

ONE BIG BEAUTIFUL BILL ACT: BEAUTIFUL, BIG, OR DANGEROUS?

July 2025 No: 61



“ONE BIG BEAUTIFUL BILL ACT”: BEAUTIFUL, BIG, OR DANGEROUS?

US politics is in turmoil with the *One Big Beautiful Bill Act* (OBBBA). Passed by the House of Representatives on May 22, 2025, with a narrow vote of 215–214; and passed by the Senate on July 01, 2025, with a narrow vote of 51–50 (with the vote of Vice-President James David Vance as the Chair of Senate) this nearly 1,000-page legislative package is unprecedented in both scope and potential impact. With extensive tax cuts, reductions in social programs, and harsh measures in defense and immigration, the bill has become a defining political instrument in both domestic and foreign affairs.

The bill currently awaits President Donald Trump’s final approval to become law. If enacted, it could trigger a series of changes whose effects will resonate in American domestic politics and globally for years.

Background: What Is It and Why Now?

The roots of this bill trace back to the Trump tax reform of 2017, which implemented significant tax cuts for individuals and corporations. However, most of those cuts were temporary. This new bill aims to make them permanent.

But the issue is not just about taxes. Although this massive bill initially resembles an economic stimulus package, a closer examination reveals a far more extensive and politically layered text. Rather than being a mere budgetary reform, it appears designed to legislate a specific worldview—commonly known as Trumpism or the MAGA ideology. In this sense, it should be understood not as a technical reform, but as an ideological project aimed at permeating the very fabric of the system.

This legislative package contains proposals not only related to economic tools, but also concerning the role of the state, the redefinition of society, and the boundaries of citizenship rights. Criminalizing immigration, limiting social welfare programs to so-called “deserving” Americans, and restructuring

environmental policies according to market priorities are not arbitrary choices. Each reflects a distinct political vision—one that favors a strong state, a weak welfare system, restricted citizenship, and economic nationalism.

What we have, then, is not a budget text buried in technical detail, but a comprehensive proposition about how the state-society relationship should function. In key areas like education, health, environment, defense, immigration, and energy, the approach seeks to scale back state responsibility and transfer authority to individual initiatives, local governments, or the private sector.

Thus, this bill stands out not only for its significance in US domestic politics, but also as a key example in the broader discussion on the trajectory of liberal democracies, the future of the welfare state, and the redefinition of the state’s role in relation to society. For some, this is a “big and beautiful” return; for others, it’s a reactionary unraveling that risks further damaging fragile social balances.

Current Situation and Criticism

Even among Republicans, some are questioning the financial burden of such a massive package. In particular, the risk of increasing the budget deficit makes the support of some conservative senators uncertain. The bill is expected to add around \$2.4 trillion (or even up to \$3–5 trillion, according to some estimates) to the deficit over 10 years. This significant increase in the US budget shortfall could affect the dollar's value, the bond market, and even the flow of capital to developing countries. Moody's has downgraded the US credit rating from AAA, potentially raising borrowing costs.

Interestingly, some business leaders typically aligned with Republicans are also against the bill. Elon Musk and other prominent figures in the business world have openly called the bill “economic suicide.” Musk has specifically criticized it for being “deficit-busting.” It's widely believed that most of the tax cuts will benefit high-income groups, potentially exacerbating existing inequalities in American society. On the other hand, Trump and his team present the bill as a tool to “revive the American Dream.”

The proposed \$800 billion+ cuts to Medicaid and SNAP could affect millions of low-income Americans. With the addition of work requirements to Medicaid, around 8.6 million people might lose their benefits. This could lead to serious difficulties in accessing healthcare services. Democrats, who describe the bill as a “social destruction package,” are increasing public pressure, particularly over cuts to Medicaid and SNAP.

The bill also includes a \$150 billion increase in defense spending, covering

infrastructure and energy investments. However, green energy tax incentives are either eliminated or delayed, potentially undermining climate targets and harming energy independence.

Increased border control, particularly along the southern border, is welcomed by Republican voters. Budget increases for ICE (US Immigration and Customs Enforcement) and proposed immigration fees are expected to enhance state control over migration. With more staff and funding allocated to ICE and border forces, and new fees imposed on asylum seekers, the bill aims to establish stronger deterrents against immigration surges. However, the hardening of immigration policies may strain diplomatic relations with countries like Mexico and others in Latin America.

The ongoing polarization in US domestic politics may also hinder the formation of partnerships in multilateral negotiations. Harsh lines in immigration, healthcare, and fiscal policies may create uncertainty among allies. For scholars of international relations, these bills are not just matters of domestic politics—they affect global dynamics as well.

