

THREE WAYS YOU CAN TELL TRUMP IS LYING ABOUT TARIFF REBATES

Trump is lying about his tariffs again (or rather, still), in fact telling similar lies that he did in a letter that backfired before SCOTUS, because he boasted about how much revenue he was making.

But, perhaps because people are just tuning in, they're treating Trump's false claims as if they're somehow less false than every other thing he says.

First, Trump promised he'd give all the non-rich \$2000 rebates from his unlawful tariffs.



Donald J. Trump

@realDonaldTrump · November 9, 2025, 7:25 AM

[Original Post](#)

People that are against Tariffs are FOOLS! We are now the Richest, Most Respected Country In the World, With Almost No Inflation, and A Record Stock Market Price. 40% of the highest EVER. We are taking in Trillions of Dollars and will soon begin paying down our ENORMOUS DEBT, \$37 Trillion. Record Investment in the USA, plants and factories going up all over the place. A dividend of at least \$2000 a person (not including high income people!) will be paid to everyone

Then, he claimed there'd still be money leftover after he had sent people "free" money.



Donald J. Trump

@realDonaldTrump · November 10, 2025, 10:43 AM

[Original Post](#)

All money leftover from the \$0.00 payments made to low and middle income USA Citizens, from the massive Tariff Income pouring into our Country from foreign countries, which will be substantial, will be used to SUBSTANTIALLY PAY DOWN NATIONAL DEBT. Thank you for your attention to this matter! President DJT

Then, he accused Democrats of making numbers up.



Donald J. Trump

@realDonaldTrump · November 10, 2025, 2:55 PM

Original Post

The "Pay Back" Numbers being quoted by the Radical Left Lunatics, who would love to see us lose on Tariffs because of how bad it would be for our Country, are much higher than those being stated by our Fake Opposition — Opposition mainly for Foreign Countries that would do nothing to be allowed to charge us Tariffs without contribution. The actual Number we would have to pay back in Tariff Revenue and Investments would be in excess of \$2 Trillion Dollars, and that, in itself, would be a National Security catastrophe. Those opposed to us in the United States Supreme Court are giving low Numbers so that the Court will think it is easy to get out of this terrible situation that these Anarchists and Thugs have put us into!

Then, he said it would create a national security crisis if the Supreme Court made him give back money he raised unlawfully.



Donald J. Trump

@realDonaldTrump · November 11, 2025, 12:37 AM

Original Post

The U.S. Supreme Court was given the wrong numbers. The "unwind" in the event of a negative decision on Tariffs, would be including investments made to be paid, and return if funds, in excess of 3 Trillion Dollars. It would not be possible to ever make up for that kind of a "drubbing." That would truly become an insurmountable National Security Event, and devastating to the future of our Country - Possibly non-sustainable!

But there are three ways you can tell Trump is just as full of shit as he always is.

First, because because Kevin Hassett invoked the Laffer Curve when trying to claim we could afford it.

Next, because — as Dean Baker laid out — the numbers don't add up.

Doing the simple arithmetic, the country has 340 million people. If 10 percent of these people fit Trump's definition of high-income, and therefore don't get the rebate, roughly 300 million people would get the checks.

At \$2,000 a piece it would come to \$600 billion, more than twice what Trump is collecting from us with his import taxes. Since he's already \$330 billion short, how can Trump think he has money to pay down the national debt? Also, he seems not to know that our deficit this

year is projected to be \$1.8 trillion, so he is actually adding considerably to the debt and would be adding even more with his \$600 billion tariff “rebate.”

Most importantly – the the likely reason he’s telling these particular lies right now – because when Trump got a stay from the first ruling that his tariffs were illegal, he promised to pay the tariffs back, at least for the plaintiffs, even while insisting it could not replace the revenue raised from the tariffs.

And a stay would not harm plaintiffs, who can be made whole through a refund, including interest, if tariffs paid during these appeals are ultimately held unlawful.

