

Revue de presse américaine

Ambassade de France aux États-Unis
Service de presse et de communication



Liberté • Égalité • Fraternité
RÉPUBLIQUE FRANÇAISE

Jeudi 26 janvier 2017, réalisation : Josselin Brémaud



FRANCE – EUROPE3

French Prosecutor Opens Probe into Pay of Front-Runner Francois Fillon's Wife.....	3
François Fillon, French Presidential Hopeful, Faces Inquiry Over Payments to Wife	3
Time : French Presidential Hopeful Accused of Giving Wife Fake Job	4
French Frontrunner Rocked by Probe Handing Opening to Rivals	4
Socialist utopia a hard sell as France swings right.....	5

France's Valls, Hamon Clash Over Basic Income in Primary Debate	6
French Socialist Candidates Seek Ban on Lawmakers Hiring Family	6
France Presidential Hopeful Macron Gains Support.....	6
French Election Jitters Will Show Up in These Market Indicators.....	7
NPR : France's Far-Right Candidate For President Is A Contender	7
Breitbart : Campaign-Trail Marine Le Pen Blocked From Entering Migrant Camp	8

France's Neighbors Sound Alarm Over Election 'Catastrophe' Risk	8	Hemel, Masur and Posner : How Antonin Scalia's Ghost Could Block Donald Trump's Wall.....	26
God Is Back – in France (online).....	9	Sticking to Unsubstantiated Claim, Donald Trump Seeks Voter-Fraud Inquiry	26
U.S. Team Wins Bocuse d'Or Competition for First Time	9	After His Claim of Voter Fraud, Trump Vows 'Major Investigation'	27
When Theresa meets Donald: A geopolitical odd couple with big implications for the West	10	Major Voter-Fraud Investigation Would Be Unprecedented	28
Editorial : The U.S.'s 'special relationship' with Britain can't come at the cost of other alliances	11	Editorial : The sore winner in chief.....	29
German party picks former E.U. lawmaker to challenge Angela Merkel	11	Trump's Impulses Now Carry the Force of the Presidency	29
INTERNATIONAL.....	12	Trump's sister weighs in on Supreme Court pick.....	30
America's New President Is Not a Rational Actor	12	Leaked Draft of Executive Order Could Revive C.I.A. Prisons.....	30
Trump's Immigration Revamp to Include Plans for Safe Zones Inside Syria	13	White House draft order calls for review on use of CIA 'black site' prisons overseas.....	32
Can Nikki Haley Change Trump's Mind About Russia and Putin?	14	Editorial : 'I Think Islam Hates Us'	33
Putin, the perpetual spoiler, tries his hand at a peace process	15	Draft executive order would begin 'extreme vetting' of immigrants and visitors to the U.S.	33
Trump administration could cut funding to United Nations	15	Editorial : Trump's politicized immigration acts are at odds with American values	34
Schlesinger : Will Trump ignore or commandeer the UN?	16	Kerwin and Aldel : Trump's vetting plan would weaken U.S. security.....	35
Trump Moves Shake Deep U.S.-Mexico Relationship.	16	Chicago Welcomes Federal Help on Violence, But Balks at National Guard	35
Cardenas : President Trump, Be Wary of a Mexican Backlash.....	17	Mac Donald : In Chicago, 'the Feds' Are Part of the Problem	36
China Likely to Stick to a Two-Child Policy.....	18	Higgins and Kerpen : The President Opens the ObamaCare Escape Hatch.....	37
North Korean Defector Says Kim Jong Un Can't Last.	19	Sen. Isakson: Price is right.....	37
Editorial : Path of patience toward North Korea.....	19	Collins : Mike Pence Pulls President Trump's Strings .37	
Editorial : Trump's Asia Reassurance Project	19	Lane: Trump can't break the Supreme Court.....	38
ETATS-UNIS	20	E. J. Dionne Jr : What's the method in Trump's madness?	39
Trump Blocks Syrian Refugees and Orders Mexican Border Wall to Be Built	20	Kristof : President Trump's War on Women Begins	39
Trump Orders Wall at Mexican Border	21	Henninger : The Trump Kaleidoscope	40
Trump signs directive to start border wall with Mexico, ramp up immigration enforcement.....	22	Rove : Who Are the 'Obstructionists' Again?	40
Donald Trump's Orders on Border Wall Stir Concern Over Presidential Power	23	Dow Closes Above 20000 for First Time	41
Editorial : The Trump Wall Rises	24	Editorial : The Promise of Dow 20000	42
Editorial : Border security is important, but Trump's wall plan is as hare-brained as they come.....	24	Editorial : Dow 20,000 Is No Vote of Confidence.....	42
A Solid Start for Trump's Border-Security and Immigration Policy	25	Felony Charges for Journalists Arrested at Inauguration Protests Raise Fears for Press Freedom...43	
Editorial : The Real Cost of Mr. Trump's Wall	25	Editorial : Does the punishment for Inauguration Day protestors fit the crime?.....	43
		Yellin : How to Save CNN From Itself.....	44
		Democrats launch scorched-earth strategy against Trump	44

FRANCE – EUROPE

THE WALL
STREET
JOURNAL

French Prosecutor Opens Probe into Pay of Front-Runner Francois Fillon's Wife

William Horobin

Updated Jan. 25, 2017 1:59 p.m. ET

PARIS—France's financial prosecutor opened a preliminary investigation into allegations that the wife of [presidential front-runner François Fillon](#) received a state salary for years without doing any work.

The probe into the alleged misuse of public funds comes after French satirical weekly, *Le Canard Enchaîné*, reported that Penelope Fillon received gross salaries totaling around €500,000 (\$536,650) between 1998 and 2012 while serving for periods as a parliamentary assistant to her husband and his deputy, Marc Joulaud. The newspaper cited another assistant to Mr. Joulaud saying that she never worked with Mrs. Fillon.

The preliminary investigation pulls Mr. Fillon into a potential scandal as he sets out on the campaign trail as a [no-nonsense, conservative candidate](#) pledging to [cut back the largess of the French state](#). The bedrock of his election manifesto is €100 billion in spending cuts and the

elimination of 500,000 state-funded jobs.

Mr. Fillon—who polls show would likely [face National Front leader Marine Le Pen](#) in the second round of a presidential election—called the accusations unfounded on Wednesday and said he was “scandalized” by the report in *Le Canard Enchaîné*. He described the article as contemptuous and sexist.

“Because she is my wife, does that mean she doesn't have the right to work?” said Mr. Fillon, who added later that he had asked to meet with investigators as soon as possible.

“I will fight for the triumph of truth and to defend my honor,” he said.

Spokesmen for Mr. Fillon's campaign jumped to the couple's defense Wednesday, saying that it was standard practice in France for lawmakers to employ their spouses.

“Penelope Fillon worked with her husband, which is completely fair and is completely legal,” Thierry Solère, a spokesman for Mr. Fillon, said on French radio RFI.

The head of Mr. Fillon's Les Républicains party Bernard Accoyer

said Mrs. Fillon regularly participated in her husband's work at the National Assembly, France's lower house.

“Penelope Fillon has a role even if she is discreet,” Mr. Accoyer said on French radio France Inter.

Le Canard Enchaîné also reported that Mrs. Fillon, a lawyer by training, was hired in 2012 at a literary review owned by a friend of Mr. Fillon, where she received €5,000 a month as a literary adviser.

Michel Crépu, the director of the *Revue des Deux Mondes* at the time, said he published two items by Mrs. Fillon but nothing that corresponded to the task of a literary adviser.

“I never, never met Penelope Fillon,” Mr. Crépu said in a radio interview Wednesday.

Mrs. Fillon didn't comment on his wife's role at the literary review. The French prosecutor's office said the preliminary investigation would also examine alleged misuse of company assets.

Mrs. Fillon, who didn't immediately respond to requests for comment,

has avoided the media spotlight, rarely giving interviews during her husband's political career. But in an interview in October with *Le Bien Public*, a regional newspaper covering central France, she said she had only recently become involved [in Mr. Fillon's campaign](#).

“Until now, I never got involved in the political life of my husband,” said Mrs. Fillon, who has five children with Mr. Fillon.

The former prime minister is also under pressure from rivals centering their campaigns on calls for a renewal France's political class.

Emmanuel Macron—a centrist [pledging to undo insider privileges](#) in France's political and business establishment with his fledgling movement *En Marche*—has risen to a close third in the polls in recent weeks, while support for Mr. Fillon has slipped.

Write to William Horobin at William.Horobin@wsj.com

The
New York
Times

François Fillon, French Presidential Hopeful, Faces Inquiry Over Payments to Wife

Adam Nossiter

François Fillon and his wife, Penelope, at a campaign rally in Paris, in November. Philippe Lopez/Agence France-Presse — Getty Images

PARIS — France's financial prosecution office opened an embezzlement investigation Wednesday into [François Fillon](#), a leading presidential candidate, following a newspaper report that his wife had been paid around \$535,000 in public money for a no-

show job, a revelation that could upend the tightly contested election.

Mr. Fillon, [who won November's center-right primary](#), has been considered a favorite in the race, but now must contend with questions about whether the payments to his wife were inappropriate. According to the satirical weekly *The Canard Enchaîné*, Mr. Fillon's wife, Penelope, received about 500,000 euros over eight years, first as his parliamentary assistant and then as assistant to his deputy Marc

Joulaud, who took over when Mr. Fillon became a minister in the government in 2002.

It is not illegal in France for members of Parliament to employ family, and around 10 to 15 percent do so, according to French media. But if Mrs. Fillon did nothing, holding a fake job, in effect, in return for the public funds, her husband could be in trouble.

“This could be painful to Fillon, fairly damaging,” Gérard Grunberg, a political scientist at Sciences-Po, the

prestigious political science institute, said Wednesday in an interview. He added: “Everything depends on whether it was a bogus job. If it's proved that it was — and a well-paid one, too — then this is going to be important. She always said she didn't participate in political life. So she sort of condemned herself in advance.”

Mr. Fillon, the center-right candidate, has been leading in polls, ahead of his two main challengers, [Marine Le Pen of the far-right](#)

[National Front](#), and the former economy minister in the Socialist government, [Emmanuel Macron, who is running as an independent](#). The general election is in April, with a runoff expected in May. Either Ms. Le Pen — most likely — or Mr. Macron will wind up in the presidential runoff against Mr. Fillon, analysts have predicted.

In a [2012 posting on Twitter](#), Mr. Fillon denounced those who “don’t work and receive public money,” in what has become a principal theme of his campaign.

But in its investigation, The Canard Enchaîné quoted another of Mr. Joulaud’s assistants as saying: “I never worked with her,” adding, “I knew her only as the minister’s wife.” Mrs. Fillon has always told interviewers that she stayed away from politics and devoted herself to the couple’s five children, and to domestic pursuits. Of Welsh origin, Mrs. Fillon has been known for her interest in horses and has been photographed with her family in and around the couple’s chateau in Western France.

The affair could be all the more damaging because the image of Mr.

Fillon has been based on probity and austerity, and he has called for sacrifices from the French, including cuts to civil servant jobs.

Campaigning in Bordeaux on Wednesday, Mr. Fillon angrily denounced the new reports as “stink balls,” saying, “So, because she’s my wife, she doesn’t have the right to work.” He called the Canard’s report “misogynist.”

On Twitter he wrote, “I’m astonished that these old, and legal, facts have become a story, three months from the first round of presidential voting.”

The Socialists criticized Mr. Fillon on Wednesday. “You can’t call yourself the candidate of honesty, of transparency, and then be unable to explain yourself on these matters,” said Manuel Valls, one of two in the Socialists’ primary runoff on Sunday.

The Canard also reported that Mrs. Fillon had been paid 5,000 euros a month over a year and a half by a wealthy friend of Mr. Fillon’s, Marc Ladreit de Lacharrière, who owns The Revue des Deux Mondes, an old-line political review. The newspaper suggested that Mrs. Fillon had in fact done little work in return for the pay.

Time : French Presidential Hopeful Accused of Giving Wife Fake Job

Samuel Petrequin / AP

(PARIS) — French presidential hopeful Francois Fillon’s campaign hit its first major hurdle Wednesday, when financial prosecutors opened a preliminary investigation following claims that his wife was paid about 500,000 euros (\$537,000) with parliamentary funds while holding a fake job.

France’s financial prosecutor launched its probe into suspected embezzlement and misappropriation of public funds just hours after *Le Canard Enchaîné* newspaper reported that Penelope Fillon earned the money as a parliamentary aide to her husband during his tenure as a lawmaker without actually working.

Fillon, [the conservative candidate](#) in France’s spring election, blasted the report, saying he hopes to talk to the financial prosecutor’s office as quickly as possible to “re-establish the truth.”

The probe “will allow me to silence this campaign of calumny and end

these baseless accusations,” he said.

He did not deny that his wife was a paid aide, saying instead he was surprised that “such old and legal acts” are in the news three months ahead of the presidential election.

It’s not illegal for French legislators to hire their relatives as long as they are genuinely employed.

According to the weekly newspaper, which said it had access to Penelope Fillon’s pay slips, the candidate’s wife was paid by her husband from 1998 to 2002 when he was lawmaker serving his native Sarthe region.

Read More: [Europe’s Far-Right Leaders Unite at Dawn of the Trump Era](#)

When Fillon was handed a minister position in 2002 under Jacques Chirac’s presidency, Penelope Fillon became an assistant to Marc Joulaud, who replaced her husband at the French parliament. *Le Canard Enchaîné* said her wages went up

during that period, earning between 6,900 to 7,900 euros a month before taxes.

The newspaper claims that she was re-employed by her husband for at least six months in 2012 after Francois Fillon was elected Paris legislator.

As the conservative nominee, Fillon, a former prime minister, has been championing transparency and deep cuts in the ranks of civil servants to lower state spending. Early opinion polls suggest that he and far-right National Front leader [Marine Le Pen](#) could advance to the second round of the April-May election.

During a trip to the southwestern city of Bordeaux, the conservative candidate hit back at the report, slamming the newspaper for what he called a misogynistic approach.

He said he was “outraged by the contempt and the misogyny in this story. Just because she is my wife, she should not be entitled to work? Could you imagine a politician

saying, as this story did, that the only thing a woman can do is making jam? All the feminists would scream.”

Read More: [Why France’s Marine Le Pen Is Doubling Down on Russia Support](#)

Fillon spokesman Philippe Vigier earlier insisted that Penelope Fillon’s work wasn’t fictional.

Benoit Hamon, who is vying with former Prime Minister Manuel Valls to be the Socialists’ presidential candidate and could face Fillon in the presidential race, proposed that, in the future, close relatives of politicians should not be hired and paid for by parliamentary funds.

“Lawmakers should not be allowed to hire their children, cousins, relatives or wives anymore,” Hamon told French public TV.

Bloomberg

French Frontrunner Rocked by Probe Handing Opening to Rivals

@HeleneFouquet
More stories by

Helene Fouquet

by and

26 janvier 2017 à 00:00 UTC–5
26 janvier 2017 à 05:18 UTC–5

- Fillon employed his wife as parliamentary aide for years
- Polls show tight three-way race with Le Pen, Macron rising

Francois Fillon.

Photographer: Marlene Awaad/Bloomberg

The French presidential campaign saw its first major scandal break on Wednesday when prosecutors

opened a probe into front-runner Francois Fillon.

The national financial prosecutor started a preliminary criminal investigation into Fillon’s employment of his wife as a parliamentary aide starting in 1998. Satirical weekly *Canard Enchaîné* reported a day earlier that Penelope Fillon collected a public salary totaling about 500,000 euros (\$537,000) over multiple years without actually doing any work.

For 62-year-old Fillon, who pollsters have made the clear favorite since he won the Republicans’ nomination in November, the consequences are potentially far-reaching. The lifelong politician has vaunted his probity as one of his main qualifications for office.

In a statement on Wednesday evening, Fillon said the investigation will allow him to put an end to unfounded accusations and he wants to speak to prosecutors as soon as possible. Fillon’s spokesman said Thursday that Penelope’s work was mostly representing her husband in his rural constituency in Western France when he was at the National Assembly in Paris.

“This is no small matter and anything could happen,” said Gerard Grunberg, a senior researcher at the Paris Institute for Political Sciences. “This affair hurts Fillon’s political image, which was built on transparency and old-fashioned respectability.”

Twists and Turns

In a race that has already seen Fillon’s Republicans reject France’s most popular politician for their candidate, former President Nicolas Sarkozy lose in a first-round primary and the governing Socialists eclipsed by 39-year-old independent Emmanuel Macron, the prosecutors’ decision adds a new layer of volatility. Macron may be in the best position to benefit.

A former economy minister under Francois Hollande and before that a banker at Rothschild & Co. advising on mergers, Macron is relatively new to politics and has remained largely free from scandal. In the same *Canard Enchaîné* issue that broke the Fillon story, there was a report that Macron took advantage of ministerial resources to launch his campaign last year. The candidate denied any abuse of funds and used

the occasion to paint himself as an outsider to the political system that has nurtured his rivals over decades.

"Emmanuel Macron has already proved his freedom from a political system to which the other candidates are inextricably linked for the good reason that they live off it," his campaign said in a statement.

While he's yet to break into the top two in polling for the first round in April, he's seen his support grow steadily since declaring his candidacy last year and large, enthusiastic crowds attend many of his rallies.

"Macron can benefit," Grunberg said. "Despite everything, there have been some centrists that went to Fillon and given the situation, they may turn to Macron."

Le Pen's team is also sensing an opportunity.

"For a candidate who boasted of his integrity, the fact that he was above the fray, this is surprising," David Rachline, Le Pen's campaign chief said on France 5 television. "It raises a lot of questions."

Le Pen herself faces a fraud investigation for her use of 339,900 euros in European Parliament funds to employ aides doing unrelated work. Rachline dismissed the issue by saying that those employees did actually work.

Polls Tighten

"This increases the gap between the people and their politicians and it hits Fillon hard," said pollster Jerome Fourquet from the Ifop Institute.

