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### A. Uniqueness

1. Trump has been backed into a corner and will start pushing protectionism—his first 100 days have been weak and his base cares about free trade more than any other issue.

Drabold 4-21, Will, Journalist for MIC specializing in Trump AND a frequent journalist for Time Magizine, Free trade is back in the crosshairs of Donald Trump’s executive orders. Here’s why., 2017, https://mic.com/articles/174887/free-trade-is-back-in-the-crosshairs-of-donald-trump-s-executive-orders-here-s-why#.KBcW5scq3

The White House is planning a sustained campaign around fighting an issue it finds favorable: free trade. On Thursday, Trump signed an executive order that opens an investigation into whether imports of steel threaten American national security. Wilbur Ross, Trump's commerce secretary, said the investigation could yield a tariff on foreign steel, which would send a message to Trump's supporters and foreign leaders he is serious about protectionism. This order follows Trump's "[Buy American, Hire American](https://mic.com/articles/174533/h-1b-executive-order-how-buy-american-hire-american-will-affect-visa-holders#.DY0CBQnAQ)" executive order signed Tuesday and Vice President Mike Pence’s trip to Japan during which he said the United States wants to [renegotiate trade](http://www.npr.org/2017/04/18/524473913/after-south-korea-pence-visits-japan) between the two countries. Flashing his "America First" views, Trump pressed Italian Prime Minister Paolo Gentiloni on Thursday to answer whether the American ally would contribute a full 2% of its GDP to NATO — an amount Trump demanded during the campaign. Earlier this week, Trump [reiterated](https://www.forbes.com/sites/johnbrinkley/2017/04/20/trump-is-now-as-angry-at-canada-over-nafta-as-he-is-at-mexico/#49f3f3ff2b26) his campaign trail position that the North American Free Trade Agreement "has been a disaster for the United States." Instead of criticizing Mexico, a frequent target of his attacks, Trump set his sights on Canada, [calling](http://thehill.com/business-a-lobbying/329733-trump-nafta-changes-will-come-in-two-weeks) a Canadian tax on American milk "very unfair" and a "disgrace." In the next two weeks, Trump [said](http://www.foxbusiness.com/markets/2017/04/20/trump-says-there-will-be-report-about-nafta-intentions-in-two-weeks.html) he will announce his plans for NAFTA, saying he would scrap the deal if the U.S. does not receive concessions to the current deal. More than any other issue, free trade may have been the talking point that put Trump in the White House. A plurality of voters last fall, according to [exit polls](http://edition.cnn.com/election/results/exit-polls), said free trade "takes away U.S. jobs" — and Americans with that view cast their ballot for Trump by a 32 point margin. In Michigan, Pennsylvania and Wisconsin, at least half of voters said free trade was bad for American jobs and voted for Trump by a similarly wide margin. As Trump's first 100 days come to a close, it is unlikely he will notch the major legislative victory the White House is looking for. The president and congressional Republicans have been successful in rolling back [Barack Obama](https://mic.com/topic/barack-obama)-era regulations. But a victory on health care or concrete progress on tax reform have been elusive. The president [has reason to believe](https://mic.com/articles/174360/there-s-one-place-trump-seems-to-think-he-can-actually-win-foreign-policy#.CYI7i27Oj) he can win through aggressive foreign policy. Pursuing protectionist economic policy may offer Trump a similar winning political issue to prop up a struggling presidency. Gut check: Trump's approval rating is [at 43%](http://www.gallup.com/poll/201617/gallup-daily-trump-job-approval.aspx). That's eight points higher than three weeks ago.

But, Trump ability to pass tariffs hinges on looking strong to get backing from reluctant Congressional Republicans, who have been historically opposed to protectionist policies but also don’t want to push back against Trump too much. Chicago Tribune 12/5:

Chicago Tribune 12-5, Trump's tariff plan hits a hurdle: Congressional Republicans, 2016, <http://www.chicagotribune.com/news/nationworld/politics/ct-trump-tariff-plan-republicans-20161205-story.html>

President-elect Donald Trump's plan to use steep tariffs to punish companies that move overseas is running into an obstacle: Congressional [Republicans](http://www.chicagotribune.com/topic/politics-government/republican-party-ORGOV0000004-topic.html). House Majority Leader Kevin McCarthy warned Monday that such an approach could cause a trade war. A better way to achieve the goal of keeping companies in the U.S. and growing jobs would be to rewrite the tax code and lower corporate rates, McCarthy said. "I think that's a better way of solving the problem than getting into a trade war with a 35 percent tariff," the California Republican told reporters at the Capitol. "We've got to have a level playing field, that companies in America can compete on a level playing field across the world, and right now we do not have one." McCarthy's comments came in response to Trump's threat, made in a series of tweets over the weekend, that he would level taxes on companies that relocate overseas and then try to sell their products back into the U.S. "There will be a tax on our soon to be strong border of 35% for these companies," Trump wrote. Republicans have typically opposed such tariffs as an intrusion on the free market, and it was just the latest example of Trump making a statement or coming up with a plan that flouts GOP orthodoxy. But Republican leaders are proving reluctant to challenge the president-elect, and McCarthy wrangled at some length with reporters at a pen-and-pad session, disputing suggestions that he and others in the party are soft-pedaling long-held beliefs in deference to Trump. For example, Republicans routinely criticized the Obama administration for taking steps that favored individual corporations, accusing the administration of "picking winners and losers." Yet GOP leaders applauded when Trump got involved to save hundreds of jobs at a Carrier plant in Indiana last week, even though it came with a cost to state taxpayers of about $7 million in tax breaks and grants. "I think a president wants to get involved any time it's about jobs being created in America, and I think that's healthy," McCarthy argued Monday. A few moments later, though, he appeared to contradict himself, asserting: "You want to know my philosophical belief? I believe in the free market, I don't think government should be picking winners or losers." Trump would likely need congressional approval to impose tariffs on a specific company or a group of companies, trade law experts said. The president has broad authority to impose tariffs on specific categories of imported goods, but not to single out individual companies that make them. House Speaker [Paul Ryan](http://www.chicagotribune.com/topic/politics-government/government/paul-ryan-PEPLT005726-topic.html) was also asked about the tariff issue Monday, in an interview with the Milwaukee Journal-Sentinel in his home state of Wisconsin. He declined to comment directly, the paper reported, and, like McCarthy, focused on tax reform instead. "We can get at what he's talking about through smart tax reform. What his concern is, is legitimate — American companies are moving overseas, are shifting headquarters and factories overseas," said Ryan, blaming "our terrible tax code." Outside GOP-friendly groups, meanwhile, lined up against Trump's tariff proposal. "Tax cuts and deregulation will make the American economy great again, but tariffs and trade wars will make it tank again," said Club for Growth president David McIntosh. "The president-elect is spot on when he calls for cutting taxes and federal regulations, but 35-percent tariffs would be devastating to consumers and businesses." The U.S. Chamber of Commerce chief economist, J.D. Foster, called tariffs "self-destructive" in an appearance on Fox Business' "The Intelligence Report with Trish Regan," adding: "You can make companies want to come into the U.S. by making the U.S. a better place to do business."

2. Trump pushing tax reforms now, but it won’t pass. Congressional Republicans are too divided and Trump can’t unite them

Irwin 4-11, Neil, Can Trump and Congress Solve the Rubik’s Cube of Tax Reform?, 2017, https://www.nytimes.com/2017/04/11/upshot/can-trump-and-congress-solve-the-rubiks-cube-of-tax-reform.html?\_r=0

As Congress and the Trump administration turn their sights on overhauling the tax code, it’s a good time to think about the great three-dimensional brain twister of the 1980s, the [Rubik’s Cube](https://www.rubiks.com/store/cubes). That’s partly because the first and last time there was a comprehensive rewrite of the tax code, it was 1986. But there is more than that. What makes trying to solve a Rubik’s Cube so exasperating is that every rotation you make to align the colors on one side messes up something on one of the other sides. Nothing moves in isolation; everything affects everything else, and rarely for the better. The 1986 tax overhaul took two years. Despite bipartisan backing from the Reagan administration and congressional Democrats, it had many false starts and reversals in its voyage to becoming a law. [Continue reading the main story](https://www.nytimes.com/2017/04/11/upshot/can-trump-and-congress-solve-the-rubiks-cube-of-tax-reform.html?_r=0#story-continues-2) “There are thousands of moving pieces in full-blown tax reform,” said Jeffrey Birnbaum, an author of a book about the passage of that legislation, “[Showdown at Gucci Gulch](http://www.nytimes.com/1987/07/05/books/and-they-said-it-couldn-t-be-done.html?pagewanted=all),” and now a public affairs strategist at [BGR Group](http://www.bgrdc.com/). “Every entity and interest you can think of has a stake, and there are inevitably winners and losers. And if you’re a loser, you know it.” Add in a [more polarized](https://www.nytimes.com/2017/01/03/business/economy/trump-election-democracy.html) political environment, an administration that has been [light on policy expertise](https://www.nytimes.com/2016/12/01/upshot/donald-trump-is-betting-that-policy-expertise-doesnt-matter.html), and a Republican congressional contingent that hasn’t shown [much ability](https://www.nytimes.com/2017/02/28/upshot/why-the-trump-agenda-is-moving-slowly-the-republicans-wonk-gap.html) to pass complex legislation in more than a decade, and the puzzle looks all the more complicated. Congress and the Trump administration will solve tax reform only by navigating difficult trade-offs. Think of these trade-offs as the six sides of a Rubik’s cube, each of which needs to match up perfectly — but each of which can foul up the others. Bipartisan support vs. conservative goals. The Republican majority in the Senate is narrow: It takes only three Republican senators (out of 52) to vote against a measure to ensure its failure, should Democrats stay united in opposition. The [G.O.P.](http://topics.nytimes.com/top/reference/timestopics/organizations/r/republican_party/index.html?inline=nyt-org) majority in the House is not as narrow, but it might as well be because of ideological divisions. That means Republican tax writers need a bill to keep party members on board, or one that could attract significant Democratic support and allow more room for Republican defections. In theory at least, there’s room for common ground with Democrats on the corporate income tax. President Obama proposed corporate tax changes that would have lowered the rate on businesses to 28 percent from its current 35 percent while changing its structure. But to gain any hope of [meaningful Democratic support](https://www.wsj.com/articles/how-to-make-tax-reform-bipartisan-1491164051), some key conservative goals would almost certainly need to be cast aside. Say goodbye to [lowering the top rate](https://www.wsj.com/articles/democrats-conditions-for-tax-overhaul-make-bipartisan-deal-unlikely-1491735604) on individuals’ income or other changes that primarily benefit the wealthy, or to anything that decreases the amount of revenue the government will collect in the years ahead. Even if those concessions are made, Democrats will be resistant to giving President Trump a big policy win — meaning it may take more concessions than it would in a less polarized political moment to get even a few Democrats to the table. Republicans, who showed their internal divisions during the health bill debate, need to stay united or to give up on some of the longstanding priorities of the conservative movement (and of Republican donors).

### B. Links

Trump campaigned against political correctness and retaliated against the Berkeley protests, which means even if universities are the actor, he perceptually gets credit for the implementation of the aff. It proves he can beat even the most liberal institutions. Brown and Mangan 17:

Brown & Mangan 17 [Sarah Brown and Katherine Mangan, “Trump Can’t Cut Off Berkeley’s Funds by Himself. His Threat Still Raised Alarm,” The Chronicle of Higher Education, Feb. 3, 2017, <http://www.chronicle.com/article/Trump-Can-t-Cut-Off/239100?cid=trend_right>.] JW

Back in October, when President Trump vowed to "end" political correctness on college campuses, it was unclear how the then-presidential candidate planned to go about doing that. On Thursday, he dropped a hint: He threatened to cut off federal funding to the University of California at Berkeley after violent protests there prompted campus leaders to call off a talk by a far-right provocateur. Milo Yiannopoulos is a Breitbart News editor and Trump supporter who has for months traveled to campuses to give talks that often draw protests and have sometimes resulted in violence. He was once permanently banned from Twitter for his role in a harassment campaign against the actress Leslie Jones, and he has drawn heavy fire for his insulting comments about feminists, Black Lives Matters protesters, Islam, and topics he considers part of leftist ideology. Mr. Yiannopoulos was scheduled to speak on Berkeley’s campus late Wednesday, as part of his "Dangerous Faggot" tour, and more than 1,500 students gathered outside the venue to peacefully protest. Then about 100 additional protesters — mostly nonstudents, Berkeley officials said — joined the fray and hurled smoke bombs, broke windows, and started fires. The violence forced the campus police to put Berkeley on lockdown and led university leaders to cancel the event. The following morning, a political commentator suggested on Fox & Friends First that President Trump should take away Berkeley’s federal funding. Shortly thereafter, Mr. Trump decided to weigh in. Not surprisingly, Mr. Yiannopoulos liked that idea. On Facebook Thursday, he linked to a Breitbart article about the federal money Berkeley receives, adding, "Cut the whole lot, Donald J. Trump." Others were quick to condemn the president’s threat. U.S. Rep. Barbara Lee, a California Democrat whose district includes the Berkeley campus, tweeted back: "President Trump doesn’t have a license to blackmail universities. He’s the president, not a dictator, and his empty threats are an abuse of power." Later, in a statement, Ms. Lee said Mr. Yiannopoulos "has made a career of inflaming racist, sexist and nativist sentiments." Meanwhile, she wrote, "Berkeley has a proud history of dissent and students were fully within their rights to protest peacefully." Could Mr. Trump take away a university’s federal funding for what he sees as a violation of the First Amendment? Not on his own, and not entirely, some scholars say, though there are ways he could advocate for cutting some of it. Regardless, Mr. Trump’s singling out of Berkeley is worth paying attention to, they say, because it serves as a message to other campus officials that they may soon be put in the position of responding to the president’s social-media whims. How Berkeley Prepared Berkeley’s chancellor, Nicholas B. Dirks, went to great lengths last week to explain why the university would not give in to demands to cancel Mr. Yiannopoulos’s appearance. The First Amendment, the chancellor wrote, does not allow the university to censor or prohibit such events. "In our view, Mr. Yiannopoulos is a troll and provocateur who uses odious behavior in part to ‘entertain,’ but also to deflect any serious engagement with ideas," Mr. Dirks wrote. But, he added, "we are defending the right to free expression at an historic moment for our nation, when this right is once again of paramount importance." Mr. Dirks went on to warn that the university "will not stand idly by" if anyone tries to violate university policies by disrupting the talk. Still, the furor over the protests delighted many activists who have been arguing for years that pressure to be politically correct on campuses has stifled those with conservative views. Among them were members of the "alt-right" movement, a loosely affiliated group characterized by its white nationalist, sexist, and anti-Semitic views. The group clearly felt vindicated by the president’s assertion that Berkeley doesn’t allow free speech, which came on the heels of the online discussion group Reddit banning an alt-right community for publishing personally identifiable information about people it is criticizing. The Left is trying to shut us down because they are losing. We’re the real opposition on the Right. We’re... https://t.co/Q9HayfRhSD — AltRight.com (@AltRight\_com) February 2, 2017 On Thursday, Mr. Dirks released a statement doubling down on his earlier comments about the campus’s commitment to free speech. The violence, he said, was perpetrated by "more than 100 armed individuals clad all in black who utilized paramilitary tactics to engage in violent, destructive behavior" designed to shut the event down. "We deeply regret that the violence unleashed by this group undermined the First Amendment rights of the speaker as well as those who came to lawfully assemble and protest his presence." The university had anticipated a large crowd of protesters at Mr. Yiannopoulos’s talk on Wednesday night and had brought in dozens of police officers from across the university system to help maintain order. But "we could not plan for the unprecedented," Mr. Dirks wrote. The event was called off only after the campus police concluded that the speaker had to be evacuated for his own safety, he added. “We could not plan for the unprecedented.” Mr. Trump’s threat was also criticized by a group that is known for condemning campuses that it sees as violating free speech rights. The Foundation for Individual Rights in Education, known as FIRE, released a statement Thursday objecting to "both violence and attempts to silence protected expression." The group said, however, that it had seen no evidence that Berkeley, as an institution, had made any effort to silence Mr. Yiannopoulos, and that the university had, in fact, resisted calls to cancel his visit until the situation got out of hand. FIRE added a caution that seemed to be directed at President Trump’s threat to strip funding from Berkeley. "To punish an educational institution for the criminal behavior of those not under its control and in contravention of its policies, whether through the loss of federal funds or through any other means, would be deeply inappropriate and most likely unlawful," its statement said. Withholding Federal Funds The idea of punishing colleges for free-speech controversies was originally Ben Carson’s idea, said Jonathan Zimmerman, a professor of the history of education at the University of Pennsylvania. Mr. Carson, a neurosurgeon and former Republican presidential candidate, said in October 2015 that he would have the U.S. Department of Education "monitor our institutions of higher education for extreme political bias and deny federal funding if it exists." Terry W. Hartle, a senior vice president at the American Council on Education, took the question mark on the end of Mr. Trump’s tweet literally. The president might have been asking, Could I withhold federal funds from Berkeley? Mr. Hartle said. Yes, the federal government has the authority to withhold federal funds like financial aid from colleges that engage in certain activities, Mr. Hartle said. And it has the authority to attach conditions to the money it gives out. The Solomon Amendment, for instance, requires colleges to admit ROTC or military recruiters to their campus or risk losing money. But Congress would have to act to give the government the ability to take away federal funds for controversies involving the First Amendment, Mr. Hartle said. The government also couldn’t pull funding from Berkeley by retroactively saying the institution’s federal money is contingent on protecting free speech, said Alexander (Sasha) Volokh, an associate professor of law at Emory University. "If the funding comes explicitly with strings attached, which is that you must adequately protect free speech on your campus if you want these funds, and if the university takes these funds knowing the condition, that’s one thing," he said. The U.S. Supreme Court has weighed in several times on strings attached to federal funding, Mr. Volokh said, and has determined that such conditions must be clearly stated in advance and related to the matter being funded. For instance, he said, the court said it was OK for the government to tie federal highway funds to a requirement for states to adopt a drinking age of 21, because highway safety could be affected by the drinking age. But the National Institutes of Health probably couldn’t attach a requirement for free-speech protection to a grant for researching Ebola, he said. Moving forward, Mr. Trump could tell federal research agencies that some of their contracts with colleges and researchers should now include stipulations about free speech, Mr. Volokh said. "I have the feeling that Trump had something much blunter in mind," he said. ‘Uncharted Territory’ Mr. Trump’s social-media attack on Berkeley raises another question for colleges: how to respond to such tweets. "This is uncharted territory for all organizations," not just colleges, Mr. Hartle said, citing Mr. Trump’s criticism of Boeing for what he considered to be an overpriced contract for constructing two Air Force One planes that future presidents will use. (Boeing subsequently promised to keep the cost below $4 billion.) “You can't just ignore it if the president of the United States tweets about you.” It might not be wise to pick a fight with someone who has millions of Twitter followers, Mr. Hartle said, but "you can’t just ignore it if the president of the United States tweets about you." Berkeley is in a particularly difficult situation, Mr. Hartle said, because in his view the university did everything right when Mr. Yiannopoulos came to the campus. "Berkeley tried to allow him to speak and to allow protesters to protest," he said. "Everything was fine until the protests turned violent." One challenge for colleges, he said, will probably involve dealing with people, particularly nonstudents, who want to disrupt speakers and who "now see resorting to violence as simply another tactic in an effort to accomplish their purpose." If Mr. Trump were to push Congress to pass a law giving him the authority to take away federal funds from colleges for free-speech controversies, Mr. Hartle said, "they should carve out some sort of exception when it involved violence or a police request." “Trump is not wrong when he says a lot of people on these campuses want to squelch free speech.” While the president might not make such legislation a priority, college officials shouldn’t dismiss his criticism of Berkeley, said Mr. Zimmerman, of Penn. "It’s ridiculous and frightening for the president to be threatening to withhold money based on his perception of what’s happening with free speech on campus," he said. On the other hand, he said, "Trump is not wrong when he says a lot of people on these campuses want to squelch free speech." When institutions disinvite speakers or try to quash a right-wing group’s event or demonstration, Mr. Zimmerman said, "they’re playing right into Trump’s hands." Given the violence, Mr. Zimmerman doesn’t begrudge Berkeley’s administration for canceling the speech. But he described as problematic a letter signed by dozens of professors saying that Mr. Yiannopoulos shouldn’t be allowed to speak on campus. Ultimately, Mr. Volokh is more concerned about the way in which Mr. Trump made his point, versus the content of the tweet. "It wasn’t enough for him to say that free speech is important," Mr. Volokh said. "He had to do it in a way that was threatening."

2 independent internal links.

1. Winners win: Presidential boldness creates a steamroll effect.

Green 10 [David Michael Green, professor of political science at Hofstra University, “The Do-Nothing 44th President,” OpEd News, June 11, 2010, http://www.opednews.com/articles/The-Do-Nothing-44th-Presid-by-David-Michael-Gree-100611-648.html] JW

Moreover, there is a continuously evolving and reciprocal relationship between presidential boldness and achievement. In the same way that nothing breeds success like success, nothing sets the president up for achieving his or her next goal better than succeeding dramatically on the last go around. This is absolutely a matter of perception, and you can see it best in the way that Congress and especially the Washington press corps fawn over bold and intimidating presidents like Reagan and George W. Bush. The political teams surrounding these presidents understood the psychology of power all too well. They knew that by simultaneously creating a steamroller effect and feigning a clubby atmosphere for Congress and the press, they could leave such hapless hangers-on with only one remaining way to pretend to preserve their dignities. By jumping on board the freight train, they could be given the illusion of being next to power, of being part of the winning team. And so, with virtually the sole exception of the now retired Helen Thomas, this is precisely what they did.

