

Pillars of a Presidency: An Analysis of the Trump Administration's Policies on Trade, Immigration, and the Press

Introduction

The Trump presidency represents a deliberate and sustained disruption of the post-war American political and economic consensus. The administration's signature policies on international trade, domestic immigration enforcement, and relations with the press are not disparate or reactive initiatives but rather interconnected components of a coherent worldview. This worldview is animated by a transactional, nationalist ideology that prioritizes an expansive interpretation of executive authority and seeks direct, unmediated communication with a political base. It concurrently views established institutions—whether international trade bodies, the federal judiciary, or independent news media—as obstacles to be bypassed, delegitimized, or brought to heel.

This report provides a comprehensive, multi-disciplinary analysis of these three foundational pillars of the Trump administration. Section I, "The Tariff Wars," deconstructs the legal framework, global implementation, and multifaceted economic consequences of using tariffs as a primary instrument of statecraft. It examines how the administration has leveraged and expanded executive power to wage a multi-front trade war, challenging the rules-based global economic order. Section II, "The Deportation Machine," analyzes the administration's maximalist approach to immigration enforcement. It maps the policy architecture designed to facilitate mass removals, details the operational scaling-up of the enforcement apparatus, and critically assesses the logistical, economic, and humanitarian implications of this agenda. Section III, "The War on the Press," documents the systematic rhetorical and political campaign against news media institutions. It details the specific actions taken to control information, punish critics, and erode public trust, analyzing the resulting impact on press freedom and democratic accountability.

By dissecting each of these pillars before synthesizing their common logic, this report illuminates a unified governing philosophy. It is a philosophy that redefines traditional policy objectives, recasts the role of the executive, and fundamentally alters the relationship between the state and the institutions designed to check its power. The analysis that follows seeks to provide a definitive understanding of this paradigm and its lasting impact on American governance and its role in the world.

Section I: The Tariff Wars — Economic Nationalism and Executive Power

The Trump administration's deployment of tariffs as a primary tool of economic and foreign policy marks a radical departure from decades of U.S. trade liberalization. This strategy is not merely a shift in economic preference but a fundamental reassertion of executive power over an area constitutionally delegated to Congress. By invoking and reinterpreting emergency and national security statutes, the administration has constructed a legal arsenal to impose sweeping import taxes, triggering global trade disputes and creating profound economic and legal uncertainty.

I.A: The Legal Arsenal and Its Discontents

The administration's tariff strategy has been underpinned by an aggressive and legally contentious use of various statutory authorities, stretching them far beyond historical precedent and creating a profound constitutional conflict over the power to regulate commerce.

Invocation of Emergency and National Security Powers

The administration has relied on three primary legal instruments to unilaterally impose tariffs, bypassing the traditional legislative process.

First, **Section 232 of the Trade Expansion Act of 1962** has been used to justify

tariffs on national security grounds. This authority was the basis for levies on steel, aluminum, and automobiles.¹ In a significant escalation in 2025, the administration expanded the use of Section 232, eliminating prior exemptions for close allies—including Australia, Canada, Mexico, and the European Union—and raising tariff rates dramatically. For instance, tariffs on most steel and aluminum imports were increased from 25% to a punishing 50%.¹ The scope was further broadened to include derivative products and household appliances, with tariffs applied in proportion to their steel or aluminum content.¹ The administration also initiated a new Section 232 investigation into copper imports, signaling a continued reliance on this national security rationale.⁴

Second, **Section 301 of the Trade Act of 1974**, which targets unfair trade practices, served as the legal foundation for the initial trade war with China during the first Trump term. These tariffs, which were largely continued by the subsequent Biden administration, targeted hundreds of billions of dollars in Chinese goods.⁵

Third, and most controversially, the administration has invoked the **International Emergency Economic Powers Act (IEEPA) of 1977**. Historically used to impose economic sanctions and freeze assets in response to foreign policy crises, IEEPA was repurposed to justify broad-based tariffs on an unprecedented scale.⁵ The administration declared the U.S. trade deficit itself to be a national economic emergency, providing the pretext to impose so-called "reciprocal tariffs" on nearly all U.S. trading partners.⁵ IEEPA was also the authority cited for specific "fentanyl tariffs" on imports from China, Canada, and Mexico, linking trade policy to drug trafficking concerns.⁷

The consistent choice to utilize the broadest and most ambiguous legal authority available, particularly IEEPA, reveals a core governing philosophy. Unlike more specific trade statutes that require lengthy agency investigations and adherence to established criteria, IEEPA allows the president to act unilaterally and immediately upon the declaration of a "national emergency".⁵ This circumvention of institutional process is not merely a legal tactic; it is a manifestation of a worldview that sees established checks and balances as impediments to the swift exercise of executive will. The legal chaos and economic uncertainty that follow are not unintended side effects but the direct consequence of a strategy that prioritizes executive discretion above all else, effectively creating a state of permanent emergency to justify extraordinary actions.

The Legal Challenge and Judicial Skepticism

The administration's novel interpretation of IEEPA has triggered a wave of legal challenges from U.S. businesses, industry groups, and a dozen states, who argue that the president has exceeded his statutory and constitutional authority.⁵

The core legal argument advanced by plaintiffs is that the U.S. Constitution explicitly grants Congress the power "To lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises".⁵ They contend that IEEPA, which authorizes the president to "regulate" or "prohibit" imports, does not contain the word "tariff" and cannot be read as a wholesale delegation of Congress's taxing power.⁹ Plaintiffs further argue that other statutes, such as Section 122 of the Trade Act of 1974, provide specific but highly constrained authority for the president to impose temporary, limited tariffs to address balance-of-payments problems, implying that Congress never intended for IEEPA to grant a far more expansive and unlimited power.⁹

This reasoning has found a receptive audience in the federal judiciary. In May 2025, the U.S. Court of International Trade (CIT) ruled that the IEEPA tariffs were *ultra vires*—beyond the president's legal authority—and invalidated them.⁹ The court cited fundamental separation-of-powers concerns, including the nondelegation doctrine, which requires Congress to provide an "intelligible principle" to guide executive action, and the major questions doctrine, which holds that Congress must "speak clearly" when delegating authority of vast economic and political significance.⁹ The CIT concluded that interpreting IEEPA to grant "unlimited tariff authority" would violate these constitutional principles.⁹

Despite these lower court rulings, the tariffs have often been allowed to remain in effect while the government appeals the decisions, perpetuating a state of profound legal and economic instability.⁷ During a hearing before the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Federal Circuit, an 11-judge panel expressed broad and pointed skepticism regarding the administration's arguments. Judges repeatedly noted that IEEPA makes no mention of tariffs and that, by the administration's own admission, "no president has ever read IEEPA this way".⁵ The cases are widely expected to ultimately be decided by the U.S. Supreme Court.¹⁰

I.B: Global Implementation and Retaliation

The rollout of the administration's tariff regime has been broad, dynamic, and frequently chaotic, affecting nearly every U.S. trading partner and sparking retaliatory measures that have escalated into a multi-front global trade war.

A Multi-Front Trade War

The administration's tariff strategy has not been confined to a single adversary but has been applied globally, with a complex and often overlapping set of levies.