Fillon was already losing momentum in the polls before the story broke.

Le Pen, who wants to take France out of the euro, edged into the lead with about 26 percent support compared with about 25 percent for

Fillon in this month's Ipsos poll. Macron has moved within striking distance of the two favorites for the first round with about 21 percent. In mid-December, Fillon led by 3 percentage points.

Explanations Sought

Penelope, mother of Fillon's five children, took a salary as her husband's parliamentary assistant and as the aide to his one-time replacement as lawmaker over multiple years, though she may not have actually worked in that capacity, Canard Enchaîné reported Tuesday, without citing anyone.

Fillon's spokesman Thierry Solere said on RMC Radio Thursday that it's common practice for lawmakers from both the left and right to employ family members, and that Penelope had always "accompanied" her husband's work in politics. Bernard Accoyer, the former head of the National Assembly and a member of Fillon's

party, told France Inter radio he'd "often seen" Penelope participating in work at the National Assembly and in Fillon's election district. Bruno Retailleau, the Senate whip for Fillon's party, told Europe1 radio that Fillon would start presenting evidence of his wife's work to investigators today.

Fillon's wife was brought up in Wednesday night's debate between the two remaining candidates in the Socialist Party's primary. Manuel Valls and Benoît Hamon said lawmakers should be barred from hiring relatives, as they are in the European Parliament.

Valls couldn't resist taking a dig.

"Fillon has based his campaign on three issues: cutting 500,000 civil service jobs, cutting France's welfare state, and his propriety," Valls said. "I think he does have something to explain."



Socialist utopia a hard sell as France swings right

TRAPPES, France —

At the "Friz-Lys" styling salon, Jocelyne Gisquet is luxuriating in the freedom of answering emails with a laptop balanced on her knees while having her hair curled. Working where she wants, when she wants, are among the pay-offs of the 45-year-old's bold step last year to quit a stable job as a marketing director at one of France's largest multinationals to set up in business for herself.

That risk-taking spirit of get-up-and-go is what French presidential hopeful Benoît Hamon hopes to unleash on a national scale with his radical proposal that all French adults — rich and poor, working or unemployed — be paid a modest but regular monthly no-strings-attached salary to give them the freedom to try new things without the fear of unpaid bills.

Hamon's campaign for "universal income" has catapulted him from obscurity on the left wing of the ruling Socialist Party to within touching distance of its presidential ticket. With 35 percent of the vote in the Socialist primary's first round, the 49-year-old is in pole position to beat ex-Prime Minister Manuel Valls, who got 31 percent, in the decisive second-round ballot on Sunday.

But in Trappes, the blue-collar town west of Paris where he is the elected lawmaker, Hamon hasn't won over Gisquet or her stylist,

Françoise Larcher, weaving bright plastic rollers into the entrepreneur's dark head of hair.

Where Hamon sees 750 euros (\$800) per month for all liberating the French and their creative forces, and cushioning them from an automated future of fewer jobs for humans, Gisquet and Larcher see just another state handout that France neither needs nor can afford.

"That's the problem with the left. They are far too utopian," said Gisquet. "They make promises they can't keep. That's intolerable."

That opponents of his signature proposal are so vocal and easy to find even in Hamon's district, where he vacuumed up 55 percent of votes in the primary first round last Sunday and where people warmly describe him as a salt-of-the-earth type who is generous with his time, gives a foretaste of the steep uphill battle the expected Socialist Party candidate will face in France's presidential election in April and May.

In his favor: Quitting François Hollande's government (he was education minister) in 2014 put distance between Hamon and the Socialist president whose catastrophic unpopularity killed his own hopes for a second five-year term.

Rebelling against the government's pro-business shift spared Hamon the taint that has undermined the candidacy of Valls, who infuriated

many as Hollande's prime minister by forcing reforms through parliament without a vote.

But in a country that has shifted to the right since Hollande's victory in 2012, Hamon's firm anchorage on the Socialist left could prove an impossible sell. So, too, could the huge expense of providing a universal income to more than 50 million adults. Hamon himself has estimated the cost to be at least 300 billion euros (\$320 billion), to be financed by taxing robots and other measures.

Valls, hardening his tone to try to make up ground on his rival, this week called Hamon "a merchant of illusions."

Even in his own campaign team, some worried that Hamon's proposals, which also include the legalization of cannabis, amounted to political suicide, says Ali Rabeh, one of his aides.

"The audacity of it scared quite a few people," he said in an interview in Hamon's parliamentary office in Trappes, as campaigners dropped by to restock on thick piles of leaflets and posters.

But even if Hamon doesn't win the primary or the presidency, Rabeh argues that they've already scored a victory by planting the argument that universal income isn't utopian, but rather a necessity that would lift France from the doldrums of diminishing work.

"We are one of the most pessimistic countries in the world," he said. "This is a way of boosting our state of mind, our collective spirit."

"The debate is no longer whether there will be a universal basic income but when," he said.

Nursing a morning glass of rose wine at the bar of a nearby café, 72-year-old retiree Gerard Sierra said the Socialists are on course for "a whipping" at the polls, with fiery far-left presidential candidate Jean-Luc Mélenchon and Emmanuel Macron, Hollande's center-left former economy minister, both siphoning off support.

Sierra's working life started in the rail yards that helped transform Trappes, from where water used to be pumped for royal use in the Palace of Versailles, into a blue-collar town. The drinks factory where Sierra later labored for 25 years closed down, leaving him unemployed.

Hamon argues that the cushion of a monthly stipend would liberate workers from such uncertain trajectories, giving them more freedom to pick and choose jobs and to reinvent themselves.

"An interesting idea," Sierra mused, and then shot it down.

"Universal: That means everyone would get it, and that bothers me," he said. "Nothing is free in life. That's just reality."

France's Valls, Hamon Clash Over Basic Income in Primary Debate

@gviscusi More stories by

Gregory Viscusi

by

25 janvier 2017 à 17:53 UTC-5

- Benoit Hamon is favorite in Sunday's Socialist primary run-off
- Debate also showed different views on deficits, place of Islam

Benoit Hamon and Manuel Valls prior to a televised debate on Jan. 25.

Photographer: Bertrand Guay/AFP via Getty Images

The two remaining candidates in the French Socialist Party's primary expressed dramatically different views of the country's economic future as they clashed in their only debate ahead of Sunday's vote.

Benoit Hamon defended his proposals for a shorter work week and a basic income of 750 euros (\$800) a month for all citizens, saying technical change threatens to make work rare. Manuel Valls said lower payroll taxes and job training in new technologies would enable the country to keep creating jobs and cut France's 10 percent unemployment rate.

"Work has become rarer and rarer, and we must prepare now," said Hamon, 49, a former education minister. "We must share work; some don't have it, some suffer from it."

Valls, a 54-year-old former prime minister, responded that "our economies are changing, the nature of work is changing, but work is not going to disappear. Some professions will disappear and some professions will be created. It's up to us to create and adapt." He cited French advances in electric cars, and said every worker should have the right to lifelong job training.

Hamon took 36 percent of the vote in the primary's first round last Sunday, with Valls second at 31.5 percent. Hamon is the favorite for this Sunday's run-off, having won the endorsement of third-placed Arnaud Montebourg, who took 19 percent. Regardless, neither man is likely to be France's next president. Polls suggest the Socialist candidate will finish a distant fourth or fifth in the first round of the presidential election on April 23, with nationalist Marine Le Pen and Francois Fillon from the center-right Republicans going through to the May 7 runoff.

According to a flash Internet poll by Elabe, 60 percent of viewers said Hamon won the debate while 37 percent said Valls won.

Hamon and Valls represent opposite wings of the French Socialist Party, and Hamon quit Valls's government in 2014 over what he said were overly business-friendly policies.

"Valls faces a very hard challenge," Bruno Cautres, a professor at Sciences Po Institute in Paris, said in an interview before the debate. "The momentum is clearly with Hamon."

Sharing the Wealth

Hamon avoided repeated questions from the debate moderators over how he'd pay for his basic income for all, explaining that it would be phased in over several years and that there's scope to raise taxes on wealth, stock options, robots, and multinational companies, and that more exercise and lower pollution would cut medical bills. "A universal income isn't an additional cost, but a sharing of riches," he said.

A study by OFCE, an economics research unit linked to Sciences Po, said the measure would cost a net 480 billion euros a year, after accounting for various existing welfare payments it would replace. That's equal to 22 percent of gross domestic product, in a country where taxes already account for 45 percent of economic output. Among 35 rich countries tracked by the OECD, only Denmark has a higher tax take.

When Hamon said many French young people were unable to find a job or were in short-term contracts, Valls interrupted to say "It's not like that everywhere in Europe."

"What he proposes is just not possible without a massive increase in taxation," Valls said.

Honoring Commitments

Valls said France had to live up to European Union commitments to bring its budget deficit down to 3 percent, though he said he wouldn't go much further because of the need to invest in new technologies and boost military and police spending.

Hamon said he'd renegotiate European treaties on deficit and debt targets. "We have to do away with this obsession of 3 percent deficits," he said.

The men also clashed on social issues, with Hamon arguing that France needed to be more accepting of pious Muslim practices. "I don't want to live in a country where the only good Muslim is a Muslim who isn't a Muslim," Hamon said. "Secularism shouldn't be used as a weapon against our Muslim co-citizens who have nothing to do with radicalism."

Speaking about Islamic-style head scarves, Valls said "we have to stop thinking these are religious symbols. We must not cede ground. We must say to these women that we are here to help you be emancipated."

There was less disagreement over combating terrorism, with both saying that young French militants returning from having served with Islamic State in Syria had to be arrested and tried, and that the European Union needed to strengthen controls on its external borders. They both backed ongoing French military operations in Mali, Syria and Iraq, and agreed European nations needed to increase military cooperation in response to a more aggressive Russia and a less predictable U.S.

One question came via Internet, and was whether they spoke English. Hamon answered simply "Yes." Valls, who was born in Barcelona, responded, in English, that "I speak very bad but I speak well Spanish."

French Socialist Candidates Seek Ban on Lawmakers Hiring Family

Gregory Viscusi

25 janvier 2017 à 17:27 UTC-5

Candidates in the left-wing primary for the 2017 French presidential election, former French education minister Benoit Hamon, left, and former French prime minister Manuel Valls, take part in a televised debate ahead of the primary's second-round runoff, in La Plaine-Saint-Denis, north of Paris, on Jan. 25.

France's two Socialist presidential hopefuls said members of parliament should be barred from hiring family members after the Republican nominee admitted that he employed his wife using public funds.

"It's a law that has now become essential," former Prime Minister Manuel Valls said during a debate Wednesday evening against his former Education Minister Benoit Hamon, who said he also favored a

ban. The two men face off in the second round of the Socialist primary this Sunday.

Paris prosecutors said earlier that they opened a preliminary probe into presidential frontrunner Francois Fillon after he confirmed press reports that his wife had worked for years as his parliamentary aide. While lawmakers hiring relatives isn't illegal in France, press reports have raised questions whether

Fillon's spouse actually worked for her salary.

Fillon called the revelations "unfounded accusations."

"Fillon has based his campaign on three issues: cutting 500,000 civil service jobs, cutting France's welfare state and his propriety," Valls said. "I think he does have to explain."

France Presidential Hopeful Macron Gains Support

PARIS —

The real winner of France's left-wing presidential primary may be a man who demonstrably shunned it: Emmanuel Macron.

The 39-year-old former investment banker and ex-economy minister with pro-free market, pro-European views has chosen not to take part in the Socialist primary. Instead, in recent days he has been drawing attention away from the campaign by traveling to the Mideast and

pushing like-minded lawmakers to abandon the once-powerful, now-troubled Socialists and join his centrist movement.

Voters will choose Sunday between ex-Socialist prime minister Manuel Valls and Benoit Hamon, an ex-

government member and hard-left candidate.

Whoever the winner is, polls show election prospects remain poor for the Socialist nominee in the April-May presidential race.

Meanwhile, Macron is ranked the third most popular choice for president, just behind the two top contenders, far-right leader Marine Le Pen and conservative candidate Francois Fillon.

Macron announced his movement "In Motion" (*En Marche*) will present one contender in every electoral district for the parliamentary elections in June. He issued a call for candidates, saying applications will be examined "quickly" on a first come, first served basis.

This move puts pressure on lawmakers, especially those on the center-left who would like to be associated with Macron's popularity — which now appears to be much higher than the Socialist party's.

Meanwhile, Macron is also seeking to boost his international stature.

In Lebanon this week, he discussed the Syrian conflict, terrorism and refugee issues with the country's highest authorities.

"Today one cannot be a French official, one cannot pretend to take a role in the Republic, without being aware of the diplomatic and military situations which are part of our world," Macron said in Beirut.

Earlier this month, he visited Germany where he addressed a conference on the European Union in English — a language he can speak fluently, a rare trait among French politicians.

He also visited the United States in December and met with Antonio Guterres before he became Secretary-General of the United Nations.

Macron may also benefit from the Socialist party's deep divisions inherited from French President Francois Hollande's unpopular, troubled term.

If Hamon wins the Socialist nomination on Sunday over the more center-leaning candidate, former prime minister Valls, voters

with moderate views could choose to support Macron in the presidential race.

Lawmaker Richard Ferrand, a Socialist who joined "In Motion" last year, said both Socialist finalists "will not be able to reconcile and create a dynamic. That's why we say for a long time people with progressive ideas must gather around Emmanuel Macron".

Macron is a former investment banker with Rothschild. He became President Francois Hollande's economic adviser at the Elysee palace in 2012 and two years later, economy minister.

He passed pro-business measures that have been criticized by many on the left, saying they undermined France's famous workplace protections.

He left the government last year after he launched his own political movement. He was never a member

of the Socialist Party, and has never held an elected office.

As a presidential candidate, he suggests loosening some of France's stringent labor rules — especially the 35-hour workweek — to boost job hiring. Younger workers could do more hours than older ones, he said.

Sylvie Marchal, 37, a member of Macron's movement, used to vote for a right-wing candidate in previous elections.

She praised the "youthful, credible" candidate and a "realistic speech" enriched by his experience both in a private company and in government.

"The fact that he is placing himself outside the [political] parties is attracting many people, because we see a limit to the two-party system" alternating between a traditional left and a radical right, Marchal told the AP. "We feel like he's trying to pick up on good ideas from both sides."



French Election Jitters Will Show Up in These Market Indicators

by Stephen Spratt
More stories by

Stephen Spratt

26 janvier 2017 à 06:31 UTC-5

- Nation's 10-year bond futures likely to feel brunt of selling
- Bank stocks will be most sensitive to stress over fate of EU

And so to France.

As a wave of populism makes political risk the [biggest concern](#) for analysts in 2017, the French election represents one of the next major potential flash points.

With front-runner Francois Fillon facing a criminal probe into hiring his wife as an aide, investors are weighing the prospect of President Marine Le Pen. The National Front leader says Europe's single currency is "destroying" her country's economy.

Here's where the risk may show up first in rates and credit markets:

Yield Spreads

An increase in political risk premium in French bonds should result in some widening in the yield spread over core countries, such as Germany. The France-Germany 10-year yield spread has been gradually increasing since November, but that may have been influenced by French bond sales and reduced buying support from the ECB.

France's yield spreads over peripheral nations may be less predictable, as a Le Pen victory would likely result in a flight to quality and so away from the periphery.

Open Interest

You will now receive the Pursuits

The brunt of any selling would likely be felt in the liquid futures market of the French 10-year bond, as was the case after Trump's election victory. Investors often look at the open interest -- the active number of bets -- which can leave footprints as to when positioning changes. Currently, front-month OAT futures have a record-high open interest,

which may increase as we approach the election.

OAT futures are testing critical support at 148.73, which represents a peak and breakout point from 2015. A firm move below here introduces the 50 percent correction line at 147.44 and then the 61.8 percent Fibonacci of the 2015 to 2015 rally at 144.86.

The medium-term outlook remains negative following the violation of the 2013 bullish trendline in the week of Trump's election win. The near-term resistance is at the January high of 152.52.

Credit-Default Swaps

France's five-year credit-default swaps have retraced about 50 percent of the post-Brexit gains following Trump's election victory.

Both France and Germany have been forces for economic and monetary union, and each country has a general election this year. The outcomes will be key to the stability

of the euro and, in the medium term, to credit risk.

Inflation Swaps

Fillon has proposed increasing value-added tax rates by 2 percent. That's widened the spread between front-end French and euro inflation swaps, as it may induce inflationary pass-through.

Banks

Banking stocks, which have been the most sensitive to concern about the fate of the euro zone, are the most vulnerable to rising political risk. French automakers, which have a strong exposure to Europe, would also feel the impact. Big multinational groups such as Sanofi, LVMH Moet Hennessy Louis Vuitton SE and Total SA, which have a small exposure to France, would be more protected.

France's benchmark equity index, the CAC 40, has gained 0.5 percent this year while Germany's DAX added 3.3 percent and Italy's FTSE MIB rose 2.4 percent.

NPR : France's Far-Right Candidate For President Is A Contender

Eleanor Beardsley Facebook Twitter Instagram

Far-right leader and candidate in next spring's French presidential elections, Marine Le Pen, acknowledges applause at a meeting of European nationalists in Koblenz, Germany, last weekend. **Michael Probst/AP hide caption**

A confident Marine Le Pen strides into a room in her new campaign headquarters, greeting reporters in her signature, husky voice.

The candidate takes a seat in front of a calming blue campaign poster that bears no mention of the National Front party or the Le Pen surname. It says simply, "IN THE

NAME OF THE PEOPLE: Marine — President."

"This isn't just a slogan," she says. "It's a profession of my beliefs. I would never betray the people. It's unbearable to see the people betrayed time and again by politicians who don't keep their

promises and by the technocrats at the European Union."

Marine Le Pen speaks to reporters in her campaign headquarters. **Eleanor Beardsley/NPR hide caption**

Eleanor Beardsley/NPR

Le Pen took over leadership of the National Front six years ago. Her father, Jean-Marie Le Pen, founded the party in 1972 and was known for his xenophobia and anti-Semitism.

