

Every four years, Iowans who commit to caucus strengthen our democracy. For some of them, the process of choosing a future party nominee is hard work - *evaluating* the backgrounds, strengths, weaknesses and promises of various candidates. Others find it easier to back the candidate *who they feel* has the best chance of winning. I believe the latter approach is highly problematic, especially given the large number of candidates running. It's more of a gut check and everyone has their own unique set of feelings that are personal. Just look at the current poll results. The top 4 candidates – Bernie, Joe, Pete and Liz – all have similar levels of support, and keep trading places. So in this cycle, I believe it's imperative that we not only take the harder approach but share our conclusions with each other.

My conclusions:

1. Amy is the ONLY candidate who can defeat Trump;
2. Amy is the most qualified candidate running for President;
3. Amy will be *Everyone's President*

As February 3rd approaches, I know that a growing number of Iowans will engage in the harder approach of doing substantive assessments. I believe this will pay off for Amy. So it was with a sense of great optimism that I left Iowa in December and returned to my home in California, to put together *Why I Support Amy*. My presentation begins with some quantitative data that strengthened convictions I already had about Amy. Those convictions grew out of five qualitative factors that, even before I knew who was running, prepared me to narrow my choices once the candidate field became known. At that point, I quickly and enthusiastically threw my support behind Amy. The rest of this provides some background on these five qualitative factors.

#1 – Business experience is precisely the wrong kind

Almost four years ago, as the election between Hillary Clinton and Donald Trump approached, I spoke to a gymnasium full of people who were about to select northern California's delegates to the Democratic National Convention in Philadelphia. I only had 30 seconds which I used to draw the stark contrast that I saw, as the founder/CEO of a startup venture that had worked for many years with a handful of city governments, elected officials and community leaders:

Ladies and Gentlemen

- this race is between a politician and a businessman;
- a good politician represents everyone's interests; she makes compromises to get things done;
- a good businessman represents his own interests; he ignores, if not tramples others' interests;
- essentially, one's a diplomat while the other's a dictator, not absolutely, but in relative terms;
- as President, Clinton will compromise whereas Trump will trample;
- so, can we all say it together? - "CLINTON WILL COMPROMISE; TRUMP WILL TRAMPLE"

And my time was up. I observed many frowns when I used the word dictator. Perhaps many thought I was one of those anti-business radicals in Berkeley, CA. They didn't know I'm a die-hard capitalist who saw in his own career how much harder it was for my public sector friends to govern their cities than it was for me to grow my markets. Sure I had to please multiple constituents – customers, employees, partners, suppliers, directors and advisors – but I did not have to please *everyone*. Furthermore, I could modify our service and hire/fire at will (and without cause) – simply put, private sector work of any kind

is much less challenging. So when I see business people run for office, I expect them to over-promise. And when I see business people elected, I expect them to under-produce. This is why Trump takes credit for everything good that happens, deflects blame for everything bad that happens.

#2 – Only a woman could defeat Trump (and only if the right one came along)

In 2017, Donald Trump verbally dismantled 16 other Republican primary candidates, 15 of whom were men. It wasn't even close. But then he barely defeated a severely handicapped Hillary Clinton in the Electoral College who still earned 3 million more votes. I say severely, because Hillary had so many forces working against her, not a single one of which can be quantified even today. And again, she still got more votes. I believe there's a lesson in what happened, and it has two dimensions.

First, as a society we've reached a tipping point wherein the reactions to the abusive and unfair treatment of women have started to eclipse the harm they do. There is now much evidence of this in so many areas, including politics. In her book, Amy writes, "In the twenty-first century, the use of sexist or demeaning comments may actually no longer work against women candidates; in fact, they can backfire."

Second, Donald Trump will not be able to restrain himself *if* he has the opportunity to run for re-election. When he does lash out, I believe he will pay a huge price at the ballot box for having done so, assuming the Democratic nominee is a woman.

#3 – His antithesis of some dimensions would have to run against him

Since elections are a choice, the best candidate would most likely be someone who offers

- i) *stark contrasts* to what most view as the incumbent's grave flaws;
- ii) *modest improvements* to what most view as his acceptable shortcomings.

Among the women candidates, I believe Amy is the only one who meets both of these criteria.

Stark Contrasts
(where a challenger *must be* perceived as his antithesis)

Amy	Trump
Female	Male
A law enforcer	A law breaker
Started life with nothing	Started life with everything
Views obstacles as her path	Creates obstacles that divert his path
Advances the well-being of others	Uses others to advance his self-interest
A public servant	A private dictator
Guided to common ground by others	Blinded from common ground by self

Modest Improvements
(where challenger *must not be* perceived as his antithesis)

<i>Amy</i>	<i>Trump</i>
Address climate change (but not without balancing interests)	Ignored climate change
Regulate private insurance industry (but don't dismantle it)	Bow to private insurance industry
Raise taxes on some (but not on all)	Lowered taxes on everybody
Reduce our military presence abroad (but don't eliminate it)	Used our military might indiscriminately

#4 – We need a former prosecutor in the White House

I never thought I'd make being a former prosecutor a top five factor as I have a general disdain for lawyers. Their code of ethics obligates them to defend their clients, irrespective of moral or ethical considerations. That said, Americans have long viewed laws as *rights* (i.e. *I can do something because it's legal*) when, I believe, they should be viewed as *boundaries* (i.e. *the law prevents my doing something that is not legal*). It's really a question of focus. Do we think of ourselves or the law when determining how to behave in any given situation?

The former leads to rationalizing behavior while the latter leads to restraining it. The former is especially problematic if you happen to be President of the United States and have sweeping views of your rights. The mere existence of laws that might otherwise constrain you may not even factor into how you act or what you do.

Amy and Liz are both legal scholars and have been practicing lawyers. As such, they're both highly qualified to oversee the slow, steady restoration of the lawful culture that America had, but that has sadly attenuated for decades, and at an accelerating rate in recent years. But as a former prosecutor, only Amy has the experience and expertise to address the immediate challenges that the aftermath of Trump will no doubt present. So while strengthening and modernizing our Nation's current laws will be one kind of challenge, making sure that our current laws are fully enforced will be another kind altogether.

#5 – Amy's proven electability and effectiveness are so impressive

What I admire most about Amy is that she not only embodies the single most important quality in a politician – the ability to compromise to get things done – but she also has an eye for what issues in the first instance have the potential to attract bipartisan support. In her book, Amy refers to this as *standing one's ground while seeking common ground*. In the startup world that I come from, we often say *make sure the perfect does not become the enemy of the good*. Whether it's politics or business, the end goal is the same – to get things done! Since governing a country is much harder than running a business, I believe that finding this all-important attribute in a politician *is even more important* than finding it in a business person.