
Approaches Of Presidents To Differed Action for Childhood Arrivals: Comparative Essay

In this Essay I will be comparing and contrasting our President Donald J. Trump's approach to previous presidents such as Bill Clinton, George W. Bush, and Barack Obama. I have to provide my input on what type of compromise (if any) should be considered between the two political parties to address: the Wall, DACA (Differed Action for Childhood Arrivals), the millions of illegal aliens currently in the U.S., and how to address states and cities that have declared themselves a Sanctuary State/City. I wanna start of by saying in traditional political terms, there is always an alternate agenda to an incumbent president's that reasonable voters can debate and In Trump's case, two massive annual budget deficits — coming on top of the previous two administrations that doubled the national debt — seem fair game. No president such as Bill Clinton, George W. Bush, and Barack Obama for the past 19 years has sought to offer any budget. With still relatively low interest rates, massive federal spending, a \$22 trillion national debt, and an annual deficit of nearly \$1 trillion, it is really hard to image, in extremis, there are remains any notion of “stimulus” other wise known as an influx of cash into the economy that is designed to help the economy to gain momentum or energy or “pump-priming” other wise known as the stimulation of economic activity by investment is left.

Yet we hear little about such financial profligacy, not a word comes from Trump's critics about the need for Social Security or Medicare reform to ensure the long-term viability of each other than the Democrats' promises to extend the financially and very shaky programs to millions of new clients well beyond the current retiring Baby Boomer cohorts who are already taxing the limits of the system. To counter every signature Trump issue, there is really almost no rational alternative advanced. That void helps explain the bizarre, three-year litany of dreaming of impeachment, the emoluments clause, the Logan Act, the 25th Amendment, the Mueller special-counsel investigation, Stormy Daniels and Michael Avenatti, Trump's tax returns, White Supremacy, Recession, and who knows what the next big thing is. There's so many compromises going on right now. The subtext of all these Wile E. Coyote all-too-clever efforts at trapping road-runner Trump is not just the wish to abort an elected presidency; they're offering the heat of hatred rather than the light of a viable political alternative.

The pushback against Trump on China is that tariffs are taboo and very dangerous. Perhaps, but there's no serious critic has offered any other strategy to really counter four decades of systematic Chinese mercantilism and economic exploitation.

Does anyone believe at this late date that the Chinese juggernaut wishes to pause to discuss at length patent infringement, copyright violation, dumping, currency manipulation, technological expropriation, systematic espionage, or massive subsidized surpluses — given that its comprehensive assault on the international commercial order has made China the second-richest country in the world? Well the Western world's cumulative appeasement of Chinese buccaneerism since 1980 is no longer viable in 2019. At least it is not if the United States wishes to maintain its global influence, protect its allies, and ensure prosperity for its hollowed-out interior.

Yet for decades, we heard nothing but more diplomatic pabulum from the Chinese as they

appeared sober and judicious at global G-something summits and left with poorly disguised contempt for their silly Western appeasers. In terms of commercial magnitude, six months of retaliatory tariffs are small beer compared with 30 years of currency manipulation, forced technological appropriation, and copyright and patent theft.

What type of compromise (if any) should be considered between the two political parties to address: the Wall, DACA (Differed Action for Childhood Arrivals), the millions of illegal aliens currently in the U.S., and how to address states and cities that have declared themselves a Sanctuary

State/City? I believe the type of compromise that should be considered between the two political parties to address is the Wall. I think this because a border wall would save many lives, it would reduce illegal immigration, smuggling, and drug trafficking, and it would also protect private property. A border wall would also make a lot of people feel more safe and secure. This was my essay on the President Donald J. Trump's approach to previous presidents and my input on what type of compromise should be considered between the two political parties to address.

edubirdie.com