His daughter is trying to make the National Front more palatable to mainstream voters by abandoning that rhetoric. Le Pen's strategy has paid off at the polls. The party has become one of the most successful in France, attracting younger voters and more women. And people who've never voted for the far right in their life.

That describes 74-year-old Jacqueline Castanaer in the Mediterranean port city of Nice, who says the surge in immigration the past few years has become too much.

"They pass illegally over the border from Italy," Castanaer says. "I think Le Pen could come in and clean things up a bit. And it would be good to close the borders. The left and right just go back and forth in this country but nothing ever changes."

Le Pen says as president the first thing she'll do is seek a return of French sovereignty over its borders, currency and laws. If need be, with a referendum to leave the EU, which she calls an undemocratic organization that advances by threats and blackmail. She says Brexit and the election of U.S. President Donald Trump show that the people are not going to lie back and take it anymore.

"The people are rejecting so-called free trade and globalization that the

elites presented as a positive thing," she says. "But it's actually causing massive migration and the collapse of industries."

Speaking to cheering crowds at a gathering of the European far-right last weekend in Koblenz, Germany, Le Pen said she would close French borders. She said the current wave of illegal migrants is in addition to the 200,000 legal immigrants France has been accepting every year for the last decade. The crowds yelled in agreement when she said it was time to end mass immigration.

"Immigration has a huge cost on social programs and it lowers salaries and drives up unemployment," said Le Pen. "It's also a source of insecurity. We know there are terrorists hiding among the waves of migrants, so how much longer are we going to continue on like this?"

Though Le Pen calls Islamic fundamentalism one of the biggest dangers facing France, she says she is not anti-Muslim. Le Pen says there are two kinds of Islam and one is completely compatible with French values.

"Practicing Muslims, like Christians and Jews, have never posed a threat to French values," she says. "But there's another political fundamentalist, totalitarian Islam that wants sharia [Islamic] law over French law. And this is the one I will fight without mercy."

Le Pen has made no secret of her admiration for Russian President Vladimir Putin. She says he always

has the interests of Russia and the Russian people in mind, which is the way it should be. Le Pen supported Russia's annexation of Crimea after what she called a legitimate referendum.

Le Pen says the insurrection in eastern Ukraine is entirely Europe's fault, because the EU tried to blackmail Ukraine with a commercial deal in order to force it to break ties with Russia.

"The EU – probably on instructions from the U.S. – created the conditions for this coup d'etat and completely artificial conflict," says Le Pen.

Le Pen says she's very pleased that there will no doubt be an easing of tensions between the U.S. and Russia with President Trump in office. "If only for selfish reasons - because we're in the middle," she says laughing.

Le Pen calls for a multi-polar world. She says France should be under no other nation's control, as she says it is now with regard to the U.S. and NATO. Le Pen says she will take France out of NATO's central command if elected.

As for President Trump? Le Pen says his policies are good for France.

"He scrapped the transatlantic trade deal and he's against the U.S. playing the role of the world's policeman. Lord knows we've all been paying the price for that these last years."

But not everything is going Le Pen's way. She's had to adapt her campaign to some unforeseen events. François Hollande, the unpopular Socialist president, is not seeking a second term.

And a social conservative, François Fillon, is the surprise choice as presidential candidate of the mainstream right. Fillon's support of traditional, Catholic values could attract many of the voters Le Pen had been counting on.

Jean-Yves Camus, with the French Institute for Strategic and International Affairs, says Le Pen is now adopting Trump's tactics.

"She's going to the left on the economy and social issues," he says. "That is, explaining to the workers that globalization is bad, that the EU is bad."

Camus says the platform of the far left and the far right are practically identical except on immigration.

Le Pen says the labels left and right don't mean anything anymore. Today's split is between those who support global organizations and open borders, and those who want strong nation states.

"I see the great return of sovereign nations with their borders, protections and patriotism," she says.

For Marine Le Pen, Brexit and the election of Trump herald the beginning of a new era. French voters will decide if that's true when they go to the polls in April.

Breitbart : Campaign-Trail Marine Le Pen Blocked From Entering Migrant Camp

A migrant camp in the French city of Dunkirk has stated populist Front National presidential candidate Marine Le Pen is not welcome in the camp because "humanity is a value she ignores".

The move infuriated the Front National leader who has been a sharp critic of the migrant policies of the current government and is currently campaigning for the French presidency. Ms. Le Pen arrived at the camp, run by charity Utopia 56, unannounced claiming if she had made prior arrangements "they only show you what they want to show you", French broadcaster BFMTV [reports](#).

Mayor of Grande-Synthe Damien Careme welcomed the move by the charity to ban Le Pen from entering and took to Twitter writing, "I am the one who denied Marine Le Pen entry to the Grande-Synthe refugee camp – she had the audacity to show up without prior warning!" adding, "humanity is a value that she ignores".

Ms. Le Pen fired back at Mayor Careme on Twitter saying, "This is democracy in France: only pro-immigrant officials are allowed to visit migrant camps!"

After being refused, entry Le Pen and her entourage set up a press conference near the camp in which she slammed both Mr. Careme and Mayor of Calais Natacha Bouchart

saying they had both been "irresponsible" in their dealing with the migrant situation.

"Officials are sending migrants conflicting signals, and they are therefore partly to blame for the crisis. We tell immigrants that we don't want them to come to France, but at the same time, we encourage the ones that are here to stay!" said Le Pen. She added, "What's more, we are facilitating their illegal entry into the UK by setting up camps near the border".

After the press conference had ended, Le Pen once again took to Twitter writing, "Calais is a martyred town that has been crushed by the migrant crisis. Immigrants are returning to Calais; the situation

there has become intolerable. We must take back control of our borders."

Ms. Le Pen was among several prominent populist politicians who attended the "2017: Year of the Patriots" conference last weekend in Koblenz, Germany. The Front National leader spoke of ["the return of nation-states"](#) and slammed the European Union (EU), which she has said France [may leave](#) if she becomes the next French president in May.

Le Pen has said the EU must restore member states the power to enforce their own borders and have more independence in their economic and fiscal policies.



France's Neighbors Sound Alarm Over Election 'Catastrophe' Risk

26 janvier 2017 à 07:51 UTC-5

Leaders in Spain and Germany voiced concern that the Europe

Union faces collapse as a result of anti-establishment forces campaigning to tear down the bloc, singling out their common neighbor France as the potential trigger.

Europe's unprecedented electoral calendar, with ballots this year in France, the Netherlands and Germany -- plus possibly in Italy -- presents the continent's "enemies"

with the chance to wreck the EU, according to German Vice Chancellor Sigmar Gabriel, a Social Democrat. He cited Brexit's cheerleaders among the bloc's foes.

Separately, Spanish Prime Minister Mariano Rajoy, who saw off his own populist challenge last year, expressed alarm at the French presidential ballot in April and May and September's parliamentary vote in Germany, elections that will determine the future direction of the two biggest economies in the euro area. Victories for the National Front in France and Alternative for Germany would "destroy" the continent, he said.

"I don't want to even think about it," Rajoy, whose People's Party is a member of the same Christian Democratic umbrella group as Chancellor Angela Merkel's party, said on Onda Cero radio. "That would be a catastrophe."

Trump Inspiration

Polls suggest that National Front leader Marine Le Pen will make it to France's run-off vote on May 7, giving her a shot at claiming the

presidency on anti-euro, EU-skeptic ticket. She shared a stage last weekend with Frauke Petry of Alternative for Germany and Geert Wilders, whose anti-Islam platform has helped propel his Freedom Party to within reach of winning the March 15 Dutch election.

[Europe's populist forces see Trump's victory as a clarion call, click here for more](#)

Europe's anti-establishment forces are drawing inspiration from Donald Trump's surprise elevation to the U.S. presidency and unexpected victory of Brexit supporters in last year's referendum. Another common strand is an anti-immigration stance that has flourished during the worst refugee crisis since World War II, with more than one million people fleeing war and oppression in Syria, Afghanistan and elsewhere having sought asylum in Germany alone.

Gabriel, who is poised to become German foreign minister in a cabinet

reshuffle allied to the Sept. 24 election, pointed to France's two-round ballot as the key moment that will shape Europe's destiny. While no recent poll has shown Le Pen coming close to winning the second round, Brexit and Trump's victory have made political analysts and investors reluctant to rule anything out.

"If Europe's enemies, after Brexit last year, manage once again in France or in the Netherlands to be successful, then the threat to us is the collapse of the greatest civilization project of the 20th century, the European Union," Gabriel said in a speech to lower-house lawmakers in Berlin on Thursday.

German Exports

He cited protectionist tendencies from the Trump administration and elsewhere that are "very, very dangerous," for the world economy and for Germany, whose luxury

cars, specialized machinery and chemicals make it the world's third-largest exporter after China and the U.S.

"With Europe oriented toward international cooperation, Germany would be isolated and alone -- and after the U.K. and the U.S., more partners would be lost to us," he said of the risks ahead. "The situation could hardly be more dramatic."

Still, Rajoy, who rules a minority government, said he's convinced that either Republican candidate Francois Fillon or the Socialists will win in France.

"It's crucial for Europe's future that elections in Germany and France go well," said Rajoy.

The New York Times God Is Back – in France (online)

Sylvie Kauffmann

The debate will not go away. Catholics, who took part in mass demonstrations against legalization of gay marriage three years ago, are emerging as a political force in this campaign. In the Republicans' primary in November, candidates discussed which one of them was closer to Pope Francis' views on social issues. Campaigning this month in the Socialist primary, the former prime minister Manuel Valls, challenged by a young Muslim woman on the issue of the Islamic veil — which he views as an enslavement of women — described France as "a country with Christian roots that hosts the oldest Jewish community in Europe."

This fresh enthusiasm for Christianity has less to do with God, though, than with culture and identity. Polls usually show that close to 55 percent of French citizens describe themselves as Roman Catholics (the rest being divided among Muslims, Jews and Protestants), but only 5 percent to 8 percent go to church regularly.

An Ipsos study recently commissioned by the Catholic media group Bayard has created a new category of believers: "committed Catholics," people who don't necessarily attend church but identify with the Catholic Church through philanthropy, family life or social involvement. This group is said to include 23 percent of the French population.

Though they represent a variety of opinions on matters from migrants to Pope Francis or political orientations, this group can be seen as a potential electoral bloc. "These cultural Catholics have been under the radar screen because polls did not identify them, and because secularized political and media elites did not see them," Jean-Pierre Denis, the editor of the Catholic weekly La Vie, told me. The socially conservative Mr. Fillon, he said, "has been smart enough to spot them and tap into them."

Mr. Denis says he has often wondered in the past when French Catholics would turn into a small, organized, misunderstood minority, like the Jewish community. But this

is not happening. Experts like him notice a stronger feeling of belonging among French Catholics. One important factor is obviously the rise of Islam, now the second religion in France, and the wave of terrorist attacks carried out by groups claiming to be Islamist fundamentalists. In one of those attacks, [an 85-year-old Catholic priest was killed](#) in his church while saying Mass, his throat slit.

As Europe grows more secular and as Islam takes root on the Continent, the face of French Catholicism is evolving. Clearly, the political dividing line for today's Catholic voters is immigration, along with national identity.

Two powerful books published this month perfectly illustrate this divide: one, "Church and Immigration: The Great Malaise," by Laurent Dandrieu, an editor of the right-wing magazine Valeurs Actuelles, accuses the Catholic hierarchy of erasing centuries of resistance to Islam. Mr. Dandrieu's views are shared by Marion Maréchal-Le Pen, Ms. Le Pen's young niece and a French Parliament member, who,

unlike her aunt, is an openly practicing, very conservative Catholic.

The other, "Identity: The Evil Genius of Christianity," by the lawyer and blogger Erwan Le Morhedec, adheres to a more tolerant Christian-Democrat line and warns Catholics against the temptation of finding solace in extremism and an aggressive assertion of national identity.

The books have set off a passionate debate within the Catholic media; no doubt the candidates in the general election are now watching this debate closely, probably realizing that their secularism, after all, is not as widely shared in the electorate as they had assumed. Interestingly, the [Vatican](#) newspaper Osservatore Romano recently republished an editorial by Mr. Denis about the two books that clearly took the side of Mr. Le Morhedec's, the more moderate one. Now — who knows? — maybe not only God, but even the pope will be a factor in the French presidential campaign.

The New York Times U.S. Team Wins Bocuse d'Or Competition for First Time

Fabricant

Florence

Winners of the Bocuse d'Or in Lyon, France, were teams from the United States, center, in first place; Norway, left, in second; and Iceland, right, in third. Zsolt Szigetvary/European Pressphoto Agency

A team of American chefs on Wednesday won the biennial [Bocuse d'Or](#) culinary competition — the equivalent of the Olympics for professional cooks — for the first time in the contest's 30-year history.

In the finals in Lyon, France, a group of 10 chefs and helpers from the United States won the gold medal. Norway took the silver medal, and Iceland won the bronze. In 2015 an

American team was awarded the silver medal in the competition, which was founded by the French chef Paul Bocuse. Teams from 24 countries competed this year.

"I promised Monsieur Paul 10 years ago that we'd make it to the top of the podium," said the chef [Thomas Keller](#), who is the president of Team U.S.A. "We made it in nine."

The team's head chef was Mathew Peters, 33, from Meadville, Pa., who was most recently the executive sous-chef of Mr. Keller's New York restaurant, [Per Se](#). His commis, or helper, was Harrison Turone, 21, from Omaha, who also worked at [Per Se](#).

Both of the chefs took a year off to prepare for the contest, a fierce competition in which the American

team is made up of younger chefs who can spare the time to train.

NYT FoodFood NewsFollow On

Philip Tessier, a member of the team that won second place in 2015, was the Americans' coach.

This year the chefs were required to prepare a meat platter and a vegan dish in 5 hours 35 minutes. "We had to use two proteins, Bresse chicken and crayfish," Mr. Peters said. "And this was the first year there was a vegan dish."

The teams were required to interpret "Poulet de Bresse aux Écrevisses," a Lyonnaise classic. The American

version involved the chicken with morel mushroom sausage, braised wings, a wine glaze and sauce Américaine, a kind of lobster sauce. Alongside were a chicken liver quenelle with foie gras, corn custard, black-eyed peas and toasted pistachios, as well as lobster tail with Meyer lemon mousse. The garnishes included preparations using carrots, Vidalia onions, black truffles, carrots, peas and potatoes. They brought some of the ingredients from the United States.

For the vegan dish, the chefs prepared California asparagus with cremini mushrooms, potatoes, a custard made of green almonds,

Meyer lemon confit, a Bordelaise sauce and a crumble using an almond and vegetable yeast preparation that mimicked Parmesan cheese.

The team arrived in Lyon 10 days ago. After the winners were announced at 7:25 p.m. local time, Mr. Peters, who had been cooking since 8:40 a.m., said his energy was starting to come back. An estimated 300 American supporters were in the hall to cheer the team.

Unlike some teams, the Americans were supported only by commercial sponsors and contributions, with no government funding.

"I don't think our government knows who we are," Mr. Keller said.

Mr. Keller said he could not estimate how much participation in the contest cost. But he said that experience was essential. "We learned along the way," he said. "Our win was built on the shoulders of a thousand people."

Correction: January 25, 2017

An earlier version of this article misstated the number of chefs and helpers on the United States team. It was 10, not more than a dozen.



When Theresa meets Donald: A geopolitical odd couple with big implications for the West

<https://www.facebook.com/anne.gearan>

LONDON — When British Prime Minister Theresa May on Friday becomes the first world leader to meet with President Trump in the Oval Office, the two will have much in common to discuss.

Both were catapulted to power on the back of populist shocks in 2016. Both have promised to deliver radical change to their countries. And both now lead nations at the heart of a Western alliance facing its most serious identity crisis in decades.

Yet beneath the similarities lie profound differences in style and substance that make the two leaders less the second coming of the Thatcher-Reagan transatlantic lovefest and more a geopolitical odd couple.

Today's Headlines newsletter

The day's most important stories.

Please provide a valid email address.

May is everything that Trump is not: a careful, low-key and pragmatic member of the political establishment with a decades-long career in elective office. She holds mainstream positions on critical issues such as trade and security that put her sharply at odds with Trump's protectionism and isolationism. She tweets about Christmas and World AIDS Day, not alleged voter fraud or feuds with the news media, celebrities or political opponents.

She prizes the NATO military alliance and holds skeptical views of Russia — uncertain ground with Trump.

British Prime Minister Theresa May has promised a government report on Britain's Brexit plans. It comes

amid growing pressure for a formal document from MPs after the UK's highest court ruled lawmakers must vote on Article 50. U.K.'s Theresa May promises government report on Brexit (Reuters)

Whether those differences dominate their meeting or they manage to bond over their shared circumstances, this could be a critical moment for both leaders.

May probably has more to gain or lose from the visit, which includes an unusual address to Republican members of Congress the day before she visits the White House.

May will say Brexit offers a chance for a new partnership with the United States, according to excerpts of her remarks to Republicans released Wednesday.

"As we rediscover our confidence together — as you renew your nation just as we renew ours — we have the opportunity — indeed the responsibility — to renew the special relationship for this new age," May will say. "We have the opportunity to lead, together, again."

With her country preparing to [leave the European Union](#), she is gambling her premiership on her ability to forge new relationships beyond the continent — with a strengthened Anglo-American bond at the top of her wish list. She also needs to convince Trump that NATO fits into his "America first" vision of defense and overseas engagement.

The invitation to be Trump's first foreign visitor is a diplomatic nicety that was in doubt as recently as a week before the visit. And it follows an awkward series of actions by Trump that could easily be read as snubs. Just days after Trump's win, he invited anti-E.U. firebrand Nigel Farage to meet him at Trump Tower — then tweeted that Farage would [make a fine British](#)

[ambassador to the United States](#).

According to a leaked transcript, Trump suggested during their first telephone call that if May were passing through Washington, she should let Trump know.