- **China:** The trade conflict with China, which began during the first Trump term, escalated dramatically. By early 2025, the U.S. had imposed a 10% IEEPA tariff on all Chinese imports, which was subsequently increased to 20%.⁷ Additional levies brought the total tariff rate on some goods to a staggering 145%, prompting significant retaliation from Beijing.⁶ The administration also revoked the *de minimis* exemption for small-value shipments from China, a move that particularly affects e-commerce.¹⁴ Subsequent negotiations in Stockholm sought to de-escalate from these peak rates to a "status quo" of a 30% U.S. tariff and a 10% Chinese retaliatory tariff, though a final agreement remains elusive.¹⁵
- **Canada and Mexico:** Despite the existence of the United States-Mexico-Canada Agreement (USMCA), both North American partners were targeted. In early 2025, the administration imposed 25% "fentanyl" tariffs under IEEPA on both countries.⁷ Canada later saw this rate increased to 35%, a move its government called "unjustified".¹⁷ While many goods compliant with USMCA rules were exempted, key sectors such as energy, non-USMCA potash, steel, and aluminum faced significant duties.³ Mexico narrowly avoided a threatened 30% tariff increase by entering a 90-day negotiating period, but existing 25% tariffs on many products and 50% tariffs on metals remained in effect during this period.¹⁶
- **European Union and United Kingdom:** After threatening a 30% tariff on all EU goods, the administration reached a preliminary deal establishing a 15% rate for most products.²⁰ However, this agreement did not spare European producers from the separate 50% tariff on steel and aluminum.²¹ The United Kingdom, post-Brexit, negotiated a 10% tariff rate on its exports to the U.S., a substantial increase from the low single-digit rates it paid previously but lower than what other allies faced.¹
- **"Reciprocal Tariffs" on the World:** In a sweeping executive order in late July

2025, the administration codified a new global tariff regime set to take effect on August 7.¹⁶ This order established a tiered system of "reciprocal tariffs" for dozens of countries, with rates determined by factors such as trade imbalances and regional economic profiles.¹⁶ The rates ranged from a baseline of 10% for partners like the UK and Brazil; to 15% for Japan, South Korea, and most of Africa; 19-20% for nations like Pakistan and Vietnam; 25% for India; and as high as 39% for Switzerland and 41% for Syria.¹⁶ Any country not explicitly listed on the order faces a default 10% duty, ensuring the system's universal application.²³

This erratic implementation, marked by sudden announcements on social media, shifting deadlines like the April 2 "Liberation Day" tariffs, and a flurry of last-minute deals, can be understood as a deliberate strategic approach.⁵ The induced chaos keeps trading partners off-balance, creates immense pressure to negotiate, and allows the president to personally broker "deals" that can be presented as political victories.¹⁶ The constantly shifting rationales—from trade deficits to fentanyl to national security—further enhance this flexibility, allowing the administration to justify any action against any country at any time. This transforms trade policy from a predictable, rules-based system into a highly personalized and volatile exercise of executive power.

Stated Rationales and Global Retaliation

The administration has offered a variety of justifications for its tariff policies, often tailored to the specific target. The primary rationales cited include the need to correct chronic trade imbalances, protect U.S. national security, and combat the cross-border flow of illicit drugs like fentanyl.¹⁵ The fentanyl justification was applied to Canada, Mexico, and China, though the Canadian government vehemently rejected the premise, noting it accounts for only 1% of U.S. fentanyl imports and has significantly increased border security.¹⁷

In response, major trading partners have implemented targeted retaliatory tariffs on U.S. goods, creating a vicious cycle of escalation. Canada imposed duties on a wide range of American consumer products, including ketchup, washing machines, and peanut butter.¹⁷ China's retaliation has focused on key U.S. exports such as agricultural products (especially soybeans) and energy.⁶ The European Union had prepared billions of dollars in counter-tariffs before reaching its 15% agreement, demonstrating the high stakes of the negotiations.²¹ These retaliatory measures are a

critical component of the economic fallout, often harming U.S. export-oriented industries and complicating the administration's economic calculus.

Table 1: Summary of Major Trump Administrati on Tariffs (as of August 2025)					
Legal Authority	Target Country/Re gion	Key Goods Affected	Tariff Rate(s) & Timeline	Stated Rationale	Retaliatory Action
IIEPA / Section 301	China	All goods	Baseline 20% (IIEPA), escalating up to 145% on some goods. Effective Feb/Mar 2025.	Fentanyl trafficking, unfair trade practices, trade imbalance.	Tariffs on U.S. agricultural products (soybeans), energy (oil), and industrial goods. ⁶
IIEPA Fentanyl	Canada	All non-USMCA goods	25%, increased to 35% effective Aug 1, 2025.	Fentanyl trafficking.	Tariffs on U.S. consumer goods (ketchup, appliances) and industrial products. ¹⁷
IIEPA Fentanyl	Mexico	All non-USMCA goods	25% (threatened increase to 30% paused for 90 days).	Fentanyl trafficking, border security.	Ongoing negotiations.

IIEPA Reciprocal	European Union	Most goods	15% effective Aug 2025 (deal avoided threatened 30%).	Trade imbalance, lack of reciprocity.	Deal averted major retaliation, but counter-tariffs were prepared. ²⁰
IIEPA Reciprocal	United Kingdom	Most goods	10% effective Aug 2025.	Trade imbalance.	No major retaliation announced.
IIEPA Reciprocal	India	Most goods	25% effective Aug 2025.	Trade imbalance, continued trade with Russia.	Assessing impact; trade negotiations ongoing. ²³
Section 232	Global (most countries)	Steel & Aluminum	25% increased to 50% effective June 4, 2025. UK exempt from increase.	National security.	Retaliatory tariffs from multiple partners, including Canada and the EU. ¹⁷
IIEPA Reciprocal	All other countries	All goods	Default 10% tariff for countries not otherwise listed.	Lack of reciprocity.	Varies by country.

I.C: The Economic Battlefield — Models and Consequences

There is a stark divergence between the administration's portrayal of its tariff policy as an economic success and the more sobering assessments produced by a consensus of independent economic analyses. While proponents claim the tariffs are boosting revenue and industry without negative side effects, most models project significant costs to the U.S. economy, businesses, and households.

The Administration's Narrative vs. Independent Models

Proponents of the tariff strategy, such as those cited in *Briefings for Britain*, argue that the policies are already working. They contend that the tariffs are raising substantial revenue, helping to reduce the federal budget deficit, and promoting U.S. re-industrialization, all without triggering a recession or significant inflation.²⁴ This narrative points to a federal budget surplus in June 2025 and a 16% annualized rise in business equipment production in the first half of the year as early evidence of success.²⁴

In sharp contrast, a wide range of independent economic institutions project significant, long-term negative consequences.

- **Gross Domestic Product (GDP) and Employment:** The Penn Wharton Budget Model (PWBM) offers one of the most severe forecasts, projecting that the tariffs will reduce long-run GDP by approximately 6% and wages by 5%.²⁵ The Tax Foundation estimates a more modest, but still negative, 0.8% long-run reduction in GDP and the loss of 788,000 full-time equivalent jobs.⁷ The Yale University Budget Lab projects the U.S. economy will be persistently 0.6% smaller, equivalent to an annual loss of \$180 billion.²⁶ The nonpartisan Congressional Budget Office (CBO) projects a smaller but steady drag on the economy, reducing the annual GDP growth rate by 0.06 percentage points.²⁷
- **Inflation and Household Costs:** A consistent finding across analyses is that tariffs function as a tax on U.S. importers, who then pass the costs on to American consumers.⁵ The Yale Budget Lab estimates that the full suite of 2025 tariffs will cause a short-run price level increase of 2.3%, translating to a loss of purchasing power of \$3,800 for the average household.²⁶ The Tax Foundation calculates an average tax increase per household of \$1,219 in 2025 and \$1,453 in 2026.⁷ The CBO projects the tariffs will add 0.4 percentage points to the annual inflation rate in both 2025 and 2026.²⁷ These costs disproportionately affect lower-income households, for whom essential goods make up a larger share of spending.²²
- **Federal Revenue and Deficit:** While tariffs generate revenue, the net fiscal effect is complex. The CBO projects a \$2.8 trillion reduction in the federal deficit over ten years.²⁷ However, this comes with the significant trade-off of a shrinking economy and reduced household wealth.²⁷ Other models note that this "static" revenue gain is eroded by "dynamic" effects; slower economic growth and

retaliatory tariffs reduce the total revenue collected over time.²⁶

This reveals a fundamental disconnect in how the policy's effects are framed. The administration's narrative focuses on the top-line revenue figure, often claiming that foreign countries are paying "hundreds of billions" of dollars to the U.S. Treasury.²⁴ However, economic analyses and reports from U.S. businesses consistently demonstrate that the tariffs are paid by American importers at the border.⁵ These companies must then either absorb the cost—reducing profits, wages, and investment—or pass it on to consumers in the form of higher prices.³¹ The government's balance sheet may improve, as the CBO's deficit projection suggests, but this is achieved primarily by a wealth transfer from the private sector (households and businesses) to the government. The administration's rhetoric deliberately obscures this domestic transfer by framing the policy as an external punitive measure, a rhetorical strategy essential for maintaining political support for a policy that most independent models show is a net negative for the average American's purchasing power.

