the atmosphere is indeed changing and that we contribute to that change, also that a wait-and-see policy may mean waiting until it is too late and that there would be significant warming as a result of fossil-fuel combustion.

Conclusion:

Rather than succumbing to partisan conflict and political divides because it generally seems to liberal-leaning people not to address climate change. It may be possible to conduct research and present information which allows for a reappraisal of the socioeconomic impact of changing policies related to fossil fuel use and carbon emissions, mainly if persuasive arguments it will be socioeconomically beneficial in the long run. This approach could foster more adaptive responses based on acceptance and reappraisal, rather than on threat-based assessments and membership-based adherence to group norms. Such arguments have been effective in changing insurance company policies when advocacy groups have demonstrated that spending money upfront will save money later, for example showing that treating mental health and addictions leads to significant financial savings in the future by preventing physical severe health consequences. Therefore, research like this may also help liberal-leaning individuals to have

greater empathy for their conservative counterparts and giving the public the truth which could allow for more constructive dialogue, making bipartisan efforts more likely to succeed. Confrontational or derisive approaches, on the other hand, tend to lead to greater polarization. Finally, given that conservative identification may lead people to adopt group values supporting climate change denial, persuading those conservative leaders who accept climate change as a severe problem to speak out may be an effective strategy to change attitudes over time. (Manning, Krygsman & Speiser 2017).

References

- Clarke, Ling, Kothe and Richardson (2017), *Perceived Mitigation Threat Mediates Effects of Right-Wing Ideology on Climate Change Beliefs*,
- Clayton S, Manning CM, Krygsman K & Speiser M (2017) *Mental Health and Our Changing Climate: Impacts, Implications, and Guidance*. Washington, DC: American Psychological Association, and Eco America.
- Ed Markey, Markey Statement on Latest North Korea Ballistic Missile Test (July 4, 2017), <https://www.markey.senate.gov/news/press-releases/markey-statement-on-latest-north-korea-ballistic-missile-test>.
- Fershee, J. P. (n.d.). The Rising Tide of Climate Change: What America's Flood Cities Can Teach Us About Energy Policy and Why We Should Be Worried. Retrieved from https://www.academia.edu/1103648/The_Rising_Tide_of_Climate_Change_What_Americas_Flood_Cities_Can_Teach_Us_About_Energy_Policy_and_Why_We_Should_Be_Worried.
- John McCain, Remarks at the Vestas Training Facility in Portland, Oregon, THE AMERICAN PRESIDENCY PROJECT (May 12, 2008), <http://www.presidency.ucsb.edu/ws/?pid=77300>.
- Hornblower, supra note 17 (citing Geophysics Study Committee, National Research Council, STUDIES IN GEOPHYSICS: ENERGY AND CLIMATE (National Academy of

Sciences) (temperature increases “in the next 200 years”)); GEOPHYSICS STUDY COMMITTEE, *supra* note 18, at vii-viii.

Knapp, T. L., & Center, W. L. G. (2019, August 25). Knapp column: 'Nuance' in politics and public policy? No thanks. Retrieved from <https://www.superiortelegram.com/opinion/columns/4624903-Knapp-column-Nuance-in-politics-and-public-policy-No-thanks>. Geneva, Switzerland, 151 pp.

Margot Hornblower, *World Faces A Heating-Up, Study Warns*, WASH. POST, July 25, 1977, at A1. <https://www.gpo.gov/fdsys/pkg/GPO-CRECB-1977-pt20/pdf/GPO-CRECB-1977-pt20-2-3.pdf>.

Melting the Polarization Around Climate Change Politics. (n.d.). Retrieved from <https://www.law.georgetown.edu>.

Melting the Polarization Around Climate Change Politics. (n.d.). Retrieved from https://www.law.georgetown.edu/environmental-law-review/wp-content/uploads/sites/18/2018/07/melting-_GT-GELR180017.pdf[du/environmental-law-review/wp-content/uploads/sites/18/2018/07/melting-_GT-GELR180017.pdf](https://www.law.georgetown.edu/environmental-law-review/wp-content/uploads/sites/18/2018/07/melting-_GT-GELR180017.pdf).

North Korea Says Missile Test Shows All US Within Range, BBC (July 29, 2017), <http://www.bbc.com/news/world-Asia-40760583>.

Vivian E. Thomson & Vicki Arroyo, *Upside-Down Cooperative Federalism: Climate Change Policymaking and the States*, 29 VA. ENVTL. L. J. 1 (2011).