The breach of diplomatic protocol alarmed May's inner circle, which sees Farage as a meddlesome adversary. Rather than jabbing back, however, Downing Street began trying to curry favor.

Foreign Secretary Boris Johnson boycotted an emergency E.U. meeting called to discuss Trump's win, dismissing it as a "whinge-orama." May also made a point of rejecting Obama administration criticism of Israel, echoing Trump talking points.

British officials have even gone so far as to float the idea that May could play Thatcher to Trump's Reagan in a revival of 1980s-style relations between Washington and London.

British political observers say, however, that the sort of transatlantic warmth exhibited at the height of the Cold War is unlikely with this duo because of a fundamental mismatch in worldviews.

Their approach toward Vladimir Putin's Russia — May is a hawk while Trump says he wants closer ties — is just one glaring example.

"The problem is that Ronnie and Maggie had a common enemy in the Soviet Union and world communism," said Tim Bale, a politics professor at Queen Mary University of London.

On a range of other issues — global trade, NATO, climate change and the nuclear accord with Iran — there's a similarly wide gap between the two leaders.

For Trump, May's arrival within a week of his inauguration is a chance for him to project legitimacy and normality to U.S. allies still struggling to come to grips with his unexpected electoral victory and who still view him with suspicion — if not outright contempt. The meeting suggests a continuity with familiar American foreign policy priorities that also reassured some Trump skeptics at home.

The "special relationship," as the modern U.S. alliance with Britain is called, has always been an unequal one, with the United States the richer and more powerful partner.

But the partnership has huge benefits for the United States, especially in the intelligence, diplomatic and military realms. The two countries share intelligence closely and usually move in tandem in international negotiations such as the Iran nuclear pact. The United States has relied on Britain's highly trained armed forces in Iraq, Afghanistan and Ukraine, sometimes to the domestic political detriment of British leaders.

Trump, a self-proclaimed Anglophile, has signaled a willingness to negotiate a free-trade deal with Britain as soon as it is out of the E.U. British officials have responded with enthusiasm, and May has said the issue will be at the top of her priority list for her meeting with Trump.

The meeting, she told Parliament on Wednesday, is "a sign of the strength of the special relationship between the United Kingdom and the United States of America. A special relationship on which he and I intend to build."

Yet British analysts say May is deluding herself if she thinks Trump is the partner Britain needs to

ensure its safe landing outside the E.U.

"If you look at the way Donald Trump thinks about deals, rushing over there as quickly as possible and looking like you're desperate doesn't exactly work to your advantage," said Mark Leonard, director of the European Council on Foreign Relations. "So I don't think this is very clever of her from a tactical standpoint."

The
Washington
Post

Editorial : The U.S.'s 'special relationship' with Britain can't come at the cost of other alliances

<https://www.facebook.com/washingtonpostopinions>

BRITISH PRIME Minister Theresa May, who pushed to become [the first foreign leader to meet with President Trump this week](#), appears to be hoping that a free-trade deal with the United States will ease her country's exit from the European Union and set the stage for the new "global Britain" she envisions. Mr. Trump seems to think that reinforcing "the special relationship" with London will substitute for [nurturing Western institutions](#) such as NATO. If so, both are deluded.

Ms. May, who took power following [Britain's Brexit vote last June](#), shares with Mr. Trump an aversion to some aspects of globalization and a determination to limit immigration. But in [a speech last week](#), she outlined a post-E.U. Britain that would embrace economic liberalization and aggressively pursue free trade with the rest of the world. A logical

Unlike other European leaders, such as German Chancellor Angela Merkel and French President François Hollande, who have held Trump at arm's length and emphasized that their friendship is contingent on Trump's [not trampling core Western values](#), May has rushed to embrace the new U.S. president.

Bale said that one reason May probably wanted to meet Trump early in his presidency is that she wanted to find out for herself where

he stands when he's not whipping up a crowd or provoking opponents on Twitter. She may even think that on some issues she can bring him around to her views.

But the diplomacy will be exceptionally tricky.

She cannot afford to antagonize the famously thin-skinned Trump, because she needs his support for a trade deal. But if she does not challenge him, Bale said, then "she'll be seen to be sucking up to

someone who shouldn't be sucked up to and who can't be relied upon. That could backfire at home, and it could do damage to her relations with other European leaders."

Gearan reported from Washington. Karla Adam in London and Carol Morello in Washington contributed to this report.

The
Washington
Post

German party picks former E.U. lawmaker to challenge Angela Merkel

By Stephanie
Kirchner

BERLIN — Germany's second-largest party has sought to inject new life into its election hopes with a surprise move to select a combative former E.U. official to challenge Chancellor Angela Merkel.

But the bid by the Social Democratic Party to unseat Merkel in September does not appear to play on the populist and anti-immigrant sentiments rocking the political systems in places such as France.

Both the Social Democrats and Merkel's Christian Democrats strongly favor keeping together the European Union amid internal strains from Britain's decision to leave and the rise of right-wing groups questioning E.U. powers. The new Social Democrats leader, former E.U. Parliament president Martin Schulz, had backed Merkel's

policies to allow in more than 1 million migrants since 2015, including many from war-battered nations such as Syria and Iraq. Schulz is also a fervent backer of the European Union.

Today's WorldView

What's most important from where the world meets Washington

Please provide a valid email address.

[\[Europe's right-wing populist leaders to confer in Germany\]](#)

The Social Democrat's reshuffle highlights its challenge to carve out a different identity from Merkel's political base. Schulz replaces the deputy chancellor, Sigmar Gabriel, who had been widely seen as the most likely challenger in Sept. 24 parliamentary elections.

Read These Comments

The best conversations on The Washington Post

Please provide a valid email address.

In reality, Ms. May's embrace of a "hard" Brexit that would give up the E.U.'s single market and customs union is fundamentally at odds with a "global Britain." Her determination to [control immigration](#) will make it difficult for potential foreign investors to recruit necessary talent and probably will prevent free-trade deals with key nations such as India. As it is, the prospect of losing automatic access to other European nations has caused [big international banks to announce plans](#) to eliminate thousands of jobs in London — hardly a step toward a European Singapore.

Mr. Trump's notion that investing in relations with Britain and a handful of other countries — Israel, Egypt and perhaps Russia — will

substitute for the web of alliances the United States forged after World War II is similarly shallow. Thanks to large defense cuts in recent years, [Britain's military will be unable](#) to provide major support to any military operations the Trump administration launches; it certainly could not fill gaps that would be left by a breach with NATO. Just as Mr. Trump is unlikely to welcome British manufacturing imports, Ms. May does not favor a weakening of NATO or further E.U. disintegration.

Certainly, a U.S.-Britain free-trade treaty could benefit both countries and ought to be explored. But an attempt by either leader to turn the "special relationship" into an instrument for devaluing other Western alliances would damage both countries. At Friday's summit meeting, Ms. May instead should nudge Mr. Trump toward a more positive approach to NATO and other Western institutions.

At a joint news conference Tuesday in Berlin, Gabriel said he was convinced that Schulz had the "best chances," adding, "I'm sure he's the right one."

Schulz, accepting the nomination, said he was "deeply moved."

Members of the Christian Democratic Party appeared to take the unexpected news calmly. "Neither are we going to panic now, nor fall into depression," party deputy chairman Thomas Strobl told the DPA news agency.

Jürgen Falter, a political science professor at the University of Mainz, said he did not view Schulz as a serious threat to Merkel and her center-right party. Merkel's party currently heads the polls with 37 percent; 21 percent of voters support the Social Democrats.

But Falter agreed with the Social Democrats' assessment that Schulz is a better candidate than Gabriel to try to cut into Merkel's lead. "He comes across as more human, more authentic, less distant than Gabriel," he said.

[\[German politicians demand new deportation centers, more police powers and revetting of migrants\]](#)

Schulz, who served as E.U. Parliament president for four years until his term ended this month, has spoken openly about his past personal life, including periods of unemployment and alcohol abuse.

He has a reputation of not mincing his words, and observers expect him to lead a tough-minded campaign.

While Schulz has advocated for a tightknit and more democratic Europe, his domestic policy agenda is unclear. At Tuesday's news

conference, he remained vague. "We want the hardworking people in this country, who stick to the rules, to live safely and well here in Germany," he said.

Falter said that Schulz is unlikely to strongly oppose Merkel on one of the most contentious political issues in Germany: how to deal with the

large influx of asylum seekers. One effort sought to spread the migrant burden across the 28-nation European Union.

"He supported Merkel's refugee policy on an E.U. level and failed due to a lack of support of the quotas among the member states," Falter said.

Green Party lawmaker Jürgen Trittin weighed in on the announcement, telling reporters: "As a response to [new U.S. President] Trump, we must keep Europe together. And Martin Schulz is not the worst candidate for that."

Falter suggested the "visibility and prestige" of Schulz's former position

as president of the E.U. Parliament is likely to help Schulz. He was among the E.U. officials who accepted the Nobel Peace Prize on behalf of the European Union in 2012.

"It will only harm him with a minority of E.U. skeptics," he said.

INTERNATIONAL



America's New President Is Not a Rational Actor

A lot of people have been appalled by Donald Trump's behavior during the transition, at his inauguration, and in his first week in office. You can count me among them. But I also find his actions baffling from the perspective of Trump's own self-interest. People who opposed his administration's policies should take heart, because his conduct so far will make it harder to proceed as he seems to want.

For starters, Trump made zero effort to exploit the honeymoon period traditionally accorded a new president by the press, didn't try to drive a wedge or two in the large coalition that opposes him, and declined to appeal to a broader sense of national unity. Thus far he has played entirely to his base, painting a dark portrait of a crumbling America where everybody except Trump himself is untrustworthy, corrupt, deceitful, and not to be heeded at all. The result: a president who lost the popular vote by 2.5 million people is even less popular now, and he enters office with the lowest approval ratings of any new president in history.

Never mind the irony of such a [deeply corrupt and dishonest person](#) accusing others of corruption; the odd thing is that he has been doing just about everything he can to unite key institutions against him. This may not matter if he and his lackeys can disseminate a squid-ink cloud of "alternative facts" and convince their many followers that down is up, black is white, 2+2=5, and what the president said on camera last week really never took place. As [I've warned before](#), Trump & Co. seems

to be operating straight from the Erdogan-Berlusconi-Putin playbook, and it remains an open question whether this approach will work in a country with many independent sources of information, some of which are still committed to facts.

The same goes for the agencies of the government that he is now supposedly leading. Government bureaucrats have been held in low regard for a long time, which makes them an easy target. But you also can't do anything in public policy without their assistance, and my guess is that Americans will be mighty unhappy when budget cuts, firings, resignations, and the like reduce government performance even more. Get ready for a steady drip, drip, drip of leaks and stories emanating from dedicated civil servants who are committed to advancing the public interest and aren't going to like being treated with contempt and disdain by a bunch of hedge fund managers, wealthy Wall Streeters, or empty suits like Energy Secretary Rick Perry, all led by President Pinocchio.

Then there's Trump's delicate relationship with the national security establishment. Having picked a fight with the intelligence community during the campaign and transition, Trump had a golden opportunity to mend fences during [his visit to the CIA last week](#). No one expected him to offer a lengthy mea culpa; all he had to do was tell his audience he understood their work was important, he believed them to be patriots, he recognized that some of them had made sacrifices for the country that dwarf any he has ever made, and that he was counting on them to do outstanding work henceforth. He

started off OK, but proceeded to make [a weird and narcissistic detour](#) into the size of his electoral victory, his uncle who taught at MIT, and his complaints about media coverage of the crowd size at his inauguration and whether or not it rained during his speech. [Read this transcript](#), and see if you can find a statesman anywhere in this incoherent and self-centered performance. An even more relevant question: Did he think this sort of behavior would advance his cause?

There's also the broader question of his overall approach to foreign policy. As [I've noted repeatedly](#), a few elements of Trump's worldview make sense, such as his aversion to nation-building in the greater Middle East. But as Jessica Mathews points out in an [important essay](#) in the *New York Review of Books*, Trump and key advisors like Michael Flynn also believe Islamic extremism is a mortal danger and have promised to get rid of the Islamic State right away. But how do you do that, and how do you make sure the Islamic State doesn't come back, if you aren't busy invading, occupying, and nation-building in the areas where it and other extremist movements live and recruit? In fact, Islamic extremism is a problem but not an existential threat, which is why the United States does not need to try to transform the whole region. But Trump doesn't seem to see things this way.

Even more important, Trump seems to be blithely unaware that the United States is engaged in a serious geopolitical competition with China, and that this rivalry isn't just about jobs, trade balances, currency values, or the other issues

on which he's fixated. Instead, it is mostly about trying to keep China from establishing a hegemonic position in Asia, from which it could eventually project power around the world and possibly even into the Western hemisphere itself. It's easier to favor "America First" when no other great power is active near our shores, but that fortunate position may not last if China establishes a position in its neighborhood akin to the one the United States has long enjoyed in its backyard. With its surroundings secured, China could forge alliances around the world and interfere in distant regions — much as the United States has done since World War II — including areas close to U.S. soil. This development would force Americans to worry a whole lot more about defending our territory, something we haven't had to worry about for more than a century.

Here's a news flash, Mr. President: The United States is not located in the Western Pacific. As a result, its ability to prevent China from becoming a hegemonic power there *requires* close cooperation with Asian partners. The United States should not try to shoulder this burden by ourselves, but we sure ain't gonna do it alone. That is why Trump's hasty decision to scrap the Trans-Pacific Partnership is so short-sighted. It is even dumber if he plans to pick lots of fights with Beijing on economic issues and the South China Sea while launching bare-knuckle bilateral trade talks with the rest of Asia. Forget about Russia: Thus far, Trump's nonstrategic behavior toward China makes me wonder if there is a Chinese word for "*kompromat*."

But by far the most baffling lapse in the post-election period has been Trump's near-silence on his strategy for dealing with Russia.

But by far the most baffling lapse in the post-election period has been Trump's near-silence on his strategy for dealing with Russia. And the truly weird part is that there is a perfectly sensible geo-strategic case for mending fences with Moscow, and it's not hard to explain or understand at all. Suppose Trump met with a sympathetic journalist and said something along these lines:

"There are some losers who think I'm too fond of President Putin, and who believe he's got something on me. That's dumb, absurd, a crazy conspiracy theory that's being promoted by the dishonest media. What these people don't understand is that a better relationship with Russia is in our national interest. Russia is a major European and Asian power. It has thousands of nuclear weapons. Putin is a tough guy who really hates terrorists, and he doesn't want Iran to get a nuclear weapon. Putin also helped the world get rid of Assad's chemical weapons. As my really good friend Henry Kissinger told me, a bad relationship with Russia makes it harder to solve problems in lots of places.

"But for the past 25 years, the traditional foreign-policy establishment here in Washington kept ignoring Russia's geopolitical concerns and pushing NATO eastward. How dumb was that? And they kept talking all the time about spreading democracy and criticizing Moscow for not being just like us. I can't believe how stupid this was: All it did was alarm the Russians and eventually lead them to seize Crimea. That wasn't good, but can

you blame them? No, you should blame Obama and all those liberals in the EU. Even worse, this dumb policy just pushed Moscow closer to Beijing. Is that what we want?

"Look, I love this country — and why not? The American people chose me to be president! I'm no fan of the Russian political system. But my job is to advance the national interest. I'm going to show the American people that I can get a better deal from Russia working with them than working against them. Trust me, it's gonna be TREMENDOUS."

Reasonable people can still disagree about a statement like that, but explaining the underlying balance-of-power logic behind Trump's desire for better relations with Russia would help dilute the suspicion that he's acting this way because he owes the Russian oligarchs billions, or because the Russians have some embarrassing *kompromat* on him. It would also diminish concerns that he and Rex Tillerson just want to lift sanctions so that Exxon can start drilling in Russian oil and gas fields.

Which raises the obvious question: Why hasn't he offered such an obvious explanation? I don't have the slightest idea. It's possible nobody in his inner circle understands geopolitics in a serious way (and his scuttling of the TPP supports that point), so maybe it just hasn't occurred to them. Or it's possible that some of the rumors are in fact correct, and there really is some dirty laundry lurking behind the scenes.

But there's a third possibility, one that offers a unified, coherent explanation for some of the apparent contradictions in Trump's foreign-policy views. Trump and some of his advisors (most notably

Stephen Bannon) may be operating from a broad, [Huntingtonian "clash of civilizations" framework](#) that informs both their aversion to multiculturalism at home and their identification of friends and foes abroad. In this essentially cultural, borderline racist worldview, the (mostly white) Judeo-Christian world is under siege from various "other" forces, especially Muslims. From this perspective, the ideal allies are not liberals who prize tolerance, diversity, and an open society, but rather hard-core blood-and-soil nationalists who like walls, borders, strong leaders, the suppression or marginalization of anyone who's different (including atheists and gay people, of course) and the promotion of a narrow and fairly traditional set of cultural values.

For people who see the world this way, Putin is a natural ally. He declares Mother Russia to be the main defender of Christianity and he likes to stress the dangers from Islam. European leaders like Marine Le Pen of France, Nigel Farage of Great Britain, and Geert Wilders of the Netherlands are Trump's kind of people, too, and on this dimension so are the right-wingers in the Israeli government. And if Islam is the real source of danger, and we are in the middle of a decades-long clash of civilizations, who cares about the balance of power in Asia?

The problem with this way of thinking, as [I wrote back](#) when *The Clash of Civilizations* first appeared, is that it rests on a fundamental misreading of world politics. "Civilizations" are not political entities; they do not have agency and do not in fact act. For good or ill, states still drive most of world politics, and clashes *within* Huntington's various "civilizations" are still more frequent and intense

than clashes *between* them. Moreover, seeing the future as a vast contest between abstract cultural groupings is a self-fulfilling prophecy: If we assume the adherents of different religions or cultural groups are our sworn enemies, we are likely to act in ways that will make that a reality.