2. Aff gives Trump polcap- the plan wins over the Ways and Means committee—they see it as bipartisan and it’s a top priority

**Jagoda 16** [NAOMI JAGODA , 3-2-2016, "House Republican concerned about colleges stifling students' speech,”]

The chairman of the House Ways and Means oversight subcommittee expressed concern Wednesday that colleges are stifling students’ political speech because they are incorrectly worried that such speech could jeopardize the schools’ tax-exempt statuses. Through provisions in the tax code, “taxpayers give financial benefits to schools based on the educational value that they offer to our society,” Rep. Peter Roskam (R-Ill.) said at a hearing. “When colleges and universities suppress speech, however, we have to question whether that educational mission is really being fulfilled.” Roskam asked students, faculty and administrators who have had their speech suppressed to share their experiences with the committee by emailing campus.speech@mail.house.gov. Frances Hill, a professor at the University of Miami School of Law, said during the hearing that “students can do almost anything” without jeopardizing a college’s tax-exempt status. The Internal Revenue Service (IRS) is more likely to be concerned about university administrators engaging in political speech without making clear that they are not speaking on behalf of the school, she added. Catherine Sevcenko, director of litigation at the Foundation for Individual Rights in Education, said that students are likely being censored because colleges are confused about IRS guidelines. “As long as the IRS guidance is ambiguous, censorship will win out every time,” she said, adding that lawmakers need to communicate to the IRS that there is an “urgent need for guidance.” Sevcenko also said the issue of censorship is a “bipartisan problem,” and students are being stifled for both liberal and conservative speech. Roskam told reporters after the hearing that he’s interested in looking to see if there’s something the IRS can do to make it clear that student expression won’t jeopardize colleges’ tax exemptions. “It seems like the letter of the law is clear, but for whatever reason, it’s not penetrating,” he said. Democrats on the panel argued the free speech issue does not fall under the committee's jurisdiction. They suggested that it would be a better use of the panel’s time to hold hearings about the effect of budget cuts on the IRS’s customer service and about identity thieves stealing taxpayer information. “Let me be clear. We have plenty of work do, and this is not it,” said Rep. John Lewis (D-Ga.), the subcommittee’s ranking member. Rep. Joseph Crowley (D-N.Y.) said the subcommittee is “searching for a problem where no problem exists.” But Roskam and other Republicans defended a hearing about colleges limiting students’ free expression. “To say that we don’t have a role here is disingenuous,” said Rep. Tom Reed (R-N.Y.).

### C. Impacts

1. New tarrifs doom millions and millions to extreme poverty. They also have a spillover effect, multiplying the impact.

Beauchamp 16, Zach, Apr 5, 2016, If you're poor in another country, this is the scariest thing Bernie Sanders has said http://www.vox.com/2016/3/1/11139718/bernie-sanders-trade-global-poverty

Free trade is one of the best tools we have for fighting extreme poverty. If Sanders wins, and is serious about implementing his trade agenda as outlined in the NYDN interview and elsewhere, he will impoverish millions of already-poor people. What's worse is that the specific ways Sanders has proposed to roll back previous trade agreements could lead to serious reprisals from the affected countries. The nightmare scenario, experts say, is a global slide toward protectionism, wherein China and other countries take cues from the US and impose their own retaliatory tariffs. That would devastate economies in the developing world, dooming many more millions to a lifetime of crushing poverty. What makes this issue particularly tricky, though, is that there's real truth to Sanders's critique: Recent economic research suggests that freer trade has hurt many Americans, particularly those who worked in manufacturing. The question, then, is how much we're willing to hurt the world's poor in order to help ourselves. Sanders wants to reverse decades of US trade liberalization Bernie Sanders's opposition to trade goes far beyond opposing new agreements, like the Trans-Pacific Partnership (TPP) and the Transatlantic Trade and Investment Partnership (TTIP). His website promises to "reverse" NAFTA and the Central American FTA (CAFTA), bills slashing US tariffs on goods from around the Americas. It also promises to get rid of permanent normal trade relations (PNTR) with China, a Clinton-era designation that prevents the US from imposing special tariffs on China that it doesn't impose on other trading partners. "If corporate America wants us to buy their products they need to manufacture those products in this country, not in China or other low-wage countries," [**Sanders's website says**](https://berniesanders.com/issues/income-and-wealth-inequality/). According to Gary Hufbauer, a senior fellow at the Peterson Institute for International Economics and an expert on trade law, Sanders could unilaterally withdraw from NAFTA and CAFTA. Ending PNTR for China would probably be impossible without congressional buy-in, but Sanders could unilaterally [**impose new tariffs**](http://www.vox.com/2016/2/18/11050194/donald-trump-president-immigration-trade) on Chinese goods, which would accomplish the same end of limiting imports from China. "There is power within the White House to increase duties on imported goods," Hufbauer tells me. "That's especially true with so-called safeguard laws, where [the president alleges] an injury to a domestic industry." But would Sanders actually do it? There's certainly reason for skepticism. Kim Elliott, an expert on trade at the Center for Global Development, notes that previous candidates (including both Barack Obama and Hillary Clinton in 2008) have suggested they would quit NAFTA. Of course, she points out, Obama did no such thing. Daniel Drezner, a professor and trade expert at Tufts University's Fletcher School of Law and Diplomacy who's been following the campaign closely, disagrees. He thinks Sanders's strong convictions on corporate America — his deep, ideological belief that American economic policy is arranged to benefit the rich and hurt the poor — would cause him to take a harder line on trade than any prior president. "Bernie thinks the American worker has gotten screwed," Drezner tells me. "He thinks the solution to that, at least in part, is to raise trade barriers against China and other low-wage economies." Sanders's record in Congress strongly supports Drezner's case. The candidate has bragged, [**in debates**](https://www.washingtonpost.com/news/the-fix/wp/2016/02/04/sanders-clinton-debate-transcript-annotating-what-they-say/), of never supporting a trade agreement. In 1993, he was literally [**on the picket line**](https://twitter.com/berniesanders/status/695454724867264512) against NAFTA; in 2005, Rep. Sanders [**spearheaded**](http://money.cnn.com/2005/02/09/news/international/china_trade/) a congressional effort to reverse PNTR status for China. His campaign issued a [**fact sheet**](https://berniesanders.com/wp-content/uploads/2016/02/Bernie-Clinton-trade.pdf) contrasting his decades of opposition to trade with [**Clinton's decades of supporting new agreements**](http://www.ontheissues.org/celeb/Hillary_Clinton_Free_Trade.htm). "If we are serious about rebuilding the middle class and creating the millions of good paying jobs we desperately need, we must fundamentally rewrite our trade policies," Sanders wrote in a 2015 piece for [**the Guardian**](http://www.theguardian.com/commentisfree/2015/apr/29/so-called-free-trade-policies-hurt-us-workers-every-time-we-pass-them). There is no reason to doubt his sincerity on this issue. If he doesn't prioritize rolling back trade agreements, he betrays not only a series of campaign promises but an entire career's worth of advocacy. Sanders's policies would be devastating for China and Latin America To understand why these policies trouble development economists, you need to understand a little bit about who the world's poorest people really are. Extreme poverty — defined by the World Bank as living on less than [$1.90 a day](http://www.vox.com/2015/10/7/9465999/world-bank-poverty-line)— is crushing. It's the kind of grinding poverty where you don't get access to running water, adequate food, proper toilets, or basic health care. Wealthy countries like the US have ([nearly](http://www.vox.com/2015/9/2/9248801/extreme-poverty-2-dollars)) eradicated this kind of poverty. Thankfully, extreme poverty is in decline globally, with the biggest declines (roughly 800 million people's worth since 1981) coming in China: Here's the problem for Sanders: The global decline in extreme poverty is inseparable from the global trading regime. When poor countries can sell cheap goods to rich countries, or bring in a lot of foreign direct investment, growth skyrockets. This means more jobs, better government services, and thus less poverty. "The free trade, or freer trade, that we've had since the end of the Second World War has been the great engine which has lifted up literally hundreds of millions of people out of poverty — far more than any aid programs," Hufbauer says. "The econometrics is indisputable." See, for example, [this 2008 study](http://www-wds.worldbank.org/external/default/WDSContentServer/WDSP/IB/2013/05/28/000442464_20130528112411/Rendered/PDF/775730JRN020080alization0and0Growth.pdf) by UCLA economist Romain Wacziarg and Karen Horn Welch. Wacziarg and Welch looked at 50 years of trade data to figure out the effects of trade liberalization on economic growth. They found that, on average, economic growth increased by 1.5 points after a country passed laws opening up to foreign trade: China is, of course, the most dramatic example of this effect: Its incredible economic growth since 1981 came principally from exports. While the Chinese economy has since shifted away from exports somewhat, the sector still makes up 22.6 percent of Chinese GDP. Trade with the US — the world's largest economy — is a key part of that story of uplift. Any serious attempt by a Sanders administration to impede trade with China would put a serious crimp in Chinese economic growth, which is already slowing down. This would make it harder for the roughly 54 million Chinese people still living in extreme poverty to escape — and it could potentially could throw even more Chinese people into poverty. "If Sanders were to impose significant trade barriers with China," Drezner says, "the marginal middle class, or the ones who had just gotten out of poverty, would likely wind up falling back into poverty." "China's economy is already not doing as well as it was," Charles Kenny, a senior fellow at the Center for Global Development, says. "Anything that slows down the growth of exports … is going to be bad for future reductions in Chinese poverty." Canceling NAFTA and CAFTA would also be quite bad. While there's not a lot of extreme poverty in Mexico and Central America, these countries are still far poorer than the US. Impeding free trade with those countries would prevent US dollars from flowing in, thus further impoverishing their poorest. "The proposals to end particular trade agreements — that could be devastating for Central America," Elliott says. "If it meant going back to the trade barriers that we had in place a decade ago, that's going to mean much less trade coming out of Central America to the United States, [and thus] many fewer jobs." Even [Dani Rodrik](http://www.nber.org/chapters/c11058.pdf) — a Harvard economist who called NAFTA a "huge disappointment" for Mexico in our conversation — thinks rolling back it and CAFTA would be a bad idea. "It would make a big difference to how America's partners in the world look at it, in terms of its credibility to be a leader," he says. Asked about a major tariff on Chinese goods, he waxed apocalyptic. "The example of the 1930s — with the US Smoot-Hawley tariff increases, and the kind of trade war that seriously exacerbated the Great Depression in the world economy, and the downward spiral of global trade — I think that should stand as a very serious warning," he says. The global consequences could be even worse These decisions don't happen in a vacuum. The global trade system, generally speaking, depends on leadership by example. When the United States opens up its own markets, other countries tend to do the same. If the US were to embrace protectionism, other countries would follow suit. The logic here is fairly ironclad. If the world's largest economy feels the need to protect its own industries from foreign competition, why shouldn't other, less economically powerful countries do the same? "Without the United States, you can't have global trade deals, you can't have progress in this area," Kenny says. "If the United States does start backsliding towards protectionism, that is quite likely to set off a spiral toward greater protectionism worldwide." American tariffs "are legally capped at 2, 3, 4 percent" under international trade law, says Elliott. Violating that restriction "risks setting off the kind of trade war that we saw in the early years of the Great Depression. Other countries are not just going to sit around and not respond to that." How bad this gets, of course, depends on how committed Sanders is to throwing up barriers to foreign trade. The more he uses executive authority to enact new tariffs, the more retaliation from other countries you're likely to see. The people who would be screwed over the most by a global backlash to free trade would, clearly, be the roughly 900 million people still living in extreme poverty. These people, clustered in South Asia and sub-Saharan Africa, could still reap tremendous benefits from exporting goods to foreign markets — essentially replicating a major part of China's growth strategy. But if richer countries like China and the US get into a serious trade war, with overall tariffs escalating on both sides, they could lose access to these markets. No more exports means much less growth, which in turn dooms millions — maybe hundreds of millions — of people to extreme poverty. Smaller, poorer countries "are just going to be bystanders who have to take what comes at them from the global economy," Elliott says. "The poor countries don't have anything in the way of fiscal or financial sources to cushion the blow, especially for the poorest people." Sanders's war on trade might be aimed at helping the American working class. But if he were really serious about it, the damage to the world's very poorest would be astronomical.

2. Trump tax reform will doom millions to poverty- he will cut anti-poverty spending by more than 6 trillion.

Thompson 16, Derek, Things Are About to Get Much Worse for Poor Americans, <https://www.theatlantic.com/business/archive/2016/11/things-are-about-to-get-much-worse-for-poor-americans/507143/>

In the last eight years, President Barack Obama oversaw [the largest growth in federal spending to reduce inequality](https://www.theatlantic.com/business/archive/2016/09/obamas-war-on-inequality/501620/) since the Great Society of the 1960s. In the next four years, President-elect Donald Trump and the Republican majorities in the Senate and the House of Representatives will probably try to undo almost all of it. President Obama’s anti-inequality crusade has had three main pillars. First, the Affordable Care Act, or Obamacare, brought the percentage of uninsured down from 16 percent in 2010 to 9 percent, the lowest in U.S. history. Second, tax benefits passed in the 2009 stimulus, and extended throughout the last seven years, raised the overall income of millions of poor Americans. Third, the administration went beyond the tax code to increase anti-poverty spending, like food stamps and long-term unemployment benefits, and to support the national movement for a higher minimum wage. Together, these measures helped to reduce after-tax inequality more than any administration on record, according to the [non-partisan Congressional Budget Office](https://www.theatlantic.com/business/archive/2016/09/obamas-war-on-inequality/501620/). How will Republicans roll back these measures? Trump’s [boldest proposals and most radical promises](https://www.theatlantic.com/business/archive/2016/05/donald-trumps-economy/481743/)—to build a border wall and establish a police force to deport 10 million undocumented workers, while instigating a trade war, cutting taxes, trying to balance the budget, and hinting that the U.S. won’t pay back its debt—are together a recipe for financial panic and a possible recession. But even if the U.S. gets a more moderate version of Trump that dovetails with the wishes of his Republican Congress, there is another clear conclusion to draw. Quite simply, his administration would make it much harder to be poor in America. First, Obamacare may be toast. By rolling back the Medicaid expansion and ending private subsidies, Republicans would almost certainly send the uninsured rate back up to Bush-era levels. In the last six years, the number of uninsured families living around the poverty line fell by almost 50 percent. Those gains would be reversed, and [more than 20 million people](http://www.vox.com/2016/11/9/13487772/trump-obamacare-repeal), many of them just above the poverty line, could suddenly lose access to health care. Second, [Trump’s proposed tax cut](http://www.taxpolicycenter.org/publications/analysis-donald-trumps-revised-tax-plan/full) will be one of the largest ever, possibly reducing federal revenues by more than $6 trillion in the next decade. His plan is in line with tax cuts envisioned by House Speaker Paul Ryan. Although taxes would be cut at every level, “the highest-income taxpayers would receive the biggest cuts, both in dollar terms and as a percentage of income,” according to [the Tax Policy Center](http://www.taxpolicycenter.org/publications/analysis-donald-trumps-revised-tax-plan/full). The richest 0.1 percent of the country would save, on average, more than $1 million. What does that have to do with the poor? Well, the massive size of the proposed Trump tax is significant, because House Republicans are also calling for [a balanced budget](http://paulryan.house.gov/issues/issue/?IssueID=9974#2). Mathematically that means that the GOP will be on the lookout for $6 trillion in spending cuts over the next decade. And Trump has essentially declared more than half the budget off-limits for cuts, since he wants to grow the military and preserve Social Security and Medicare. With protective collars around defense and spending on the elderly, the rest of government spending would have to be bulldozed. This remainder is dominated by assistance for the young and poor. Medicaid would shrink, as might the Children’s Health Insurance Program. Food stamps would be cut. Federal unemployment insurance spending would fall, as would housing and energy assistance for the poor. The Department of Education would have to be gutted, taking federal student loans with it. It’s not clear which of Obama’s economic policies would actually face elimination, because Trump has been so vague about his own plans, beyond Mexican walls and Chinese trade wars. In the absence of more details, one document that gives a sense of where things could go is Ryan’s grand plan [“A Better Way.”](https://abetterway.speaker.gov/_assets/pdf/ABetterWay-Poverty-PolicyPaper.pdf) This document is more thoughtful and potentially less draconian than Ryan’s previous budgets, which concentrated massive pain on the poor and the sick. But even this relatively kinder and gentler approach would still make it harder to be poor in America, by cutting welfare and health insurance payments to the poor in order to balance the budget while financing a historic tax cut for the wealthy. If President Obama was a throwback to the programs of the 1960s, this could be a throwback to the 1950s.

# Trade Politics DA

Trump pushing protectionism now- using last 100 day push

Drabold 4-21, Will, Journalist for MIC specializing in Trump AND a frequent journalist for Time Magizine, Free trade is back in the crosshairs of Donald Trump’s executive orders. Here’s why., 2017, https://mic.com/articles/174887/free-trade-is-back-in-the-crosshairs-of-donald-trump-s-executive-orders-here-s-why#.KBcW5scq3

The White House is planning a sustained campaign around fighting an issue it finds favorable: free trade. On Thursday, Trump signed an executive order that opens an investigation into whether imports of steel threaten American national security. Wilbur Ross, Trump's commerce secretary, said the investigation could yield a tariff on foreign steel, which would send a message to Trump's supporters and foreign leaders he is serious about protectionism. This order follows Trump's "[Buy American, Hire American](https://mic.com/articles/174533/h-1b-executive-order-how-buy-american-hire-american-will-affect-visa-holders#.DY0CBQnAQ)" executive order signed Tuesday and Vice President Mike Pence’s trip to Japan during which he said the United States wants to [renegotiate trade](http://www.npr.org/2017/04/18/524473913/after-south-korea-pence-visits-japan) between the two countries. Flashing his "America First" views, Trump pressed Italian Prime Minister Paolo Gentiloni on Thursday to answer whether the American ally would contribute a full 2% of its GDP to NATO — an amount Trump demanded during the campaign. Earlier this week, Trump [reiterated](https://www.forbes.com/sites/johnbrinkley/2017/04/20/trump-is-now-as-angry-at-canada-over-nafta-as-he-is-at-mexico/#49f3f3ff2b26) his campaign trail position that the North American Free Trade Agreement "has been a disaster for the United States." Instead of criticizing Mexico, a frequent target of his attacks, Trump set his sights on Canada, [calling](http://thehill.com/business-a-lobbying/329733-trump-nafta-changes-will-come-in-two-weeks) a Canadian tax on American milk "very unfair" and a "disgrace." In the next two weeks, Trump [said](http://www.foxbusiness.com/markets/2017/04/20/trump-says-there-will-be-report-about-nafta-intentions-in-two-weeks.html) he will announce his plans for NAFTA, saying he would scrap the deal if the U.S. does not receive concessions to the current deal. More than any other issue, free trade may have been the talking point that put Trump in the White House. A plurality of voters last fall, according to [exit polls](http://edition.cnn.com/election/results/exit-polls), said free trade "takes away U.S. jobs" — and Americans with that view cast their ballot for Trump by a 32 point margin. In Michigan, Pennsylvania and Wisconsin, at least half of voters said free trade was bad for American jobs and voted for Trump by a similarly wide margin. As Trump's first 100 days come to a close, it is unlikely he will notch the major legislative victory the White House is looking for. The president and congressional Republicans have been successful in rolling back [Barack Obama](https://mic.com/topic/barack-obama)-era regulations. But a victory on health care or concrete progress on tax reform have been elusive. The president [has reason to believe](https://mic.com/articles/174360/there-s-one-place-trump-seems-to-think-he-can-actually-win-foreign-policy#.CYI7i27Oj) he can win through aggressive foreign policy. Pursuing protectionist economic policy may offer Trump a similar winning political issue to prop up a struggling presidency. Gut check: Trump's approval rating is [at 43%](http://www.gallup.com/poll/201617/gallup-daily-trump-job-approval.aspx). That's eight points higher than three weeks ago.

#### Trump protectionism won’t pass- Congressional republicans are blocking him, but it is close. They don’t want to push back against Trump too much.

#### Chicago Tribune 12-5, Trump's tariff plan hits a hurdle: Congressional Republicans, 2016, <http://www.chicagotribune.com/news/nationworld/politics/ct-trump-tariff-plan-republicans-20161205-story.html>

President-elect Donald Trump's plan to use steep tariffs to punish companies that move overseas is running into an obstacle: Congressional [Republicans](http://www.chicagotribune.com/topic/politics-government/republican-party-ORGOV0000004-topic.html). House Majority Leader [Kevin McCarthy](http://www.chicagotribune.com/topic/politics-government/government/kevin-mccarthy--PEPLT0008991-topic.html) warned Monday that such an approach could cause a trade war. A better way to achieve the goal of keeping companies in the U.S. and growing jobs would be to rewrite the tax code and lower corporate rates, McCarthy said. "I think that's a better way of solving the problem than getting into a trade war with a 35 percent tariff," the California Republican told reporters at the Capitol. "We've got to have a level playing field, that companies in America can compete on a level playing field across the world, and right now we do not have one." McCarthy's comments came in response to Trump's threat, made in a series of tweets over the weekend, that he would level taxes on companies that relocate overseas and then try to sell their products back into the U.S. "There will be a tax on our soon to be strong border of 35% for these companies," Trump wrote. Republicans have typically opposed such tariffs as an intrusion on the free market, and it was just the latest example of Trump making a statement or coming up with a plan that flouts GOP orthodoxy. But Republican leaders are proving reluctant to challenge the president-elect, and McCarthy wrangled at some length with reporters at a pen-and-pad session, disputing suggestions that he and others in the party are soft-pedaling long-held beliefs in deference to Trump. For example, Republicans routinely criticized the Obama administration for taking steps that favored individual corporations, accusing the administration of "picking winners and losers." Yet GOP leaders applauded when Trump got involved to save hundreds of jobs at a Carrier plant in Indiana last week, even though it came with a cost to state taxpayers of about $7 million in tax breaks and grants. "I think a president wants to get involved any time it's about jobs being created in America, and I think that's healthy," McCarthy argued Monday. A few moments later, though, he appeared to contradict himself, asserting: "You want to know my philosophical belief? I believe in the free market, I don't think government should be picking winners or losers." Trump would likely need congressional approval to impose tariffs on a specific company or a group of companies, trade law experts said. The president has broad authority to impose tariffs on specific categories of imported goods, but not to single out individual companies that make them. House Speaker [Paul Ryan](http://www.chicagotribune.com/topic/politics-government/government/paul-ryan-PEPLT005726-topic.html) was also asked about the tariff issue Monday, in an interview with the Milwaukee Journal-Sentinel in his home state of Wisconsin. He declined to comment directly, the paper reported, and, like McCarthy, focused on tax reform instead. "We can get at what he's talking about through smart tax reform. What his concern is, is legitimate — American companies are moving overseas, are shifting headquarters and factories overseas," said Ryan, blaming "our terrible tax code." Outside GOP-friendly groups, meanwhile, lined up against Trump's tariff proposal. "Tax cuts and deregulation will make the American economy great again, but tariffs and trade wars will make it tank again," said Club for Growth president David McIntosh. "The president-elect is spot on when he calls for cutting taxes and federal regulations, but 35-percent tariffs would be devastating to consumers and businesses." The U.S. Chamber of Commerce chief economist, J.D. Foster, called tariffs "self-destructive" in an appearance on Fox Business' "The Intelligence Report with Trish Regan," adding: "You can make companies want to come into the U.S. by making the U.S. a better place to do business."

B. Trump campaigned against political correctness and retaliated against the Berkeley protests, which means even if universities are the actor, he perceptually gets credit for the implementation of the aff. It proves he can beat even the most liberal institutions.