Table 2: Comparative Analysis of Economic Impact Projections of 2025 Tariffs				
Economic Model	Long-Run GDP Impact	Household Income / Wage Impact	Short-Term Inflation / Cost Impact	10-Year Federal Revenue Impact (Dynamic)
Congressional Budget Office (CBO)²⁷	-0.06 percentage points per year	Overall reduction in household wealth	+0.4 percentage points to inflation (2025-26)	+\$2.8 trillion (deficit reduction)
Penn Wharton Budget Model (PWBM)²⁵	-6%	-5% (wages); \$22k lifetime loss for middle-income household	Higher prices for imported goods	+\$4.5 trillion

Yale Budget Lab ²⁶	-0.6% (persistently smaller economy)	-\$3,800 per household (loss of purchasing power)	+2.3% to price level	+\$2.5 trillion (net of dynamic effects)
Tax Foundation ⁷	-0.8%	-\$1,453 per household (avg. tax increase in 2026)	Higher prices for consumers	+\$1.4 trillion
Pro-Administration View (Briefings for Britain) ²⁴	Positive impact on growth (target 2.5-3.0%)	Not specified	"One-off lift to some prices," no long-term impact	Substantial revenue helping reduce budget deficit

Sector-Specific Impacts

The economic pain and gain from the tariffs are not distributed evenly.

- **Consumers** face broad-based price hikes on everyday goods. Staples like coffee from Brazil (50% tariff) and Vietnam (20% tariff) are more expensive.¹⁷ Consumer durables like cars, electronics, and appliances are affected by both direct tariffs and higher input costs for domestic producers.¹⁷ Apparel prices are projected to rise by a sharp 17%.²⁶
- **Manufacturing and Construction** industries, which the tariffs are ostensibly meant to help, face a double-edged sword. While domestic steel and aluminum producers benefit from the protection of 50% tariffs, allowing them to raise their own prices, downstream U.S. manufacturers that use these metals as inputs—such as automakers, appliance manufacturers, and aerospace firms—are squeezed by higher costs.¹⁷ A study by the Federal Reserve Board of Governors linked the 2018 metal tariffs to a net loss of 75,000 U.S. manufacturing jobs due to these higher input costs.³⁴ Similarly, tariffs on steel, aluminum, copper, and Canadian lumber directly increase the cost of home construction.¹⁷
- **Agriculture** has been a primary target for foreign retaliation, particularly from China, which has historically been a massive market for U.S. soybeans and other farm products.⁶ This has severely impacted American farmers and reshaped global agricultural trade flows.³⁵

I.D: Strategic Assessment

Evaluating the efficacy of the administration's tariff strategy requires assessing its performance against its own stated goals and considering its broader geopolitical consequences. The policy appears to fall short on its primary economic objectives while generating significant diplomatic friction and undermining the international trade system.

Evaluating Stated Goals

The administration's core justifications for the tariffs do not hold up well under economic scrutiny. The goal of **correcting bilateral trade deficits** is viewed by most economists as fundamentally misguided. A country's overall trade balance is determined by macroeconomic factors like national savings and investment rates, not by tariffs on specific goods from specific countries.²⁰ Tariffs are more likely to divert trade—for example, causing U.S. importers to shift from Chinese suppliers to those in Vietnam or Mexico—than to eliminate the overall U.S. trade deficit.²⁰

Similarly, the objective of **boosting domestic industry** is severely complicated by the structure of modern supply chains. The policy's failure to distinguish between finished goods and intermediate inputs means that tariffs designed to protect one domestic industry (e.g., steel) actively harm other domestic industries that rely on those inputs (e.g., automotive, construction).¹⁷ This internal contradiction undermines the goal of a broad-based industrial revival.

Geopolitical Fallout and the Redefinition of "Winning"

The broader consequences of the tariff strategy extend far beyond domestic economics. The unilateral imposition of tariffs, particularly the use of a national security rationale against close allies like Canada, the EU, and Japan, has deeply strained diplomatic relationships and eroded trust in the United States as a

predictable and reliable partner.¹⁷ This approach represents a deliberate pivot away from the U.S.-led, rules-based multilateral trading system, embodied by the World Trade Organization (WTO), toward a system governed by unilateral power and bilateral deals.

This shift reveals a fundamental redefinition of what it means to "win" in international trade. In the traditional, post-war framework, success was measured by mutual economic benefit—increased trade volumes, lower consumer prices, and higher overall growth driven by comparative advantage. The Trump administration operates on a different logic, one rooted in a zero-sum view of global economics. In this framework, "winning" is not about shared prosperity but about demonstrating dominance, extracting concessions, and altering the terms of bilateral relationships in America's favor.⁵

From this perspective, forcing allies like the United Kingdom, the European Union, and Japan to accept higher tariff rates than they paid before is framed as a victory, even if it makes goods more expensive for American consumers.²² The act of imposing the tariff and compelling a negotiation is, in itself, the political win. This transforms trade policy from a tool of economic optimization into a weapon in a geopolitical contest. The economic costs borne by U.S. households and the systemic damage to the multilateral order are treated as acceptable collateral damage in the pursuit of this new, more confrontational definition of a "win."

Section II: The Deportation Machine — Reshaping Immigration Enforcement

Concurrent with its disruption of international trade, the Trump administration has embarked on an equally ambitious and disruptive agenda to reshape U.S. immigration enforcement. This agenda is characterized by a maximalist approach aimed at achieving the "single largest Mass Deportation Program in History".³⁶ To this end, the administration has constructed a formidable policy and legal architecture designed to strip protections from noncitizens, accelerate removals, and mobilize an unprecedented level of resources—financial, human, and technological—to power a vastly expanded deportation apparatus.

II.A: The Architecture of Mass Removal

The administration's strategy for achieving mass deportation hinges on a set of interlocking policies designed to bypass the traditional, and heavily backlogged, immigration court system. These policies systematically dismantle existing protections and create new, faster pathways for removal.

Dismantling Protective Statuses and Parole

A primary objective has been to terminate programs that have provided legal status and protection from deportation to hundreds of thousands of long-term residents. The administration has moved to end **Temporary Protected Status (TPS)** for individuals from countries afflicted by war or natural disaster, including Haiti, Venezuela, Honduras, and Afghanistan, placing over a million people at risk of deportation.³⁷ It has also ended the broad use of

humanitarian parole, a discretionary tool used to admit individuals for urgent reasons. This includes the termination of the CHNV (Cuban, Haitian, Nicaraguan, and Venezuelan) parole program and the revocation of existing parole-based employment authorizations, effectively stripping legal status from those already in the country.³⁷

Expanding and Expediting Removal Processes

To accelerate the physical removal of noncitizens, the administration has aggressively expanded tools that circumvent the immigration courts. A key mechanism is **"expedited removal,"** a provision of immigration law that allows enforcement officers to deport certain individuals without a hearing before a judge.³⁹ The administration has broadened this authority to its maximum statutory limit, making it applicable to any noncitizen apprehended anywhere in the United States who cannot affirmatively prove they have been continuously present for at least two years.⁴⁰ While this expansion has been challenged in court, with one federal judge temporarily blocking its application to individuals who had entered legally through the parole process, it

remains a central pillar of the rapid-deportation strategy.³⁹

Simultaneously, the administration has reinstated the **Migrant Protection Protocols (MPP)**, commonly known as the "**Remain in Mexico**" policy.⁴¹ This program requires asylum seekers arriving at the southern border to be returned to Mexico to await their U.S. court hearings. Human rights organizations have extensively documented the dangers this policy creates, exposing vulnerable migrants to kidnapping, extortion, and violence in Mexican border cities.⁴¹ Furthermore, it creates nearly insurmountable barriers to securing legal representation, resulting in an asylum grant rate of just 0.1% during the program's first iteration.⁴¹

These policies, taken together, reveal a strategic effort to re-engineer the immigration system away from one of adjudication toward one of rapid processing for removal. The U.S. immigration court system is crippled by a backlog of 3.7 million cases, which serves as the primary practical bottleneck to large-scale deportations.⁴⁶ The administration's policies are all designed to bypass this judicial chokepoint. Expedited removal eliminates the court hearing entirely, while MPP pushes the asylum seeker outside U.S. territory, making meaningful participation in their court case nearly impossible. This transforms the process from one of determining if an individual has a legal right to remain in the country to one of simply processing them out. The legal architecture is thus being used as a tool to achieve a pre-determined outcome of mass removal, rather than as a system for case-by-case adjudication of legal claims.