So where does this leave us? Way too soon to tell, but I'll hazard two guesses. First, foreign and defense policies are going to be a train wreck, because they don't have enough good people in place, the people they have appointed don't agree on some pretty big issues (e.g., NATO), the [foreign-policy "blob"](#) will undercut them at every turn, and Trump himself lacks the discipline or strategic vision to manage this process and may not care to try. Even if you agree with his broad approach, his team is going to make a lot more rookie mistakes before they figure out what they are doing.

Second, get ready for a lot of unexpected developments and unintended consequences. If the United States is giving up its self-appointed role as the "indispensable nation" and opting instead for "America First," a lot of other countries will have to rethink their policies, alignments, and commitments. Unraveling a long-standing order is rarely a pretty process, especially when it happens quickly and is driven not by optimism but by anger, fear, and resentment. I've long favored a more restrained U.S. grand strategy, but I also believed that that process had to be done carefully and above all strategically. That doesn't appear to be President Trump's approach to anything, which means we are in for a very bumpy ride to an unknown destination.

Trump's Immigration Revamp to Include Plans for Safe Zones Inside Syria

Carol E. Lee

Updated Jan. 25, 2017 6:55 p.m. ET

WASHINGTON—President Donald Trump is crafting executive orders that would institute sweeping changes to U.S. refugee and immigration policies, including a ban on people from countries in the Middle East and North Africa deemed by the new administration as a terror risk, according to people familiar with the plans.

A separate order also would lay the groundwork for an escalation of U.S. military involvement in Syria by directing the Pentagon and the State Department to craft a plan to create safe zones for civilians fleeing the conflict there, those familiar with the plans said. Mr.

Trump has said such safe zones could serve as an alternative to admitting refugees to the U.S.

News of the actions, which are expected Thursday, was [met with distress](#) across the Middle East. They point to a dramatic reshaping of America's relations in the region by a president just days in office, when the U.S. is engaged on multiple fronts in the fight against the Islamic State terrorist group.

The initial step on the safe-zone proposal represents another policy reversal from the administration of Barack Obama, who long resisted pressure for such an approach from Congress and U.S. allies in the Middle East because he believed it

would draw the U.S. too deeply into another war.

With his executive actions, Mr. Trump will follow through on promises he made during the campaign, especially to institute "extreme vetting" of immigrants from global conflict zones, and is poised to reignite a national debate over the U.S. approach to the global fight against terrorism.

Mr. Trump's order banning entry to the U.S. by people who come from countries deemed terrorism risks was expected to include Iraq, Iran, Syria, Yemen, Somalia, Sudan and Libya. It is a modification of a ban he promoted during the campaign regarding Muslims entering the U.S.

Mr. Trump's actions would end the current allowance of Syrian

refugees into the U.S. and halt all visas to Syrians until a later time.

Mr. Trump also plans to suspend America's entire refugee program for 120 days while officials determine which countries pose the least security risk and to implement new tests of those applying for visas.

Ultimately, Mr. Trump plans to reduce the cap for refugees into the U.S. from 110,000, as set by Mr. Obama, to 50,000 for the 2017 fiscal year.

His moves would suspend issuing visas to countries where the administration determines adequate screening can't occur.

The new policy would ban people who engage "in bigotry, honor

killings, violence against women, or who persecute other religions, or who oppress members of one race, one gender, or sexual orientation,” according to a summary of the plan. It also prioritizes the admission of refugees who claim religious persecution.

Mr. Trump’s plan was met with concern by students, family members and governments who worried whether recently granted visit and study visas would remain valid and how they would see their relatives resettled in America.

“What a terrible move!” Abdi Aynte,

Somalia’s international cooperation minister wrote on social media.

In the 2016 fiscal year, 3,660 immigration visas—meant for people who are planning to move permanently to the U.S.—were issued to Iraqis, according to the State Department. Citizens of Iran, a nation considered an adversary of the U.S., were granted more than twice that number.

The vast majority of Iraqi immigration visas went to so-called Special Immigrants, classified by the department as those people who had worked with the U.S.

government or military. Extremists in Iraq have put bounties on those who helped Americans.

Since Mr. Trump became president last Friday, the U.S. has admitted about 1,100 refugees, including 200 from Syria.

Establishing safe zones in Syria would mark an escalation in America’s military involvement there. In addition to the initial military buildup that likely would be needed to create the zones, ground troops and additional air power will be needed to protect them, military officials have said.

Such zones also could put U.S.-allied forces in dangerous proximity to foreign troops, including forces from Russia and the regime of Syrian President Bashar al-Assad.

—Felicia Schwartz in Washington, Tamer El-Ghobashy in Erbil, Iraq, Asa Fitch in Dubai and Matina Stevis in Nairobi, Kenya contributed to this article.

Write to Carol E. Lee at carol.lee@wsj.com



Can Nikki Haley Change Trump’s Mind About Russia and Putin?

Paul McLeary | 57 mins ago

President Donald Trump has pledged a new era in U.S.-Russian relations. But his recently confirmed U.N. envoy, outgoing South Carolina Gov. Nikki Haley, is having none of it.

In a Senate hearing and in written responses to questions from Foreign Relations Committee members, Haley has made it clear that Russia could never be a fully trusted friend of the United States as long as President Vladimir Putin remains in power.

“The lesson to learn from the failed Russian ‘reset’ is that as long as Vladimir Putin is in charge, Russia will never be a credible partner for the United States,” Haley wrote. “I do not see, at present, the conditions that would allow the U.S. to forge a new relationship with Russia” at the U.N. Security Council.

Far from pledging to rally forces with Russia in the war on terror, Haley vowed to use her U.N. megaphone to counter what she described as “Russia’s malign influence” in the elections of the United States and other Western powers. She said she would also rally support from “like-minded” allies to maintain pressure on Russia to reverse its grab for land in Ukraine and to halt its brutal repression of opposition groups in Syria.

The stark contrast with Trump’s views reflects the through-the-looking-glass nature of foreign policy under a new American president whose vision has, so far, been largely repudiated by those whom he has charged with making it a reality. Top advisors from Secretary of State nominee Rex Tillerson to Secretary of Defense James Mattis have differed with Trump on issues including Russia, climate change, and the effectiveness of torture.

But no one in Trump’s cabinet has taken stances that appear as starkly at odds with Trump’s worldview as Haley has. The 45-year-old Indian-American politician acknowledged the differences in confirmation hearings last week as she expressed her opposition to a registry for Muslims and highlighted the importance of preserving NATO. But she voiced confidence that she and other foreign-policy advisors could persuade Trump to change his stripes.

She doubled down on those tough sentiments in her written responses to the panel, further underscoring the differences between her and Trump.

“Russia’s actions in eastern Ukraine — and its invasion and illegal occupation of Crimea — establish a very dangerous precedent only last seen in Europe during World War II,” she wrote. “This could lead to a complete breakdown in the postwar settlement that has largely endured peace and stability throughout much of Europe since 1945. This would have a profound negative impact on U.S. national interests.”

The big question is whether Haley, from her cabinet seat and through day-to-day diplomacy in the U.N. trenches, can actually prevail upon Trump to revise his foreign-policy priorities, and to view Putin more as America’s adversary than a partner, or whether she will be steamrolled by his radically different view of U.S. foreign policy.

If Haley is going to push back against some of her boss’s ideas, she has a potentially powerful perch. The U.S. ambassador to the United Nations has long served as America’s face before the world, a high-visibility diplomat who projects American values to 193 member states.

The post has functioned as a weigh station for big-name politicians in need of a job and as a critical

springboard to higher office for political up-and-comers.

George H.W. Bush did time at Turtle Bay long before ascending to the presidency, and Madeleine Albright moved on to secretary of state while her onetime protégé Susan Rice became former President Barack Obama’s national security advisor. Haley, the daughter of Indian immigrants, is viewed by many as a rising Republican star with the potential to become president or vice president in the future. But it is rare for a U.N. envoy to take positions so much at odds with the president he or she serves.

But by publicly challenging Trump, she may run the risk of squandering whatever influence she might have over a political leader she sharply criticized during his presidential campaign.

In New York and Washington, Democratic stalwarts and foreign delegates are rooting for Haley to succeed. They see her brand of establishment Republicanism as more firmly rooted in the mainstream, reaffirming the U.S. commitment to promote human rights and embracing the need to work with allies.

She has reaffirmed bedrock principles that a week ago would have been unremarkable: that climate change is not a hoax; that Russia’s annexation of Crimea is illegal; and that Russian pilots have committed war crimes in Syria. On Tuesday, Haley breezed through the confirmation process, with only four Senators — including Bernie Sanders (I-Vt.) — opposing her.

Ben Cardin (D-Md.), the ranking member of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, said he was impressed by Haley’s pledge to promote “U.S. values, including universal human rights, good governance, and press and religious freedom.”

“The United States is stronger when we have a seat and a voice at the U.N., and the U.N. is better off with American leadership and values on display,” he added, calling the body “an indispensable force for good in the world that bolsters American national security.”

But some observers worry that Haley will have little real influence in the White House. Her commitments to uphold free speech and human rights frontally collide with an administration that just tried to place a gag order on some federal workers and which is mulling the prospect of re-establishing “black site” detention centers.

“I have no reason to assume she is going to have a lot of influence on policymaking in the administration,” said one European ambassador. “But I think there is a general consensus here that she is probably the least bad option we could have got among the names floated.”

“The chances of Nikki Haley having a great deal of influence on the president are not large,” said Michael Doyle, a Columbia University law professor who served as a top advisor to former U.N. Secretary-General Kofi Annan, noting that she lacks a close personal relationship with Trump and has no experience in international affairs.

But when it comes to Russia, she won’t be alone in the administration and her views could ultimately prevail, some experts say. Previous administrations, including those of Obama and George W. Bush, sought to forge a new relationship with Moscow. But those efforts foundered, said Bruce Jones, the vice president for foreign policy at the Brookings Institution, “because Russian interests and American interests don’t align.”

“Trump may have a different view of America’s interests, and he may push this further than other presidents,” he said. But some

cabinet members are also skeptical of Russia, including Mattis and retired Gen. John Kelly, the secretary of homeland security, as are nearly all Republicans in Congress, he noted.

"Trump may find himself having much less room to maneuver on Russia than he thinks," Jones said.

One issue that unites Trump, Haley, and the Republican-controlled Congress is Israel. Haley has echoed Trump's outrage over a U.N. Security Council resolution in December condemning Israeli settlements. The United Nations

will have to reach some sort of accommodation with Washington on Israel, said Peter Yeo, the president of the Better World Campaign, a U.N. advocacy group.

But Haley has also pushed back on legislation proposed by Sens. Lindsey Graham (R-S.C.) and Ted Cruz (R-Texas) that threatens to withhold all U.S. financial assistance to the United Nations if the Security Council fails to repeal its settlements resolution — a demand diplomats at Turtle Bay view as a nonstarter.

Saying she opposes "slash-and-burn cuts," Haley urged Congress to

consider "targeted and selective withholding" to secure specific goals, such as pressuring the U.N. Human Rights Council to stop introducing resolutions denouncing Israel's human rights abuses.

As ambassador, she said she would recommend that Trump announce that the United States "no longer supports that resolution and would veto any U.N. Security Council efforts to implement it or enforce it and block any future U.N. sanctions based on it."

But the prospect of resolving the settlement standoff appeared increasingly remote Tuesday, as

Israel announced its approval of a large new wave of 2,500 housing units to be built in the occupied West Bank.

Haley also pledged to negotiate a deal reducing the U.S. share of the U.N.'s nearly \$8 billion peacekeeping budget, down to 25 percent from about 29 percent presently. The annual peacekeeping tab for the United States is more than \$2.5 billion.

**The
Washington
Post**

Putin, the perpetual spoiler, tries his hand at a peace process

<https://www.facebook.com/roth.andrew?fref=ts>

MOSCOW — Russian President Vladimir Putin has made it his mission to reestablish his country as a dominant, indispensable player in the Middle East, one that can rival the influence of the United States. And, by some measures, he is succeeding.

Not only has Russia's 15-month airstrike campaign probably saved the regime of Bashar al-Assad, but it also [has spawned this week's negotiations](#) sponsored by Russia, Iran and Turkey to agree on a mechanism to support a delicate cease-fire in the Syrian conflict. It was a Russian-led diplomatic effort testing Moscow's improbable role as peacemaker, with a twist that must draw smiles in the Kremlin: no formal role for the United States.

"Russia is seeking to show it has national interests not only in Crimea, Donbas and Georgia but everywhere, throughout the Middle East," said Alexei Malashenko, a Middle East expert at the Carnegie Moscow Center. "It is a very important symbol." (Donbas is a disputed section of eastern Ukraine.)

According to Putin, those interests have been threatened by the United States, which he has accused of fomenting the current instability in the Middle East through a flawed foreign policy of intervention and democracy

promotion. Decisions such as the 2003 invasion of Iraq, as well as the Arab uprisings beginning in 2011 (which he accused the United States of paying to foment), have encouraged the spread of radicalism, he says.

The nadir for Putin came in March 2011, when he was prime minister. The president at the time, Dmitry Medvedev, declined to veto a U.N. no-fly resolution in Libya that paved the way for NATO airstrikes there. The decision seemed to confirm Russia's role as a second-rate power in the Middle East. A deeply angry Putin publicly broke with Medvedev, his protege, and [declared the U.N. resolution](#) "reminiscent of a medieval call for a crusade."

Russia, Turkey and Iran, which back warring parties in Syria, end two days of talks in Astana, Kazakhstan with a promise to enforce the country's fragile cease-fire. Russia, Turkey and Iran pledge to enforce Syria cease-fire (Reuters)

Now in his third term as president and amid a growing rift with the United States over the annexation of Crimea, Putin has dug in his heels.

Russia "can no longer tolerate the current state of affairs in the world," he told the U.N. General Assembly [in a 2015 speech](#), days before [announcing his intervention](#) in Syria.

"Instead of the triumph of democracy and progress, we got violence, poverty and social disaster," Putin said in the speech. "I cannot help asking those who have caused the situation, do you realize now what you've done? But I am afraid no one is going to answer that."

Putin likes to portray himself as part of the solution, forging an anti-terrorist alliance he compares to the coalition against Nazi Germany. But for a world leader who has so often embraced the role of spoiler and antagonist to the liberal West, converting military force into diplomatic sway will prove complex.

Putin has had diplomatic triumphs, among them the 2013 deal he struck with the United States to [seize Syria's chemical weapons](#) (and ward off military strikes against Assad for using them). But mediating the Syrian conflict, with its fractious and shifting politics, is far more difficult than taking part in it.

"Yes, everyone is at this point forced to listen to Russia's concerns," said Leonid Isayev, a Middle East researcher at the Moscow-based Higher School of Economics. "But influence is not always positive. You can be a destructive force or you can try to resolve conflicts. The first is simpler and Russia has the military potential for that. The question is whether

their military influence can now be translated into political influence."

As a result, the goal of the negotiations in Astana, the capital of Kazakhstan, was modest: shoring up a cease-fire, rather than seeking a political solution to the conflict that has eluded negotiators in Geneva for years. But in bringing together the warring sides for the first time, the Kremlin has already achieved some success.

The negotiations are "a stress test for Russian capacity," said Nikolay Kozhanov, an expert in Middle East Affairs at St. Petersburg University. "Now after the regime victory in Aleppo, the Astana meeting is a serious claim to prove that Russia has become an influential realm in the region."

Headlines recently have been dominated by Putin's growing influence abroad but mostly in the West: Russia's meddling in the 2016 U.S. presidential election and expectations of the same in forthcoming European elections that could determine the fate of the European Union. A Kremlin connection is suspected but unproven, and Putin is unlikely to claim responsibility.

But in the Middle East, he may seek to establish a legacy for himself, by taking on a growing diplomatic and political role in a conflict that has outlasted the Obama administration.

**The
Washington
Post**

Trump administration could cut funding to United Nations

<https://www.facebook.com/eilperi>

n

The Trump administration is proposing a 40 percent reduction in voluntary U.S. support for the United Nations and other global bodies, and an end to "wasteful and counterproductive" spending that does not serve U.S. interests,

according to a draft of a forthcoming order.

If adopted, the proposed directive would represent a broad attack on the value and priorities of the United Nations, which Trump has recently called an ineffectual talk shop. A separate order would limit U.S. participation in some treaties.

Trump's new U.N. ambassador, Nikki Haley, has pledged to put U.S. interests first and use the leverage of disproportionate U.S. funding of the body. But the draft order would go much further, and with an apparent goal of slashing U.S. participation across a swath of U.N. agencies and activities to which the

Trump administration objects on fiscal or ideological grounds.

Haley, who was confirmed this week by a vote of 96 to 4, told senators at her confirmation hearing that the Trump administration would question whether the U.S. "gets what it pays for" from the United Nations.

The draft order could reverse or roll back funding for priorities championed by former president Barack Obama, including international peacekeeping missions and U.S. support for development work under the U.N. umbrella.

A White House spokesman declined to comment Wednesday.

The White House directive would launch a one-year review of U.S. support for international organizations including the United Nations and its related agencies, describe how U.S. money is used and offer recommendations for ways to reduce mandated U.S. contributions.

The review panel would include the State Department, the Pentagon, the Justice Department, the office of the Director of National Intelligence, the Office of Management and Budget and the White House national security adviser.

U.S. agencies would be directed to identify the "compelling national interest" for continued funding. Separately, the draft order obtained by The Washington Post directs the review committee to "recommend at least 40 percent overall decrease in the amount of overall funding of voluntary contributions," in addition to other cuts.

"The United States is in fact the United Nations' largest supporter, providing nearly a quarter of its total revenues, and the American contribution continues to grow annually," an introduction to the order reads.

"This financial commitment is particularly burdensome given the current fiscal crisis and ballooning national deficits and national debt. And while the United States' financial support for the United Nations is enormous, the United Nations often pursues an agenda that is contrary to American interests."

The draft order, titled "Auditing and Reducing U.S. Funding of International Organizations," has not been released, and it was not clear whether changes were planned before its release.

The order was first reported by the New York Times.