Brown & Mangan 17 [Sarah Brown and Katherine Mangan, “Trump Can’t Cut Off Berkeley’s Funds by Himself. His Threat Still Raised Alarm,” The Chronicle of Higher Education, Feb. 3, 2017, <http://www.chronicle.com/article/Trump-Can-t-Cut-Off/239100?cid=trend_right>.] JW

Back in October, when President Trump vowed to "end" political correctness on college campuses, it was unclear how the then-presidential candidate planned to go about doing that. On Thursday, he dropped a hint: He threatened to cut off federal funding to the University of California at Berkeley after violent protests there prompted campus leaders to call off a talk by a far-right provocateur. Milo Yiannopoulos is a Breitbart News editor and Trump supporter who has for months traveled to campuses to give talks that often draw protests and have sometimes resulted in violence. He was once permanently banned from Twitter for his role in a harassment campaign against the actress Leslie Jones, and he has drawn heavy fire for his insulting comments about feminists, Black Lives Matters protesters, Islam, and topics he considers part of leftist ideology. Mr. Yiannopoulos was scheduled to speak on Berkeley’s campus late Wednesday, as part of his "Dangerous Faggot" tour, and more than 1,500 students gathered outside the venue to peacefully protest. Then about 100 additional protesters — mostly nonstudents, Berkeley officials said — joined the fray and hurled smoke bombs, broke windows, and started fires. The violence forced the campus police to put Berkeley on lockdown and led university leaders to cancel the event. The following morning, a political commentator suggested on Fox & Friends First that President Trump should take away Berkeley’s federal funding. Shortly thereafter, Mr. Trump decided to weigh in. Not surprisingly, Mr. Yiannopoulos liked that idea. On Facebook Thursday, he linked to a Breitbart article about the federal money Berkeley receives, adding, "Cut the whole lot, Donald J. Trump." Others were quick to condemn the president’s threat. U.S. Rep. Barbara Lee, a California Democrat whose district includes the Berkeley campus, tweeted back: "President Trump doesn’t have a license to blackmail universities. He’s the president, not a dictator, and his empty threats are an abuse of power." Later, in a statement, Ms. Lee said Mr. Yiannopoulos "has made a career of inflaming racist, sexist and nativist sentiments." Meanwhile, she wrote, "Berkeley has a proud history of dissent and students were fully within their rights to protest peacefully." Could Mr. Trump take away a university’s federal funding for what he sees as a violation of the First Amendment? Not on his own, and not entirely, some scholars say, though there are ways he could advocate for cutting some of it. Regardless, Mr. Trump’s singling out of Berkeley is worth paying attention to, they say, because it serves as a message to other campus officials that they may soon be put in the position of responding to the president’s social-media whims. How Berkeley Prepared Berkeley’s chancellor, Nicholas B. Dirks, went to great lengths last week to explain why the university would not give in to demands to cancel Mr. Yiannopoulos’s appearance. The First Amendment, the chancellor wrote, does not allow the university to censor or prohibit such events. "In our view, Mr. Yiannopoulos is a troll and provocateur who uses odious behavior in part to ‘entertain,’ but also to deflect any serious engagement with ideas," Mr. Dirks wrote. But, he added, "we are defending the right to free expression at an historic moment for our nation, when this right is once again of paramount importance." Mr. Dirks went on to warn that the university "will not stand idly by" if anyone tries to violate university policies by disrupting the talk. Still, the furor over the protests delighted many activists who have been arguing for years that pressure to be politically correct on campuses has stifled those with conservative views. Among them were members of the "alt-right" movement, a loosely affiliated group characterized by its white nationalist, sexist, and anti-Semitic views. The group clearly felt vindicated by the president’s assertion that Berkeley doesn’t allow free speech, which came on the heels of the online discussion group Reddit banning an alt-right community for publishing personally identifiable information about people it is criticizing. The Left is trying to shut us down because they are losing. We’re the real opposition on the Right. We’re... https://t.co/Q9HayfRhSD — AltRight.com (@AltRight\_com) February 2, 2017 On Thursday, Mr. Dirks released a statement doubling down on his earlier comments about the campus’s commitment to free speech. The violence, he said, was perpetrated by "more than 100 armed individuals clad all in black who utilized paramilitary tactics to engage in violent, destructive behavior" designed to shut the event down. "We deeply regret that the violence unleashed by this group undermined the First Amendment rights of the speaker as well as those who came to lawfully assemble and protest his presence." The university had anticipated a large crowd of protesters at Mr. Yiannopoulos’s talk on Wednesday night and had brought in dozens of police officers from across the university system to help maintain order. But "we could not plan for the unprecedented," Mr. Dirks wrote. The event was called off only after the campus police concluded that the speaker had to be evacuated for his own safety, he added. “We could not plan for the unprecedented.” Mr. Trump’s threat was also criticized by a group that is known for condemning campuses that it sees as violating free speech rights. The Foundation for Individual Rights in Education, known as FIRE, released a statement Thursday objecting to "both violence and attempts to silence protected expression." The group said, however, that it had seen no evidence that Berkeley, as an institution, had made any effort to silence Mr. Yiannopoulos, and that the university had, in fact, resisted calls to cancel his visit until the situation got out of hand. FIRE added a caution that seemed to be directed at President Trump’s threat to strip funding from Berkeley. "To punish an educational institution for the criminal behavior of those not under its control and in contravention of its policies, whether through the loss of federal funds or through any other means, would be deeply inappropriate and most likely unlawful," its statement said. Withholding Federal Funds The idea of punishing colleges for free-speech controversies was originally Ben Carson’s idea, said Jonathan Zimmerman, a professor of the history of education at the University of Pennsylvania. Mr. Carson, a neurosurgeon and former Republican presidential candidate, said in October 2015 that he would have the U.S. Department of Education "monitor our institutions of higher education for extreme political bias and deny federal funding if it exists." Terry W. Hartle, a senior vice president at the American Council on Education, took the question mark on the end of Mr. Trump’s tweet literally. The president might have been asking, Could I withhold federal funds from Berkeley? Mr. Hartle said. Yes, the federal government has the authority to withhold federal funds like financial aid from colleges that engage in certain activities, Mr. Hartle said. And it has the authority to attach conditions to the money it gives out. The Solomon Amendment, for instance, requires colleges to admit ROTC or military recruiters to their campus or risk losing money. But Congress would have to act to give the government the ability to take away federal funds for controversies involving the First Amendment, Mr. Hartle said. The government also couldn’t pull funding from Berkeley by retroactively saying the institution’s federal money is contingent on protecting free speech, said Alexander (Sasha) Volokh, an associate professor of law at Emory University. "If the funding comes explicitly with strings attached, which is that you must adequately protect free speech on your campus if you want these funds, and if the university takes these funds knowing the condition, that’s one thing," he said. The U.S. Supreme Court has weighed in several times on strings attached to federal funding, Mr. Volokh said, and has determined that such conditions must be clearly stated in advance and related to the matter being funded. For instance, he said, the court said it was OK for the government to tie federal highway funds to a requirement for states to adopt a drinking age of 21, because highway safety could be affected by the drinking age. But the National Institutes of Health probably couldn’t attach a requirement for free-speech protection to a grant for researching Ebola, he said. Moving forward, Mr. Trump could tell federal research agencies that some of their contracts with colleges and researchers should now include stipulations about free speech, Mr. Volokh said. "I have the feeling that Trump had something much blunter in mind," he said. ‘Uncharted Territory’ Mr. Trump’s social-media attack on Berkeley raises another question for colleges: how to respond to such tweets. "This is uncharted territory for all organizations," not just colleges, Mr. Hartle said, citing Mr. Trump’s criticism of Boeing for what he considered to be an overpriced contract for constructing two Air Force One planes that future presidents will use. (Boeing subsequently promised to keep the cost below $4 billion.) “You can't just ignore it if the president of the United States tweets about you.” It might not be wise to pick a fight with someone who has millions of Twitter followers, Mr. Hartle said, but "you can’t just ignore it if the president of the United States tweets about you." Berkeley is in a particularly difficult situation, Mr. Hartle said, because in his view the university did everything right when Mr. Yiannopoulos came to the campus. "Berkeley tried to allow him to speak and to allow protesters to protest," he said. "Everything was fine until the protests turned violent." One challenge for colleges, he said, will probably involve dealing with people, particularly nonstudents, who want to disrupt speakers and who "now see resorting to violence as simply another tactic in an effort to accomplish their purpose." If Mr. Trump were to push Congress to pass a law giving him the authority to take away federal funds from colleges for free-speech controversies, Mr. Hartle said, "they should carve out some sort of exception when it involved violence or a police request." “Trump is not wrong when he says a lot of people on these campuses want to squelch free speech.” While the president might not make such legislation a priority, college officials shouldn’t dismiss his criticism of Berkeley, said Mr. Zimmerman, of Penn. "It’s ridiculous and frightening for the president to be threatening to withhold money based on his perception of what’s happening with free speech on campus," he said. On the other hand, he said, "Trump is not wrong when he says a lot of people on these campuses want to squelch free speech." When institutions disinvite speakers or try to quash a right-wing group’s event or demonstration, Mr. Zimmerman said, "they’re playing right into Trump’s hands." Given the violence, Mr. Zimmerman doesn’t begrudge Berkeley’s administration for canceling the speech. But he described as problematic a letter signed by dozens of professors saying that Mr. Yiannopoulos shouldn’t be allowed to speak on campus. Ultimately, Mr. Volokh is more concerned about the way in which Mr. Trump made his point, versus the content of the tweet. "It wasn’t enough for him to say that free speech is important," Mr. Volokh said. "He had to do it in a way that was threatening."

C. Aff gives Trump polcap- the plan wins over the Ways and Means committee—they see it as bipartisan and it’s a top priority

**Jagoda 16** [NAOMI JAGODA , 3-2-2016, "House Republican concerned about colleges stifling students' speech,”]

The chairman of the House Ways and Means oversight subcommittee expressed concern Wednesday that colleges are stifling students’ political speech because they are incorrectly worried that such speech could jeopardize the schools’ tax-exempt statuses. Through provisions in the tax code, “taxpayers give financial benefits to schools based on the educational value that they offer to our society,” Rep. Peter Roskam (R-Ill.) said at a hearing. “When colleges and universities suppress speech, however, we have to question whether that educational mission is really being fulfilled.” Roskam asked students, faculty and administrators who have had their speech suppressed to share their experiences with the committee by emailing campus.speech@mail.house.gov. Frances Hill, a professor at the University of Miami School of Law, said during the hearing that “students can do almost anything” without jeopardizing a college’s tax-exempt status. The Internal Revenue Service (IRS) is more likely to be concerned about university administrators engaging in political speech without making clear that they are not speaking on behalf of the school, she added. Catherine Sevcenko, director of litigation at the Foundation for Individual Rights in Education, said that students are likely being censored because colleges are confused about IRS guidelines. “As long as the IRS guidance is ambiguous, censorship will win out every time,” she said, adding that lawmakers need to communicate to the IRS that there is an “urgent need for guidance.” Sevcenko also said the issue of censorship is a “bipartisan problem,” and students are being stifled for both liberal and conservative speech. Roskam told reporters after the hearing that he’s interested in looking to see if there’s something the IRS can do to make it clear that student expression won’t jeopardize colleges’ tax exemptions. “It seems like the letter of the law is clear, but for whatever reason, it’s not penetrating,” he said. Democrats on the panel argued the free speech issue does not fall under the committee's jurisdiction. They suggested that it would be a better use of the panel’s time to hold hearings about the effect of budget cuts on the IRS’s customer service and about identity thieves stealing taxpayer information. “Let me be clear. We have plenty of work do, and this is not it,” said Rep. John Lewis (D-Ga.), the subcommittee’s ranking member. Rep. Joseph Crowley (D-N.Y.) said the subcommittee is “searching for a problem where no problem exists.” But Roskam and other Republicans defended a hearing about colleges limiting students’ free expression. “To say that we don’t have a role here is disingenuous,” said Rep. Tom Reed (R-N.Y.).

D. New tarrifs doom millions and millions to extreme poverty. They also have a spillover effect, multiplying the impact.

Beauchamp 16, Zach, Apr 5, 2016, If you're poor in another country, this is the scariest thing Bernie Sanders has said http://www.vox.com/2016/3/1/11139718/bernie-sanders-trade-global-poverty

Free trade is one of the best tools we have for fighting extreme poverty. If Sanders wins, and is serious about implementing his trade agenda as outlined in the NYDN interview and elsewhere, he will impoverish millions of already-poor people. What's worse is that the specific ways Sanders has proposed to roll back previous trade agreements could lead to serious reprisals from the affected countries. The nightmare scenario, experts say, is a global slide toward protectionism, wherein China and other countries take cues from the US and impose their own retaliatory tariffs. That would devastate economies in the developing world, dooming many more millions to a lifetime of crushing poverty. What makes this issue particularly tricky, though, is that there's real truth to Sanders's critique: Recent economic research suggests that freer trade has hurt many Americans, particularly those who worked in manufacturing. The question, then, is how much we're willing to hurt the world's poor in order to help ourselves. Sanders wants to reverse decades of US trade liberalization Bernie Sanders's opposition to trade goes far beyond opposing new agreements, like the Trans-Pacific Partnership (TPP) and the Transatlantic Trade and Investment Partnership (TTIP). His website promises to "reverse" NAFTA and the Central American FTA (CAFTA), bills slashing US tariffs on goods from around the Americas. It also promises to get rid of permanent normal trade relations (PNTR) with China, a Clinton-era designation that prevents the US from imposing special tariffs on China that it doesn't impose on other trading partners. "If corporate America wants us to buy their products they need to manufacture those products in this country, not in China or other low-wage countries," [**Sanders's website says**](https://berniesanders.com/issues/income-and-wealth-inequality/). According to Gary Hufbauer, a senior fellow at the Peterson Institute for International Economics and an expert on trade law, Sanders could unilaterally withdraw from NAFTA and CAFTA. Ending PNTR for China would probably be impossible without congressional buy-in, but Sanders could unilaterally [**impose new tariffs**](http://www.vox.com/2016/2/18/11050194/donald-trump-president-immigration-trade) on Chinese goods, which would accomplish the same end of limiting imports from China. "There is power within the White House to increase duties on imported goods," Hufbauer tells me. "That's especially true with so-called safeguard laws, where [the president alleges] an injury to a domestic industry." But would Sanders actually do it? There's certainly reason for skepticism. Kim Elliott, an expert on trade at the Center for Global Development, notes that previous candidates (including both Barack Obama and Hillary Clinton in 2008) have suggested they would quit NAFTA. Of course, she points out, Obama did no such thing. Daniel Drezner, a professor and trade expert at Tufts University's Fletcher School of Law and Diplomacy who's been following the campaign closely, disagrees. He thinks Sanders's strong convictions on corporate America — his deep, ideological belief that American economic policy is arranged to benefit the rich and hurt the poor — would cause him to take a harder line on trade than any prior president. "Bernie thinks the American worker has gotten screwed," Drezner tells me. "He thinks the solution to that, at least in part, is to raise trade barriers against China and other low-wage economies." Sanders's record in Congress strongly supports Drezner's case. The candidate has bragged, [**in debates**](https://www.washingtonpost.com/news/the-fix/wp/2016/02/04/sanders-clinton-debate-transcript-annotating-what-they-say/), of never supporting a trade agreement. In 1993, he was literally [**on the picket line**](https://twitter.com/berniesanders/status/695454724867264512) against NAFTA; in 2005, Rep. Sanders [**spearheaded**](http://money.cnn.com/2005/02/09/news/international/china_trade/) a congressional effort to reverse PNTR status for China. His campaign issued a [**fact sheet**](https://berniesanders.com/wp-content/uploads/2016/02/Bernie-Clinton-trade.pdf) contrasting his decades of opposition to trade with [**Clinton's decades of supporting new agreements**](http://www.ontheissues.org/celeb/Hillary_Clinton_Free_Trade.htm). "If we are serious about rebuilding the middle class and creating the millions of good paying jobs we desperately need, we must fundamentally rewrite our trade policies," Sanders wrote in a 2015 piece for [**the Guardian**](http://www.theguardian.com/commentisfree/2015/apr/29/so-called-free-trade-policies-hurt-us-workers-every-time-we-pass-them). There is no reason to doubt his sincerity on this issue. If he doesn't prioritize rolling back trade agreements, he betrays not only a series of campaign promises but an entire career's worth of advocacy. Sanders's policies would be devastating for China and Latin America To understand why these policies trouble development economists, you need to understand a little bit about who the world's poorest people really are. Extreme poverty — defined by the World Bank as living on less than [$1.90 a day](http://www.vox.com/2015/10/7/9465999/world-bank-poverty-line)— is crushing. It's the kind of grinding poverty where you don't get access to running water, adequate food, proper toilets, or basic health care. Wealthy countries like the US have ([nearly](http://www.vox.com/2015/9/2/9248801/extreme-poverty-2-dollars)) eradicated this kind of poverty. Thankfully, extreme poverty is in decline globally, with the biggest declines (roughly 800 million people's worth since 1981) coming in China: Here's the problem for Sanders: The global decline in extreme poverty is inseparable from the global trading regime. When poor countries can sell cheap goods to rich countries, or bring in a lot of foreign direct investment, growth skyrockets. This means more jobs, better government services, and thus less poverty. "The free trade, or freer trade, that we've had since the end of the Second World War has been the great engine which has lifted up literally hundreds of millions of people out of poverty — far more than any aid programs," Hufbauer says. "The econometrics is indisputable." See, for example, [this 2008 study](http://www-wds.worldbank.org/external/default/WDSContentServer/WDSP/IB/2013/05/28/000442464_20130528112411/Rendered/PDF/775730JRN020080alization0and0Growth.pdf) by UCLA economist Romain Wacziarg and Karen Horn Welch. Wacziarg and Welch looked at 50 years of trade data to figure out the effects of trade liberalization on economic growth. They found that, on average, economic growth increased by 1.5 points after a country passed laws opening up to foreign trade: China is, of course, the most dramatic example of this effect: Its incredible economic growth since 1981 came principally from exports. While the Chinese economy has since shifted away from exports somewhat, the sector still makes up 22.6 percent of Chinese GDP. Trade with the US — the world's largest economy — is a key part of that story of uplift. Any serious attempt by a Sanders administration to impede trade with China would put a serious crimp in Chinese economic growth, which is already slowing down. This would make it harder for the roughly 54 million Chinese people still living in extreme poverty to escape — and it could potentially could throw even more Chinese people into poverty. "If Sanders were to impose significant trade barriers with China," Drezner says, "the marginal middle class, or the ones who had just gotten out of poverty, would likely wind up falling back into poverty." "China's economy is already not doing as well as it was," Charles Kenny, a senior fellow at the Center for Global Development, says. "Anything that slows down the growth of exports … is going to be bad for future reductions in Chinese poverty." Canceling NAFTA and CAFTA would also be quite bad. While there's not a lot of extreme poverty in Mexico and Central America, these countries are still far poorer than the US. Impeding free trade with those countries would prevent US dollars from flowing in, thus further impoverishing their poorest. "The proposals to end particular trade agreements — that could be devastating for Central America," Elliott says. "If it meant going back to the trade barriers that we had in place a decade ago, that's going to mean much less trade coming out of Central America to the United States, [and thus] many fewer jobs." Even [Dani Rodrik](http://www.nber.org/chapters/c11058.pdf) — a Harvard economist who called NAFTA a "huge disappointment" for Mexico in our conversation — thinks rolling back it and CAFTA would be a bad idea. "It would make a big difference to how America's partners in the world look at it, in terms of its credibility to be a leader," he says. Asked about a major tariff on Chinese goods, he waxed apocalyptic. "The example of the 1930s — with the US Smoot-Hawley tariff increases, and the kind of trade war that seriously exacerbated the Great Depression in the world economy, and the downward spiral of global trade — I think that should stand as a very serious warning," he says. The global consequences could be even worse These decisions don't happen in a vacuum. The global trade system, generally speaking, depends on leadership by example. When the United States opens up its own markets, other countries tend to do the same. If the US were to embrace protectionism, other countries would follow suit. The logic here is fairly ironclad. If the world's largest economy feels the need to protect its own industries from foreign competition, why shouldn't other, less economically powerful countries do the same? "Without the United States, you can't have global trade deals, you can't have progress in this area," Kenny says. "If the United States does start backsliding towards protectionism, that is quite likely to set off a spiral toward greater protectionism worldwide." American tariffs "are legally capped at 2, 3, 4 percent" under international trade law, says Elliott. Violating that restriction "risks setting off the kind of trade war that we saw in the early years of the Great Depression. Other countries are not just going to sit around and not respond to that." How bad this gets, of course, depends on how committed Sanders is to throwing up barriers to foreign trade. The more he uses executive authority to enact new tariffs, the more retaliation from other countries you're likely to see. The people who would be screwed over the most by a global backlash to free trade would, clearly, be the roughly 900 million people still living in extreme poverty. These people, clustered in South Asia and sub-Saharan Africa, could still reap tremendous benefits from exporting goods to foreign markets — essentially replicating a major part of China's growth strategy. But if richer countries like China and the US get into a serious trade war, with overall tariffs escalating on both sides, they could lose access to these markets. No more exports means much less growth, which in turn dooms millions — maybe hundreds of millions — of people to extreme poverty. Smaller, poorer countries "are just going to be bystanders who have to take what comes at them from the global economy," Elliott says. "The poor countries don't have anything in the way of fiscal or financial sources to cushion the blow, especially for the poorest people." Sanders's war on trade might be aimed at helping the American working class. But if he were really serious about it, the damage to the world's very poorest would be astronomical.