[snip]

And, absent a stay, the government will receive reduced revenue that it will be unable to recoup if the tariffs are ultimately upheld—another irreparable harm. See *Department of Educ. v. California*, 145 S. Ct. 966, 968-969 (2025) (per curiam).

2. Conversely, a stay would not cognizably harm plaintiffs. If tariffs imposed on plaintiffs during these appeals are ultimately held unlawful, then the government will issue refunds to plaintiffs, including any postjudgment interest that accrues. See *Sunprime Inc. v. United States*, 2017 WL 65421, at *5 (C.I.T. Jan. 5, 2017) (“there is virtually no risk to Plaintiff that it would not be made whole should it prevail”). The balance of harms is not close.

Trump’s advisors have told him he’s going to lose at SCOTUS on this. And like a kid caught with his hand in the cookie jar, he’s trying to claim (simultaenously) that the cookies have

already been eaten, but here, would you like some? in an effort to stave off an order to give the cookies back.

You could already tell in last week's hearing that the Justices are struggling with the prospect of making Trump pay the money back.

JUSTICE BARRETT: And then if you win, tell me how the reimbursement process would work. Would it be a complete mess? I mean, you're saying before the government promised reimbursement. And – and now you're saying, you know, well, that's rich, but how would this work? It seems to me like it could be a mess.

MR. KATYAL: So the first thing I would say is that just underscores how major a question this is, the very fact that you are dealing with this with quotas, there's no refund process of – to the tunes of billions of dollars or embargoes, but there is here. But for our case, the way it would work is, in this case the government's stipulated for the five plaintiffs that they would get their refunds. So for us that's how it would work.

Your question, I take it, is about everyone else. We don't have a class action or anything like that.

With respect to everyone else, there's a whole specialized body of trade law. And 19 U.S.C. 1514 outlines all these administrative procedures. It's a very complicated thing. There's got to be an administrative protest. There was a Harbor Management case earlier that this Court was involved with in United States Shoe in which, you know, the refund process took a long time. There were any number of claims and equitable relief and –

JUSTICE BARRETT: So a mess.

MR. KATYAL: So it's difficult,
absolutely

JUSTICE BARRETT: Okay.

MR. KATYAL: We don't – we don't deny
that it's difficult, but I think what
this Court has said in – in – in the
McKesson case in 1990, a serious
economic dislocation isn't a reason to
do something.

Northern Pipeline, you guys stayed your
decision for a while in order to let the
congressional process unfold. There may
be a congressional process here as well.

You know, your – you know, you may be
able to also – be that this Court could
limit its decision to prospective relief
under the John Q. Hammons case. There's
lots of possibilities.

Neal Katyal, in a rush to ensure that the
payback question doesn't given the Justices
cause to make a really bad decision, quickly
offered a bunch of terrible options for all the
other people who've been paying Trump's illegal
taxes because Judges didn't impose a stay. Trump
may think the mere prospect of paying the money
back might yet persuade his captive court to
rule for him.

But more likely, Trump is just applying
political pressure – on the Justices, with false
claims about what the real numbers are, on his
mob, in hopes they'll provide another kind of
pressure if denied money he claims is free but
which in reality they've actually already paid
out of pock themselves – to avoid being ordered
to pay the money back to everyone.

If and when SCOTUS rules against Trump on the
tariff issue, it will be a very significant
loss, the first time right and left joined
together to force Trump to stop doing something
unlawful.

But if SCOTUS rules Trump has to pay the money

back, to everyone, it will create the kind of fiscal challenge that could turn his current political woes into a crisis, not least because right wing members of Congress have been treating this tariff revenue as “free” money they could point to to pretend they were addressing the deficit.

And that’s why Trump is ranting about tariffs.

Not because he wants to give out “free” – in reality, unlawfully seized money that American consumers already paid – money. But because he doesn’t want to pay any consequences for his unlawful actions.

And he definitely wants to avoid the default reality: that Trump will be forced to pay back *importers*, but consumers will get nothing.