In addition to the reduction in voluntary U.S. donations, the order would set up criteria that could be used later to cut U.S. funding for international organizations, including whether they accord full membership to the Palestine Liberation Organization or are "controlled or substantially influenced by any state that sponsors terrorism."

The PLO has sought to use membership in U.N. bodies as a form of international recognition short of formal statehood. U.S. administrations of both parties have opposed that route, insisting that Palestinian statehood should result from negotiations with Israel over

borders, security, refugees and other issues.

While U.S. opposition to the tactic has prompted it to withhold paying its dues to the U.N. Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO) since 2011, this more sweeping policy would appear to threaten U.S. funding for U.N. Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC). The PLO joined the UNFCCC, the main forum for global climate negotiations, in December 2015.

The review panel is also told to examine whether or how U.S. funding is used in support of U.N. resolutions that "single out" Israel. That would apparently include the U.N. Security Council's December condemnation of Israel over West Bank settlements. The Obama administration abstained rather than veto that action, which Israel and Trump have called unfair.



Schlesinger : Will Trump ignore or commandeer the UN?

Stephen Schlesinger Published 11:03 a.m. ET Jan. 25, 2017 | Updated 12 hours ago

Gov. Haley sworn in as UN ambassador

Former South Carolina Gov. Nikki Haley sworn in as U.S. ambassador to the United Nations. (Jan. 25) AP

Vice President Mike Pence swears in Nikki Haley as U.S. ambassador to the United Nations. Washington, Jan. 25, 2017. (Photo: Evan Vucci, AP)

One way to figure out the direction President Trump's foreign policy is likely to go in the coming years is to look at how he handles the American relationship with the United Nations. Trump's engagement with that institution — which now encompasses all the nations of the globe — will presumably reflect his overall playbook on international matters.

Historically Republican presidents have been skeptical, if not hostile, to the U.N. because they feel it treads too much on U.S. sovereignty and is too subject to the demands of third-world nations. Ronald Reagan, for example, withheld U.S. dues to the U.N. for its maltreatment of Israel. The last Republican president, George W. Bush, did not even appoint a U.S. envoy to the U.N. until nine months into his first term in office — a reflection of his indifference to the

world body.

But Trump's U.N. ambassador, former South Carolina governor Nikki Haley, was sworn in Wednesday after the [Senate confirmed her 96-4](#). Trump had selected her weeks before taking office. This might have been a sign that he himself views the U.N. as a useful adjunct to his conduct of Washington's overseas affairs. Or maybe not. Just after Christmas, he tweeted: "The UN has such a great potential, but right now it is just a club for people to get together, talk and have a good time. So sad!"

Trump has sometimes had a rocky relationship with the organization. In 2003, casting himself as one of New York's foremost real estate construction moguls, he tried to get the contract to refurbish the creaking superstructure which contains the Security Council, the General Assembly and the Secretariat. He claimed he could do the project at one-third the estimated cost and in quicker fashion. But U.N. Secretary-General Kofi Annan turned him down, not willing to accept his promises at face value.

Trump did not take this rebuff quietly. Instead he wrote in his 2004 book, [Think Like A Billionaire](#): "It does not take a genius to recognize the enormous difference in these proposals — several years and \$1.5 billion, or \$1.1 billion more than I

would spend for a job that would not be as good as mine. [Who is in charge](#) at the United Nations? Could they be as incompetent in world affairs as they are at simple numbers?"

POLICING THE USA: A look at race, justice, media

Still Trump publicly praised the U.N. in that same 2004 book, calling it "one of the world's most valuable institutions." As a native New Yorker, he has lived comfortably with the institution all his life, and, indeed, placed one of his major apartment buildings, the Trump World Tower, directly across the street from U.N. headquarters. Just recently, he intervened to postpone an Egyptian resolution in the Security Council denouncing [Israel's expansion of settlements](#) into Palestinian territory. While his attempt failed, it showed that he is ready to play the diplomatic game at the highest levels in the organization. He vowed in the future: ["Things will be different"](#) after Jan. 20th."

Nothing is truly clear yet. Trump has two possible courses he will follow at the institution. First, he could do as his party's predecessors have done and treat the U.N. with outright antagonism or neglect, following his own "America First" credo. This would mean he would insist on getting his own way and, if he did

not, he might withhold funds from U.N. agencies or to refuse to pay U.S. dues, wield the veto more freely in the Security Council, or simply issue tweets denouncing U.N. actions.

But there is a more intriguing path that may also appeal to Trump. Given the president-elect's considerable ego, he may view the U.N. as a place where he can expand his powers across the earth. In other words, he may look upon the U.N. as an opportunity, using his command skills, to seek to dominate the organization as the world's leader, the global steward of the other 192 states in the assembly.

The key to telling us which choice he makes will be Haley's role. Her votes, her decisions, and her statements will be directly dictated by the White House as she has had no previous foreign policy experience. But don't doubt that Trump will ultimately be maneuvering to manipulate the organization so that he can control its future one way or the other.

[Stephen Schlesinger](#) is a fellow at the Century Foundation and author of [Act of Creation](#): The Founding of the United Nations.



Trump Moves Shake Deep U.S.-Mexico Relationship

José de Córdoba, Brian Baskin and Jacob M. Schlesinger

Jan. 25, 2017 7:18 p.m. ET

President Donald Trump's moves to erect new physical and economic barriers between the U.S. and Mexico are shaking up longstanding commercial and diplomatic ties between the two countries that could affect everything from manufacturing supply chains to efforts to combat the flow of illegal drugs.

In pivoting from candidate to president, Mr. Trump tried to recast his campaign promises as intended to bolster the alliance rather than just aimed at protecting Americans and U.S. jobs.

"I want to emphasize that we will be working in partnership with our friends in Mexico to improve safety and economic opportunity on both sides of the border," Mr. Trump said after announcing plans to build a border wall and crack down on immigration—pledges that have provoked widespread anger in Mexico.

Yet Mr. Trump followed his comments by reading a roll of Americans he said were killed by illegal immigrants.

And his actions are starting to reverse a quarter-century of bipartisan policies aimed at fostering greater integration between the two neighbors.

Mr. Trump is also expected soon to demand a renegotiation of the North American Free Trade Agreement, which links the two economies together with each other, and with Canada. And the new president has endorsed a "big border tax" on goods coming into the U.S.

The new policies are prompting a backlash in Mexico, where officials are threatening retaliation, and where the new U.S. stance is stoking a volatility in Mexican politics that could fuel a counter-Trump populist movement of its own, injecting still more uncertainty into the bilateral relationship.

"President Trump: your wall assaults us, and leaves the Statue of Liberty as a relic," Andrés Manuel López Obrador, head of the leftist Morena party, who leads in the polls

for the 2018 Mexican presidential election, said on Twitter.

The Mexican government Wednesday sent to Washington two top officials—Foreign Minister Luis Videgaray and Economy Minister Ildefonso Guajardo—to meet with members of Mr. Trump's inner circle, including his chief of staff, Reince Priebus, Mr. Trump's senior adviser and son-in-law Jared Kushner, and national security adviser Michael Flynn.

Both sides were expected to try to hammer out a broad framework to discuss bilateral security, migration and Nafta, preparing the groundwork for a summit between Mr. Trump and Mexican President Enrique Peña Nieto scheduled for next Tuesday in Washington.

Mr. Videgaray, who led the Mexican delegation, told Mr. Kushner that it would be impossible for Mr. Peña Nieto to go to the U.S. if Mr. Trump said during the signing of the executive order that Mexico would pay for the wall, according to a person familiar with the matter. Mr. Videgaray also urged that Mr. Trump adopt a more conciliatory stance, this person added.

Mr. Trump didn't say Mexico would pay for the wall during his presentation, although he did during in an ABC News interview that aired before the meeting between the two delegations.

Mr. Videgaray late Wednesday said in an interview on Mexican television that his delegation was encouraged by some of Mr. Trump's comments, including his statement that Mexico needed to have a strong and stable economy. Although he said the U.S. took "troubling actions" on Wednesday, his group plans to hold more meetings with U.S. officials on Thursday.

"I think there is the disposition to work with Mexico," he said.

That view of Mr. Trump's speech was echoed by one senior executive at a prominent Mexican company. "I thought Trump's presentation today was more conciliatory," the executive said.

Still, Mr. Peña Nieto remains under enormous political pressure to cancel his trip to Washington. In a

short videotaped message Wednesday night, Mr. Peña Nieto said he lamented the actions taken by Mr. Trump to build a wall and increase deportations. He said Mexico's 50 consulates in the U.S. would redouble efforts to defend the rights of migrants in the U.S.

"Mexico doesn't believe in walls," Mr. Peña Nieto said. "I've said it once and again: Mexico won't pay for any wall."

In an apparent reference to the trip, Mr. Peña Nieto said he would take a decision "on the next steps to follow" after consulting the Senate and the nation's governors, and after evaluating a report from the Mexican officials who met Wednesday with Trump administration officials.

A pillar of Mr. Trump's campaign was an attack on the whole package of policies wrapped around Nafta—launched in 1991 by Republican President George H.W. Bush, and completed three years later by his Democratic successor, Bill Clinton—as detrimental to the American economy. Mr. Trump has called the pact the worst free-trade deal in U.S. history, and said it creates unfair incentives for U.S. companies to move jobs south of the border.

Whatever the costs and benefits, Nafta has deepened the links between the two economies and societies.

"Nafta fundamentally reshaped North American economic relations, driving an unprecedented integration between Canada and the United States' developed economies and Mexico, a developing country," the Council on Foreign Relations wrote in a report issued Tuesday.

Regional trade has more than tripled to more than \$1.1 trillion—with some industrial components crossing back and forth over the border as part of the regional supply chain—while U.S. foreign direct investment has grown sevenfold to more than \$100 billion, the report said. The U.S. is Mexico's largest trading partner, while Mexico is No. 3 for the U.S., behind Canada and China.

The value of goods transported by truck and rail both ways across the

U.S.-Mexico border totaled \$340.8 billion last year through November, up 16% in the last two years, according to the U.S. Bureau of Transportation Statistics.

The day before Mr. Trump took office, [Landstar System](#) Inc., a large trucking company, opened a terminal in Laredo, Texas, that had been in the works for two years, with capacity for 30 trucks to transfer their cargo—including imports from Mexico—to big rigs waiting to carry the goods further north.

"There's a lot of uncertainty," said Chief Executive Jim Gattoni. But, he added, "my expectation is we're going to continue to drive a lot of volume through that facility."

Railroads Union Pacific Corp. and [Kansas City Southern](#) have spent billions of dollars upgrading cross-border infrastructure in recent years, while a million square feet of industrial real estate is under construction around Laredo, according to Colliers International, a real-estate brokerage, and industrial construction activity hit its highest level since 2008 in Tijuana, Mexico last year, according to [CBRE Group](#) Inc., another brokerage. Most of these projects were planned before the election.

How any of that might change depends on how much Mr. Trump ends up trying to alter Nafta and the broader economic integration—and how Mexico reacts.

Facing political pressure at home, Mr. Peña Nieto has said he would attempt to link the broader bilateral relationship with Mr. Trump's demands to rethink trade.

"We will bring to the table all the topics: commerce, yes, but also migration, and the themes of security, including border security, terrorist threats, and the illegal trade in drugs, guns, and money," Mr. Peña Nieto said Monday.

—Juan Montes and Santiago Perez contributed to this article.

Write to Brian Baskin at brian.baskin@wsj.com and Jacob M. Schlesinger at jacob.schlesinger@wsj.com

**NATIONAL
REVIEW
ONLINE**

Cardenas : President Trump, Be Wary of a Mexican Backlash

After months of controversy, senior administration officials will finally sit down this week with their Mexican counterparts to begin discussing President Trump's campaign pledges to renegotiate the North American Free Trade

Agreement (NAFTA), impose tariffs on Mexican imports to discourage relocation of U.S. factory jobs, and force Mexico to pay for a wall along the nearly 2,000-mile-long U.S.-Mexico border. To say the stakes are high would be an understatement.

Yet the real challenge for Trump's negotiating team may be not so much to accomplish those objectives as to keep the U.S.-Mexico relationship from flying off the rails and crashing in a heap of acrimony and recrimination. As it now stands, the Trump

administration risks provoking a Mexican populist backlash that could result in an anti-American government led by a Hugo Chávez wannabe taking power in 2018, an outcome that could adversely affect U.S. prosperity and security for years to come.

Unsurprisingly, the manner in which candidate Trump has discussed Mexico has had its costs. There has been widespread angst and anger among the Mexican people, who resented being used as a whipping boy in the U.S. presidential campaign and feel betrayed after overcoming decades of skepticism toward the U.S. and working to entwine our economies and deepen cooperation on a range of issues, including security and counter-narcotics operations.

This uncertainty about the future of U.S.–Mexico relations also could not come at a worse time for the Mexican economy. The drop in international oil prices is sending the economy into a tailspin. According to a report this month by the Office of the Director of National Intelligence,

President [Enrique] Peña Nieto has enacted wide-ranging reforms in key industries — such as oil, communications, and finance — as well as education in an effort to enhance Mexico's competitiveness, but growth has not increased significantly so far, and public support has soured amid corruption allegations, persistent violence, a weakening peso, and domestic crises such as the disappearance of 43 students at a demonstration in 2014.

As a result of the drop in oil prices and production, Mexico has lost

about 5 percent of its GDP. Public debt as a percentage of GDP continues to rise, while foreign investment has been effectively frozen amid the uncertainty. The value of the peso is now at its lowest levels in decades and continues to be hammered by speculators after every Trump tweet mentioning the country. Earlier this month, riots and looting erupted after Peña Nieto's broke his pledge not to cut subsidies for gasoline and prices at the pump rose as much as 20 percent in some places.

Buffeted by the poor economy, corruption scandals, and persistent violence, Peña Nieto has suffered at the polls. His approval rating has fallen to 12 percent this month, down from 24 percent in January, and is now one of the lowest for a Mexican president ever. Moreover, an overwhelming 80 percent expect an economic crisis and declining investment over the course of Trump's presidency.

López Obrador's strident rhetoric, appeals to nationalism, and rejection of politics as usual in Mexico may represent just the kind of leadership that Mexicans want to confront the Trump phenomenon.

Economic trouble in our southern neighbor should be on the radar screen of any U.S. president, but what makes the current situation that much more dangerous is that

the person who stands to gain most from the turmoil is Mexican opposition politician André Manuel López Obrador, a left-wing populist rabble-rouser in the mold of the late Venezuelan president Hugo Chávez. López Obrador is running for the Mexican presidency (for the third time) in 2018.

In the past, AMLO, as he is known, has tested the patience of Mexicans with his demagoguery and penchant for mobilizing people in the streets, disrupting daily life. However, his strident rhetoric, appeals to nationalism, and rejection of politics as usual in Mexico may represent just the kind of leadership that Mexicans want to confront the Trump phenomenon.

Over the course of the past year, AMLO's approval numbers have been steadily improving. A recent poll showed 27 percent of Mexicans supporting his National Regeneration Movement, against the rightist National Action party, with 24 percent, and Peña Nieto's PRI (Institutional Revolutionary party), with 17 percent.

Last week, AMLO announced a tour of major U.S. cities in February. "Enough of being passive," he said. "We should put a national emergency plan in place to face the damage and reverse the protectionist policies of Donald Trump."

An unfriendly government on our southern border could significantly complicate issues important to the U.S., on everything from border security, counterterrorism, and drug-war cooperation to deportations and restricting Central American migration — the main source of illegal border crossings — bound for the U.S. Continuing economic hardship, the likely result of AMLO's state-centric approach, would also likely revive outward-migration pressures from Mexico to the United States, which have abated in recent years.

Reviewing NAFTA, developing an immigration policy that truly serves the national interest, and improving border security in the age of terror are certainly legitimate objectives. And President Trump is right to set them as priorities. But respectful, firm engagement — not confrontation — with our southern neighbors will be the surest way for President Trump to achieve those objectives.

— José Cárdenas served in senior foreign-policy positions at the State Department, the National Security Council, and the U.S. Agency for International Development during the George W. Bush administration, focusing on Latin America and the Caribbean.

THE WALL STREET JOURNAL

China Likely to Stick to a Two-Child Policy

Updated Jan. 25, 2017 9:15 a.m.

ET 4 COMMENTS

BEIJING—China acknowledged it has demographic challenges, saying its population will peak in 2030 but left little hope the country would further ease birth restrictions after lifting its one-child policy a year ago.

The country's State Council, its cabinet, unveiled a key plan detailing deep demographic changes over the next 15 years, including low birthrates and a rapidly aging population, but said it would stick to a policy of letting families have a maximum of two children.

"Problems and challenges associated with population security, and the balance between population, economy and society, are not negligible," the State Council said in the blueprint released Wednesday.

China's total population, which stood at around 1.37 billion in 2015, will likely peak at 1.45 billion in 2030, it said. The population will

grow at a slower pace after 2020, as the number of women of childbearing age drops while death rates rise with the elderly constituting a larger share of the population, it said.

The timing of the peak mirrored projections by the United Nations, though the U.N. had estimated a peak of 1.42 billion in 2030, according to a report in 2015.

Chinese above 60 will be a quarter of the total population in 2030, compared with 16% last year, the State Council projected.

The working-age population, or those between ages 15 and 59, will drop by more than 80 million in 2030 from the level in 2015, said the National Development and Reform Commission, the country's top economic planner, in a separate statement Wednesday. Around 36% of Chinese of working age will be between 45 and 59 years old, said the economic planner that led the efforts to draft the plan.

A year after China scrapped the one-child policy, the number of newborns exceeded 17.86 million in

2016, the highest since 2000, the National Health and Family Planning Commission said Sunday. However, the percentage of second and third children didn't jump following the shift to let all Chinese have two children and has held steady at 45% over the past two years, the commission said.

"This is a very important long-term plan as it sets the foundation for the authorities to carry out population policies," said Mi Hong, a professor of public affairs at Zhejiang University.