# Tax Politics DA

A. Trump pushing tax reforms now, but it won’t pass. Congressional Republicans are too divided and Trump can’t unite them

Irwin 4-11, Neil, Can Trump and Congress Solve the Rubik’s Cube of Tax Reform?, 2017, https://www.nytimes.com/2017/04/11/upshot/can-trump-and-congress-solve-the-rubiks-cube-of-tax-reform.html?\_r=0

As Congress and the Trump administration turn their sights on overhauling the tax code, it’s a good time to think about the great three-dimensional brain twister of the 1980s, the [Rubik’s Cube](https://www.rubiks.com/store/cubes). That’s partly because the first and last time there was a comprehensive rewrite of the tax code, it was 1986. But there is more than that. What makes trying to solve a Rubik’s Cube so exasperating is that every rotation you make to align the colors on one side messes up something on one of the other sides. Nothing moves in isolation; everything affects everything else, and rarely for the better. The 1986 tax overhaul took two years. Despite bipartisan backing from the Reagan administration and congressional Democrats, it had many false starts and reversals in its voyage to becoming a law. [Continue reading the main story](https://www.nytimes.com/2017/04/11/upshot/can-trump-and-congress-solve-the-rubiks-cube-of-tax-reform.html?_r=0#story-continues-2) “There are thousands of moving pieces in full-blown tax reform,” said Jeffrey Birnbaum, an author of a book about the passage of that legislation, “[Showdown at Gucci Gulch](http://www.nytimes.com/1987/07/05/books/and-they-said-it-couldn-t-be-done.html?pagewanted=all),” and now a public affairs strategist at [BGR Group](http://www.bgrdc.com/). “Every entity and interest you can think of has a stake, and there are inevitably winners and losers. And if you’re a loser, you know it.” Add in a [more polarized](https://www.nytimes.com/2017/01/03/business/economy/trump-election-democracy.html) political environment, an administration that has been [light on policy expertise](https://www.nytimes.com/2016/12/01/upshot/donald-trump-is-betting-that-policy-expertise-doesnt-matter.html), and a Republican congressional contingent that hasn’t shown [much ability](https://www.nytimes.com/2017/02/28/upshot/why-the-trump-agenda-is-moving-slowly-the-republicans-wonk-gap.html) to pass complex legislation in more than a decade, and the puzzle looks all the more complicated. Congress and the Trump administration will solve tax reform only by navigating difficult trade-offs. Think of these trade-offs as the six sides of a Rubik’s cube, each of which needs to match up perfectly — but each of which can foul up the others. Bipartisan support vs. conservative goals. The Republican majority in the Senate is narrow: It takes only three Republican senators (out of 52) to vote against a measure to ensure its failure, should Democrats stay united in opposition. The [G.O.P.](http://topics.nytimes.com/top/reference/timestopics/organizations/r/republican_party/index.html?inline=nyt-org) majority in the House is not as narrow, but it might as well be because of ideological divisions. That means Republican tax writers need a bill to keep party members on board, or one that could attract significant Democratic support and allow more room for Republican defections. In theory at least, there’s room for common ground with Democrats on the corporate income tax. President Obama proposed corporate tax changes that would have lowered the rate on businesses to 28 percent from its current 35 percent while changing its structure. But to gain any hope of [meaningful Democratic support](https://www.wsj.com/articles/how-to-make-tax-reform-bipartisan-1491164051), some key conservative goals would almost certainly need to be cast aside. Say goodbye to [lowering the top rate](https://www.wsj.com/articles/democrats-conditions-for-tax-overhaul-make-bipartisan-deal-unlikely-1491735604) on individuals’ income or other changes that primarily benefit the wealthy, or to anything that decreases the amount of revenue the government will collect in the years ahead. Even if those concessions are made, Democrats will be resistant to giving President Trump a big policy win — meaning it may take more concessions than it would in a less polarized political moment to get even a few Democrats to the table. Republicans, who showed their internal divisions during the health bill debate, need to stay united or to give up on some of the longstanding priorities of the conservative movement (and of Republican donors).

B. Trump campaigned against political correctness and retaliated against the Berkeley protests, which means even if universities are the actor, he perceptually gets credit for the implementation of the aff. It proves he can beat even the most liberal institutions.

Brown & Mangan 17 [Sarah Brown and Katherine Mangan, “Trump Can’t Cut Off Berkeley’s Funds by Himself. His Threat Still Raised Alarm,” The Chronicle of Higher Education, Feb. 3, 2017, <http://www.chronicle.com/article/Trump-Can-t-Cut-Off/239100?cid=trend_right>.] JW

Back in October, when President Trump vowed to "end" political correctness on college campuses, it was unclear how the then-presidential candidate planned to go about doing that. On Thursday, he dropped a hint: He threatened to cut off federal funding to the University of California at Berkeley after violent protests there prompted campus leaders to call off a talk by a far-right provocateur. Milo Yiannopoulos is a Breitbart News editor and Trump supporter who has for months traveled to campuses to give talks that often draw protests and have sometimes resulted in violence. He was once permanently banned from Twitter for his role in a harassment campaign against the actress Leslie Jones, and he has drawn heavy fire for his insulting comments about feminists, Black Lives Matters protesters, Islam, and topics he considers part of leftist ideology. Mr. Yiannopoulos was scheduled to speak on Berkeley’s campus late Wednesday, as part of his "Dangerous Faggot" tour, and more than 1,500 students gathered outside the venue to peacefully protest. Then about 100 additional protesters — mostly nonstudents, Berkeley officials said — joined the fray and hurled smoke bombs, broke windows, and started fires. The violence forced the campus police to put Berkeley on lockdown and led university leaders to cancel the event. The following morning, a political commentator suggested on Fox & Friends First that President Trump should take away Berkeley’s federal funding. Shortly thereafter, Mr. Trump decided to weigh in. Not surprisingly, Mr. Yiannopoulos liked that idea. On Facebook Thursday, he linked to a Breitbart article about the federal money Berkeley receives, adding, "Cut the whole lot, Donald J. Trump." Others were quick to condemn the president’s threat. U.S. Rep. Barbara Lee, a California Democrat whose district includes the Berkeley campus, tweeted back: "President Trump doesn’t have a license to blackmail universities. He’s the president, not a dictator, and his empty threats are an abuse of power." Later, in a statement, Ms. Lee said Mr. Yiannopoulos "has made a career of inflaming racist, sexist and nativist sentiments." Meanwhile, she wrote, "Berkeley has a proud history of dissent and students were fully within their rights to protest peacefully." Could Mr. Trump take away a university’s federal funding for what he sees as a violation of the First Amendment? Not on his own, and not entirely, some scholars say, though there are ways he could advocate for cutting some of it. Regardless, Mr. Trump’s singling out of Berkeley is worth paying attention to, they say, because it serves as a message to other campus officials that they may soon be put in the position of responding to the president’s social-media whims. How Berkeley Prepared Berkeley’s chancellor, Nicholas B. Dirks, went to great lengths last week to explain why the university would not give in to demands to cancel Mr. Yiannopoulos’s appearance. The First Amendment, the chancellor wrote, does not allow the university to censor or prohibit such events. "In our view, Mr. Yiannopoulos is a troll and provocateur who uses odious behavior in part to ‘entertain,’ but also to deflect any serious engagement with ideas," Mr. Dirks wrote. But, he added, "we are defending the right to free expression at an historic moment for our nation, when this right is once again of paramount importance." Mr. Dirks went on to warn that the university "will not stand idly by" if anyone tries to violate university policies by disrupting the talk. Still, the furor over the protests delighted many activists who have been arguing for years that pressure to be politically correct on campuses has stifled those with conservative views. Among them were members of the "alt-right" movement, a loosely affiliated group characterized by its white nationalist, sexist, and anti-Semitic views. The group clearly felt vindicated by the president’s assertion that Berkeley doesn’t allow free speech, which came on the heels of the online discussion group Reddit banning an alt-right community for publishing personally identifiable information about people it is criticizing. The Left is trying to shut us down because they are losing. We’re the real opposition on the Right. We’re... https://t.co/Q9HayfRhSD — AltRight.com (@AltRight\_com) February 2, 2017 On Thursday, Mr. Dirks released a statement doubling down on his earlier comments about the campus’s commitment to free speech. The violence, he said, was perpetrated by "more than 100 armed individuals clad all in black who utilized paramilitary tactics to engage in violent, destructive behavior" designed to shut the event down. "We deeply regret that the violence unleashed by this group undermined the First Amendment rights of the speaker as well as those who came to lawfully assemble and protest his presence." The university had anticipated a large crowd of protesters at Mr. Yiannopoulos’s talk on Wednesday night and had brought in dozens of police officers from across the university system to help maintain order. But "we could not plan for the unprecedented," Mr. Dirks wrote. The event was called off only after the campus police concluded that the speaker had to be evacuated for his own safety, he added. “We could not plan for the unprecedented.” Mr. Trump’s threat was also criticized by a group that is known for condemning campuses that it sees as violating free speech rights. The Foundation for Individual Rights in Education, known as FIRE, released a statement Thursday objecting to "both violence and attempts to silence protected expression." The group said, however, that it had seen no evidence that Berkeley, as an institution, had made any effort to silence Mr. Yiannopoulos, and that the university had, in fact, resisted calls to cancel his visit until the situation got out of hand. FIRE added a caution that seemed to be directed at President Trump’s threat to strip funding from Berkeley. "To punish an educational institution for the criminal behavior of those not under its control and in contravention of its policies, whether through the loss of federal funds or through any other means, would be deeply inappropriate and most likely unlawful," its statement said. Withholding Federal Funds The idea of punishing colleges for free-speech controversies was originally Ben Carson’s idea, said Jonathan Zimmerman, a professor of the history of education at the University of Pennsylvania. Mr. Carson, a neurosurgeon and former Republican presidential candidate, said in October 2015 that he would have the U.S. Department of Education "monitor our institutions of higher education for extreme political bias and deny federal funding if it exists." Terry W. Hartle, a senior vice president at the American Council on Education, took the question mark on the end of Mr. Trump’s tweet literally. The president might have been asking, Could I withhold federal funds from Berkeley? Mr. Hartle said. Yes, the federal government has the authority to withhold federal funds like financial aid from colleges that engage in certain activities, Mr. Hartle said. And it has the authority to attach conditions to the money it gives out. The Solomon Amendment, for instance, requires colleges to admit ROTC or military recruiters to their campus or risk losing money. But Congress would have to act to give the government the ability to take away federal funds for controversies involving the First Amendment, Mr. Hartle said. The government also couldn’t pull funding from Berkeley by retroactively saying the institution’s federal money is contingent on protecting free speech, said Alexander (Sasha) Volokh, an associate professor of law at Emory University. "If the funding comes explicitly with strings attached, which is that you must adequately protect free speech on your campus if you want these funds, and if the university takes these funds knowing the condition, that’s one thing," he said. The U.S. Supreme Court has weighed in several times on strings attached to federal funding, Mr. Volokh said, and has determined that such conditions must be clearly stated in advance and related to the matter being funded. For instance, he said, the court said it was OK for the government to tie federal highway funds to a requirement for states to adopt a drinking age of 21, because highway safety could be affected by the drinking age. But the National Institutes of Health probably couldn’t attach a requirement for free-speech protection to a grant for researching Ebola, he said. Moving forward, Mr. Trump could tell federal research agencies that some of their contracts with colleges and researchers should now include stipulations about free speech, Mr. Volokh said. "I have the feeling that Trump had something much blunter in mind," he said. ‘Uncharted Territory’ Mr. Trump’s social-media attack on Berkeley raises another question for colleges: how to respond to such tweets. "This is uncharted territory for all organizations," not just colleges, Mr. Hartle said, citing Mr. Trump’s criticism of Boeing for what he considered to be an overpriced contract for constructing two Air Force One planes that future presidents will use. (Boeing subsequently promised to keep the cost below $4 billion.) “You can't just ignore it if the president of the United States tweets about you.” It might not be wise to pick a fight with someone who has millions of Twitter followers, Mr. Hartle said, but "you can’t just ignore it if the president of the United States tweets about you." Berkeley is in a particularly difficult situation, Mr. Hartle said, because in his view the university did everything right when Mr. Yiannopoulos came to the campus. "Berkeley tried to allow him to speak and to allow protesters to protest," he said. "Everything was fine until the protests turned violent." One challenge for colleges, he said, will probably involve dealing with people, particularly nonstudents, who want to disrupt speakers and who "now see resorting to violence as simply another tactic in an effort to accomplish their purpose." If Mr. Trump were to push Congress to pass a law giving him the authority to take away federal funds from colleges for free-speech controversies, Mr. Hartle said, "they should carve out some sort of exception when it involved violence or a police request." “Trump is not wrong when he says a lot of people on these campuses want to squelch free speech.” While the president might not make such legislation a priority, college officials shouldn’t dismiss his criticism of Berkeley, said Mr. Zimmerman, of Penn. "It’s ridiculous and frightening for the president to be threatening to withhold money based on his perception of what’s happening with free speech on campus," he said. On the other hand, he said, "Trump is not wrong when he says a lot of people on these campuses want to squelch free speech." When institutions disinvite speakers or try to quash a right-wing group’s event or demonstration, Mr. Zimmerman said, "they’re playing right into Trump’s hands." Given the violence, Mr. Zimmerman doesn’t begrudge Berkeley’s administration for canceling the speech. But he described as problematic a letter signed by dozens of professors saying that Mr. Yiannopoulos shouldn’t be allowed to speak on campus. Ultimately, Mr. Volokh is more concerned about the way in which Mr. Trump made his point, versus the content of the tweet. "It wasn’t enough for him to say that free speech is important," Mr. Volokh said. "He had to do it in a way that was threatening."

C. 2 independent internal links.

1. Winners win: Presidential boldness creates a steamroll effect.

Green 10 [David Michael Green, professor of political science at Hofstra University, “The Do-Nothing 44th President,” OpEd News, June 11, 2010, http://www.opednews.com/articles/The-Do-Nothing-44th-Presid-by-David-Michael-Gree-100611-648.html] JW

Moreover, there is a continuously evolving and reciprocal relationship between presidential boldness and achievement. In the same way that nothing breeds success like success, nothing sets the president up for achieving his or her next goal better than succeeding dramatically on the last go around. This is absolutely a matter of perception, and you can see it best in the way that Congress and especially the Washington press corps fawn over bold and intimidating presidents like Reagan and George W. Bush. The political teams surrounding these presidents understood the psychology of power all too well. They knew that by simultaneously creating a steamroller effect and feigning a clubby atmosphere for Congress and the press, they could leave such hapless hangers-on with only one remaining way to pretend to preserve their dignities. By jumping on board the freight train, they could be given the illusion of being next to power, of being part of the winning team. And so, with virtually the sole exception of the now retired Helen Thomas, this is precisely what they did.

2. Aff gives Trump polcap- the plan wins over the Ways and Means committee—they see it as bipartisan and it’s a top priority

**Jagoda 16** [NAOMI JAGODA , 3-2-2016, "House Republican concerned about colleges stifling students' speech,”]

The chairman of the House Ways and Means oversight subcommittee expressed concern Wednesday that colleges are stifling students’ political speech because they are incorrectly worried that such speech could jeopardize the schools’ tax-exempt statuses. Through provisions in the tax code, “taxpayers give financial benefits to schools based on the educational value that they offer to our society,” Rep. Peter Roskam (R-Ill.) said at a hearing. “When colleges and universities suppress speech, however, we have to question whether that educational mission is really being fulfilled.” Roskam asked students, faculty and administrators who have had their speech suppressed to share their experiences with the committee by emailing campus.speech@mail.house.gov. Frances Hill, a professor at the University of Miami School of Law, said during the hearing that “students can do almost anything” without jeopardizing a college’s tax-exempt status. The Internal Revenue Service (IRS) is more likely to be concerned about university administrators engaging in political speech without making clear that they are not speaking on behalf of the school, she added. Catherine Sevcenko, director of litigation at the Foundation for Individual Rights in Education, said that students are likely being censored because colleges are confused about IRS guidelines. “As long as the IRS guidance is ambiguous, censorship will win out every time,” she said, adding that lawmakers need to communicate to the IRS that there is an “urgent need for guidance.” Sevcenko also said the issue of censorship is a “bipartisan problem,” and students are being stifled for both liberal and conservative speech. Roskam told reporters after the hearing that he’s interested in looking to see if there’s something the IRS can do to make it clear that student expression won’t jeopardize colleges’ tax exemptions. “It seems like the letter of the law is clear, but for whatever reason, it’s not penetrating,” he said. Democrats on the panel argued the free speech issue does not fall under the committee's jurisdiction. They suggested that it would be a better use of the panel’s time to hold hearings about the effect of budget cuts on the IRS’s customer service and about identity thieves stealing taxpayer information. “Let me be clear. We have plenty of work do, and this is not it,” said Rep. John Lewis (D-Ga.), the subcommittee’s ranking member. Rep. Joseph Crowley (D-N.Y.) said the subcommittee is “searching for a problem where no problem exists.” But Roskam and other Republicans defended a hearing about colleges limiting students’ free expression. “To say that we don’t have a role here is disingenuous,” said Rep. Tom Reed (R-N.Y.).

D. Trump tax reform will doom millions to poverty- he will cut anti-poverty spending by more than 6 trillion.

#### Trump’s tax reform will doom millions of middle and working class Americans to extreme poverty – historical precedent proves.

Matthews 16 Donald Trump’s presidency is going to be a disaster for the white working class, Updated by [Dylan Matthews](http://www.vox.com/authors/dylan) Nov 9, 2016, http://www.vox.com/policy-and-politics/2016/11/9/13572172/donald-trump-white-working-class

Lower-income whites are not going to suffer from Trump’s restrictions on Muslims traveling, or from his mass deportations, or from his cavalier attitude toward police brutality. But Trump has promised an economic agenda that will increase the ranks of the uninsured by tens of millions, that will eliminate crucial safety net programs for low- and moderate-income Americans, that could start a trade war that drives up prices and devastates the economy, and that will put in place a tax code that exacerbates inequality and leaves many families with children worse off.

That affects all Americans — and with Republicans retaining control over the House and Senate, it stands a very good chance of passing.

For the past decade, Paul Ryan has languished either in the House minority or under a Democratic president, putting together extreme proposals for completely overhauling the safety net. [Medicare would be voucherized](https://www.washingtonpost.com/news/wonk/wp/2013/03/12/paul-ryans-budget-isnt-about-the-deficit/) — either with or without the option for beneficiaries to keep the traditional program. He offered [one of the most extreme Social Security privatization proposals](http://www.cbpp.org/research/the-ryan-sununu-social-security-plan) of the 2005-’06 debate on the issue.

But the worst is saved for means-tested programs, in particular Medicaid and food stamps. He would move fast to [“block-grant” food stamps and Medicaid](http://www.cbpp.org/blog/ryan-and-block-granting-the-safety-net), transforming them from guarantees of food and medical care for the nation’s poorest people into a slush fund for states. This [approach was devastating during welfare reform](http://www.vox.com/2016/6/20/11789988/clintons-welfare-reform), and it’s impossible to imagine a way this would happen that wouldn’t exacerbate extreme poverty and hunger. After the end of welfare, food stamps were the last cash-like benefit upon which people without earnings could rely. Ryan will put an end to that.

And then [he’d cut all these programs for good measure](http://www.cbpp.org/research/ryan-plan-gets-69-percent-of-its-budget-cuts-from-programs-for-people-with-low-or-moderate). Sixty-nine percent of the cuts in his last budget came from programs for people with low or moderate incomes, including $137 billion over 10 years from food stamps (now the block grant), up to $125 billion from Pell Grants, and another $150 billion or more from other low-income programs like Supplemental Security Income and the earned income tax credit. [Medicaid would be cut by more than a quarter](http://www.cbpp.org/research/ryan-block-grant-proposal-would-cut-medicaid-by-more-than-one-quarter-by-2024-and-more) through the block grant. Ryan has sometimes trolled journalists by claiming to support boosting the EITC, only to propose paying for it by [cutting other programs for the poor](http://www.vox.com/2014/12/2/7320363/eitc-child-credit-ryan).

These are changes that will dramatically decrease insurance coverage among the poor, increase hunger, and greatly exacerbate poverty in its most extreme form. And while Trump has expressed wariness of tampering with Medicare or Social Security, he has expressed no such hesitation about Ryan’s proposed cuts to programs for the poor.

The Ryan budget has become the key economic agenda of the Republican Party over the past six years. By now it wields substantial, likely majority, support in both houses of Congress, even if Ryan himself does not survive as speaker. And it’s hard to imagine Trump using a veto to prevent these kinds of reforms and cuts from becoming law.

As a result, Trump will likely oversee the most vicious cuts to programs for poor and medium-income people of any president since Reagan — and could very well go further than Reagan did. The result will almost certainly be a massive increase in uninsurance for the lower-income working people currently covered by Medicaid, an increase in poverty and hunger for the working poor on food stamps, and a large increase in extreme poverty.

Weighing arguments

1. extreme poverty outweighs the case – not being able to have access to food at night, basic supplies, and human decency is a prerequisite to having effective speech
2. cutting programs for the poor can have a spillover effect into cutting FASFA which is what many minorities relies on in order to even get federal aid for colleges – link turns their solvency because it means minorities don’t get to college and get to interact with counterspeech

# 2NR Frontlines

## 2NR Weighing OV

1. increasing free speech on college campuses increases Trump’s credibility as he gets credit for the aff: that’s the Brown and Managan ev. His influence is inevitable and he will be seen as triumphant over the most liberal institutions.