Building the Wall Through Legislation: The Immigration Dimension

Immigration has long been a key issue in both winning elections and polarizing American society. But under the One Big Beautiful Bill Act, immigration policy is not only hardening—it is being restructured into a framework centered around bureaucratic obstruction and deterrence. This approach carries significant implications not only for migrants but also for the US's relationships with its

neighbors, its commitments to international law, and its global image.

The bill includes a wide range of immigration-related measures. Some are explicit, others more indirect, but all reflect different aspects of an anti-immigrant agenda.

It allocates billions in additional funding for agencies like ICE and the Border Patrol. New physical barriers, surveillance towers, drone systems, and thermal cameras are planned for the border regions.

High application fees are imposed on those seeking asylum, a move that could severely limit access for impoverished applicants from Central and South America.

The “safe third country” rule for asylum applications made at the US border is toughened. For instance, someone coming from Honduras who passed through Mexico would be required to apply there instead of continuing to the US.

The scope of “expedited removal” is expanded—allowing migrants to be deported without access to legal counsel or the opportunity to mount a defense.

Proponents argue that these measures will reduce irregular border crossings, improve security, and encourage a system that supports “legal immigration.” But existing realities and statistics expose the gaps in this narrative.

In 2024, over 2.3 million irregular migrants were apprehended at the US southern border—the highest number since records began. Rather than managing this scale, the bill attempts to suppress it, effectively rendering the migrant crisis invisible rather than resolved.

Asylum and immigration court cases already take years to process. Yet, the bill includes no plan to increase judicial capacity. Without expanding immigration courts, expedited removal measures are likely to violate due process.

Risks to International Law and the Image of US

The United States has long portrayed itself as a bastion of freedom and justice. But the immigration policies in this bill are in direct conflict with numerous international obligations, including the 1951 Refugee Convention.

Countries like Mexico are pushing back against what they see as the US outsourcing its immigration burden. Diplomatic tensions with countries to the south are likely to increase.

Steps that weaken collaboration with organizations like the UNHCR will damage the US's claim to global leadership.

For Trump's political base, this bill is less about immigration policy and more about campaign messaging: “Shut the border, protect the country.” But offering one-dimensional solutions to such a complex issue might serve populist interests in the short term while creating long-term crises. The normalization of anti-immigrant rhetoric is hardening the political climate and fueling ethnic tensions in American society. Meanwhile, large sectors of the US economy remain heavily dependent on immigrant labor.

Conclusion: A Grand Vision or a Dangerous Departure?

The *One Big Beautiful Bill Act* is not merely a massive legislative package—it is the

most refined expression of Trumpist politics. From tax cuts and defense spending to immigration hardening and welfare cuts, this bill functions less as a traditional legislative act and more as a manifesto for governance. It offers an ideological answer to fundamental questions about what the state is, what it does, and for whom it works.

But this answer is delivered through a populist lens, engineered for political control. Internally, it aims to consolidate the voter base through tax breaks and anti-immigration measures. Externally, as seen in the Israel–Iran crisis, Trump toggles between toughness and pragmatism. The connection between Trump’s rhetoric and this bill demonstrates that his foreign policy is deeply shaped by domestic political concerns—his “America First” slogan now functions not just economically but diplomatically as a framework of contraction and isolationism.

Altogether, this illustrates a growing tension between institutional stability and a personalized style of leadership. By expanding state capacity in defense and security while contracting the welfare state, Trump is creating a legal framework for the ideology of the “strong but isolated individual.” This marks not just a shift in America’s internal peace but a potential transformation of its global role.

If enacted, this bill will alter not just the domestic order of the United States but its international posture as well. And not just during Trump’s presidency—but possibly far beyond it. This is not just a political maneuver; it could be the start of a new constitutional vision.



DİPLOMATİK İLİŞKİLER ve POLİTİK ARAŞTIRMALAR MERKEZİ
CENTER for DIPLOMATIC AFFAIRS and POLITICAL STUDIES

+90 216 310 30 40 info@dipam.org

+90 216 310 30 50 www.dipam.org

Merdivenköy Mah. Nur Sok. Business İstanbul
A Blok Kat:12 No:115, Kadıköy/İstanbul

ABOUT THE AUTHOR

Dr. Tolga SAKMAN, is founding chairman of DİPAM. graduated from Kocaeli University, Department of Political Science and Public Administration in 2010, started the International Relations Master Program of the War Academies Command (newly National Defense University) Strategic Research Institute (SAREN) in the same year and he graduated at 2013 with his thesis about “Analysis of Turkish Diaspora’s Participation Process to European Political System: The Cases of Germany, the Netherlands, Belgium”. He completed his doctoral studies at the Department of Political Science and International Relations at Istanbul University with his thesis on “Security Management in the Presidential System”.

He has prepared about 25 paper works and 10 books/book chapters especially on diaspora, security, strategy and European politics and coordinate nearly 20 projects at home and abroad. tolga.sakman@dipam.org