China is unlikely to further ease its two-child policy at least over the next 15 and 20 years due to constraints on the environment and services such as education and medical care, said Prof. Mi, who was on a committee to review the plan.

Many demographers have called for China to abandon birth restrictions altogether as low birthrates endanger the country's growth outlook. China doesn't have the world's lowest birthrate but has the world's lowest fertility rate—or the

number of children a woman has over her lifetime—at 1.05, said Huang Wenzheng, a co-founder of the China-based website Population and the Future, which advocates the lifting of birth restrictions. Mr. Huang based the estimate on official birth data.

Prof. Mi of Zhejiang University said China's actual fertility rate is higher than official data indicate, as some Chinese parents fail to report births to the authorities for fear of punishment.

The State Council in its blueprint put the country's fertility rate at between 1.5 and 1.6 now and projected it to increase to 1.8 in 2030, still below the replacement rate of 2.1.

The cabinet pledged to boost health-care services for women and the elderly and further ease restrictions on a household-registration system, known as hukou, to stimulate population mobility.

—Liyan Qi contributed to this article.

North Korean Defector Says Kim Jong Un Can't Last

Jonathan Cheng

Updated Jan. 26,

2017 12:25 a.m. ET

SEOUL—North Korea's former deputy ambassador to Britain, who last year became [Pyongyang's highest-profile defector in two decades](#), said "Kim Jong Un's days are numbered" and vowed to help bring down the North Korean leader, calling that the only way to resolve the nuclear issue and unify the Korean Peninsula.

Thae Yong Ho, speaking to a group of foreign reporters for the first time since his defection, said he was prompted to abandon the regime in part to free his two sons from what he called the "slavery" of the North Korean system.

"I am sure that more defections of my colleagues will take place since North Korea is already on the slippery slope," said Mr. Thae, who predicted a "popular uprising" against the leadership.

"To resolve the nuclear issue on the Korean Peninsula, there is no other way but to eliminate the Kim Jong Un regime," he said.

Mr. Thae, speaking comfortably in English, said that international sanctions on the North Korean regime are working and argued that the spread of information about the outside world into North Korea is having a real impact on the elite and on ordinary citizens, who

have seen economic development in countries such as Cambodia, Laos and many parts of Africa surpass that of North Korea.

Mr. Thae isn't the first defector to predict the imminent demise of North Korea's ruling dynasty, which has ruled the country of about 25 million people since the end of World War II. And Pyongyang has weathered the previous defection of high-profile officials, chief among them Hwang Jang-yop, who was often seen at the side of state founder Kim Il Sung and was the architect of the country's ruling ideology before arriving in South Korea in 1997.

But [Mr. Thae argues that the advent of new technologies](#) has broken Pyongyang's grip on information flow to its population, denying the Kim regime the ability to shape its people's awareness of the outside world. Experts say that North Koreans are able to easily consume South Korean soap operas and news reports through smuggled flash drives and cellphones.

Mr. Thae, who studied English at an elite foreign-language school in Pyongyang and at a university in Beijing before joining the North's Foreign Ministry, [defected to South Korea](#) in the summer last year with his wife and two sons.

After being debriefed by South Korea's National Intelligence Service, Mr. Thae began speaking freely as a private South Korean

citizen late last year, though access to Mr. Thae, who is guarded around the clock by a security detail, has been limited.

Mr. Thae said he initially had high hopes for the younger Mr. Kim, who was educated abroad and "knew the world."

"I had a kind of illusion that he may bring some policy changes and modernize North Korea," he said. But after it became clear that Mr. Kim wasn't going to chart a different path from his father and grandfather, "I was greatly disappointed—not only me, but most of my colleagues shared the same thought."

Mr. Thae says plotting his defection took a long time and followed what he called a "long, detailed plan." Mr. Thae had an unusual advantage over many of the other 30,000 North Koreans who have made their way to South Korea: He was posted in a foreign embassy with his wife and children, reflecting Pyongyang's faith in Mr. Thae as a spokesman for the regime. Mr. Thae frequently defended North Korea's policies in public forums in the U.K.

While attending school in the London area, Mr. Thae's two sons, who are 26 and 19 years old, asked him questions about North Korea, including why they weren't allowed to access the internet like their peers and why the state executed officials without trial.

"This kind of environment brought in a kind of debate inside the family," Mr. Thae said.

After leaving the North Korean Embassy, his sons' first question was whether they could play videogames and watch whatever movies they liked.

"I said, 'Yes, of course, now you are free,'" Mr. Thae said. "Now you are not a slave any more."

He said the North Korean people would come to a similar realization once they are given access to the outside world.

"Now North Korean people are not very aware...that they have the right to live freely, but once they are educated to that level, I am sure that they will stand up," Mr. Thae said.

Mr. Thae said he thinks other relatives of his in North Korea have probably been sent to prison camps, which he said made him feel "very sorry for them," though he said he hoped his work to bring down the Kim regime would allow him one day to see them again and apologize.

"I wasted the first 50 years of my life," he said. "Now it is time for action, and I will be a man of action."



Science Monitor

Editorial : Path of patience toward North Korea

The Christian

January 25, 2017 —For the past quarter century, as North Korea has steadily built up its nuclear arsenal, the United States has mainly exercised two options in response: More sanctions against the North's economy. And more patience that it would alter its dangerous course. The first is a substitute for war. The second is a hope for peace. The idea of offering "carrots," such as aid, was abandoned in 2012.

Now, as a fourth American president tries to deal with a nuclearized North Korea, will Donald Trump try anything different?

During his campaign, Mr. Trump hinted at talking directly to the regime's leader,

Kim Jong-un, over a "hamburger meal." Yet dealmaking, including offers and delivery of aid, has failed again and again while the North only gets closer to developing an intercontinental ballistic missile and nuclear warheads. Instead, Rex Tillerson, Trump's choice for US secretary of State, says China must now be forced to end its lifeline of money and supplies to its close ally in Pyongyang.

"If China is not going to comply with [United Nations-ordered sanctions] then it's appropriate ... for the United States to consider actions to compel them to comply," he says. That would likely entail sanctions against Chinese companies doing business with North Korea, a risky move in light of many difficult issues with Beijing.

But what about the option of patience?

A bit of advice came this week from Thae Yong-ho, the most senior North Korean diplomat to flee his country. In interviews since his defection last year from the North Korean Embassy in London, Mr. Thae said most of the country's elite see Mr. Kim pushing North Korea "into a corner of self-destruction." The regime is also struggling to prevent outside information from reaching its isolated population.

"Low-level dissent or criticism of the regime, until recently unthinkable, is becoming more frequent," said Thae, as more North Koreans engage in private markets and watch media from other countries. As happened with him, exposure to the outside world also is exposing

the regime's lies about the country's alleged prosperity and reputation.

"I would like to make it possible for people to rise up," he told The Washington Post. "We should educate the North Korean people so that they can have their own 'Korean Spring.'"

Such views argue for more US patience as well as applying more pressure on China to squeeze the regime. The US can also further help South Korea develop defenses against the North's missiles.

Peace has been largely maintained on the Korean Peninsula under a mix of sanctions and patience, as well as military deterrence. Perhaps the option of patience is closer to allowing North Koreans to solve this problem.

Editorial : Trump's Asia Reassurance Project

Updated Jan. 25,

2017 7:50 p.m. ET 19 COMMENTS

U.S. friends in Asia are on edge after President Trump formally

withdrew from the 12-nation Trans-Pacific Partnership (TPP) trade pact

that Japan, Australia, Vietnam and others hoped would bind them more

closely to Washington. Reassuring these partners will be a yearslong effort, but Senator John McCain's proposed \$7.5 billion fund to boost Pacific security would be a good first step.

This Asia Pacific Stability Initiative, funded over five years, would allow the U.S. to increase munition supplies, expand military facilities and strengthen cooperation with allies across a region increasingly threatened by China and North Korea. New runways and other assets from Japan to northern Australia would augment the U.S. presence in and around the South China Sea, as would further rotations of U.S. forces through the region and more exercises with partner militaries.

The commander of U.S. forces in the Pacific, Admiral Harry Harris, warned last year of "critical munitions shortfalls" and the need

for "standoff strike weapons, longer-range anti-ship weapons, advanced air-to-air munitions, theater ballistic and cruise missile defenses, and cluster bombs." Our sources say the Pentagon wanted additional funds for shovel-ready projects last year but the Obama White House pushed back, fearful of Chinese complaints.

Mr. Trump may be more willing to respond to Chinese aggression. He and his aides have so far caught China's attention mostly with rhetoric, as when Secretary of State nominee Rex Tillerson promised at his confirmation hearing to deny China "access" to its artificial islands in the South China Sea.

This implied threat of a naval quarantine—an act of war—was almost surely unintentional, but the new Administration hasn't clarified. Especially while top Asia-policy jobs remain unfilled, the Trump team

would be better off signaling intent through concrete initiatives such as the McCain proposal.

The Arizona Senator proposes a total five-year increase of \$430 billion over current defense-budget plans set by the Obama Administration—the sort of hike Mr. Trump will need to modernize and grow the force as he has promised. The \$7.5 billion for Asia may seem small, but it's hardly chump change. The U.S. launched its European Reassurance Initiative to shore up NATO with annual funding of \$1 billion in 2014 (since raised to \$3.4 billion), and a similar initiative for Southeast Asia was funded with \$50 million last year.

U.S. allies should encourage the Trump Administration with their own reassurance initiatives. South Korea is paralyzed by scandal, Japan's increased defense spending under Shinzo Abe is already testing the

limits of public sentiment, and Australia plans to spend 81% more on defense by 2026. But officials in all friendly countries should be seeking additional funds to underline their commitment to regional security. An early test will come next week when James Mattis visits Japan and South Korea on his first overseas trip as the new Defense Secretary.

If the TPP is dead, the U.S. and its friends will have difficulty spending their way out of the strategic hole. That's why it's crucial for Japan, Vietnam and others to seek bilateral trade deals with Washington and otherwise try to salvage some TPP benefits while awaiting a change in U.S. policy. China and North Korea will continue to press their advantage—making Mr. McCain's proposed fund, and similar initiatives in foreign capitals, all the more important.

ETATS-UNIS

The New York Times Trump Blocks Syrian Refugees and Orders Mexican Border Wall to Be Built

Julie Hirschfeld Davis

WASHINGTON — President Trump on Wednesday began a sweeping crackdown on illegal immigration, ordering the immediate construction of a border wall with Mexico and aggressive efforts to find and deport unauthorized immigrants. He planned additional actions to cut back on legal immigration, including barring Syrian refugees from entering the United States.

At the headquarters of the Department of Homeland Security, Mr. Trump signed a pair of executive orders that paved the way for a border wall and called for a newly expanded force to sweep up immigrants who are in the country illegally. He revived programs that allow the federal government to work with local and state law enforcement agencies to arrest and detain unauthorized immigrants with criminal records and to share information to help track and deport them.

He also planned to clamp down on legal immigration in another action expected as early as Thursday. An eight-page draft of that executive order, obtained by The New York Times, would indefinitely block Syrian refugees from entering the United States and bar all refugees from the rest of the world for at least 120 days.

When the refugee program resumes, it would be much smaller,

with the total number of refugees resettled in the United States this year more than halved, to 50,000 from 110,000.

It would also suspend any immigration for at least 30 days from a number of predominantly Muslim countries — Iran, Iraq, Libya, Somalia, Sudan, Syria and Yemen — while the government toughened its already stringent screening procedures to weed out potential terrorists.

White House officials declined to comment on the coming plan, but in a wide-ranging interview that aired Wednesday on ABC, Mr. Trump acknowledged that it aimed to erect formidable barriers for those seeking refuge in the United States.

"It's going to be very hard to come in," Mr. Trump said. "Right now, it's very easy to come in."

He also said his administration would "absolutely do safe zones in Syria" to discourage refugees from seeking safety in other countries, and chided Europe and Germany in particular for accepting millions of immigrants. "It's a disaster, what's happening there," Mr. Trump said.

Taken together, the moves would turn the full weight of the federal government to fortifying the United States border, rounding up some of the 11 million people who are in the country illegally and targeting refugees, who are often among the

world's most vulnerable people. It is an aggressive use of presidential power that follows through on the nationalistic vision Mr. Trump presented during his presidential campaign.

"A nation without borders is not a nation," Mr. Trump said Wednesday at the Department of Homeland Security, where he signed the orders alongside the newly sworn-in secretary, John F. Kelly. "Beginning today, the United States of America gets back control of its borders."

The plans are a sharp break with former President Barack Obama's approach and what was once a bipartisan consensus to devise a path to citizenship for some of the nation's illegal immigrants. Mr. Obama, however, angered many immigrant groups by deporting millions of unauthorized workers, largely during his first term.

But Mr. Trump, whose campaign rallies were filled with chants from his supporters of "build the wall," has vowed to go much further. He has often described unauthorized immigrants as criminals who must be found and forcibly removed from the United States, as he did again on Wednesday.

"We are going to get the bad ones out — the criminals and the drug dealers and gangs and gang members," Mr. Trump said. "The day is over when they can stay in our country and wreak havoc. We

are going to get them out, and we are going to get them out fast."

The president had invited the families of people killed by unauthorized immigrants to watch him sign the orders alongside Homeland Security employees, and he asked each of them to stand in turn, telling of the deaths of their relatives, which he said had inspired his policies.

"We hear you, we see you, and you will never, ever be ignored again," Mr. Trump said, contending that they had been "victimized by open borders."

The immigration orders drew furious condemnation from civil rights and religious groups as well as immigrant advocacy organizations. The groups described them as meanspirited, counterproductive and costly and said the new policies would raise constitutional concerns while undermining the American tradition of welcoming people from around the world.

"They're setting out to unleash this deportation force on steroids, and local police will be able to run wild, so we're tremendously concerned about the impact that could have on immigrants and families across the country," said Joanne Lin, senior legislative counsel at the American Civil Liberties Union. "After today's announcement, the fear quotient is going to go up exponentially."

Lynn Tramonte, the deputy director of America's Voice Education Fund, an immigration advocacy group, said Mr. Trump was "wasting no time taking a wrecking ball to the [Statue of Liberty](#)." She called the orders "a dramatic, radical and extreme assault on immigrants and the values of our country."

The orders also rankled officials in countries around the world. President Enrique Peña Nieto of Mexico, who had planned to travel to Washington next week to meet with Mr. Trump, let it be known that [he was considering canceling his trip](#), senior Mexican officials said.

Mr. Trump has claimed that Mexico will ultimately pay for the wall, but officials there have repeatedly said they have no intention of doing so.

Conservative organizations in the United States and some Republican lawmakers praised Mr. Trump's moves, saying they would usher in overdue enforcement of crucial homeland security laws that Mr. Obama had refused to carry out.

"This looks like a return to enforcing the immigration laws, which is something that President Obama strayed from and has not been prioritized in a very long time," said Tommy Binion, the director of policy

outreach at the conservative-aligned Heritage Foundation. "To have President Trump focus on the problems immigration is bringing us as a nation is a relief. Finally, we have a government that recognizes the tragedies that we're facing."

Mr. Trump will not be able to accomplish the goals laid out in the immigration orders by himself. Congress would have to appropriate new funding for the construction of a wall, which some have estimated could cost tens of billions of dollars. Nonetheless, Mr. Trump directed federal agencies to use existing funds as a start to the wall and formally called for the hiring of an additional 5,000 Border Patrol agents and 10,000 immigration officers.

The order would threaten the nation's roughly three dozen sanctuary cities — jurisdictions that limit their cooperation with federal authorities seeking to detain unauthorized immigrants — with losing federal grant money if they do not comply with such requests.

At the same time, Mr. Trump is reviving a program called Secure Communities, ended by the Obama administration, in which federal officials use digital fingerprints

shared by local law enforcement departments to find and deport immigrants who commit crimes.

The provisions are chilling to many immigration advocates, who argued that they could sweep up unauthorized immigrants beyond the criminals Mr. Trump says he wants to target. Among those listed as priorities for removal are those who have "engaged in fraud or willful misrepresentation in connection with any official matter or application before a governmental agency," which would essentially include any undocumented worker who has signed an employment agreement in the United States.

The order also includes a section that directs federal agencies to adjust their privacy policies to exclude unauthorized immigrants, in effect allowing the sharing of their personal identifying information, which could be used to track and apprehend them.

"With today's sweeping and constitutionally suspect executive actions, the president is turning his back on both our history and our values as a proud nation of immigrants," said Representative Nancy Pelosi of California, the

Democratic leader. "Wasting billions of taxpayer dollars on a border wall Mexico will never pay for, and punishing cities that do not want their local police forces forced to serve as President Trump's deportation dragnet, does nothing to fix our immigration system or keep Americans safe."

The order on refugees is in line with a Muslim ban that Mr. Trump proposed during the campaign, though it does not single out any particular religion. It orders the secretary of state and the secretary of Homeland Security to prioritize those who are persecuted members of religious minorities, essentially ensuring that Christians living in predominantly Muslim countries would be at the top of the list.

"In order to protect Americans," the order states, "we must ensure that those admitted to this country do not bear hostile attitudes toward our country and its founding principles."

It says that for the time being, admitting anyone from Iraq, Syria, Iran, Sudan, Libya, Somalia or Yemen is "detrimental to the interests of the United States."

THE WALL STREET JOURNAL

Trump Orders Wall at Mexican Border

Laura Meckler

Updated Jan. 25,

2017 8:19 p.m. ET

WASHINGTON—President Donald Trump ordered stepped-up deportations and a rapid start on [building a wall on the border with Mexico](#), as he worked to make good on the promised immigration crackdown that powered his presidential campaign.

Taken together, the executive orders announced Wednesday—along with another set expected Thursday—sharply recast U.S. immigration policy.

"A nation without borders is not a nation," Mr. Trump said during a visit Wednesday to the Department of Homeland Security. "Beginning today, the United States of America gets back control of its borders."

Under former President Barack Obama, administration policy makers generally saw immigration as a net good. Though deportations at the border reached record highs early in his tenure, most illegal immigrants living in the U.S. weren't at risk of deportation unless they broke the law.