Other Policy and Legal Shifts

This architectural overhaul is complemented by other policy changes. The administration has effectively closed the southern border to asylum seekers by declaring a national border emergency, deploying troops, and shutting down the CBP One mobile application that had been used for scheduling asylum appointments.³⁷ It has rescinded the longstanding "sensitive locations" policy that discouraged ICE from conducting enforcement actions at schools, hospitals, and places of worship.³⁷ Furthermore, officials have signaled their intent to use the archaic

Alien Enemies Act of 1798, a law previously invoked to justify the internment of Japanese, German, and Italian individuals during World War II, to deport noncitizens from designated hostile nations without due process.³⁷

II.B: Operational Escalation: Funding, Manpower, and Surveillance

To execute this ambitious agenda, the administration has initiated a massive mobilization of resources, aiming to build an enforcement apparatus of unprecedented scale and scope.

Unprecedented Funding and Recruitment

A recent legislative package signed by the president allocates a staggering \$170 billion for border security and immigration enforcement over the next five years.⁴⁸ U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement (ICE) is the primary beneficiary, with its budget set to increase to \$76.5 billion—nearly ten times its previous annual funding.⁴⁸ This infusion includes \$45 billion to expand detention capacity and nearly \$30 billion to hire 10,000 new staff, with the goal of increasing ICE's total workforce from 20,000 to 30,000 employees.⁴⁸

To meet this hiring target, ICE has launched a major national recruiting campaign. Using patriotic slogans like "DEFEND THE HOMELAND" and imagery reminiscent of World War II posters, the campaign seeks to attract thousands of new deportation officers, criminal investigators, and government lawyers.⁴⁸ The effort is backed by significant financial incentives, including signing bonuses of up to \$50,000, extensive overtime opportunities, and student loan forgiveness programs.⁴⁸

Expanding the Enforcement Footprint

The administration's strategy extends beyond bolstering federal ranks. It is aggressively expanding the **287(g) program**, which deputizes state and local law enforcement officers to perform federal immigration functions.⁵¹ By pressuring local jurisdictions to enter into these agreements, the administration is creating a powerful force multiplier for its federal agents. The number of 287(g) agreements has surged,

increasing nearly six-fold since the beginning of the Biden administration.⁵¹

This physical expansion of enforcement is augmented by a vast expansion of surveillance. The administration is leveraging federal, state, and commercial databases on an unprecedented scale to identify and locate removable noncitizens.⁵³ This involves breaking down long-standing privacy firewalls to access sensitive data from agencies like the Internal Revenue Service and the Social Security Administration, as well as state-level databases for public benefits programs.⁵¹ This creation of an interoperable "web of data" for immigration enforcement raises profound privacy concerns not just for immigrants but for all U.S. residents whose information is being repurposed for this mission.⁵³

The scale of this mobilization—combining a massively funded federal agency, the co-opting of local police, the repurposing of other federal law enforcement resources, and a pervasive surveillance apparatus—amounts to the creation of a domestic security state focused primarily on a civil matter: immigration status. This reorientation of the federal government's law enforcement and intelligence capabilities inward, targeting millions of residents for removal, represents a significant shift in the function and focus of the American state.

II.C: The Feasibility and Costs: A Reality Check

Despite the administration's ambitious goals and massive resource allocation, experts across legal, economic, and logistical fields express profound skepticism about the feasibility of carrying out deportations on the scale envisioned. The practical barriers are immense, and the projected costs—financial, economic, and humanitarian—are staggering.

Logistical and Operational Bottlenecks

Executing a plan to deport millions of people faces several critical bottlenecks.

- **Manpower and Apprehension:** Federal enforcement agencies currently lack the personnel to conduct raids and arrests on the required scale.⁴⁶ Experts estimate that arresting over 13 million people would necessitate hiring between 220,000

and 409,000 new government employees and law enforcement officers, a target considered impossible to meet given current hiring challenges across the public sector.⁵⁴

- **Detention and Judicial Capacity:** The existing infrastructure is wholly inadequate. ICE currently operates a detention system with a capacity of around 57,000 beds.⁵⁵ A mass deportation operation would require building and maintaining 24 times more detention capacity, likely through the creation of vast "soft-sided" detention camps, and establishing over 1,000 new immigration courtrooms to process cases.⁵⁴ This is set against the backdrop of an already-existing court backlog of 3.7 million cases.⁴⁶
- **International Cooperation:** Deportation requires the cooperation of the receiving country to issue travel documents. Many countries are reluctant or slow to accept the return of their nationals, creating another significant logistical hurdle.

Staggering Financial and Economic Costs

The financial cost of building and operating this deportation machine would be astronomical. The American Immigration Council estimates that a one-time operation to remove the entire undocumented population would cost the federal government at least \$315 billion.⁵⁴ A more sustained operation aiming to deport one million people per year would carry an average annual price tag of \$88 billion, totaling nearly \$1 trillion over a decade.⁵⁴

Beyond the direct budgetary costs, the economic consequences of removing millions of workers and consumers from the U.S. economy would be devastating.

- **GDP and Labor Market Impact:** Mass deportation is projected to cause the U.S. GDP to shrink by 4.2% to 6.8%, an economic shock comparable in scale to the Great Recession of 2007-2009.⁵⁶ Key industries that rely on immigrant labor, such as agriculture, construction, and hospitality, would face catastrophic labor shortages, with an estimated one in eight workers being removed from the construction and agriculture sectors.⁵⁶
- **Negative Effects on U.S.-Born Workers:** Contrary to the political claim that deportations would open up jobs for American workers, rigorous economic research indicates the opposite is true. A landmark study found that past deportations led to business divestment and reduced local demand, ultimately

reducing employment and wages for U.S.-born workers. The study's model implies that for every one million immigrant workers deported, 88,000 U.S. native workers are driven out of employment.⁴⁶

The "Shock Doctrine" of Enforcement

Given that the complete removal of 11 to 20 million people is widely seen as logistically and financially impossible in the short-to-medium term, the policy's objective may be something other than its stated goal. The true purpose may not be the complete removal of every undocumented person, but rather the creation of a powerful "chilling effect" through the performance of enforcement.⁵³ The highly visible raids, the expansion of surveillance, and the constant threat of removal are designed to instill a pervasive climate of fear. This climate aims to encourage "self-deportation" and push immigrant communities further into the shadows, disrupting their lives and social fabrics.⁵² In this sense, the mass deportation agenda functions as a form of "shock doctrine." Even if it falls far short of its numerical targets, the attempt itself radically alters the social and legal landscape for millions, achieving the political goal of demonstrating a hardline stance and disrupting immigrant communities, regardless of the final deportation tally.

II.D: Statistical Reality vs. Political Rhetoric

A review of available data reveals a significant gap between the administration's ambitious deportation rhetoric and the statistical reality of its enforcement actions. While the pace of removals has increased, it remains far from the proclaimed targets and is constrained by the same logistical and legal realities that have limited past administrations.

Deportation Numbers in Context

During the first six months of the second Trump term, ICE recorded nearly 150,000 deportations, an average of over 800 per day.⁵⁵ This pace, if sustained, would result in over 300,000 removals in the first year. While this would be the highest annual total since the Obama administration in fiscal year 2014, it falls dramatically short of the administration's stated goal of one million annual deportations.⁵⁵ Some analyses, such as those from Syracuse University's TRAC, suggest the pace is even slower, with daily removals in early 2025 tracking 10.9% below the daily average under the Biden administration in FY 2024.⁶⁰

Historical context is crucial. The Obama administration, often labeled the "deporter-in-chief" by critics, deported 1.18 million people in its first three years, with a peak of 409,849 in 2012 alone.⁶¹ The Biden administration, through a combination of traditional removals, border returns, and pandemic-era Title 42 expulsions, oversaw nearly 4.4 million repatriations, outpacing the 1.5 million deportations carried out during the entire first Trump term.⁶² The key difference lies in the

method and location of enforcement. The Trump administration's focus is on interior arrests and formal removals, a more resource-intensive process than the border-focused returns and expulsions that characterized much of the Biden-era numbers.⁶²