2. outweighs:

a) scope: the DA impacts to millions of people and literally starves them out of existence. The aff is just a few people on college campuses that are now allowed to dissent against the government

b) even if you grant us 0.01% risk of link on the scenario: that’s at least still 900,000 people globally who have lost jobs and are doomed to poverty which still outweighs the aff even if you grant them 100% risk of link to their impacts.

c) winners win is an impact multiplier. If free speech gives Trump a victory on tariffs, that victory will snowball which will allow him to pass other terrible things like his budget that guts the EPA and Department of Education

## Tariffs/Trade Scenario

### AT Trump Not Pushing

1. Trump pushing for tariffs now – he wants to impose tariffs on steel imports

**Donnan 4/20** Shawn Donnan "Donald Trump moves towards imposing tariffs on steel imports" White House launches national security investigation using 1962 law The Financial Times 4/20/17 https://www.ft.com/content/d8413fe8-25e6-11e7-8691-d5f7e0cd0a16

The US has set the stage for a global showdown over steel, launching **a national security investigation** that could lead to **sweeping tariffs on steel imports** in what **would be the first significant act of economic protectionism by** President Donald **Trump**. The decision to use a 1962 law allowing the US government to limit imports that threaten its security readiness is intended to deliver on Mr Trump’s campaign promises to bolster heavy industry and “put new American steel into the spine of this country”, officials said on Thursday. But it risks setting off trade tensions with China just days after Mr Trump avoided another conflict by backing down on a promise to label Beijing a currency manipulator, citing in part its help in dealing with North Korea. Mr Trump called the move a “historic day for American steel” but insisted it “has nothing to do with China”. “**Steel is critical to both our economy and our military. This is not an area where we can afford to become dependent on foreign countries**,” he added. **The new push on steel came as Christine Lagarde, the head of the International Monetary Fund, repeated a warning that protectionism represented a serious threat to global growth**. But Ms Lagarde, who has been locked in a rhetorical battle over protectionism with Mr Trump’s commerce secretary, Wilbur Ross, sought to reach out to the White House by acknowledging a need for changes in global trade. Echoing some of Mr Trump’s criticism of the multilateral system, the former French finance minister said there were increasing signs countries were violating global trading rules. She also concurred with the Trump administration’s recent criticism of Germany, saying that addressing Berlin’s trade surplus was “highly desirable”. Mr **Trump’s move on steel drew praise from both US industry members and labour unions.** “This executive order will give us the tools we need to lure our companies back and [put] our people back to work,” said Leo Gerard, head of the United Steelworkers union. Mr Ross said the administration was concerned that rising steel imports were threatening US industry and its ability to respond quickly to national security needs. The issue was particularly relevant now because of Mr Trump’s plans to increase spending on defence programmes such as new warships that rely heavily on steel, he added. The US has in recent years launched 152 steel anti-dumping cases, with another 25 pending, but Mr Ross said the trade dispute system was “porous” because it allowed only narrowly focused complaints against specific countries. “We’re groping here to see whether the facts warrant a more comprehensive solution that would deal with a very wide range of steel products from a very wide range of countries,” he said. Any such action by the US would be likely to hurt steel producers in Europe and Asia and trigger reprisals. The US steel industry has blamed Chinese overcapacity for driving down global prices and causing it to close mills and lay off workers. The industry is now operating at only 71 per cent of its capacity, with imports accounting for more than a quarter of the domestic steel market, Mr Ross said. While Mr Trump has promised a hardline trade policy since taking office in January, his biggest action to date has been to pull the US out of a vast but never finalised 12-country Pacific trade deal. **Most other moves have been largely rhetorical. Mr Trump launched studies of US trade deficits and Buy American laws, and while he has vowed to renegotiate** the **N**orth **A**merican **F**ree **T**rade **A**greement, thus far discussions with Canada and Mexico have been tentative. In a trip through Asia **this week,** Mike **Pence**, the vice-president, **warned South Korea that the US wants to renegotiate trade deals that it feels have only added to the US trade deficit**, and **Mr Trump has held early talks with China over a trade deal**. While those initiatives remain in the pipeline, there have been few of the concrete policies advocated in Mr Trump’s campaign that were central to his economic nationalist message and helped him win industrial states such as Ohio and Michigan. The slow start on trade has come in part because Congress has yet to confirm his pick for US trade representative, Robert Lighthizer, which has frustrated an administration desperate to notch up accomplishments in its first 100 days. Mr Trump said the steel study’s recommendations could come within a month. **Mr Ross made clear he believed the investigation would lead to tariff actions and what would mark the first concrete protectionist moves by an administration that until now has been more focused on commissioning reports**. “Only the president’s actions based on those reports can show us his true colours on trade,” said Scott Lincicome, a White & Case trade lawyer also affiliated with the libertarian Cato Institute. Chad Bown, a senior fellow at the Peterson Institute for International Economics and a former economic adviser to President Barack Obama, said citing “national security” on steel amounted to invoking a “nuclear option” in trade. “This is one more piece of evidence in the worrisome trend that Trump seems to be turning over every rock and investigating each and every available tool available under US law to stop trade,” Mr Bown said.

Prefer our evidence: it’s from last week which means it’s most likely to reflect what Trump wants done especially since he flip-flops on lots of issues

#### 2. Trump has said repeatedly that he wants to impose taxes and tariffs

**Browning 4/17** Lynnley Browning "Trump's ‘Reciprocal Tax’ Seen Affirming His Love of Tariffs" April 17, 2017 Bloomberg Politics. Browning is a staff tax reporter at Bloomberg News, former senior reporter for Newsweek. Also wrote for NYT, Fortune, and Reuters on tax,o ffshore private banking, legal, insurance, real estate and investment matters.

**“When you say I’m going to charge a 10 percent or a 20 percent border tax, everyone goes crazy, because they like free trade.” Trump said** during an interview aired by Fox Business Network Wednesday. He added later: **“But when you say ‘reciprocal tax,’ nobody can get angry.”** That may remain to be seen. **Economists and tax experts who parsed Trump’s remarks say the president appeared to be calling for import tariffs** -- that is, taxes levied on specific goods or countries at varying rates. In describing his vision, Trump called for taxing imports from other countries at the same rates those countries impose on U.S. products. “You say, ‘OK, whatever you charge, we’re charging,”’ Trump said. Left unsaid was how or whether Trump’s plan would tax U.S. companies’ exports. ‘Import Tariffs’ “He’s mostly talking about import tariffs,” said Chad Bown, an international trade specialist at the Peterson Institute for International Economics. Economist Alan Viard of the American Enterprise Institute agreed, adding that **import tariffs, without corresponding export subsidies, “raise prices on imported goods relative to other goods, reducing trade and lowering consumer well-being**.” Trump’s television comments -- the first extensive remarks he’s made about his tax-overhaul plans in weeks -- left much room for interpretation. For example, in one reference to his reciprocal-tax idea, he said, “And I’m not saying that’s what I’m doing.” White House officials say they’re in the early stages of crafting tax legislation -- and some have taken pains to put the president’s stamp on it, even before it’s ready. “You will have a White House-Donald Trump tax plan that we are going to take down to the Hill and try and sell,” Mick Mulvaney, the director of the Office of Management and Budget, said during a CNBC interview Wednesday. Trump told the Wall Street Journal that he doesn’t intend to release any details of his tax plan until Congress approves legislation to repeal Obamacare -- a measure that failed to make it to a House vote last month. Ryan’s Blueprint Meanwhile, the House Ways & Means Committee is working on Ryan’s blueprint, which would replace the 35 percent corporate income tax with the 20 percent border-adjusted tax on companies’ domestic cash flow. “I can just say broadly that -- **it is clear the president [is]** and House Republicans are **sick and tired of America being at a competitive disadvantage and it’s time for pro-growth tax reform that levels the playing field for American workers**,” said Emily Schillinger, a spokeswoman for the tax-writing panel. It’s not precisely clear whether the president opposes the BAT, which would impose a single tax rate on U.S. companies’ imports, or just its name. Last week, Trump -- a billionaire whose businesses revolve around branding -- riffed through what he considered a number of better names, including “mirror tax” and “matching tax.” Both imply that he’s thinking about an approach that creates different tax rates for imports from different countries. Prior Statements “You could read his comments as re-branding BAT, but then again, you probably shouldn’t do that,” said Harold Hancock, who served as tax counsel to the Ways & Means panel for six years before joining law firm McGuireWoods LLP last month. “It’s clear he hasn’t yet decided” whether he’s on board with Ryan’s proposal. Treasury Secretary Steven Mnuchin first floated the idea of a “reciprocal tax” in late February, in reference to Trump’s thinking. “An idea that he’s looking at calling a reciprocal tax, which is basically saying we want to create a level playing field so that other countries treat us the way we’re treating them,” Mnuchin said during a Fox interview. **Trump has** also previously **called for tariffs of as much as 35 percent on the imported products of U.S. companies that move manufacturing jobs overseas**. Still, **among tax-policy watchers, the president’s latest comments have fueled new thinking that Trump is headed toward broader import tariffs**. “**His** **plan on tax is, ‘whatever you’re going to do to us,’ we’re going to do to you**,”’ said Henrietta Treyz, a managing partner and director of economic policy at Veda Partners. “‘Reciprocal’ is everything.”

### AT XO Non-unique

Their evidence doesn’t look at the bigger picture- yes Trump has some power over tarrifs, but congress has the ability to strip him of this power if they want to. Prefer my evidence it looks at the historical basis.

Mihm 1-27, Stephen, Congress Has the Power on Trade, Bloomberg, 2017, https://www.bloomberg.com/view/articles/2017-01-27/congress-has-the-power-on-trade

When it comes to trade, Trump can’t go it alone, slapping tariffs on other nations and renegotiating existing trade agreements. That’s because Congress, not the president, has largely controlled trade policy throughout the nation’s history. Trump can negotiate. But it’s Congress that is invested with the power to lead. The U.S. Constitution gives Congress the authority to “regulate Commerce with foreign nations.” It also gives Congress the power to “lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts, and Excises.” Given that trade policy in the early years of the nation consisted almost exclusively of setting tariffs on foreign goods -- a tax that provided most of the federal government’s revenue -- Congress most definitely held the upper hand the nation’s early year’s. While nineteenth-century presidents occasionally asserted their authority over trade as an extension of their oversight of foreign affairs, Congress maintained tight control by drafting tariff schedules that slapped duties on imported goods. The Republican Party was especially fond of protective tariffs because they protected domestic industrial interests. The high-water mark of legislative control came with the drafting of the infamous Smoot-Hawley Act, which imposed approximately 20,000 different protective duties on a wide range of imported goods, with ad valorem taxes averaging 53 percent. As more than one legal scholar has observed, tariff schedules invite political horse trading, as every special interest gets its cut. In fact, as the legislation took shape, it was amended no less than 1,253 times in response to requests by nearly every imaginable economic interest. This infamous piece of legislation, which President Herbert Hoover reluctantly signed, precipitated a trade war with other industrial nations and is widely thought to have contributed to the economic cataclysm known as the Great Depression. With protectionism discredited and Congress blamed for its failure to manage trade policy in the interests of the country, the door opened to free trade and a stronger role for the executive branch. In 1934, Congress passed the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act of 1934, which gave the president significant control over trade policy. Under its provisions, Congress gave the executive branch advance authority to negotiate bilateral tariff reductions with other nations. For the first time, the president was free to pursue free trade policies without Congress micromanaging the process. But Congress didn’t cede all its authority. For starters, it drew up binding guidelines as to how much tariffs could be reduced. Moreover, Congress maintained control over the process because it limited the president’s authority to a three-year period, at which point it would have to be renewed. Subsequent amendments to the law gave Congress additional say over whether domestic industries had been damaged by these trade agreements. In 1962, President Kennedy sought additional negotiating authority from Congress in order to deal with the forerunner of today’s European Union. Congress pushed back, fearful that Kennedy would negotiate over more than just tariffs (indeed, he would also seek to lower so-called NTBs, or Non-Tariff Barriers, which included subsidies, import quotas, and other contrivances that hindered free trade). These fears prompted a revolt against Kennedy’s successor, Lyndon Johnson. When the latter’s authority to negotiate came up for a vote in 1967, Congress refused. President Richard Nixon suffered the same fate. In fact, it was not until the waning months of the Nixon administration that Congress compromised. On a superficial level, the resulting legislation – known as the Fair Trade Act of 1974 – reaffirmed the president’s power to cut trade deals. It created the so-called “fast track” authority, which empowered the president to negotiate trade agreements independent of Congress. Unlike conventional international treaties, these agreements would not require the approval of two-thirds of the Senate; they would simply require a majority. Moreover, Congress agreed that it would not amend agreements negotiated by the president, much less filibuster them or otherwise meddle with them. As a committee report on the legislation put it, “such agreements negotiated by the Executive should be given an up-or-down vote by the Congress. Our negotiators cannot be expected to accomplish the negotiating goals ... if there are no reasonable assurances that the negotiated agreements would be voted up-or-down on their merits.” But the president’s newfound power, forged as the Watergate scandal forced Nixon from office, was far more contingent and fragile that it first appeared. Congress, deeply skeptical of the executive branch, tied the president’s hands in several subtle but concrete ways. The first provision limited presidential authority by specifying the objects of negotiation. In other words, the president can’t simply go it alone; he must operate within whatever parameters Congress imposes. Moreover, the president’s authority was subject to a sunset provision: Congress must renew the authority every few years. In addition, the law required that the president consult Congress and comply with elaborate certification and reporting requirements. If Congress believed the president has failed to do so, it could strip him of his fast track authority immediately. In the 1980s, Congress actually seized even greater control over the president’s ability to negotiate trade deals. Under the Trade and Tariff Act of 1984, the president was required to consult Congress even more frequently, with the latter given multiple opportunities to derail any trade negotiations. And Congress did not hesitate to bring its power to bear on subsequent presidents, shaping trade agreements and also, on more than one occasion, refusing the renew the president’s fast track authority. These conflicts invariably pitched free-trade presidents against protectionist members of Congress. But the situation is now reversed with Trump as protectionist-in-chief and most members of his own party – and more than a few Democrats – as the free traders. While it’s anyone’s guess how this will play out, it’s almost certain that these differences of opinion will ignite more than a few battles. When that happens, Trump may be surprised to learn that Congress has the upper hand. It’s one thing to kill off a trade deal that probably wouldn’t have passed Congress anyway. But if history is any guide, Congress will run circles around Trump should he be foolish enough to try and go it alone.

#### Origination clause means XO on tariffs is unconstitutional.

Kysar 1/3 [Rebecca Kysar, “Is Trump’s Tariff Plan Constitutional?” New York Times, January 3, 2017, <https://www.nytimes.com/2017/01/03/opinion/is-trumps-tariff-plan-constitutional.html?_r=0>]

True, tariffs are no longer used to raise money, but to protect domestic industries, and to punish foreign ones. But they unquestionably still produce revenue. And while tariffs on imports are aimed at foreigners, they affect domestic industries that use or compete with imports; they can also have an enormous impact on the overall economy by raising consumer prices. Allowing the executive to circumvent the House to enact otherwise unfavorable tax policies that affect Americans is what the clause is designed to avoid — that those furthest removed from the people have the ability to tax them. While there isn’t an enormous body of Supreme Court case law on the Origination Clause, what little there is supports the understanding that the clause would cover tariffs. The court’s test seems to set a pretty low bar: While paying lip service to an inquiry of the law’s purpose, the court has instead looked at whether a measure funds the general treasury rather than a specific program — a hurdle that tariffs, the money from which almost always goes into the general coffers, would easily clear. Whether the tariff exists to raise money or punish bad trade practices is likely irrelevant. Indeed, in cases where the court has analyzed the Senate’s power to amend tariff legislation originating in the House, the court has never questioned that the bills at issue fell within the scope of the clause, thereby implicitly accepting tariffs as “bills for raising revenue.”

## Tax Reform Scenario

### Uniqueness F/L

#### Tax reform won’t pass now – political infighting and federal money loss, but a win can change that.

Ollstein 17 , [The GOP’s Existential Crisis: If They Can’t Pass Tax Cuts, What Can They Do? By [ALICE OLLSTEIN](http://talkingpointsmemo.com/profile/aliceoll) Published APRIL 12, 2017 6:00 AM, <http://talkingpointsmemo.com/dc/trump-tax-reform-health-care>] MC

Republicans had originally planned to tackle the thorny issue of tax reform bolstered by achieving the repeal of the Affordable Care Act. “Success breeds success,**”** Rep. Tom Cole (R-OK) [told TPM](http://talkingpointsmemo.com/dc/obamacare-repeal-vote-ultimatiim) leading up to the health care bill’s failure, which he warned would make tax reform “infinitely more difficult.” Lawmakers, former staffers, and economists agree that the challenge now is much greater both fiscally and politically. Republicans continue to point fingers and snipe at one another over the health care bill’s demise, Trump has publicly attacked and threatened to primary the very lawmakers whose support he would need to pass a tax bill, and Republicans are [getting slammed](http://talkingpointsmemo.com/dc/republicans-aca-obamacare-health-care-recess) by their constituents and deep-pocketed conservative groups over their failure to pass a bill. “They touched the stove with health care and boy, did they get burned badly,” Scandling said. “How much of an appetite do they have now to work on something like this?” Scandling, now a consultant for the group APCO Worldwide, said the health care debacle could also embolden Republicans to continue defying the president’s wishes in the coming tax reform battle. “Now people have seen how easy it is for a certain group of people—the Freedom Caucus or Tuesday Group or Republican Study Committee or some new group in the House—they only need a small number of votes to hold everybody else hostage,” he explained. Aside from the political bruising, Republicans will also enter the tax reform fight with far less federal money to work with, having failed to pass a health care bill that would have [reduced the deficit by hundreds of billions of dollars](http://talkingpointsmemo.com/dc/cbo-obamacare-cost-deficit)**—mainly through slashing Medicaid spending.**

#### Trump will keep pushing tax reform no matter what – if he gets popular, then it would go through.

Ollstein 17 , [The GOP’s Existential Crisis: If They Can’t Pass Tax Cuts, What Can They Do? By [ALICE OLLSTEIN](http://talkingpointsmemo.com/profile/aliceoll) Published APRIL 12, 2017 6:00 AM, <http://talkingpointsmemo.com/dc/trump-tax-reform-health-care>] MC

By all accounts, President Trump is very much invested in the topic of tax reform and eager to impose his own vision on the process. **“**Unlike with health reform, he has his own ideas, and he won’t be content to just rubber stamp what comes out of Congress,” noted Scandling. But what exactly those ideas are remains a mystery. The Associated Press [reported this week](http://talkingpointsmemo.com/dc/hosted.ap.org/dynamic/stories/U/US_TRUMP_TAXES) that Trump is scrapping the tax plan he campaigned on in favor of going back to the drawing board. Treasury Secretary Steve Mnuchin, meanwhile, has revealed little about his own vision, other than [cutting individual and corporate tax breaks](https://www.bostonglobe.com/news/politics/2017/03/25/trump-tax-overhaul-doubt-after-health-care-loss/McSuALGBBQaMzetQU7A2kN/story.html), and has no previous government experience to fall back on.

### AT Tax Cuts Pay for themselves

Analysis of the past 20 years of tax policies and expert analysis indicate that tax cuts are unlikely to boost the economy

**Kruzel 4/28** John Kruzel "Do tax cuts pay for themselves? Evidence is thin" Friday, April 28, 2017 www.politifact.com/punditfact/statements/2017/apr/28/rana-foroohar/trumps-tax-plan-prompts-question-can-tax-cuts-real/. Kruzel is a staff writer for PoliticFact, PolitiFact is run by editors and reporters from the Tampa Bay Times, an independent newspaper in Florida

The Trump administration unveiled a one-page list of tax reform principles inspired by the theory that tax cuts can unleash enough economic growth to cover lost revenue. President George H.W. Bush famously derided this as "voodoo economics," and present-day critics are no less dismissive of what they see as magical thinking by the White House. "The Trump administration will say, 'Well, hey, tax cuts are going to create growth, growth is going to create revenue, that's going to offset all this deficit,'" Rana Foroohar, a CNN economic analyst and Financial Times columnist, told CNN April 26. "Well, there's no real evidence in the last 20 years that that has happened." We decided to investigate this claim. First, the big changes under the White House proposal: the business tax rate drops from 35 to 15 percent for both big and small corporations alike, personal income tax brackets go from seven brackets to three (10, 25, and 35 percent), and the so-called standard deduction -- the amount of personal income not subject to federal income tax -- will be doubled, while some other deductions are removed. There’s isn’t much more detail than that, making it difficult to put a price tag on the proposal. The nonpartisan Committee for a Responsible Federal Budget, or CRFB, attempted to analyze the one-pager’s potential effect on the debt, making a lot of assumptions along the way. Their best guess, which was quickly eaten up by Trump’s critics on TV, was an increase to the debt of $5.5 trillion, or somewhere between $3 trillion to $7 trillion. There’s other ways to offset tax cuts than economic growth: you can raise rates on other taxes, like through a tax on imports, as House Republicans want. Or you can limit tax breaks, cut spending, or do some combination of these, and it’s certainly possible the Trump administration will explore these options. A [White House fact sheet](https://www.whitehouse.gov/blog/2017/04/26/president-trump-proposed-massive-tax-cut-heres-what-you-need-know) by chief economic advisor Gary Cohn on April 26 did make a passing reference to nixing some tax breaks for the wealthy. But the administration has offered no specifics on paying for the cuts, and as of [April 20](https://www.c-span.org/video/?427261-6/institute-international-finance-policy-summit-secretary-mnuchin&start=577) Treasury Secretary Steve Mnuchin was still insisting, "The deal will pay for itself." So let’s set aside for now the other ways the administration may seek to offset lost revenue from tax cuts. **For Trump’s tax cuts to pay for themselves, the economy would have to grow by $5.5 trillion**, or roughly a sustained 4.5 percent, for the next 10 years, according to CRFB. **That’s** a mark that any president is **unlikely** to hit. Trump promised during the campaign to have [4 percent growth per year.](http://www.politifact.com/truth-o-meter/promises/trumpometer/promise/1414/grow-economy-4-percent-year/) Treasury Secretary Steve Mnuchin has since said the [target is 3 percent growth](https://www.washingtonpost.com/news/wonk/wp/2017/02/23/mnuchin-the-u-s-can-get-back-to-3-percent-growth/?utm_term=.ec9c8862908d). In reality, **the** average annual growth rate since 2001 has been 1.8 percent, [according to Vox](http://www.vox.com/the-big-idea/2017/3/21/14938698/growth-trump-economic-us-slowdown-demographics-stagnation). **Most experts** we interviewed **concurred** with Foroohar **that the idea that tax cuts could spur the level of growth needed is not realistic**. One economist went further than Foroohar, noting that steep tax cuts may actually impede economic growth. Several experts cautioned that isolating tax cuts as the sole cause of whatever economic conditions are to follow is more than a little tricky, since good or bad economic conditions can coincide with tax cuts and affect federal revenue. Another caveat is that tax cuts can be manipulated to look as if they’re boosting growth when they’re really not -- as [we’ve shown](http://www.politifact.com/punditfact/statements/2015/jun/17/ron-christie/gop-strategist-christie-tax-revenues-rose-after-bu/) before. While tax cuts don’t pay for themselves fully, tax cuts can generate some growth. For instance, take a 2005 study by the Congressional Budget Office that asked what would happen if Americans got a 10 percent income tax cut. Under CBO’s most optimistic projection, nearly one-third of the tax cut would be offset by additional tax revenue over 10 years. (We’ll get to their pessimistic projection soon.) N. Gregory Mankiw, a Harvard University economist and former chairman of the President’s Council of Economic Advisers under George W. Bush, shared a similar view. "A reasonable rule of thumb, in my judgment, is that about one-third of the cost of tax cuts is recouped via faster economic growth," Mankiw said. Edward Kleinbard, a professor of law and business at the University of Southern California, said smart corporate tax reform could stimulate the economy somewhat -- but at a net loss. "A really well-designed corporate tax reform package, including a rate cut, would be accretive to growth," he said, "but not enough to pay for any resulting large-scale deficits." So tax cuts can create some growth, according to the experts. But are there any historical cases of tax cuts producing so much growth they fully pay for themselves? "I am not aware of any credible evidence (in the U.S.) over the last several decades of a broad-based tax cut paying for itself," said Alan Auerbach, an economist at the University of California, Berkeley. "I don't think this is at all controversial among actual economists." Kleinbard was similarly emphatic: "**There is no time in modern history where tax cuts** could be said to **pay for themselves**." According to Kleinbard, **the 1981 tax cuts triggered massive federal deficits and were** largely **reversed** within three years. **The Tax Reform Act of 1986** was basically revenue neutral, he said, meaning **tax cuts were** virtually **offset by spending cuts**. He added that President Bill **Clinton’s tax hike was followed by robust growth**, while the George W. Bush tax cuts led to anemic growth. **None of the experts** interviewed **cited evidence that tax cuts under President Barack Obama produced sufficient growth to pay for themselves either**. On the contrary, there’s some evidence that tax cuts can be a drag on the economy -- like the 2005 CBO study mentioned earlier. When the CBO studied the effects of a hypothetical 10 percent income tax cut for Americans, not all the projections were as rosy as the finding above. Under the CBO’s most pessimistic projection, tax cuts would lead to a 3 percent increase in lost revenue over 10 years. Indeed, tax **cuts can have a number of adverse effects that** may actually **impede growth**, according to Kleinbard. One example is a phenomenon known as the "crowding out" effect. The basic idea is that **tax cuts create deficits that cause the government to borrow more money and** therefore **enter deeper debt, which can make private sector borrowing more expensive**. **Our ruling** Foroohar said, "**There's no** real **evidence** in the last 20 years **that" growth from tax cuts has made up lost revenue**. We searched high and low and found no economic experts who could point us to evidence of tax cuts fully paying for themselves. Neither the modern historical record (using fair benchmarks) nor government analyses we looked at supported the claim that tax cuts create enough growth to eventually offset lost revenue. On the contrary, there’s evidence that tax cuts may actually hinder economic growth. We rate Foroohar’s statement True.

