Six HUGE Numbers Which Should Automatically Disqualify Trump from Being President
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It was apparently not disqualifying enough in 2015 for Donald Trump to launch a U.S. Presidential campaign with a vulgar, racist attack on Latino immigrants. Unabated and surging in the polls, Trump has doubled down on his original victims by releasing a position paper that calls for mass deportation, reversing birthright citizenship and building border walls. This position paper---so far his first and only one---is focused on immigration and is a recipe for complete disaster. Nonetheless Trump’s positions demand a serious response, especially since his frontal anti-immigrant attacks are poisoning the national debate and are being echoed in Jeb Bush’s discussion of "anchor babies", Chris Christi’s call for FedEx tracking of immigrants and Scott Walker’s call for the construction of a wall on the Canadian border.

All together, Trump's recent record makes it possible to calculate the immense economic catastrophe and monstrous absurdity of his hateful campaign rhetoric. The only silver lining is that this despicable display presents an opportunity to clear the air of Trump’s absurd misconceptions and help redirect the discussion towards real issues and real solutions.

1. 2.6 Trillion loss to U.S. GDP due to Trump’s 11 million Deportations

The deporting of 11 million undocumented immigrants would make the U.S. economy smaller, poorer, less productive and more in debt. Our research at the UCLA NAID Center has shown that such mass deportations and the ending of undocumented migration would cost the U.S. $2.6 trillion in lost GDP over 10 years. This huge number and underlying methodology has been re-published and endorsed by both the right-leaning CATO Institute and the left-leaning Center for American Progress. For comparison, the great recession caused a net contraction of $636.2
billion in GDP. Trump’s proposed mass deportation of immigrants would cause a contraction in GDP that is four times that experienced during the great recession.

Trump’s plan would also result in a massive surge in job losses by US workers due to reduced consumption and indirect production. The NAID Center has estimated that such a policy would result in more than 3.6 million lost jobs in California alone. Trump’s plan would also result in a massive surge in the U.S. budget deficit due to a new, and even greater recession as well as the elimination of taxes paid by undocumented immigrants—especially since these immigrants pay a high net tax rate.

NAID methodology is actually cautiously conservative compared to other estimates, which suggest an even greater negative economic impact—1.7 Trillion in annual lost spending.

2. 6.3 Trillion loss of US Income through eliminating birthright citizenship.

Trump’s immigration plan also includes a section entitled, “Defend the Laws and Constitution of the United States.” In that section the presidential hopeful argues that the US must do away with the federal law, governed by the Fourteenth Amendment to the constitution, that guarantees citizenship to any child born on U.S. soil.

According to Pew there are 4.5 million U.S. born children who are under the age of 18 and who are living with at least one undocumented parent. Applying the UCLA NAID methodology for measuring DACA educational attainment and future employment, once these U.S. citizen children finish their education and are earning the median income for their education level, their collective single year income will be $158.7 billion. Over an average 40-year life of employment, the total income generated by these US citizens will be $6.3 trillion. These funds would be denied to the U.S. economy by stripping them of their citizenship.

3. $1.1 Trillion: The Cost of Building and Maintaining Fortress North America

The total cost of Trump’s radical enforcement agenda would include 1) the costs of mass deportations, 2) the costs of presumably impenetrable walls, and 3) the build up and maintenance of a hugely expanded immigration control and enforcement apparatus.

Deporting the eleven million unauthorized immigrants in the U.S. is a massive task, the equivalent of capturing, detaining, processing and expelling the combined populations of New York, San Francisco, Boston, Seattle and Detroit. The center-right American Action Forum estimates that the price tag for mass deportation would be as much as $300 billion dollars.
Building a complete wall along the 1,954 mile border with Mexico would also be a major undertaking---the completed wall would be more than twice as long as the 858 mile “iron curtain” that separated East and West Germany during the Cold War. Given that 670 miles are already walled, a Trump White House would presumably need to build an additional 1,284 miles of walls, which at $16 million per mile would cost $20 billion in total. Fulfilling GOP candidate Scott Walkers’ call for a similar border wall with Canada would add an additional 3,987 miles of walls, with another 1,538 miles for the Alaska-Canada border---costing an additional $88.4 billion.