Table 3: U.S. Deportations and Removals by Presidential Administration (FY2012-FY2025)			
Fiscal Year	Presidential Administration	Total Removals>Returns (ICE & CBP)	Notes
2012	Obama	409,849	Peak year for Obama administration removals. ⁶¹
2013	Obama	368,644	N/A
2014	Obama	315,943	N/A. ⁵⁵

2015	Obama	235,413	N/A
2016	Obama	240,255	N/A
2017	Trump	226,119	First year of Trump administration.
2018	Trump	256,085	N/A
2019	Trump	267,258	N/A
2020	Trump	185,884	Onset of COVID-19 pandemic.
2021	Biden	59,011	Start of Biden administration; heavy use of Title 42 expulsions (not included in this removal total).
2022	Biden	72,177	Continued high use of Title 42 expulsions.
2023	Biden	142,580	Title 42 ended in May 2023; removals ramped up.
2024	Biden	685,000 (est.)	Post-Title 42 increase in formal removals and returns. ⁵²
2025 (first 6 mo.)	Trump	~150,000 (ICE only)	On pace for >300,000 in first year; far short of 1 million target. ⁵⁵

Note: Data for FY2012-2023 is based on historical ICE/DHS reports. FY2024 and FY2025 data are based on estimates and partial-year figures from news reports and policy analyses. Totals represent formal removals and enforcement returns and may not include all administrative returns or Title 42 expulsions, which were technically not deportations.

The "Performance" of Enforcement

The gap between the administration's rhetoric and the statistical reality suggests that the policy's success is measured by more than just raw numbers. While ICE arrests have increased significantly, sometimes reaching daily averages of over 1,100, the removal numbers have not kept pace, highlighting the logistical and legal bottlenecks that prevent arrests from translating directly into deportations.⁶⁰ However, the visibility of enforcement has been dramatically amplified through high-profile raids, aggressive rhetoric, and the patriotic recruitment campaign.³⁶ This indicates that the goal is not only to deport but to perform enforcement. Projecting a constant image of aggressive action serves a political purpose, reinforcing a tough-on-immigration stance for a key audience, regardless of whether the ambitious numerical targets are ever met.

Section III: The War on the Press — Redefining Presidential-Media Relations

The third pillar of the Trump administration's disruptive agenda is a systematic and unprecedented campaign against the news media. This campaign moves far beyond the traditional adversarial relationship between the White House and the press, seeking to fundamentally redefine the media's role in the American political system. Through a combination of sustained rhetorical assault, the weaponization of governmental power, and a strategy to control the flow of information, the administration has aimed to delegitimize independent journalism, punish critical voices, and replace the media's watchdog function with a parallel ecosystem of politically aligned outlets.

III.A: The Rhetorical Assault and Its Consequences

The foundation of the administration's media strategy is a relentless rhetorical assault designed to erode public trust in news organizations and intimidate individual journalists.

A Campaign of Denigration

The president has habitually attacked news organizations and individual journalists with inflammatory and often dehumanizing language. The most prominent and recurring theme is the branding of the press as the "**enemy of the people**".⁶³ This phrase, with its historical association with authoritarian regimes like the Soviet Union, has been deployed dozens of times to cast journalists not as critics or watchdogs, but as malevolent actors working against the national interest.⁶³ This is coupled with the constant charge of

"**fake news**," used to dismiss any reporting that is critical of the administration, regardless of its factual basis.⁶³ These broadsides are often accompanied by personal insults, with journalists and news outlets being labeled "corrupt," "dishonest," "human scum," and "bad people".⁶³

Erosion of Public Trust

This sustained rhetorical campaign has coincided with, and demonstrably fueled, a dramatic and deeply partisan decline in public trust in the media. Polling data from Gallup shows that trust in the mass media to report the news fully, accurately, and fairly is at a five-decade low.⁶⁷ In 2024, only 31% of Americans expressed a "great deal" or "fair amount" of trust, while a record 36% said they had "none at all"—a figure that stood at just 6% in 1972.⁶⁷

This collapse in trust is overwhelmingly a partisan phenomenon. The percentage of Republicans expressing "no trust at all" in the media surged from 18% in 2001 to 59% in 2024, with the sharpest increases occurring during the Trump era.⁶⁷ In contrast, distrust among Democrats remains low, at 6%.⁶⁷ This has created a starkly divided information landscape, where a large portion of the population is primed to disbelieve factual reporting from mainstream sources. A YouGov survey found that more

Americans (44%) trusted the Trump administration to state facts accurately than trusted the media (29%).⁶⁸

This dynamic creates a symbiotic relationship that is destructive to a shared public reality. The president's attacks on the media resonate with a base already skeptical of mainstream institutions, further driving down their trust. The media, in turn, covers these attacks and the administration's controversial policies, which is then cited by the president and his supporters as further proof of bias, creating a self-reinforcing feedback loop. The result is a political environment where the president succeeds in delegitimizing a key check on his power, while the media struggles to fulfill its democratic role for a significant portion of the electorate.

Table 4: Public Trust in Mass Media by Political Affiliation (2016-2025)

This table represents a line graph showing the percentage of U.S. adults who have "a great deal" or "fair amount" of trust in the mass media to report the news fully, accurately, and fairly, broken down by political party affiliation. Data is synthesized from polling by Gallup and Pew Research Center.

X-Axis: Year (from 2016 to 2025)

Y-Axis: Percentage Expressing Trust

Line 1 (Democrats): Starts high (around 70%) in 2016, remains relatively stable or slightly increases throughout the period, ending around 75-80% in 2025. This reflects a consolidation of trust in mainstream media in opposition to the administration's attacks.⁶⁷

Line 2 (Independents): Starts in the middle (around 50%) in 2016 and shows a steady decline, ending in the 30-40% range, reflecting growing skepticism.⁶⁷

Line 3 (Republicans): Starts significantly lower than Democrats (around 30%) in 2016 and plummets dramatically, especially after 2017, bottoming out in the 10-15% range before a slight uptick in 2025. This sharp decline directly correlates with the intensification of the "enemy of the people" and "fake news" rhetoric.⁶⁷

The graph visually demonstrates the creation of a massive partisan gap in media trust, with the lines for Democrats and Republicans diverging sharply after 2016.

Increased Threats and Violence Against Journalists

The hostile climate fostered by this rhetoric has translated into a documented increase in physical threats, harassment, and violence against journalists. The Freedom of the Press Foundation recorded a 70% increase in physical assaults on journalists in the U.S. in 2025 compared to 2023.⁷¹ Reporters covering political rallies and protests have been particularly vulnerable, with some now wearing protective gear to cover domestic political events.⁶⁴ This atmosphere of intimidation is exacerbated by online harassment, which a 2022 Pew survey found had been experienced by one-third of journalists in the previous year.⁷² The cumulative effect is a palpable chilling effect, where journalists feel less safe doing their jobs and newsrooms are forced to invest in security and safety training at unprecedented levels.⁷³

III.B: Weaponizing the Levers of Government

The administration's campaign against the press extends beyond rhetoric to the active use of the powers of the federal government to punish, intimidate, and influence media organizations. This represents a significant blurring of the lines between governance and political retribution.

Legal, Regulatory, and Financial Pressure

The administration has employed a variety of tools to exert pressure on news outlets it deems critical. The president has initiated or threatened **libel lawsuits** against numerous news organizations, including ABC, The Wall Street Journal, and CNN.⁶³ In some cases, this has resulted in large financial settlements, such as the \$16 million payments made by Disney (ABC's parent company) and Paramount (CBS's parent company).⁶⁶ Critics view these settlements as a tactic by large corporations to avoid protracted and politically costly legal battles with the executive branch, which can create a chilling effect on aggressive reporting.

The administration has also sought to **weaponize regulatory bodies**. The Federal Communications Commission (FCC) has been used to open investigations into

networks like NPR, PBS, CBS, and NBC—but not into outlets like Fox News, which provide more favorable coverage.⁶³ The president and the FCC chair have openly threatened to review or revoke the broadcast licenses of critical networks.⁶³ Similarly, the Department of Justice (DOJ) has been used to apply pressure, most notably during the first term when it attempted to block the merger of AT&T and Time Warner unless the combined company sold off CNN, a frequent target of the president's ire.⁶³

This pattern transforms the tools of governance into instruments of political retribution. A company's broadcast license, a pending merger, or its vulnerability to a lawsuit becomes contingent not on regulatory compliance or legal merit, but on its perceived political loyalty. This creates a powerful incentive for media owners, who often oversee vast corporate enterprises with diverse business interests, to pressure their newsrooms to soften coverage and avoid antagonizing the administration.⁶⁶ The ultimate goal is to make independent, accountability journalism too costly and risky to practice.