Prefer –

1. Our evidence is a historical analysis of the past twenty years of tax cuts, which means it empirically denies your evidence
2. It cites multiple experts and non-partisan committees like the Congressional Budget Office and concludes that the general consensus is that tax cuts will hurt the economy

### AT Poor folks have to pay less

1. Our impact outweighs on magnitude – even if impoverished individuals have to pay less in taxes, it doesn’t matter because they can no longer get social service benefits like unemployment and Medicaid – taxes are not the major strain on impoverished people
2. Turn – even if it’s true that lower income people have less taxes to pay, it is outweighed by the increase in sales taxes and tax on imports that come with the policy – empirically proven by multiple states

**Beachum 4/26** Lateshia Beachum "Big tax cuts for the rich, less for the poor" April 26, 2017; Beachum is a Kellogg Investigative Reporting Fellow for the Center for Public Integrity <https://www.publicintegrity.org/2017/04/26/20843/big-tax-cuts-rich-less-poor>

A group of conservative think tanks wants the nation’s tax system to look more like North Carolina’s. But so far, for the working poor, that hasn’t been a great deal. Experts from think tanks heavily subsidized by anti-tax, free-market groups such as the Charles Koch Foundation have descended on state capitals armed with scholarly research arguing that tax cuts for the well-to-do lead to economic growth. **North Carolina** has been one of the laboratories for this approach. In the Tar Heel State, wealthy families had their state taxes lowered while poor folks saw their tax burden increased or go unchanged. **In 2013, the state legislature cut state income taxes**, which are progressive — meaning the rich pay a higher rate than the poor — **and increased the sales tax**, which is regressive, **meaning the poor spend a disproportionate amount of their income on the tax**. In Washington, D.C., **the Trump administration** and Congressional Republicans **have been considering a similar approach — lower federal income-tax brackets and a tax on imports** — that some **tax experts say would have comparable outcomes**. Some of the same conservative groups that convinced states to change their tax systems have advised the Trump administration on economic and tax policy. **Trump’s initial proposal**, which he is expected to discuss Wednesday, may not include a border tax, but such a levy continues to be a key provision of what Congressional GOP members are pushing. The effects on lower-income families are already playing out in a handful of states. Since 2010, besides **North** **Carolina, Arkansas, Kansas, Oklahoma, Michigan, Mississippi and Maine have either reduced income-tax rates or repealed them altogether**. At the same time, **most have increased sales and user taxes,** such as those charged **on such every-day necessities** as gasoline and soft drinks, which generally hit the poor harder. Half a dozen other states — Maryland, Illinois and Virginia among them — tried to do the same in this year’s legislative sessions. **If sales taxes “keep going up, I'm going to end up in the shelter with the ladies where I work,” said Juanita Maestos, who works as a counselor at a homeless service center in Seattle** and has watched the state Legislature fail numerous times to institute an income-tax system to reduce Washington’s nearly 9 percent sales tax. “You keep doing stuff like this and nobody is going to win.”

### AT Helps Econ

#### Even analysis that accounts for potential economic growth indicates that Trump’s tax cuts alone would massively explode the national deficit and debt

Nunns 15 [ James R. Nunns, senior fellow at the Tax Policy Center, “AN ANALYSIS OF DONALD TRUMP’S TAX PLAN,” Tax Policy Center, December 22, 2015, <http://www.taxpolicycenter.org/publications/analysis-donald-trumps-tax-plan/full>] JW

One challenge in estimating the effect of taxes on the economy is that tax changes are endogenous: for example, policymakers may choose to enact tax cuts when the economy is weak, which would lead to large apparent growth responses, or they might cut taxes when the economy is strong and revenues are surging, which would produce the opposite response. Romer and Romer (2010) identified plausibly exogenous US tax reforms in time-series data and measured a positive effect of net tax cuts on economic activity. Although Romer and Romer could not distinguish short-term demand-side responses from more permanent supply-side responses, some recent research (Barro and Redlick 2011; Mertens 2015) finds evidence that it is a supplyside effect.12 The Trump plan would require unprecedented spending cuts to avoid adding to the federal debt. We estimate that the plan would reduce revenues by $1.1 trillion in 2025 (before considering macroeconomic effects). The Congressional Budget Office (2015a) projects total noninterest outlays in 2025 of about $5.3 trillion. As a result, Congress would need to cut projected program spending by 21 percent to prevent the plan from adding to the deficit in 2025. If Congress eliminated all defense spending (about $0.7 billion), it could not meet this goal. It would need to cut discretionary spending by 82 percent or Medicare and Social Security spending by 41 percent to offset the direct revenue loss. As in the distributional analysis discussed above, financing of the tax cuts can have important effects on the long-run macroeconomic results. If spending were cut enough to offset most of the revenue losses, the economy would grow. A 2006 US Treasury study concluded that financing the permanent extension of the 2001 and 2003 tax cuts by cutting spending would raise GNP by 0.1 to 1.2 percent, depending on how responsive labor supply and saving are to tax rates (US Treasury 2006). However, if spending were not cut and the growing deficits ultimately led to tax rate increases, the same study found that GNP would fall by 0.9 percent in the long run. The experience of the past three decades suggests that large tax cuts that widen the deficit are not necessarily followed by spending cuts, but instead may ultimately require future tax increases. 13 If that pattern were repeated after enacting the Trump tax cuts, total economic output could ultimately be smaller than if the tax cuts had not been enacted in the first place. Barring politically difficult spending cuts or tax increases, the Trump tax cuts would produce deficits of as much as $11.2 trillion over the next decade, which could swamp any salutary effects arising from lowering marginal effective tax rates on work, saving, and investment. We estimate that by 2036, with no change in spending or interest rates, the proposal would raise the national debt by nearly 80 percent of GDP. If interest rates rise in response to the burgeoning public debt, the increase in the debt could be much larger. CONCLUSIONS Mr. Trump’s tax reform plan would boost incentives to work, save, and invest, and has the potential to simplify the tax code. By lowering marginal tax rates and further limiting or repealing many tax expenditures, it would reduce the incentives and opportunities to engage in some forms of wasteful tax avoidance. However, the plan could increase incentives for workers to characterize themselves as independent contractors, to take advantage of the lower tax rate on business income, unless new rules were introduced to prevent this. The proposal would cut taxes on households at every income level, but much more as a share of income at the top. The fundamental concern the plan poses is that, barring extraordinarily large cuts in government spending or future tax increases, it would yield persistently large, and likely unsustainable, budget deficits.

## AT Generic PTX Args

### A2 Compartmentalization

1. Empirical claim without an empirical warrant – you have not read evidence that indicates that democrats will not switch over which means its unverifiable, you should definitely prefer qualified authors over a random high schoolers analytics
2. Congress is on the fence now and it only takes a couple of people to switch over to get the bill through – empirically proven via things like Trump’s healthcare policy – a couple of republicans were all it took to block the passage

### A2 Pol Cap Doesn’t Exist

Omit

### A2 Logical Policymaker

1. This would make sense against a regular politics DA but not against this one – a logical policy maker could not pass the aff and stop Trump’s bill because they are two different actors

## Link F/L

### Link Add Ons

The biggest problem with the 1AR on the link debate is that it was entirely analytic – we have carded evidence by qualified authors that conclude that the aff will be seen as a win for Trump, which you should definitely prefer over some random high schooler’s analytics – this is sufficient for me to win the link debate, but I’ll read even more evidence on this question to make it an even easier debate to resolve.

First, Conservatives believe that liberal universities are eroding on free exchange of ideas, and are waiting for Trump to step in – the aff will be seen as a win for Trump.

**Wallace 4/21** Christopher Wallace "Berkeley flip-flop: Are universities complicit in muzzling free speech?" Fox News U.S. April 21, 2017 www.foxnews.com/us/2017/04/21/berkeley-flip-flop-are-universities-complicit-in-muzzling-free-speech.html

**Conservative speakers are under fire on college campuses**, and critics say school officials who should be fostering a climate of intellectual diversity are instead siding with violent groups out to shut down free speech. **The** ongoing **controversy at** University of California, **Berkeley** involving a planned speech **by** conservative firebrand Ann **Coulter is the latest example** of a school caught between provocative speech and the threat of reactionary violence. And although the school, which was the scene of violent protests earlier this year during an aborted appearance by conservative Milo Yiannopoulos, claims it reversed a decision to cancel Coulter’s April 27 remarks, Coulter insists she is still be censored. The alternative date the school offered falls after classes let out. "You cannot impose arbitrary and harassing restrictions on the exercise of a Constitutional right," Coulter told Fox News’ Sean Hannity Thursday night. School officials appear to be hoping to avoid a replay of the Yiannopoulos incident, in which masked vandals did more than $100,000 worth of damage, setting fires and breaking windows in protest of the anticipated speech. That was followed by a violent attack on conservative author Charles Murray during a speech at Vermont’s Middlebury College and part of what critics say is a growing acceptance of violence directed at conservatives on college campuses. Many are blaming the violent protests targeting conservative speakers on the left-wing agitator group Antifa. Critics say Antifa, a group that calls itself “anti-fascist,” has sparked violence on college campuses across the country to further its radical agenda. In the UC Berkeley riots that broke out recently, pictures and video were tweeted out of rioters beating people with “Antifa” flagpoles and then spraying them with pepper spray. Antifa rioters often wear masks to conceal their identity. And to separate themselves from anarchists in the black bloc, they often wave distinctive red and black flags that were often seen at the Berkeley riots. “In no uncertain terms we are working in close concert with local, regional, and national law enforcement agencies on investigations concerning the group referred to as the black bloc,” UC Berkeley Assistant Vice Chancellor Dan Mogulof told Fox News. Kyle Shideler, director of the Threat Information Office at the Washington D.C.-based think tank Center for Security Policy, said Antifa proudly trace its roots back to Antifaschistische Aktion, the street fighting wing of the German Communist party in the 1920s and 1930s.” “Increasingly college campuses have become bastions for radical leftist politics. If an individual’s free speech is viewed as inherently ‘unsafe’ or ‘dangerous’ by these colleges, then it creates a milieu where the violent resistance to such speech is viewed as legitimate,” Shideler said. “Antifa routinely take credit for such violent activities.” **Some wonder whether universities are doing enough** to stop the violence – and whether they are holding those responsible for the violence accountable. UC Berkeley told Fox News that the university employee suspected of taking part in the February riots and even may have tweeted a boast about beating up a Trump supporter at the event remains employed. “In the wake of a careful and comprehensive investigation detectives were unable to develop sufficient evidence to pursue criminal charges,” against Ian Dabney Miller, Mogulof told Fox News. It’s unclear whether Miller was actually in control of his twitter account at the time, and therefore responsible for the photos of an unconscious man with accompanying captions about punching out a Trump supporter. **By not taking the proper steps to stop the violence**, some say, **universities are** basically **letting those suppressing free speech win the war against the First Amendment**. Manhattan Institute fellow Heather MacDonald, who writes about policing in America, said when she was on her way to roundtable at Claremont McKenna College in Southern California, she had to be escorted past throngs of protesters. “There was a blockade of 250 and 300 students who prevented other students from entering. I gave my talk to an almost empty room. During the talk the protesters banged on the plate glass windows,” said MacDonald. She said there was a Facebook posting ahead of her event that called for protesters to “shut down the white supremacist fascist Heather MacDonald.” Ultimately, she said, they got their wish. “It was the threat of brute force,” she said, “The police decided they couldn’t guarantee our safety and I was told it’s over and hustled out of the building under police protection.” **Some experts wonder whether it’s time for the Trump Administration** or Congress **to step in**. “I think **an argument can be made that there is a compelling government interest in restoring** safety and free **exchange** **of ideas on college campuses**, or at a minimum, in reducing **or ending government funding for institutions** of higher education **which** **refuse to defend** student and faculties **free speech** rights,” said Shideler of the Center for Security Policy. An inquiry to the Department of Education went unanswered about potentially withholding funds from universities that do not adequately address the concerns about violence and free speech on campus. As for whether the Department of Homeland Security is checking into the actions of antifa on campus as a potential terrorist threat, a high-ranking DHS official told Fox News, “We are not and typically would not unless they were threatening critical infrastructure.” For MacDonald, the law enforcement expert, there is already a solution available to local and campus authorities. “The only way to stop this is with swift certain penalties for this sort of behavior,” MacDonald said. “If people get away with quite literally fascist behavior without consequences we’re going to see more of it.”

Prefer our evidence – (a) Christopher Wallace is a top conservative commentator for Fox News which is Trump’s base, explaining how experts and the public will view the aff as the president stepping in. (b) Recency – this evidence is from 10 days ago which means its an accurate analysis of the current political climate

Trump promised to end political correctness on college campuses during his campaign – even if universities are the actor, he will still be seen as the main reason why the aff is implemented.

**Kolowich 16** Steve Kolowich October 20, 2016 "Trump Said He Would ‘End’ Political Correctness on Campuses. Could a President Do That?" The Chronicle of Higher Education www.chronicle.com/article/Trump-Said-He-Would-End-/238124

Speaking to college students last week in Columbus, Ohio, Donald J. **Trump told conservative watchers of higher education** something many of them might love to hear. "In the past few decades, **political correctness** — oh, what a terrible term — **has transformed our institutions of higher education from ones that fostered** spirited **debate to** a place of **extreme censorship, where students are silenced for the smallest of things,**" said Mr. Trump. "You say a word somewhat differently, and all of a sudden you’re criticized — sometimes viciously," he continued. **"We will end the political correctness and foster free** and respectful **dialogue**." The Republican nominee did not elaborate on how he would use the presidency to "end" political correctness on campuses, and his campaign did not respond to an inquiry from The Chronicle. And Mr. Trump probably will not become president, according to the latest polls. Still, he is hardly the first Republican politician to criticize political correctness on campus, and his pledge to "end" that phenomenon raises the question of whether any president could keep that promise. "You can’t ‘end’ it, that would be ridiculous," said Peter Lawler, a professor of government at Berry College who has written critically about political correctness. "That’s not something that you could easily reduce to the four corners of a policy proposal, as they say," said Walter Olson, a senior fellow at the Cato Institute. Policy experts noted, however, that **there are things a president could do to mitigate the federal government’s role in shaping how colleges** define and **respond** to the sort of criticism that Mr. Trump and many conservatives lament. A Change in Direction A president could start by reshuffling the priorities of the Education Department, and particularly the Office for Civil Rights — assuming that he does not move to eliminate the department entirely, as Mr. Trump and other Republicans have threatened to do. The Office for Civil Rights, which is responsible for making sure colleges that receive federal aid are following federal antidiscrimination laws, is obligated — no matter who is in charge — to consider complaints and investigate those in its jurisdiction. However, Mr. Trump might direct officials to focus their energies elsewhere and put resolving sexual and racial discrimination complaints on the back burner, according to Art Coleman, managing partner at the consulting firm Education Counsel. If an administration were really averse to addressing complaints against individual campuses, said Mr. Coleman, the civil-rights office might narrow its interpretation of what kind of conduct crosses the line. That might involve circumventing years of statutory and case law, he said, but a Trump administration might enforce its own standards until a court compels it to do otherwise. "You could certainly see a play toward mischief there if one were so inclined," said Mr. Coleman, who worked at the Office for Civil Rights from 1993 to 2000. The president could also influence how the office uses its discretionary authority to conduct broad "compliance reviews," which officials can open even when no complaint has been file Kolowich d, he added. "You could literally shut that down." The Obama administration has taken a proactive approach. In recent years the Education Department has aggressively sought to enforce federal antidiscrimination laws, investigating hundreds of colleges for potential violations of Title IX, the federal gender-equity law. Title IX has been on the books for four decades, and the department has been urging colleges to use a controversial standard of proof for campus cases since the mid-1990s. But colleges didn’t necessarily see investigating and resolving reports of sexual assault as crucial to their compliance until 2011, when the Obama administration reminded them they had to do it. That is a testament to the power of a presidential administration to influence campus policies from afar. So what if a Trump administration wanted to nudge it in the other direction? Some people would be satisfied to see the next president rein in the Office for Civil Rights on Title IX enforcement and let colleges handle their own business. "Ultimately, the responsibility lies with leaders on campus and duly elected and appointed trustees — not federal bureaucrats — to adopt policies that protect free speech and foster robust debate at the campus level," Michael B. Poliakoff, president of the American Council of Trustees and Alumni, said through a spokesman. The Executive Option **A**nother **possibility is that Mr. Trump**, who has denied a string of sexual-assault allegations against him and dismissed his own sexually aggressive remarks as "locker-room talk," **would use the Education Department to hammer colleges that he believes are creating hostile environments for students and professors who feel**, as he put it, "viciously" attacked or **"silenced" by the P.C. police**. "The Obama administration has set a precedent that you can use these really squishy executive maneuvers to tell colleges how to act," said Alexander Holt, an education-policy analyst at New America. The Education Department used a "Dear Colleague" letter, a guidance document not subject to notice and comment, to dictate federal rules on Title IX compliance, said Mr. Holt. Colleges had to comply to avoid risking costly investigations that might conclude with the federal government branding them as hostile environments for women. That tactic, he said, could hold appeal for Mr. Trump, who is known for his blunt-force litigiousness and admiration of political strongmen. "I could see a Trump administration going crazy on these ‘Dear Colleague’ letters," said Mr. Holt. Mr. Holt referred to "The Coddling of the American Mind," an essay by Greg Lukianoff, president of the Foundation for Individual Rights in Education, and Jonathan Haidt, a professor of ethical leadership at New York University’s school of business, which The Atlantic published last year. In that essay, the authors argued that the Education Department should apply a standard that defines peer-to-peer harassment as "a pattern of objectively offensive behavior by one student that interferes with another student’s access to education." Mr. Trump’s education secretary could send a "Dear Colleague" letter to that effect, said Mr. Holt. Still, there are limits to how far Mr. Trump, or any American president, could swing the pendulum away from "political correctness." The standards of acceptable speech on campuses have been shifting for years, not because of federally enforced "speech codes" but because colleges themselves have gradually responded to the needs and demands of diversifying student bodies. "Our colleges," said Mr. Lawler, the Berry government professor, "are going to be what they are: a little more liberal than Republicans would like."

Prefer this evidence – it cites Trump’s rhetoric and what he told his supporters – he promised his supporters during the campaign to end political correctness on college campuses, the aff is seen as fulfilling this promise

### AT Brown ev old

#### White nationalist and alt right groups are holding rallies this week to protest the denial of free speech to conservatives – the aff is seen as a response to their activism.

**Gecker 4/27** Jocelyn Gecker, Associated Press "Alt-right group to rally after Coulter talk cancelled" April 27, 2017 www.detroitnews.com/story/news/nation/2017/04/27/berkeley-ann-coulter/100972188/

Berkeley, Calif. — Ann Coulter said Wednesday that she was forced to cancel her speaking event Thursday at the University of California, Berkeley amid concerns of violence but might still “swing by to say hello” to all her supporters. Police and university officials said they were bracing for possible trouble whether Coulter comes to campus or not, citing intelligence and online chatter by groups threatening to instigate violence. A group of **far-right supporters plans to hold a rally Thursday at** a **Berkeley** park **to denounce** **what they claim is** **an attempt to silence their conservative views**. KCBS reports that Gavin **McInnes**, **founder of the pro-Trump “Proud Boys,” says he will speak** at 2 p.m. at Civic Center Park **and is encouraging other alt-right groups to make a large showing at the gathering**. In emails to The Associated Press on Wednesday, Coulter confirmed that her planned speech on illegal immigration, followed by a question-answer session, was canceled. But she remained coy about what she might do instead. “I’m not speaking. But I’m going to be near there, so I might swing by to say hello to my supporters who have flown in from all around the country,” Coulter said in an email. “I thought I might stroll around the graveyard of the First Amendment.” Officials at UC Berkeley said last week they feared renewed violence on campus if Coulter followed through with plans to speak. They cited “very specific intelligence” of threats that could endanger Coulter and students, as Berkeley becomes a platform for extremist protesters on both sides of the political spectrum. Efforts by the university to cancel or delay the Coulter event dealt a blow to Berkeley’s image as a bastion of tolerance and free speech. Chancellor Nicholas B. Dirks sent a letter to the campus Wednesday saying the university is committed to defending free speech but also to protecting its students. “This is a university, not a battlefield,” Dirks said in the letter. “The university has two non-negotiable commitments, one to Free Speech the other to the safety of our campus community.” **Berkeley’s reputation as one of the country’s most liberal universities, in one of America’s most liberal cities, has made it a flashpoint for the nation’s political divisions in the era of** Donald **Trump**. Earlier this month, a bloody brawl broke out in downtown Berkeley at a pro-Trump protest that featured speeches by members of the white nationalist right. They clashed with a group of Trump critics who called themselves anti-fascists. Similar violent clashes also erupted at the same site, a public park, on March 4. In February, violent protesters forced the cancellation of a speech by right-wing writer Milo Yiannopoulos, who like Coulter was invited by campus Republicans. The Berkeley College Republicans and the Young America’s Foundation, a conservative group that had helped book Coulter’s campus speaking events, both pulled their support Tuesday citing fears of violence. They blamed the university for failing to ensure protection of conservative speakers. “Berkeley College Republicans do not want to endanger people’s lives so because of the university’s unwillingness to do their job we are forced to cancel the event,” Troy Worden, president of the campus Republicans, said Wednesday. Coulter echoed the blame on Twitter: “I’m very sad about Berkeley’s cancellation, but my sadness is greater than that. It’s a dark day for free speech in America.” Capt. Alex Yao of the Berkley campus police force said police presence will be strong Thursday. “You will see a high number of highly visible law enforcement. We’re going to have a very, very low tolerance for any violence,” he told a news conference. He said Berkeley police had reached out to local and state police forces “to let them know we might be calling for assistance.”

#### Conservatives believe that liberal universities are eroding on free exchange of ideas, and are waiting for Trump to step in – the aff will be seen as a win for Trump.