Finally Trump has called for significantly increasing the $41 billion annual budget of the Department of Homeland Security (DHS), specifically tripling the number of Immigration and Customs Enforcement (ICE) officers. Conservatively estimating a $60 billion annually increase in the DHS budget adds an additional $600 billion in spending over the next ten years.

The US government already provides more federal funds to the agencies tasked with immigration enforcement than it does to all other federal law enforcement agencies combined---this includes the FBI, DEA, ATF and Secret Service among many others. The budget of the immigration enforcement agencies was almost eleven times larger in 2013 than it had been twenty years earlier. The result was that while in 1992 the apprehension of unauthorized immigrants cost the US government around $1,000 per migrant, by 2013 that cost had risen to more than $26,000 per migrant apprehended. Those are funds that could have gone to the law enforcement agencies tasked with crime reduction and towards lowering the cost of higher education, expanding job-training programs, and other initiatives that “put the American worker first.”

4. 30 million more Mexicans in Poverty

Ignored by Donald Trump and virtually all U.S. media is the devastating effect that his policy agenda would have on Latin American economic growth. Trump’s policy would lead to collapsing wages and soaring poverty, which would likely cause dramatic political and social instability, increase migration pressure, and deepen the refugee crisis. The UCLA NAID Center has calculated that mass deportations to Mexico would reduce already low wages by over 40% in both rural and urban labor markets, plunging over 30 million more people into extreme poverty.

Adding insult to injury, Trump has demanded that “Mexico must pay for the [border] wall and, until they do, the United States will, among other things: impound all remittance payments derived from illegal wages.” This call to impound remittances is of course absurd on its face since remittances would be radically reduced due to mass deportations.

Trump’s remittance policy is inspired by prejudice and political opportunism, but even when engaging with Trump on his own terms, his plan is deeply flawed. If, as he has stated, his immigration platform is aimed at ending undocumented immigration, obstructing the $60 billion
remittance flow to Latin America would not be effective. Again if, as he has so vehemently expressed, reducing crime and unauthorized immigration are Donald Trump’s main objectives, his proposal to “impound all remittance payments” is at best counter-productive.

Trump’s remittance plan would instead result in a dramatic increase in unauthorized migration to the United States. Three of the top migrant sending nations---El Salvador, Honduras, and Guatemala---are countries that are mired in poverty and violence, while also being heavily dependent on US remittances. Remittances are between 15% and 20% of GDP in El Salvador and Honduras, and just below 15% in Guatemala. Impounding these remittances would precipitate an immediate economic crisis in these countries and cause a dramatic increase in out-migration, not to mention causing a lasting humanitarian crisis.

5. **$1.5 Trillion in U.S GDP Growth would be generated by Comprehensive Immigration Reform and Legalization**

Donald Trump was correct when he states that, “Real immigration reform puts the needs of working people first,” however none of his proposed reforms would have that effect. On the other hand, comprehensive immigration reform (CIR) with a path to citizenship would be a much-needed boon for American workers---both native and foreign-born. It would also lead to a dramatic increase in economic growth generally.

UCLA NAID Center research found that a CIR bill that included a path to citizenship would generate GDP growth of $1.5 trillion over ten years. The Congressional Budget Office (insert link) conducted a similar study and came to the same conclusion. More importantly, such reform would also create more than 1.4 million new jobs.

6. **27.7 Million Latinos are Projected to be Eligible to Vote in 2016, 30 million in 2020 and 40 million in 2030.**

While Trump’s intolerance has mobilized the GOP’s base, it has not gone unnoticed by Latino communities that are growing in political influence. According to a recent Gallup poll, Trump’s net favorability among Hispanics is -51. This level of hostility is unsurprising but should put the GOP on notice nonetheless. In order to win in 2016, the eventual Republican nominee may need to receive between 42% and 47% of the Latino vote in a number of key battle ground states. If Trump is nominated that looks all but impossible.

In addition, nominating Trump might spur record Latino turnout at a time when the number of eligible Latino voters in growing rapidly. In 2014, there were 25.2 million Latinos who were eligible to vote. In 2016, that figure is expected to grow to 27.7 million. With such high
unfavorable numbers, one can assume that Trump’s candidacy would help mobilize Latino participation. Even if he is not the nominee, his popularity should remind Latino voters and organizers what the republican base thinks of them, their families, and immigration reform generally.
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