Firing the Fact-Finders and Prosecuting Sources

The administration's intolerance for information that contradicts its political narrative extends to the government's own data-producing agencies. In a stark example, the president ordered the firing of Erika McEntarfer, the commissioner of the Bureau of Labor Statistics, immediately following the release of a disappointing monthly jobs report. The president provided no evidence for his claim that the politically independent agency's figures were "RIGGED" and "manipulated for political purposes".⁷⁶ This action threatens to undermine the credibility of all U.S. government economic data, long considered the global "gold standard" for its integrity and freedom from political interference.⁷⁶

Furthermore, the administration has shown a willingness to use the Espionage Act to prosecute government sources who leak information to the press. The first Trump administration escalated the use of this law, and its indictment of WikiLeaks founder Julian Assange for the act of publishing classified documents was widely seen by press freedom advocates as a grave threat to the routine work of national security journalists.⁷³

III.C: Controlling the Narrative: Access and Legitimacy

A central component of the administration's strategy is to bypass and reshape the media environment by controlling who has access to information and by elevating the status of friendly, partisan outlets.

The administration has repeatedly restricted or denied access to the White House for journalists and outlets that produce critical coverage. CNN's Jim Acosta famously had his press pass revoked, a move that was reversed only after a lawsuit.⁶³ The Associated Press, a cornerstone of the White House press corps, was banned from many pooled press events after a dispute with the president.⁶⁶ In a more systematic move, numerous major news organizations, including The New York Times, The Washington Post, and NPR, were denied their traditional office space in the Pentagon.⁶³

As these established outlets have been pushed out, the administration has actively cultivated a parallel media ecosystem by granting access and legitimacy to conservative-leaning and overtly pro-Trump media. The Pentagon office spaces vacated by mainstream outlets were given to organizations like Newsmax, Breitbart News, and One America News Network.⁶³ A permanent seat in the White House press briefing room has been reserved for "new media," such as bloggers and podcasters, who are often more sympathetic to the administration's agenda.⁶⁷

This strategy is not simply about attacking the existing media; it is about replacing it. By denying access to established, fact-based organizations while simultaneously granting it to partisan ones, the administration is actively constructing a new, more favorable media environment within the halls of power. This serves two purposes: it guarantees a steady stream of positive coverage from those on the "inside," and it further delegitimizes the "outside" media, who can be portrayed as out of the loop and irrelevant. The long-term goal appears to be the erosion of the distinction between journalism and political communication, thereby neutralizing the media's role as an independent check on power.

III.D: First Amendment Under Pressure

The cumulative effect of the administration's actions—the rhetorical assault, the

weaponization of government, and the control of access—is to place the First Amendment and the institution of a free press under unprecedented pressure. The normalization of calling the press an "enemy," using government power for retribution, and selectively granting access based on political loyalty threatens to permanently alter the landscape of American journalism.⁶⁴

This approach also has significant global implications. The president's anti-press playbook has been emulated by authoritarian and illiberal leaders around the world, who now justify their own crackdowns on domestic media by citing the U.S. president's example.⁶⁴ This undermines decades of U.S. foreign policy aimed at promoting democracy and press freedom globally.

The administration's war on the press is not a separate or secondary issue; it is the essential lynchpin that holds the other pillars of its agenda together. The tariff policies are based on legally dubious grounds and have economic consequences that most independent models show are negative for the country. The deportation policies are logically fraught, economically damaging, and face significant legal and public opposition. For these policies to be politically sustainable, the administration must control the narrative and discredit the sources of contrary information. By attacking the media, the administration attempts to invalidate economic reports from the CBO, reporting on the human cost of deportations, and legal analysis of its use of executive power. A delegitimized press cannot effectively check the executive, clearing the path for the administration to pursue its disruptive agenda with a diminished level of public accountability.

Conclusion: A Unified Theory of Disruption

The Trump administration's policies on trade, immigration, and the press, while distinct in their subject matter, are not disparate initiatives. They are deeply interconnected, springing from a singular and coherent governing philosophy centered on the disruption of established norms and institutions. A comprehensive analysis reveals three unifying themes that bind these pillars together: the assertion of unilateral executive power, the use of the "emergency" as a primary tool of governance, and the systematic delegitimization of mediating institutions.

First, the common thread linking the tariff wars, the deportation machine, and the attacks on the press is an assertion of a maximalist and unilateral vision of executive

power. The invocation of the International Emergency Economic Powers Act to impose sweeping tariffs without congressional approval, the pursuit of mass deportation through executive action rather than legislation, and the weaponization of federal agencies against media critics all represent a strategic effort to circumvent or neutralize the institutional checks and balances designed to constrain the presidency.

Second, the administration consistently frames policy challenges as existential emergencies or threats to national security. Trade deficits become a "national economic emergency," justifying IEEPA tariffs. The presence of immigrants is framed as an "invasion," justifying the suspension of asylum and the use of military resources. Critical news coverage is portrayed not as legitimate scrutiny but as the work of an "enemy of the people." This rhetorical framing is a crucial governing tool, as it provides the political and, in the administration's view, legal justification for the use of extraordinary powers and the suspension of normal processes.

Finally, these policies demonstrate a systematic effort to delegitimize the mediating institutions that stand between the executive and the public. This includes international bodies like the World Trade Organization, the federal judiciary (which has repeatedly been challenged in trade and immigration cases), and, most explicitly, the independent news media. The strategic goal is to erode public trust in these institutions, thereby clearing a path for the executive to communicate directly with its base and exercise power with diminished accountability.

The lasting impact of this disruptive approach on American governance is profound. It has accelerated political polarization, particularly in the realm of public trust in foundational institutions like the press and the government's own data agencies. It has strained international alliances and fundamentally challenged the post-war American-led consensus on global trade and the rule of law. Domestically, it has tested the resilience of the separation of powers and fostered a climate of legal and economic uncertainty. The long-term consequences include a weakened institutional capacity to address complex national challenges and a more volatile and unpredictable role for the United States in the world. The pillars of this presidency, therefore, represent not just a collection of policies, but a concerted effort to reshape the very nature of American statecraft and its relationship with both its citizens and the global community.

Works cited

1. Trump Administration Increases Steel and Aluminum Section 232 Tariffs to 50% and Narrows Reciprocal Tariff Exception | White & Case LLP, accessed on August 3, 2025,

<https://www.whitecase.com/insight-alert/trump-administration-increases-steel-and-aluminum-section-232-tariffs-50-and-narrows>

2. Trump Expands National Security Tariffs on Steel and Aluminum ..., accessed on August 3, 2025,
<https://www.wiley.law/alert-Trump-Expands-National-Security-Tariffs-on-Steel-and-Aluminum-Products>
3. Trump proclamation resets steel and aluminum tariffs - Economic Policy Institute, accessed on August 3, 2025,
<https://www.epi.org/policywatch/trump-proclamation-resets-steel-and-aluminum-tariffs/>
4. Fact Sheet: President Donald J. Trump Takes Action to Address the Threat to National Security from Imports of Copper - The White House, accessed on August 3, 2025,
<https://www.whitehouse.gov/fact-sheets/2025/07/fact-sheet-president-donald-j-trump-takes-action-to-address-the-threat-to-national-security-from-imports-of-copper/>
5. Appellate judges question Trump's authority to impose tariffs without Congress, accessed on August 3, 2025,
<https://apnews.com/article/trump-tariffs-court-lawsuit-trade-4c289f51008f6a3a02939caa73ab5404>
6. China–United States trade war – Wikipedia, accessed on August 3, 2025,
https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/China%20United_States_trade_war
7. Trump Tariffs: Tracking the Economic Impact of the Trump Trade War - Tax Foundation, accessed on August 3, 2025,
<https://taxfoundation.org/research/all/federal/trump-tariffs-trade-war/>
8. US-China Trade War Tariffs: An Up-to-Date Chart | PIIE, accessed on August 3, 2025,
<https://www.piie.com/research/piie-charts/2019/us-china-trade-war-tariffs-date-chart>
9. Court Decisions Regarding Tariffs Imposed Under the International ..., accessed on August 3, 2025, <https://www.congress.gov/crs-product/LSB11332>
10. Federal court question Trump's tariff authority; cites limit of emergency law, case likely headed to Supreme Court, accessed on August 3, 2025,
<https://timesofindia.indiatimes.com/world/us/federal-court-question-trumps-tariff-authority-cites-limit-of-emergency-law-case-likely-headed-to-supreme-court/articleshow/123028321.cms>
11. Further Modifying the Reciprocal Tariff Rates - The White House, accessed on August 3, 2025,
<https://www.whitehouse.gov/presidential-actions/2025/07/further-modifying-the-reciprocal-tariff-rates/>
12. Court of International Trade's Flawed Ruling on Trump's Tariffs - Just Security, accessed on August 3, 2025,
<https://www.justsecurity.org/116792/international-trade-court-flawed-ruling-tariffs/>
13. Federal appeals court weighs Trump's tariffs in major legal test - CBS News,

accessed on August 3, 2025,

<https://www.cbsnews.com/news/trumps-tariffs-poised-for-major-test-before-federal-appeals-court/>