**Wallace 4/21** Christopher Wallace "Berkeley flip-flop: Are universities complicit in muzzling free speech?" Fox News U.S. April 21, 2017 www.foxnews.com/us/2017/04/21/berkeley-flip-flop-are-universities-complicit-in-muzzling-free-speech.html

**Conservative speakers are under fire on college campuses**, and **critics say school officials** who **should be fostering a climate of intellectual diversity** are instead siding with violent groups out to **shut down free speech**. **The ongoing controversy at University of California, Berkeley involving a planned speech by conservative firebrand Ann Coulter is the latest example** of a school caught between provocative speech and the threat of reactionary violence. And although the school, which was the scene of violent protests earlier this year during an aborted appearance by conservative Milo Yiannopoulos, claims it reversed a decision to cancel Coulter’s April 27 remarks, Coulter insists she is still be censored. The alternative date the school offered falls after classes let out. "**You cannot impose arbitrary and harassing restrictions on the exercise of a Constitutional right," Coulter told Fox News’ Sean Hannity Thursday night**. School officials appear to be hoping to avoid a replay of the Yiannopoulos incident, in which masked vandals did more than $100,000 worth of damage, setting fires and breaking windows in protest of the anticipated speech. That was followed by a violent attack on conservative author Charles Murray during a speech at Vermont’s Middlebury College and **part of what critics say is a growing acceptance of violence directed at conservatives on college campuses**. **Many are blaming the violent protests targeting conservative speakers on the left-wing** **agitator group Antifa**. Critics say Antifa, a group that calls itself “anti-fascist,” has sparked violence on college campuses across the country to further its radical agenda. In the UC Berkeley riots that broke out recently, pictures and video were tweeted out of rioters beating people with “Antifa” flagpoles and then spraying them with pepper spray. Antifa rioters often wear masks to conceal their identity. And to separate themselves from anarchists in the black bloc, they often wave distinctive red and black flags that were often seen at the Berkeley riots. “In no uncertain terms we are working in close concert with local, regional, and national law enforcement agencies on investigations concerning the group referred to as the black bloc,” UC Berkeley Assistant Vice Chancellor Dan Mogulof told Fox News. Kyle Shideler, director of the Threat Information Office at the Washington D.C.-based think tank Center for Security Policy, said Antifa proudly trace its roots back to Antifaschistische Aktion, the street fighting wing of the German Communist party in the 1920s and 1930s.” “Increasingly college campuses have become bastions for radical leftist politics. If an individual’s free speech is viewed as inherently ‘unsafe’ or ‘dangerous’ by these colleges, then it creates a milieu where the violent resistance to such speech is viewed as legitimate,” Shideler said. “Antifa routinely take credit for such violent activities.” **Some wonder whether universities are doing enough to stop the violence – and whether they are holding those responsible for the violence accountable**. UC Berkeley told Fox News that the university employee suspected of taking part in the February riots and even may have tweeted a boast about beating up a Trump supporter at the event remains employed. “In the wake of a careful and comprehensive investigation detectives were unable to develop sufficient evidence to pursue criminal charges,” against Ian Dabney Miller, Mogulof told Fox News. It’s unclear whether Miller was actually in control of his twitter account at the time, and therefore responsible for the photos of an unconscious man with accompanying captions about punching out a Trump supporter. **By not taking the proper steps to stop the violence, some say, universities are basically letting those suppressing free speech win the war against the First Amendment**. Manhattan Institute fellow Heather MacDonald, who writes about policing in America, said when she was on her way to roundtable at Claremont McKenna College in Southern California, she had to be escorted past throngs of protesters. “There was a blockade of 250 and 300 students who prevented other students from entering. I gave my talk to an almost empty room. During the talk the protesters banged on the plate glass windows,” said MacDonald. She said there was a Facebook posting ahead of her event that called for protesters to “shut down the white supremacist fascist Heather MacDonald.” Ultimately, she said, they got their wish. “It was the threat of brute force,” she said, “The police decided they couldn’t guarantee our safety and I was told it’s over and hustled out of the building under police protection.” **Some experts wonder whether it’s time for the Trump Administration or Congress to step in**. “**I think an argument can be made that there is a compelling government interest in restoring safety and free exchange of ideas on college campuses, or at a minimum, in reducing or ending government funding for institutions of higher education which refuse to defend student and faculties free speech rights**,” said Shideler of the Center for Security Policy. An inquiry to the Department of Education went unanswered about potentially withholding funds from universities that do not adequately address the concerns about violence and free speech on campus. As for whether the Department of Homeland Security is checking into the actions of antifa on campus as a potential terrorist threat, a high-ranking DHS official told Fox News, “We are not and typically would not unless they were threatening critical infrastructure.” For MacDonald, the law enforcement expert, there is already a solution available to local and campus authorities. “**The only way to stop this is with swift certain penalties for this sort of behavior**,” MacDonald said. “If people get away with quite literally fascist behavior without consequences we’re going to see more of it.”

#### Conservative activists are lobbying for the plan – if it’s passed, it will be perceived as a win for them.

**Grinberg 4/18** Emanuella Grinberg "Meet the conservative student activist who wants to 'make campus great again'" CNN Politics April 18, 2017 www.cnn.com/2017/04/18/politics/lauren-cooley-conservative-activism/ Emanuella Grinberg covers criminal justice, race and gender issues for CNN Digital's news desk

While American student activism has long been considered a leftist affair, **Cooley is part of a push to amplify conservative voices on campuses amid what they call liberal attempts to silence their viewpoints**. "People get motivated when they get outraged," said Morton Blackwell, founder of conservative incubator the Leadership Institute, which Cooley credits with making her the activist she is today. "**There's more conservative student activism going on because leftist activism is so outrageous**." Though still the minority presence in campus activism, some **conservative youth groups** say they **have experienced a surge in interest since the presidential election**. Such growth is typical, especially for the winning party, said Ted Dooley, co-chair of the College Republican National Committee. This time around, though, **college Republican groups are seeing more new members who are expressing political interest for the first time**. Most who joined in the past already had a background in political activism, Dooley said. **While conservative activists have long existed on college campuses, what's new is the intense sense of persecution for their political views and how they are rallying around that**, said Angus Johnston, CUNY history professor and author of "History of American Student Activism." These days, student **activists** **on** both the left and **the right see themselves as embattled and outnumbered -- a sense conservatives appear to be holding onto despite Trump's election and Republican control of the House and Senate**. "They both see themselves as underdogs, but their understanding of what it means to be an underdog are playing out in very, very different ways," Johnston said. In the short term, **conservative activists want to bring more like-minded speakers to colleges, fight against safe spaces and make campuses more hospitable to their ideas**. To win those battles, they're taking up the language of diversity for their own ends, and embracing tactics of "direct action" that were typically the province of the left. "We're recalibrating. We have to because for eight years we were the resistance, and that's a fun label to play and now the left is embracing that," said Charlie Kirk, co-founder of Turning Point USA. The conservative student group, launched in 2012, is known for its controversial tactics. It created a "Professor Watchlist" naming professors on campuses across the country who they claim are advancing "a radical agenda." Cooley worked for Turning Point from 2014-2015 as its first Florida field director, learning from its playbook as she set up campus chapters there. Since this time last year, Turning Point USA grew from 250 to 350 chapters, 50 of which have launched since January, Kirk said. About 80% of the new chapters were started by students who approached Turning Point instead of the other way around. The long game, Cooley says, is to coax young closet conservatives out of their shells and draw moderates to the right for the 2018 midterms. "Fighting for conservative values to be represented on campus is fighting for conservative values to be more mainstream," she said. "The further left campuses go, the more moderate conservative thought will be." **It remains to be seen whether conservatives will capitalize on their recent momentum in a way that swings young voters toward the right for 2018**. Cooley believes it's possible -- that's why she's taking her message of grassroots organizing on the road. So far, she's making appearances at schools in Florida and Texas, and says there are more to come. The tour will supplement her income from writing and other speaking engagements while she transitions Campus Red into a nonprofit intended to pair college conservatives with members of the establishment. **She** **thinks the Republican Party could make more headway on college campuses by emphasizing what it stands for**, like the benefits of free enterprise. **But the current climate calls for a mix of offensive and defensive tactics as challenges from the left mount, Cooley said**. Speaking to the crowd at UCF, **Cooley encouraged students to "push a free speech agenda" by protesting outside the designated areas schools set aside for political advocacy**. If and **when administrators attempt to shut them down, students should document the encounter, leave peacefully and use the documentation to lobby for policy change**, she said. "We've got to find what we can do that will actually make an impact on campus as a whole," she said. "If you can make policy changes on campus you'll actually be able to see the shift in the culture on your campus." Cooley stressed the importance of advocating for "diversity of thought" in reading material and among teaching staff. She suggested looking up professors' voter registration records and using that information to lobby for more conservative educators. "This is not to say we're going to create a list (saying) every single Democratic professor is bad. Some of the best professors I ever had were extreme liberals, but they didn't put their values in the class," she said. "Aren't you concerned that something like that may lead to some form of political affirmative action?" UCF student and political blogger Sean Hartman asked Cooley. "I don't think there's anything wrong with using the left's tactics against themselves," she replied. "If we're going to have affirmative action and that's something that's widely accepted, there's no reason we shouldn't be able to use that." Where she stands Many of the college Republicans at UCF said they knew Cooley from social media. On Twitter, where Cooley has more than 43,000 followers, she defends the Trump administration and highlights instances of what she considers leftist attacks against conservatives. View image on Twitter In December, she shared a picture of herself with former Breitbart editor Milo Yiannopoulos and later denounced CPAC's decision to cancel his appearance as an abrogation of free speech. She has called feminism a cancer, declared the Women's March "gross," and called equal pay day "the day when misinformed feminists spread a fake statistic making it seem like women are less successful than we are." Despite being anti-abortion, she declared herself #TeamTomi after conservative pundit Tomi Lahren lost her gig as a contributor to The Blaze after coming out in favor of abortion rights. "Really tired of people tearing each other down over jealousy or petty disagreement," she wrote on Twitter. "Why can't we celebrate the success of others?"

#### Trump and the alt right’s main platform is anti-liberal political correctness culture – the aff is a win for them because now they can go say whatever they want on campuses.

**Grinberg 4/19** Emanuella Grinberg and Eliott C. McLaughlin, CNN "Against its wishes, Auburn hosts white nationalist Richard Spencer" 4/19/17 www.cnn.com/2017/04/18/politics/auburn-richard-spencer-protests/

Auburn, Alabama (CNN) **Three people were arrested Tuesday at Auburn University amid mostly peaceful protests over the appearance of white nationalist Richard Spencer**, whose speaking events have sparked an outcry at other schools. A crowd of several hundred had gathered by early evening at the public university in eastern Alabama, monitored by dozens of police officers with police dogs. Student groups organized a concert before the speech in what they called a peaceful counter to Spencer's hate speech. Elsewhere on campus, students told CNN they witnessed a fistfight between a Spencer supporter and a protester that ended with police arresting both men. Inside, hundreds of people packed Foy Hall, many of whom appeared too old to be traditional students, as Spencer delivered on his reputation for inflammatory rhetoric. There were several attempts to shout him down as he extolled the virtues of being white and and called on whites to fight for their rights. People called him names and yelled at him to get to his point. **Spencer's supporters** occasionally **chanted, "Let him speak"** when he was interrupted. Reiterating his key talking points, Spencer denounced diversity as "a way of bringing to an end a nation and a culture" defined by white people. "There would be no history without us," he said, prompting shouts from the crowd. "The alt-right is really about putting Humpty Dumpty back together again." **Though the auditorium was packed when Spencer began speaking, the crowd thinned considerably toward the end of Spencer's two-hour speech**. Hundreds of students and protesters congregated outside Foy Hall. Students in the crowd reported arguments and plenty of flags and protest placards during the speech but no real violence aside from the fight before the Spencer event. But as several dozen Spencer supporters exited the auditorium following his remarks, **the students and protesters spotted them and gave chase**. The mob chased them off campus and through downtown. It was an event that almost did not happen. Spencer, 38, director of the white nationalist think tank National Policy Institute, has been a target for his radical beliefs. He has advocated a "peaceful ethnic cleansing," where people who are not of European descent voluntarily leave the United States. **After President Donald Trump's election victory last November, Spencer addressed a gathering of the alt-right movement at which he shouted, "Hail Trump!" and audience members apparently gave Nazi salutes**. **On the day of Trump's inauguration, he was punched in the face by a masked assailant** during an interview with the Australian Broadcasting Corporation. He said his Auburn appearance was sponsored by AltRight.com, a white nationalist site. He paid $700 to rent the hall and an additional fee for security from the Auburn Police Department, according to The Plainsman, an Auburn student newspaper. Citing safety concerns, Auburn canceled the event Friday. Then, a federal judge granted Spencer's request for an injunction, effectively ordering Auburn to host his speaking event as originally scheduled. **"While Mr. Spencer's beliefs and message are controversial, Auburn presented no evidence that Mr. Spencer advocates violence,"** U.S. District Court Judge W. Keith Watkins said in his ruling, **noting that peaceable free speech is protected by the Constitution**. **Debates over free speech on college campuses have flared up in recent months after appearances by such controversial speakers as Charles Murray and Milo Yiannopoulos**. A scheduled speech by Yiannopoulos sparked violent protests in February at the University of California-Berkeley. The injunction prompted Auburn administrators to call for peace Tuesday amid what it called attempts from uninvited, unaffiliated, off-campus groups to provoke racially divisive, disruptive conflict.

### AT Link is small

1. Not true- trump is getting the most liberal institutions on earth, ie public universities, to make a huge policy shift to favor his viewpoints. This makes him look extremely powerful.
2. Bar is so low for Trump- he is such an idiot, achieving anything makes him look really great. Think about Syria, he basically just followed his general’s orders and general republican paths and people applauded him for that.

#### 3. Implementing the aff is the vindication that the Trump administration needs: he railed against “political correctness” and built up popular support on the campaign trail based on it

Weigel 16 [Moira Weigel, writer and academic, “Political correctness: how the right invented a phantom enemy,” The Guardian, November 30, 2016, <https://www.theguardian.com/us-news/2016/nov/30/political-correctness-how-the-right-invented-phantom-enemy-donald-trump>] JW

Three weeks ago, around a quarter of the American population elected a demagogue with no prior experience in public service to the presidency. In the eyes of many of his supporters, this lack of preparation was not a liability, but a strength. Donald Trump had run as a candidate whose primary qualification was that he was not “a politician”. Depicting yourself as a “maverick” or an “outsider” crusading against a corrupt Washington establishment is the oldest trick in American politics – but Trump took things further. He broke countless unspoken rules regarding what public figures can or cannot do and say. Every demagogue needs an enemy. Trump’s was the ruling elite, and his charge was that they were not only failing to solve the greatest problems facing Americans, they were trying to stop anyone from even talking about those problems. “The special interests, the arrogant media, and the political insiders, don’t want me to talk about the crime that is happening in our country,” Trump said in one late September speech. “They want me to just go along with the same failed policies that have caused so much needless suffering.” Trump claimed that Barack Obama and Hillary Clinton were willing to let ordinary Americans suffer because their first priority was political correctness. “They have put political correctness above common sense, above your safety, and above all else,” Trump declared after a Muslim gunman killed 49 people at a gay nightclub in Orlando. “I refuse to be politically correct.” What liberals might have seen as language changing to reflect an increasingly diverse society – in which citizens attempt to avoid giving needless offence to one another – Trump saw a conspiracy. Throughout an erratic campaign, Trump consistently blasted political correctness, blaming it for an extraordinary range of ills and using the phrase to deflect any and every criticism. During the first debate of the Republican primaries, Fox News host Megyn Kelly asked Trump how he would answer the charge that he was “part of the war on women”. “You’ve called women you don’t like ‘fat pigs,’ ‘dogs,’ ‘slobs,’ and ‘disgusting animals’,” Kelly pointed out. “You once told a contestant on Celebrity Apprentice it would be a pretty picture to see her on her knees …” “I think the big problem this country has is being politically correct,” Trump answered, to audience applause. “I’ve been challenged by so many people, I don’t frankly have time for total political correctness. And to be honest with you, this country doesn’t have time either.” Trump used the same defence when critics raised questions about his statements on immigration. In June 2015, after Trump referred to Mexicans as “rapists”, NBC, the network that aired his reality show The Apprentice, announced that it was ending its relationship with him. Trump’s team retorted that, “NBC is weak, and like everybody else is trying to be politically correct.” In August 2016, after saying that the US district judge Gonzalo Curiel of San Diego was unfit to preside over the lawsuit against Trump Universities because he was Mexican American and therefore likely to be biased against him, Trump told CBS News that this was “common sense”. He continued: “We have to stop being so politically correct in this country.” During the second presidential debate, Trump answered a question about his proposed “ban on Muslims” by stating: “We could be very politically correct, but whether we like it or not, there is a problem.” Every time Trump said something “outrageous” commentators suggested he had finally crossed a line and that his campaign was now doomed. But time and again, Trump supporters made it clear that they liked him because he wasn’t afraid to say what he thought. Fans praised the way Trump talked much more often than they mentioned his policy proposals. He tells it like it is, they said. He speaks his mind. He is not politically correct. Trump and his followers never defined “political correctness”, or specified who was enforcing it. They did not have to. The phrase conjured powerful forces determined to suppress inconvenient truths by policing language. There is an obvious contradiction involved in complaining at length, to an audience of hundreds of millions of people, that you are being silenced. But this idea – that there is a set of powerful, unnamed actors, who are trying to control everything you do, right down to the words you use – is trending globally right now. Britain’s rightwing tabloids issue frequent denunciations of “political correctness gone mad” and rail against the smug hypocrisy of the “metropolitan elite”. In Germany, conservative journalists and politicians are making similar complaints: after the assaults on women in Cologne last New Year’s Eve, for instance, the chief of police Rainer Wendt said that leftists pressuring officers to be politisch korrekt had prevented them from doing their jobs. In France, Marine Le Pen of the Front National has condemned more traditional conservatives as “paralysed by their fear of confronting political correctness”. Trump’s incessant repetition of the phrase has led many writers since the election to argue that the secret to his victory was a backlash against excessive “political correctness”. Some have argued that Hillary Clinton failed because she was too invested in that close relative of political correctness, “identity politics”. But upon closer examination, “political correctness” becomes an impossibly slippery concept. The term is what Ancient Greek rhetoricians would have called an “exonym”: a term for another group, which signals that the speaker does not belong to it. Nobody ever describes themselves as “politically correct”. The phrase is only ever an accusation.

#### 4. Trump promised to end political correctness on college campuses during his campaign – even if universities are the actor, he will still be seen as the main reason why the aff is implemented.

**Kolowich 16** Steve Kolowich October 20, 2016 "Trump Said He Would ‘End’ Political Correctness on Campuses. Could a President Do That?" The Chronicle of Higher Education www.chronicle.com/article/Trump-Said-He-Would-End-/238124

**Speaking to college students** last week in Columbus, Ohio, Donald J. **Trump told conservative watchers of higher education something many of them might love to hear**. "In the past few decades, **political correctness** — oh, what a terrible term — **has transformed our institutions of higher education from ones that fostered spirited debate to a place of extreme censorship, where students are silenced for the smallest of things," said Mr. Trump**. "You say a word somewhat differently, and all of a sudden you’re criticized — sometimes viciously," he continued. **"We will end the political correctness and foster free and respectful dialogue."** **The Republican nominee did not elaborate on how he would use the presidency to "end" political correctness on campuses**, and his campaign did not respond to an inquiry from The Chronicle. And Mr. Trump probably will not become president, according to the latest polls. Still, he is hardly the first Republican politician to criticize political correctness on campus, and his pledge to "end" that phenomenon raises the question of whether any president could keep that promise. "You can’t ‘end’ it, that would be ridiculous," said Peter Lawler, a professor of government at Berry College who has written critically about political correctness. "That’s not something that you could easily reduce to the four corners of a policy proposal, as they say," said Walter Olson, a senior fellow at the Cato Institute. **Policy experts noted**, however, that **there are things a president could do to mitigate the federal government’s role in shaping how colleges define and respond to the sort of criticism that** Mr. **Trump** and many conservatives **lament**. A Change in Direction A president could start by reshuffling the priorities of the Education Department, and particularly the Office for Civil Rights — assuming that he does not move to eliminate the department entirely, as Mr. Trump and other Republicans have threatened to do. The Office for Civil Rights, which is responsible for making sure colleges that receive federal aid are following federal antidiscrimination laws, is obligated — no matter who is in charge — to consider complaints and investigate those in its jurisdiction. However, Mr. Trump might direct officials to focus their energies elsewhere and put resolving sexual and racial discrimination complaints on the back burner, according to Art Coleman, managing partner at the consulting firm Education Counsel. **If an administration were really averse to addressing complaints against individual campuses, said Mr. Coleman, the civil-rights office might narrow its interpretation of what kind of conduct crosses the line**. That might involve circumventing years of statutory and case law, he said, but a Trump administration might enforce its own standards until a court compels it to do otherwise. "You could certainly see a play toward mischief there if one were so inclined," said Mr. Coleman, who worked at the Office for Civil Rights from 1993 to 2000. **The president could also influence how the office uses its discretionary authority to conduct broad "compliance reviews," which officials can open even when no complaint has been** file Kolowich d, he added. "You could literally shut that down." The Obama administration has taken a proactive approach. In recent years the Education Department has aggressively sought to enforce federal antidiscrimination laws, investigating hundreds of colleges for potential violations of Title IX, the federal gender-equity law. Title IX has been on the books for four decades, and the department has been urging colleges to use a controversial standard of proof for campus cases since the mid-1990s. But colleges didn’t necessarily see investigating and resolving reports of sexual assault as crucial to their compliance until 2011, when the Obama administration reminded them they had to do it. That is a testament to the power of a presidential administration to influence campus policies from afar. So what if a Trump administration wanted to nudge it in the other direction? Some people would be satisfied to see the next president rein in the Office for Civil Rights on Title IX enforcement and let colleges handle their own business. "**Ultimately, the responsibility lies with leaders on campus and duly elected and appointed trustees — not federal bureaucrats — to adopt policies that protect free speech and foster robust debate at the campus level,**" Michael B. Poliakoff, president of the American Council of Trustees and Alumni, said through a spokesman. The Executive Option **Another possibility is that Mr. Trump**, who has denied a string of sexual-assault allegations against him and dismissed his own sexually aggressive remarks as "locker-room talk," **would use the Education Department to hammer colleges that he believes are creating hostile environments for students and professors who feel, as he put it, "viciously" attacked or "silenced" by the P.C. police**. "The Obama administration has set a precedent that you can use these really squishy executive maneuvers to tell colleges how to act," said Alexander Holt, an education-policy analyst at New America. The Education Department used a "Dear Colleague" letter, a guidance document not subject to notice and comment, to dictate federal rules on Title IX compliance, said Mr. Holt. Colleges had to comply to avoid risking costly investigations that might conclude with the federal government branding them as hostile environments for women. That tactic, he said, could hold appeal for Mr. Trump, who is known for his blunt-force litigiousness and admiration of political strongmen. "I could see a Trump administration going crazy on these ‘Dear Colleague’ letters," said Mr. Holt. Mr. Holt referred to "The Coddling of the American Mind," an essay by Greg Lukianoff, president of the Foundation for Individual Rights in Education, and Jonathan Haidt, a professor of ethical leadership at New York University’s school of business, which The Atlantic published last year. In that essay, the authors argued that the Education Department should apply a standard that defines peer-to-peer harassment as "a pattern of objectively offensive behavior by one student that interferes with another student’s access to education." Mr. Trump’s education secretary could send a "Dear Colleague" letter to that effect, said Mr. Holt. Still, there are limits to how far Mr. Trump, or any American president, could swing the pendulum away from "political correctness." **The standards of acceptable speech on campuses have been shifting for years, not because of federally enforced "speech codes" but because colleges themselves have gradually responded to the needs and demands of diversifying student bodies**. "Our colleges," said Mr. Lawler, the Berry government professor, "are going to be what they are: a little more liberal than Republicans would like."