14. Trump 2.0 tariff tracker - Trade Compliance Resource Hub, accessed on August 3, 2025,
<https://www.tradecomplianceresourcehub.com/2025/07/30/trump-2-0-tariff-tracker/>
15. US and China to talk in Stockholm on trade with eye on Trump-Xi summit later this year, accessed on August 3, 2025,
<https://apnews.com/article/stockholm-trade-china-us-besson-he-lifeng-5a0a9e723eb521dc72df00f2ae549a9e>
16. Trump signs order imposing new tariffs on a number of trading partners that go into effect in 7 days, accessed on August 3, 2025,
<https://apnews.com/article/trump-tariffs-mexico-3b03b98296424e59c7dc19a865d21969>
17. From clothing to coffee: Trump escalates tariff war - What's going to get more expensive for Americans?, accessed on August 3, 2025,
<https://timesofindia.indiatimes.com/business/international-business/from-clothing-to-coffee-trump-escalates-tariff-war-whats-going-to-get-more-expensive-for-americans/articleshow/123046199.cms>
18. Fact Sheet: President Donald J. Trump Amends Duties to Address the Flow of Illicit Drugs Across our Northern Border - The White House, accessed on August 3, 2025,
<https://www.whitehouse.gov/fact-sheets/2025/07/fact-sheet-president-donald-j-trump-amends-duties-to-address-the-flow-of-illicit-drugs-across-our-northern-border/>
19. Trump unleashes new tariffs on 69 countries, set to take effect in 7 ..., accessed on August 3, 2025,
<https://economictimes.indiatimes.com/news/international/global-trends/trump-unleashes-new-tariffs-on-69-countries-set-to-take-effect-in-7-days-full-list-and-details/articleshow/123032466.cms>
20. Trump's Misleading Justification for Higher Tariffs on Imports of EU Goods - FactCheck.org, accessed on August 3, 2025,
<https://www.factcheck.org/2025/07/trumps-misleading-justification-for-higher-tariffs-on-imports-of-eu-goods/>
21. Trump sets 15% tariff on EU: Here are the key aspects of the trade deal, accessed on August 3, 2025,
<https://economictimes.indiatimes.com/news/international/global-trends/trump-sets-a-tariff-of-15pc-on-eu-here-are-the-key-aspects-of-the-trade-deal/articleshow/122938807.cms>
22. From Laos to Brazil, Trump's tariffs leave a lot of losers. But even the winners will pay a price, accessed on August 3, 2025,
<https://apnews.com/article/trump-trade-tariffs-deals-winners-losers-25e65f0c984b0cb7d795265aa2976265>
23. Trump's tariff hit: India among dozens to be impacted after new deadline - 10 key

takeaways for the world from the fresh White House order, accessed on August 3, 2025,

<https://timesofindia.indiatimes.com/business/industry/trumps-tariff-hit-india-among-dozens-to-be-impacted-after-new-deadline-10-key-takeaways-for-the-world-from-the-fresh-white-house-order/articleshow/123049596.cms>

24. Trumponomics Is Already Working - Briefings For Britain, accessed on August 3, 2025, <https://www.briefingsforbritain.co.uk/trumponomics-is-already-working/>
25. The Economic Effects of President Trump's Tariffs — Penn Wharton ..., accessed on August 3, 2025, <https://budgetmodel.wharton.upenn.edu/issues/2025/4/10/economic-effects-of-president-trumps-tariffs>
26. Where We Stand: The Fiscal, Economic, and Distributional Effects of All U.S. Tariffs Enacted in 2025 Through April 2 - Yale Budget Lab, accessed on August 3, 2025, <https://budgetlab.yale.edu/research/where-we-stand-fiscal-economic-and-distributional-effects-all-us-tariffs-enacted-2025-through-april>
27. Trump's tariffs would cut US deficits and shrink the economy, CBO ..., accessed on August 3, 2025, <https://apnews.com/article/cbo-trump-tariffs-cut-deficits-shrink-economy-18a07a73b72a31a164b15835dd34fd61>
28. New CBO Analysis Exposes Devastating Impact of Trump's Tariffs, accessed on August 3, 2025, <https://democrats-budget.house.gov/news/press-releases/new-cbo-analysis-exposes-devastating-impact-trumps-tariffs>
29. Trump tariffs rake in big money, but who is paying?, accessed on August 3, 2025, <https://economictimes.indiatimes.com/news/international/global-trends/trump-tariffs-rake-in-big-money-but-who-is-paying/articleshow/123046781.cms>
30. Trump calls reporter who questioned absence of tariffs in 1st term a 'lunatic'; Watch video, accessed on August 3, 2025, <https://economictimes.indiatimes.com/news/international/global-trends/trump-calls-reporter-who-questioned-absence-of-tariffs-in-1st-term-a-lunatic-watch-video/articleshow/123034046.cms>
31. Trump's tariffs could squeeze US factories and boost costs by up to 4.5%, a new analysis finds, accessed on August 3, 2025, <https://apnews.com/article/trump-tariffs-factory-costs-manufacturing-4c928842b57c7f36db9d5ca26a84108b>
32. Trump's 50% steel and aluminum tariffs take effect today. Here's what could get more expensive. - CBS News, accessed on August 3, 2025, <https://www.cbsnews.com/news/tariff-steel-aluminum-effective-date-trump/>
33. Tariffs impact U.S. industries differently, with manufacturing the most exposed, accessed on August 3, 2025, <https://equitablegrowth.org/tariffs-impact-u-s-industries-differently-with-manufacturing-the-most-exposed/>
34. US Tariffs on Steel and Aluminum: Impact on the Metals Industry | Coface, accessed on August 3, 2025, <https://www.coface.com/news-economy-and-insights/50-us-tariffs-on-steel-and>

[-aluminum-a-fatal-blow-or-a-saving-grace-for-the-us-metals-industry](#)

35. Trump Tariffs On Agriculture: 5 Key Impacts For 2025 - Farmonaut, accessed on August 3, 2025,
<https://farmonaut.com/usa/trump-tariffs-on-agriculture-5-key-impacts-for-2025>
36. Trump directs immigration authorities to prioritize deportations in Democratic-run cities, accessed on August 3, 2025,
<https://www.cbsnews.com/news/trump-directs-ice-deportations-democratic-run-cities/>
37. Trump's actions on immigration explained | American Friends Service Committee, accessed on August 3, 2025,
<https://afsc.org/news/trumps-executive-orders-immigration-explained>
38. Six Months of Keeping America Safe Under President Trump and Secretary Noem, accessed on August 3, 2025,
<https://www.dhs.gov/news/2025/07/20/six-months-keeping-america-safe-under-president-trump-and-secretary-noem>
39. Judge pauses Trump administration's push to expand fast-track deportations, accessed on August 3, 2025,
<https://apnews.com/article/fast-track-deportations-judge-cobb-ruling-trump-fba29ea49599c07922660fcd11678c5>
40. Assessing Trump's aggressive deportation goals (part 1): how many migrants and which ones? - Real Instituto Elcano, accessed on August 3, 2025,
<https://www.realinstitutoelcano.org/en/analyses/assessing-trumps-aggressive-deportation-goals-part-1-how-many-migrants-and-which-ones/>
41. Remain in Mexico - Wikipedia, accessed on August 3, 2025,
https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Remain_in_Mexico
42. Remain in Mexico/Migrant Protection Protocols (MPP) Administration Policy: President Trump signed the Securing Our Borders Execu, accessed on August 3, 2025,
<https://republicanpolicy.house.gov/sites/evo-subsites/republicanpolicy-evo.house.gov/files/evo-media-document/RPC%20Remain%20in%20Mexico%20MPP%20Memo.pdf>
43. The "Migrant Protection Protocols": an Explanation of the Remain in Mexico Program, accessed on August 3, 2025,
<https://www.americanimmigrationcouncil.org/fact-sheet/migrant-protection-protocols/>
44. 'Remain in Mexico' | Human Rights Watch, accessed on August 3, 2025,
<https://www.hrw.org/tag/remain-in-mexico>
45. Frequently Asked Questions: "Remain in Mexico" Policy - Justice for Immigrants, accessed on August 3, 2025,
https://justiceforimmigrants.org/wp-content/uploads/2019/02/Remain-in-Mexico_en.pdf
46. Could Trump actually enforce 'mass deportations' of migrants?, accessed on August 3, 2025,
<https://priceschool.usc.edu/news/trump-mass-deportation-immigrants-deport-migrants-border-wall/>

47. The Trump-Vance Administration Priorities - The White House, accessed on August 3, 2025, <https://www.whitehouse.gov/issues/>
48. 'Defend the homeland': ICE aims to double workforce as immigration crackdown expands; seeks 'heroic Americans' in new campaign, accessed on August 3, 2025, <https://timesofindia.indiatimes.com/world/us/defend-the-homeland-ice-aims-to-double-workforce-as-immigration-crackdown-expands-seeks-heroic-americans-in-new-campaign/articleshow/123005583.cms>
49. ICE entices new recruits with patriotism pitch and promise of \$50,000 signing bonuses, accessed on August 3, 2025, <https://apnews.com/article/immigration-hiring-trump-border-mass-deportations-ed1580c3f5c0c2a2b5c1ebd621574365>
50. ICE says it has made tentative job offers to more than 1,000 as hiring ramps up, accessed on August 3, 2025, <https://apnews.com/article/immigration-hiring-trump-border-mass-deportations-c89c6d51aa13a5cfce75705377afe2e5>
51. Realigning the Federal Government as a Mass Deportation Machine, accessed on August 3, 2025, <https://www.americanimmigrationcouncil.org/blog/realigning-federal-government-mass-deportation-machine/>
52. In First 100 Days, Trump 2.0 Has Dramatically Reshaped the U.S. Immigration System, but Is Not Meeting Mass Deportation Aims - Migration Policy Institute, accessed on August 3, 2025, <https://www.migrationpolicy.org/article/trump-2-immigration-first-100-days>
53. Seeking to Ramp Up Deportations, the Trump Administration Quietly Expands a Vast Web of Data, accessed on August 3, 2025, <https://www.migrationpolicy.org/article/trump-ice-data-surveillance>
54. Mass Deportation - American Immigration Council, accessed on August 3, 2025, <https://www.americanimmigrationcouncil.org/report/mass-deportation/>
55. ICE on track for most deportations since Obama years, but still far short of 1 million target, accessed on August 3, 2025, <https://www.cbsnews.com/news/ice-deportations-trump-six-months/>
56. New Report Details Catastrophic Impact of Mass Deportation and Family Separation Plans, accessed on August 3, 2025, <https://www.americanimmigrationcouncil.org/press-release/new-report-details-catastrophic-impact-mass-deportation-plans/>
57. Near Certain Cataclysmic Consequences of a Mass Deportation Program, accessed on August 3, 2025, <https://www.socialworkers.org/Advocacy/Social-Justice/Social-Justice-Briefs/Near-Certain-Cataclysmic-Consequences-of-a-Mass-Deportation-Program>
58. Grist: Trump's proposed mass deportations could 'decimate' the US food supply, accessed on August 3, 2025, <https://www.padilla.senate.gov/newsroom/news-coverage/grist-trumps-proposed-mass-deportations-could-decimate-the-us-food-supply/>
59. Trump's proposed mass deportations would backfire on US workers ..., accessed on August 3, 2025,

<https://www.piie.com/blogs/realtime-economics/2024/trumps-proposed-mass-deportations-would-backfire-us-workers>

60. Trump Immigrant Removals Now 10 Percent Below Biden's Record - TRAC, accessed on August 3, 2025, <https://tracreports.org/reports/756/>
61. Deportations lower under Trump administration than Obama: report, accessed on August 3, 2025, <https://docs.house.gov/meetings/GO/GO00/20200109/110349/HHRG-116-GO00-20200109-SD007.pdf>
62. Comparing the Biden and Trump Deportation Records - Migration Policy Institute, accessed on August 3, 2025, <https://www.migrationpolicy.org/article/biden-deportation-record>
63. Donald Trump's conflict with the media - Wikipedia, accessed on August 3, 2025, https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Donald_Trump%27s_conflict_with_the_media
64. Press Freedom's Dark Horizon, accessed on August 3, 2025, <https://freedomhouse.org/report/freedom-press/2017/press-freedoms-dark-horizon>
65. Four ways the media have changed since Trump became president, accessed on August 3, 2025, <https://journalism.uoregon.edu/news/seth-lewis-news-after-trump>
66. Trump is waging war against the media – and winning - The Guardian, accessed on August 3, 2025, <https://www.theguardian.com/us-news/ng-interactive/2025/jul/05/trump-attack-us-media>
67. Five Key Insights Into Americans' Views of the News Media - Gallup News, accessed on August 3, 2025, <https://news.gallup.com/opinion/gallup/657239/five-key-insights-americans-views-news-media.aspx>
68. More Americans trust the Trump administration than trust the media for fair, full, and accurate facts | YouGov, accessed on August 3, 2025, <https://today.yougov.com/politics/articles/51666-more-americans-trust-donald-trump-administration-than-trust-media-poll>
69. Republicans have become more likely since 2024 to trust information from news outlets, social media - Pew Research Center, accessed on August 3, 2025, <https://www.pewresearch.org/short-reads/2025/05/08/republicans-have-become-more-likely-since-2024-to-trust-information-from-news-outlets-social-media/>
70. Trust in Media Growing Under Donald Trump - Newsweek, accessed on August 3, 2025, <https://www.newsweek.com/trust-media-growing-under-donald-trump-2077856>
71. U.S. Elections: Press as Enemies of the People, or Democracy's Watchdogs? | ICFJ, accessed on August 3, 2025, <https://www.icfj.org/news/us-elections-press-enemies-people-or-democracy-s-watchdogs>
72. US press freedom under unprecedeted pressure, report finds - VOA, accessed on August 3, 2025, <https://www.voanews.com/a/us-press-freedom-under-unprecedented-pressure->

[report-finds/7806682.html](#)

73. On Edge: What the US election could mean for journalists and global press freedom, accessed on August 3, 2025,
<https://cpj.org/special-reports/on-edge-what-the-us-election-could-mean-for-journalists-and-global-press-freedom/>
74. Alarm bells: Trump's first 100 days ramp up fear for the press, democracy, accessed on August 3, 2025,
<https://cpj.org/special-reports/alarm-bells-trumps-first-100-days-ramp-up-fear-for-the-press-democracy/>
75. Journalists Under Fire: U.S. Media Report Daily Threats, Harassment and Attacks at Home, accessed on August 3, 2025, <https://www.iwmf.org/underfire/>
76. Trump removes official overseeing jobs data after dismal employment report, accessed on August 3, 2025,
<https://apnews.com/article/trump-jobs-firing-f00e9bf96d0110519be9bf4f3ec89195>
77. It's Trump's economy now. The latest financial numbers offer some warning signs, accessed on August 3, 2025,
<https://apnews.com/article/trump-economy-warning-signs-financial-numbers-6f9754dbb6b21c9ef5c557b1ebfe6ce9>
78. Beware the Attacks on the First Amendment by a Trump Presidency, accessed on August 3, 2025,
<https://medialaw.org/beware-the-attacks-on-the-first-amendment-by-a-trump-presidency/>
79. How Trump Shaped the Media | Rutgers University, accessed on August 3, 2025,
<https://www.rutgers.edu/news/how-trump-shaped-media>