### A2 Link should’ve been triggered

1. It’s not like just because he’s had one win and that’s enough, it is cumulative. Best case scenario for them is that it’s brink based and the aff pushes him way closer to the brink – it’s a question of risk, a risk of a link to our impact outweighs the aff given how huge our impact is

2. Trump has no major victories yet—anything done so far would be expected with a full majority, so it doesn’t trigger the link

**Tankersley 4/24** [Jim Tankersley, “Donald Trump is obsessed with winning, and that's why he's losing”, Vox, 4/24/17]

President Donald Trump famously promised Americans so much winning that they’d be sick of it. He appears obsessed with this promise, to the point of actively undermining it. He is so focused on winning — or claiming to win — every little battle, that he has neglected the patient work required to win big wars in Congress. This strategy should unnerve conservatives; almost **any other Republican president** drawn from last year’s primary field **would be scoring more wins** for their cause right now **than Trump** has. It should especially worry Trump’s advisers. This week, the president appears set to obsess his way into a series of unforced errors that could hurt his agenda in the months and years to come. Nearly 100 days into his term, **Trump has delivered few major victories**, either for the country or for his own supporters. **He lost in** his short-lived bid to repeal and replace **Obamacare**, demanding a rushed vote on a much-derided bill, only to back down at the last moment when it was clear he didn’t have the votes. **Courts have blocked** two of **his attempts to ban** refugees and **travel** from several Muslim-majority countries. **Trump backed out of a currency fight with China**, which he promised repeatedly while campaigning. He keeps punting on a pledge to detail his tax reform plan, **and** he **hasn’t stoked** anything close to **a** massive **jobs revival** in manufacturing or coal mining. **His wins**, such as they are, **would be layups for any Republican** president working **with a** full **congressional majority**.

3. The reason Trump can’t push through legislation is because his prior successes were contingent on procedural modifications in Congress like the “nuclear option” for Gorsuch. Increasing his popularity helps him solve polarization within the Republican caucus

Binder 4/26 [Sarah Binder, professor of political science at George Washington University and a senior fellow at the Brookings Institution, “This is why Trump’s legislative agenda is stuck in neutral,” The Washington Post, April 26, 2017, <https://www.washingtonpost.com/news/monkey-cage/wp/2017/04/26/this-is-why-trumps-legislative-agenda-is-stuck-in-neutral/?utm_term=.da65850741d2>] JW

Political capital is built on public support and post-election momentum — and often peaks in a president’s first few months in office. Most presidents leverage their electoral boost to push through major initiatives and proposals blocked by their predecessor. After President Bill Clinton’s rocky start, Democrats swiftly enacted a first-ever family leave law vetoed by President George H.W. Bush. The second President Bush made quick progress on a multitrillion-dollar tax cut, as well as landmark education reform. Within a month, President Barack Obama’s Democratic Congress delivered a record-size fiscal stimulus, soon followed by pay equity and children’s health reforms that President George W. Bush had vetoed. Before and after the November election, Trump outlined a menu of ambitious offerings — including immigration and tax restructuring, infrastructure spending, trade renegotiation, his oft-emphasized southern border wall, as well as Affordable Care Act repeal and Wall Street deregulation. The Senate has confirmed Neil M. Gorsuch as a Supreme Court justice, albeit only after nuking the need for Democratic votes. And via the Congressional Review Act, a seldom-used, fast-track law, Republicans quietly overturned more than a dozen late-term Obama rules — loosening regulatory limits on oil, gas, coal and telecom industries, among others. Ongoing Republican efforts to repeal and replace the health-care law have been far more visible. Even with tactics designed to cut out the Democrats, House Republicans remain at odds with their Senate colleagues, the White House and one another over how to unwind an increasingly popular law, wasting precious legislative floor time in the process. [Senate Democrats are battling every Trump nomination. That will hurt the rest of his agenda.] In turn, without offering any substantive proposals, Trump has bounced between advocating action on health care, taxes and infrastructure. Coincidentally, the federal spending authority expires on the eve of Trump’s 100th day in office. A government shutdown looms should Congress and the president fail to strike a budget deal this week. This is why Republicans struggle to legislate But the Republicans’ governing difficulties run deeper than an unpopular president backed by inexperienced advisers pursuing deeply polarizing proposals. A view inside the Capitol suggests why. In the figure below, we use lawmakers’ ideological scores to place every House majority party since 1901 along two dimensions. (When Republicans hold the White House and Congress, the start of the Congress is marked in red; periods of unified Democratic control are marked in blue; a divided government shows up in gray.) [Why presidential candidates (like Trump) campaign as isolationists but (like Trump) govern as hawks] As you can see, the 2017 House is nearly the most polarized in more than a century. And among the years under unified Republican control, 2017 stands out as the most polarized. The current House is unusual in another critical way. Along the Y-axis, we map each Congress based on the relative ideological breadth of the two House parties. When the score is high, it means that Republicans are more divided than their Democratic opponents. When the score is low, Republicans were the more cohesive party. Today’s GOP House stands out in the upper-right quadrant. The parties are extremely polarized, and Republicans are far more fractured ideologically than the Democrats. That’s what we saw in the Republican stalemate over Obamacare, in which the far-right Freedom Caucus rejected anything but flat-out repeal while the moderate Tuesday Group sought improvements. Such stalemates may well recur when Republicans turn to tax restructuring and other Trump proposals. Unless Republicans can overcome their extreme internal divisions, Ryan will be challenged to corral his conference and move major legislation. We see a more mixed bag in the Senate, as shown in the chart below. Like the House, the Senate is deeply polarized, meaning that Republicans will continue to have a hard time bringing Democrats on board. Republicans are also more divided than Democrats, but these GOP cleavages are not nearly as sharp as they are in the House. This suggests that the GOP agenda may gain more traction in the upper chamber. Ideological disagreements between the parties surely shaped Republicans’ legislative strategy this year: Anticipating that Democrats would oppose Trump’s agenda, the GOP leaned heavily on procedures that eliminated the need to court Democratic votes. But those tactics backfired. Yes, they enabled the GOP to quickly repeal some Obama regulations. But using the filibuster-proof budget reconciliation process highlighted internal Republican Party disagreements over how to restructure health care. It threatens to do the same for tax restructuring, as well. In other words, ironically, the GOP’s parliamentary strategy limits what Trump and Congress can achieve. [Racial bias motivated Trump voters more than authoritarianism. By a lot.] A more popular president with a more disciplined and fully staffed administration might have had more success herding these fractured Republican majorities. But Trump attracts so much popular opposition that the divided Republican majority can’t come together to make the compromises needed to legislate. As David Jones wrote here at The Monkey Cage yesterday, presidents can recover from slow legislative starts. But the road is likely to be uphill for Trump and his unruly Republican Congress.

### AT Hurts Trump Pol Cap

1. non-unique: Trump has the worst approval rating in history for this early in the presidency, just failed to pass healthcare, and had his muslim ban blocked twice. He has no political capital to lose, just to gain.

2. Extend Jagoda 16: Trump loses pol cap when he does something super unpopular with landed politicians like the Muslim ban but both sides of the aisle like the aff and Trump gets to take credit.

### AT Protest Against Trump Link Turn

1. NU- there have been thousands of protest against trump- including millions of people in the women’s march and science march. None of these have phased Trump, he doenst give a shit what liberals think of him.
2. My link o/w it’s more tied to Trump because it is an overarching policy decision and macro issue. While protest are much smaller and the average lawmaker doesn’t care about it.
3. More criticism of Trump only feeds his presidency, empirically proven in his ongoing war with the mainstream media outlets

Loiaconi 16 [Stephen Loiaconi, Sinclair Broadcast Group, “Media mockery may only make Donald Trump stronger, experts say,” Feb. 10, 2016, <http://wjla.com/news/nation-world/media-mockery-may-only-make-donald-trump-stronger-experts-say>] JW

Some media outlets were not shy in expressing their disgust at Donald Trump's Republican primary victory in New Hampshire on Tuesday night. A Huffington Post headline blared, "A Racist, Sexist Demagogue Just Won The New Hampshire Primary." The New York Daily News described Trump's supporters as "mindless zombies" and revived its ongoing depiction of the billionaire as a clown. The horror theme carried through on liberal commentary sites. A Vox story called Trump's success "a terrifying moment in American politics," while Salon reported that the Republican primary race is "officially a horror film." Some conservatives were equally displeased, with the National Review calling the outcome in New Hampshire "a bad night" for conservatives and "Armageddon" for the Republican establishment. Media disdain for Trump is obviously nothing new. The Huffington Post spent much of last year relegating its coverage of the GOP front-runner to its entertainment section. The site recently began capping all of its Trump stories with an editor's note declaring that he is "a serial liar, rampant xenophobe, racist, misogynist, birther and bully." The horror theme carried through on liberal commentary sites. A Vox story called Trump's success "a terrifying moment in American politics," while Salon reported that the Republican primary race is "officially a horror film." Some conservatives were equally displeased, with the National Review calling the outcome in New Hampshire "a bad night" for conservatives and "Armageddon" for the Republican establishment. Media disdain for Trump is obviously nothing new. The Huffington Post spent much of last year relegating its coverage of the GOP front-runner to its entertainment section. The site recently began capping all of its Trump stories with an editor's note declaring that he is "a serial liar, rampant xenophobe, racist, misogynist, birther and bully." The horror theme carried through on liberal commentary sites. A Vox story called Trump's success "a terrifying moment in American politics," while Salon reported that the Republican primary race is "officially a horror film." As a candidate whose campaign feeds on controversy and thrives on free media coverage, though, vocal opposition from the mainstream media may only be making Trump stronger. "For the angry voters, it helps," said Steffen Schmidt, professor of political science at Iowa State University. "I think it at least feeds into the narrative that he's this guy taking on the establishment," said Kirby Goidel, a professor of communication at Texas A&M University. "Insofar as the support for him stems from a disenchantment with the establishment...things like this get read as kind of confirming what they thought," said Robert Hockett, a professor of law at Cornell Law School. It can also just make them madder and drive them to fight harder for Trump. "The mainstream media seal of disapproval is mother's milk to Trump," according to John Carroll, assistant professor of mass communication at Boston University. "It plays right into his narrative, which is that establishment politicians and establishment media are self-serving, are essentially defensive, protecting their turf, and every attack against Trump verifies what his followers believe."

## Generic Uniqueness F/L

### AT Pol Cap high Now

Is this a joke? Trump has utterly failed in his first 100 days, has no pol cap.

Cnn 4-27, Van Jones, SE Cupp and Errol Louis are the only ones cited in the evidence but the article features Errol Louis SE Cupp Van Jones Kayleigh McEnany Aaron David Miller Jen Psaki Yascha Mounk Steve Israel Sally Kohn Salena Zito Jeffrey Lord Alice Stewart Michael D'Antonio, Trump's report card: His best, his worst and what he should do next, 2017, http://www.cnn.com/2017/04/27/opinions/100-days-report-card-opinion-roundup/

Errol Louis: Trump missed the honeymoon because there was never a marriage President Trump's low public approval numbers suggest that the early-term honeymoon is already over. Only [44% of adult Americans](http://www.cnn.com/2017/04/26/politics/donald-trump-100-days-poll/) approve of his performance so far, with 54% disapproving -- by far the worst numbers of any president at this point in his term since modern polling began. Trump missed the honeymoon because there was never a marriage. Instead of reaching out to Democratic leaders in Congress or trying to woo supporters of Hillary Clinton, Trump spent much of his first three months [antagonizing Democrats](https://www.usatoday.com/story/news/politics/onpolitics/2017/04/17/donald-trump-barack-obamatwitter/100558042/" \t "_blank) on social media, scrambling to [organize his staff](http://www.chicagotribune.com/news/nationworld/politics/ct-trump-white-house-chaos-20170213-story.html" \t "_blank) and squelch nagging questions about [Russian interference](https://www.washingtonpost.com/news/monkey-cage/wp/2017/04/27/why-wont-congress-investigate-the-trump-campaigns-ties-to-russia/?utm_term=.8a87234fc1d5" \t "_blank) in the 2016 elections. That didn't leave much time or energy to focus on his main agenda items. It's telling that the Trump's top aides who appear to be getting the most done are the men with substantial Washington experience, especially Attorney General Jeff Sessions, who spent a dozen years in the Justice Department and a decade as a senator on Capitol Hill. While Beltway newcomers like Treasury chief [Steve Mnuchin](http://www.vanityfair.com/news/2017/04/steven-mnuchin-donald-trump-tax-reform" \t "_blank) and Secretary of State Tillerson have [stumbled](https://www.nytimes.com/2017/04/27/us/politics/state-department-diplomats-tillerson.html?_r=0" \t "_blank) out of the gate, Sessions has made aggressive moves to [curb funding](https://www.washingtonpost.com/world/national-security/sessions-takes-step-toward-enforcing-threat-to-strip-funding-from-sanctuary-cities/2017/04/21/f0e53d3a-26a2-11e7-b503-9d616bd5a305_story.html?utm_term=.12886acd057f" \t "_blank) for sanctuary cities and [review](http://www.cnn.com/2017/04/03/politics/sessions-police-reform-review/) Obama-era consent decrees and other reforms. Trump's single best move for the future will be to tone down the anti-Democratic antagonism by staging meaningful blue-state visits and policy speeches aimed at core Democratic constituencies, including women, blacks, Latinos, and young people. It's never too late to hope for a honeymoon. Grade: B- Errol Louis is a CNN political commentator and the host of "Inside City Hall," a nightly political show on NY1, a New York all-news channel. SE Cupp: Until his supporters care, what we say about Trump matters very little It's clear by most any metric, President Trump's first 100 days in office have amounted to a fairly anemic success record. But as a limited government conservative, I'm hardly disappointed. That the era of big government programs, sweeping reform and overreach has seemingly come to an abrupt halt -- whether by design or default -- is nothing to mourn. For those of us who never thought Trump could make good on many of his promises -- to rip up various "bad deals" on day 1, to replace Obamacare quickly, to build a wall that Mexico pays for, to stamp out ISIS easily -- our measure of his first few months is irrelevant. Nor does it really matter what his critics on the left and in the media think of how he's doing. All that matters is whether or not his supporters approve. And by that measurement, he's doing just fine. According to a new [ABC News/Washington Post poll](http://www.langerresearch.com/wp-content/uploads/1186a1Trump100Days.pdf" \t "_blank), Trump's approval is at record lows. But among his supporters? Ninety-six percent say they would vote for him again. That is a staggering figure, considering how few promises he's managed to keep. Further, the poll indicates that if the election were held today, he could beat Hillary Clinton again and win the popular vote. The pundit class can hem and haw all it wants about how earth-shattering it is that Trump's accomplished so little in his first 100 days. And it's inarguable that he has. But until his supporters care, our assessments matter little. Grade: B S.E. Cupp is an HLN host of a prime-time program covering contemporary issues and a CNN political commentator. Van Jones: This sin will prove hardest to forgive 100 years from now, Americans will have harsh words about Trump's first 100 days. But no day will more represent the lasting damage than day 89. That is really saying something. After all, this president is embroiled in scandal, from Russia's undue influence to business conflicts of interest. He has tried and failed three times to ban Muslims from America. Turnout at protests dwarfed his meager inaugural crowd. His hand-picked attorney general perjured himself and has pushed outdated criminal justice policies opposed by many in both parties. Nominees have withdrawn, his close ally Michael Flynn resigned in disgrace, and health care went down in flames in the face of town hall outrage. In fact, Sen. Mitch McConnell can claim more credit for the sole bright spot for Republicans -- now Supreme Court Justice Neil Gorsuch -- than can Trump.B ut on Tuesday, April 18 -- day 89 -- [scientists recorded](http://www.huffingtonpost.com/entry/410-ppm-co2-limit_us_58fd8e77e4b018a9ce5c4463?dy9&ncid=inblnkushpmg00000009" \t "_blank) the first carbon dioxide reading above 410 parts per million. On that day, one thing became clear: the potentially catastrophic impact of Trump's decision to single out the Environmental Protection Agency for the greatest budget cuts of any agency. Now is the worst time for a US president to deny the reality of climate science. Of all his sins, this one will prove the hardest to forgive.

### AT Trump Unpopular

#### 1. Empirically denied: Trump has defied literally every single Washington convention but he still holds clout

Grunwald 4/26 [Michael Grunwald, writer at Politico, “Trump’s First 100 Days: What Mattered, And What Didn’t,” Politico, April 26, 2017, <http://www.politico.com/magazine/story/2017/04/26/trump-first-100-days-president-rating-accomplishments-215071>] JW

The indelible takeaway from those first 100 days is that Trump’s assault on political norms has continued. In fact, he has violated Washington norms so casually and constantly that his norm-breaking is becoming normalized. That shattering of protocol and expectations may turn out to be more consequential than any of his massive policy promises or modest policy achievements to date. Some of Trump’s he-did-what? provocations have been consequential in their own right, like his explosive accusation that President Barack Obama wiretapped him, which he refused to retract even after it was debunked, or his conspiracy theory about 3 million illegal voters, which many see as a prelude to a push to restrict voting rights. He’s flouted democratic norms with banana-republic attacks on journalists, judges, protesters, the Congressional Budget Office and other critics beyond his control. He’s flouted anti-corruption norms by refusing to divest his business empire, spending almost every weekend at his own clubs, and making little apparent effort to avoid conflicts of interest. He’s defied the Washington hypocrisy police with incredibly brazen flip-flops on Syria, Medicaid cuts, China, NATO, Goldman Sachs and the nefariousness of presidential golf. And even though he had no experience in government, he’s shocked Washington by surrounding himself with aides with no experience in government: his son-in-law, his daughter, the former head of a right-wing website and a Goldman executive. What’s also shocking is what’s no longer shocking, like the president getting his news from "Fox & Friends," or calling the Senate minority leader a “clown,” or obsessively trashing Hillary Clinton months after he beat her, or congratulating Turkey’s leader for rolling back democratic rules, or repeatedly threatening to let the individual health insurance market collapse to score political points, or suggesting his speech to Congress was the best speech ever given to Congress, or appearing to suggest he thinks his “good friend” Luciano Pavarotti and even Frederick Douglass are still alive. Trump’s Twitter feed is a through-the-looking-glass jumble of baseless allegations, over-the-top boasts and all-caps reactions to whatever he just saw on TV. Even more amazing: Trump’s national security adviser was fired after just three weeks in office for lying about his contacts with Russia, and his White House aides apparently helped engineer a charade where the House Intelligence chairman pretended to uncover evidence supporting the president’s impulsive wiretapping tweets. The thing is, whenever there’s amazing news, new amazements soon overshadow it, and the national conversation moves along. The point is that the unprecedented is becoming commonplace. Imagine how the media would have reacted if Obama had signed a party-line bill to let oil companies hide their payments to foreign governments, or if his spokeswoman had urged Americans to buy products from his daughter. Imagine how Fox News would have reacted if Obama’s White House had released (and defended!) a Holocaust remembrance statement that didn’t mention Jews, or if his wife had decided to live in Manhattan instead of the White House. In the Trump era, it all blends into Trump-being-Trump background noise. We barely notice when he promises to negotiate bilateral trade deals with European countries that are legally prohibited from negotiating bilateral trade deals, or when his administration puts out a press release consisting entirely of administration officials praising him. It wasn’t a big story when Trump’s nominees for Army secretary, Navy secretary and deputy commerce secretary withdrew because they couldn’t unwind their financial conflicts, even though their would-be boss didn’t even try to unwind his. Remember his trash talk about Arnold Schwarzenegger’s ratings at the National Prayer Breakfast? Did his White House really accuse the British of spying on him, too? The bar for surprise rises every day.

#### 2. Republicans are still willing to cooperate with Trump because he’s governed as a normal Republican so far

Grunwald 4/26 [Michael Grunwald, writer at Politico, “Trump’s First 100 Days: What Mattered, And What Didn’t,” Politico, April 26, 2017, <http://www.politico.com/magazine/story/2017/04/26/trump-first-100-days-president-rating-accomplishments-215071>] JW

Who Is Trump? Why Is He Here? One reason Washington Republicans are sticking with Trump is that, when you look past the noise, he has mostly tried to govern like a typical Washington Republican, more corporatist/globalist than populist/nationalist. He has already broken his populist promises to fight cuts to Medicaid, stay out of the Syria conflict, and declare China a currency manipulator. He signed all 13 of those Republican bills striking down Obama-era rules, even though most of them reflected the desires of GOP-friendly business groups like the U.S. Chamber of Commerce rather than his drain-the-swamp campaign rhetoric. He’s stocked his administration with Goldman alumni and K Street lobbyists, and he’s relying heavily on the CEOs he keeps shuttling into the White House for advice.

### A2 Trump has PC with supporters

1. Not responsive – it’s not a question of whether Trump’s base still supports him, but rather whether the Republicans and Democrats in Congress do
2. It might be true that his base has cherry picked success up until this point, but Trump’s 100 days are up – people are less sympathetic and less willing to wait for Trump to be successful. People are a lot more supportive and patient with the resident during the first 100 days because it is a transition period but now support for him will decrease without a big win.

### A2 Trump has failed before, low PC

1. Trump is probably the biggest clown to take office, the bar we hold him to is way lower and any tiny victory is seen as a massive success. After Syria, people praised him for finally “acting presidential” – if you thought Bush was held to a low standard, check out Trump.
2. This is our argument – Trump has low political capital now, but the aff gives him a huge amount.