Mr. Trump's actions flesh out [the "America First" agenda he set forth in his inaugural address](#). In his

vision, stricter border controls and immigration enforcement are needed to keep out undocumented workers who unfairly compete with Americans for jobs, as well as drug smugglers, criminals and terrorists who threaten their way of life.

Thursday's expected orders would amplify that message by banning the entry of people from Middle Eastern and North African countries considered terror risks, [suspending the country's refugee program](#), and implementing "extreme vetting" for some visa applicants.

Wednesday's first order directs federal officials to immediately begin planning, designing and constructing a "physical wall" on the border, though the document includes language suggesting something short of brick and mortar would qualify.

It also calls for quickly processing claims of asylum, which are often asserted by Central Americans fleeing their countries, and building more detention facilities to hold people while their cases are considered. And it says the government will consider local police agencies an extension of federal immigration enforcement.

In a companion order, Mr. Trump restored the controversial Secure

Communities program, which directs local law enforcement agencies to detain undocumented immigrants until federal agents can pick them up. He greatly expanded the group of people targeted for deportation, and directed agencies to strip federal grant funding from so-called sanctuary cities that "willfully refuse" to assist federal immigration authorities.

"These jurisdictions have caused immeasurable harm to the American people and to the very fabric of our Republic," the order reads.

Mr. Trump also called for hiring 5,000 additional border agents and 10,000 more Immigration and Customs Enforcement officers, though he said this was subject to available appropriations. A White House official said the recently announced federal hiring freeze allowed agencies discretion to hire needed personnel.

[The reaction in Mexico to the order for a barrier](#) was angry, particularly since it came on the day top Mexican officials were to meet with White House officials to discuss the [troubled bilateral relationship](#). Mexican President Enrique Peña Nieto is due to meet with Mr. Trump at the White House next week.

In an apparent reference to the trip, Mr. Peña Nieto said in a message to Mexicans late Wednesday that he would take a decision on the "next steps" to follow after consulting with his cabinet, senate members and Mexican state governors.

"This is an insult to those Mexican officials, to the president of Mexico and to all Mexicans," said Jorge Castañeda, an ex-foreign minister, in a televised interview. "It's a way of making them negotiate under threat, under insults and it should lead President Peña Nieto to cancel his trip next week."

Mr. Trump suggested relations with Mexico would improve, saying stricter border security would be good for both countries.

"I believe the steps we will take starting right now will improve the safety in both of our countries, going to be very, very good for Mexico," he said. "I have deep admiration for the people of Mexico and I greatly look forward to meeting again with the president of Mexico."

Democrats derided the orders as undermining trust in local police. House Minority Leader Nancy Pelosi (D., Calif.) called them "constitutionally suspect."

House Majority Leader Kevin McCarthy (R., Calif.) said the "actions are the right start to enforcing our laws and protecting our citizens."

Michael Matzke, president of the National Border Patrol Council Local 2554 in El Centro, California, supported the action.

"Regardless of what people say, walls work," he said, adding news of the wall and Mr. Trump's plans to tighten security "raises morale" among border patrol agents. "I think it's just the general feeling that we're the good guys again."

While Mr. Trump's plans for the border have received most attention, other components of his executive orders are likely to have a bigger impact on the day-in, day-out practice of immigration enforcement.

Many cities and counties stopped cooperating with federal immigration authorities, considering the Obama administration's immigration enforcement overly aggressive. Mr. Obama eventually narrowed his deportation targets to serious criminals and recent border crossers.

Mr. Trump is directing agencies to target criminals for deportation

under a much broader definition that includes those charged with any offense or anyone an immigration officer considers "a risk to public safety."

[Mr. Trump is likely to face a battle with cities](#), often run by Democrats who will resist cooperation and possibly challenge the move to cut their grant funding in court.

"We will not retreat one inch from welcoming diverse, global communities that made us one of the most successful cities in the world," Boston Mayor Martin Walsh said Wednesday.

The White House offered no cost estimate for the wall project, but outside experts say an end-to-end fence could easily cost \$10 billion and possibly much more, depending on details. A wall would be more.

Mr. Trump has repeatedly insisted Mexico would pay for the wall, something Mexican leaders say they won't do. In an interview with ABC News, Mr. Trump said he expected U.S. taxpayer dollars to construct the barrier and that reimbursement from Mexico would follow.

"I'm just telling you there will be a payment. It will be in a form,

perhaps a complicated form," he said.

Still, Mr. Trump faces significant challenges. There are currently just over 650 miles of fencing on the southwest border, close to the 700 miles called for in legislation passed in 2007. Unfenced portions of the border are often unsuitable for construction. Much of it is open desert, private land or areas along the Rio Grande where the soil isn't amenable to construction. In many places, roads would first need to be built to reach the border, and then a barrier constructed, adding to the complexity and cost.

Technology, such as aerial surveillance, and targeted increases in manpower are seen by experts as more effective than a physical barrier. Some of them say the only way to truly deter illegal crossings is to change the rules for what happens once people arrive in the U.S.

Rep. Will Hurd (R., Texas), whose southwestern Texas district stretches along the Mexico border, said it would be "impossible" to build a wall in much of its terrain. "The facts have not changed," he said. "Building a wall is the most expensive and least effective way to secure the border. Each section of the border faces unique

geographical, cultural, and technological challenges that would be best addressed with a flexible, sector-by-sector approach."

Further, a 1970 treaty requires that the U.S. consult with and possibly get approval from Mexico before it builds any sort of barrier that would affect the Rio Grande, which runs along 1,254 miles of the U.S.-Mexican border.

On the border, some questioned how a wall could be built.

Gary Jacobs, a retired banker in Laredo, Texas, pointed to a local golf course whose clubhouse sits on the banks of the Rio Grande, barely a stone's throw from the Mexican bank.

"Where exactly would we build a wall?" asked Mr. Jacobs, who counts President George H.W. Bush and a host of Republican leaders as friends. "I don't care how smart you are, how many big buildings you've built. It can't be done."

—Siobhan Hughes, Dudley Althaus, Damian Paletta and Jon Kamp contributed to this article.

Write to Laura Meckler at laura.meckler@wsj.com



Trump signs directive to start border wall with Mexico, ramp up immigration enforcement

<https://www.facebook.com/nakamuradavid>

(Bastien Inzaurrealde, Jayne Orenstein/The Washington Post)

President Trump on Jan. 25 vowed to start "immediate construction" of a wall on the Southern border while lawmakers reacted to his unfounded claims about voter fraud. President Trump vows to start "immediate construction" of a wall on the Southern border while lawmakers react to his unfounded claims about voter fraud. (Bastien Inzaurrealde, Jayne Orenstein/The Washington Post)

President Trump on Wednesday began putting in place his plan to ratchet up immigration enforcement, following through on major campaign pledges by signing executive actions to build a border wall with Mexico and cut off funds to cities that do not report undocumented immigrants to federal authorities.

In an appearance at the Department of Homeland Security, Trump kicked off the rollout of a series of directives aimed at clamping down on the estimated 11 million immigrants living illegally in the

United States and potentially tightening restrictions on those trying to come to the country through legal channels.

Aides said more directives could come later this week, including [new restrictions on refugees and immigrants](#) from Muslim-majority countries over concerns about terrorism.

The presidential directives signed Wednesday aim to create more detention centers, add thousands of Border Patrol agents and withhold federal funds from what are known as sanctuary cities, which do not comply with federal immigration laws. One order calls for the "immediate construction of a physical wall."

[\[Read Trump's executive order on the border and immigration\]](#)

5 challenges Trump may face building a border wall

"We are going to restore the rule of law in the United States," Trump told a crowd of DHS employees, who applauded several times during the president's remarks. "Beginning today, the United States gets control of its borders."

The construction of a wall along the southern U.S. border was Trump's chief campaign promise as he blamed illegal immigration for constricting the U.S. job market for Americans and adding to national security concerns.

But his moves prompted an immediate backlash from congressional Democrats and immigrant rights groups, which accused the president of hyperbole to whip up fear in the electorate at the expense of immigrants and refugees. Protesters gathered outside the White House within hours of Trump's announcement.

"The hateful, xenophobic, anti-immigrant and anti-Muslim rhetoric that was a hallmark of the Trump campaign is starting to become a reality," said Marielena Hincapie, executive director of the National Immigration Law Center. "Chaos and destruction will be the outcome."

Though Trump promised that construction of the border wall would begin within months, it remained unclear how [his directive](#) would accelerate the project or pay for the added enforcement personnel. Federal funds would

have to be appropriated by Congress, and construction industry analysts have said the total costs of a barrier along the southern U.S. border with Mexico could approach \$20 billion.

Trump's directives also call for an additional 5,000 Border Patrol agents and 10,000 immigration officials. Administration officials have said they are discussing funding options with GOP lawmakers.

In [an interview with ABC News](#), Trump said construction would begin "as soon as we can physically do it. I would say in months." He has said the project would start with U.S. tax dollars in order to begin quickly, but he reiterated his promise that the United States would be reimbursed by the Mexican government.

Trump is scheduled to welcome Mexican President Enrique Peña Nieto — who told him during the campaign that his administration would not pay for a wall — for a bilateral meeting at the White House next week. Mexicans called on Peña Nieto to cancel the summit.

[\[Mexicans want their president to cancel Washington visit after Trump touts his wall\]](#)

"We'll be reimbursed at a later date from whatever transaction we make from Mexico," Trump said in the television interview. "I'm just telling you there will be a payment. It will be in a form, perhaps a complicated form."

Peña Nieto, in a televised address Wednesday night, said "I regret and reject" Trump's decision to build the wall and added: "I have said time and again, Mexico will not pay for any wall." He also said that the 50 Mexican consulates across the United States will "turn into places to defend rights of Mexicans. Where a Mexican needs legal help, they will be there."

Trump also scoffed at concerns that his proposed actions could further fuel hatred of the United States and motivate Islamic State terrorists. "Anger? There's plenty of anger right now. How can you have more?" Trump told ABC's David Muir.

Congressional Republicans cheered Trump's announcement as a long overdue focus on border security, but Democrats warned that it would torpedo efforts to achieve bipartisan consensus on a comprehensive immigration reform bill that eluded the administrations of Republican George W. Bush and Democrat

Barack Obama.

Democrats have called for stricter enforcement to be coupled with a path to citizenship for undocumented immigrants who have not committed additional crimes.

"Turning away legitimate asylum seekers at the border, and requiring mandatory detention of families and children, will do nothing to make America safer," Sen. Benjamin L. Cardin (D-Md.) said.

Trump kicked off his campaign with a fiery speech in 2015 during which he referred to illegal immigrants from Mexico as criminals and rapists and pledged to make stronger enforcement a centerpiece of his agenda.

The strategy defied a growing consensus among establishment Republicans that the GOP must pursue comprehensive reform, including a path to citizenship, in order to make inroads with the fast-growing Latino population. After a comprehensive reform bill died in Congress in 2014, Obama moved to focus his administration's enforcement efforts on those who had committed felonies or had ties to terrorism.

During his visit to DHS, Trump thanked the Border Patrol agents and immigration officers who, he claimed, "unanimously endorsed me" — though it was the unions

representing the employees, whose leadership had chafed at Obama's policies, that had backed his candidacy.

Trump told the employees that retired Marine Gen. John F. Kelly, sworn in last week as the new homeland security secretary, would be charged with carrying out his directives.

"He's a rough, tough guy, but he's also got a good heart," Trump said.

Trump also recognized members of the Remembrance Project, a Texas-based advocacy group that represents the families of victims who were killed by people not legally in the country. Trump was frequently joined by the parents of these victims at campaign rallies, especially those in states close to the southern border.

On Wednesday, he thanked them for having "kept the flame of justice alive."

"Your children will not have lost their lives for no reason," Trump said.

The executive actions include measures to bolster enforcement inside the United States, suggesting that Trump aims to make good on promises to boost workplace raids and ramp up deportations.

The actions include a directive to Kelly to examine ways to limit federal funding to sanctuary cities — including Washington, Los

Angeles and San Francisco — that were a focus of attacks from Trump on the campaign trail.

And White House press secretary Sean Spicer said the Trump administration would resume the Secure Communities program that granted greater immigration enforcement powers to local authorities — a program that was shut down by the Obama administration over concerns it had led to abuse.

Yet Trump on Wednesday did not sign any orders overturning the Obama administration's Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals program, which has allowed more than 700,000 younger immigrants brought to the country illegally as children to apply for two-year work visas.

During the campaign, Trump had promised to end DACA, which has been enormously popular among the immigrant rights community.

"The president understands the magnitude of this problem," Spicer said of DACA. "He's a family man. He has a huge heart."

Trump will work through it "in a very humane way," the spokesman added.

Jenna Johnson contributed to this report.

THE WALL STREET JOURNAL

Donald Trump's Orders on Border Wall Stir Concern Over Presidential Power

Siobhan Hughes, Kristina Peterson and Natalie Andrews

Updated Jan. 25, 2017 4:51 p.m. ET

WASHINGTON—President Donald Trump's wide-ranging [immigration and national-security initiatives](#) are prompting Republican allies in Congress to evaluate whether his impulse to take executive actions might eventually infringe on their congressional authorities.

Many Republicans say the president is within his rights to reverse former President Barack Obama's executive actions and take steps to ensure the country's security, consistent with his role as commander in chief. Many also generally support Mr. Trump's promises to build a wall along the Mexican border, an effort to boost security.

"The question is not if someone issues executive orders as president, but what kind," said Sen. Mike Lee (R., Utah), who added he hadn't seen any orders from Mr.

Trump so far that he thought indicated executive overreach.

But underneath their public support for Mr. Trump lies a budding skepticism about whether the president will respect the role played by Congress in both overseeing the executive branch and providing funding for its initiatives. Republicans said Mr. Obama's [actions on immigration, health care and other matters](#) usurped powers that rightfully belonged to Congress, and they are on watch for signs that Mr. Trump might do the same.

"The onus is on Congress to strike early in this administration, maybe before President Trump becomes too fond of some of the authorities at his disposal," said Todd Gaziano, senior fellow in constitutional law at the Pacific Legal Center, a conservative group formed decades ago by aides to President Ronald Reagan.

The orders to expedite construction of a wall are expected to require the Department of Homeland Security

to use money in its existing budget, instead of requiring Congress to appropriate new money.

But eventually, Mr. Trump will need money for construction and enforcement actions, potentially including new border agents, that will require increased government spending of the sort Congress—and not the executive branch—controls.

"There are a number of conservatives who want to make sure we give the president the tools to do what he promised the American people, and yet do it in an appropriate way that doesn't set a bad precedent for bypassing the Congress or his constitutional authority," said Rep. Mark Meadows (R., N.C.), chairman of the House Freedom Caucus, a group of House conservatives.

Centrist Republicans are also on guard. Rep. Mike Coffman (R., Colo.) said Mr. Trump's use of executive orders so far was "very aggressive." Mr. Coffman said he was still evaluating Mr. Trump's use of his executive authority.

"If it is within the scope of legislation that's already been enacted, then I think it's appropriate. If it's enacting new law, then I think it's inappropriate," he said.

Most Democrats opposed Mr. Trump's executive actions. Sen. Chris Murphy of Connecticut said Congress should pass legislation that secures the borders and helps law enforcement while also providing a pathway to citizenship for some people who are in the U.S. illegally. "President Trump's divisive policies that build walls and take money away from local police do nothing to make us safer," he said.

In recent years, Congress has been an inconsistent guardian of its own prerogatives. While railing loudly at Mr. Obama's 2014 decision to bypass Congress and shield millions of illegal immigrants from deportation, Congress that same year declined to weigh in on whether to authorize the use of military force to combat Islamic State, essentially ceding to the White House the war-declaration

powers that many lawmakers say belong to them.

Attempting to assert another power over the executive branch, Sen. Chuck Grassley (R., Iowa) [used a series of Twitter messages](#) to set a tone regarding Congress's constitutionally-derived oversight powers. Mr. Grassley said that he had provided Mr. Trump's cabinet nominees with letters containing

questions he had previously sent the Obama administration and which never prompted a reply.

"I hope somebody in the White House will explain to Pres Trump how important the oversight responsibility is to this senator," wrote Mr. Grassley.

Sen. John McCain (R., Ariz.) expressed concern that Mr. Trump

might go beyond the law if he signs an executive order directing a review of interrogation policies. On the campaign trail, Mr. Trump said he would do things that were a "hell of a lot worse" to terrorist suspects than now-banned waterboarding, although he later appeared to reverse himself by saying he wouldn't order a military officer to disobey the law.

"The president can sign whatever executive orders he likes," Mr. McCain said in a statement. "But the law is the law. We are not bringing back torture in the United States of America."

Write to Siobhan Hughes at siobhan.hughes@wsj.com and Kristina Peterson at kristina.peterson@wsj.com

THE WALL STREET JOURNAL

Editorial : The Trump Wall Rises

Updated Jan. 25, 2017 7:45 p.m.
ET 316 COMMENTS

President Trump's executive order to build a wall on the Mexican border won't go down as America's finest hour. But at least the policy he's setting out is more moderate than his campaign rhetoric and makes some concessions to immigration reality.

Mr. Trump ran and won on mass deportation of illegal immigrants and building a "great, great wall," and he's honoring his campaign promises. Nobody can claim he's springing what the order calls a "secure, contiguous and impassable physical barrier" on unsuspecting voters. But Mr. Trump also often signaled in 2016 that he would "soften" these positions in office, and in some ways he has.

The symbolism of "the wall"—or double-layered fence, perhaps—is contrary to America's best traditions. A country that prizes liberty, and that historically has welcomed and assimilated immigrants, is sending a powerful signal against newcomers who have always made America greater. The wall antagonizes a friendly neighbor, and the political backlash against the U.S. in Mexico might empower the nationalist left.

The wall also won't solve the problems Mr. Trump claims it will, to

the extent they're problems. There are already 652 miles of vehicle and pedestrian fencing along the 1,954-mile U.S.-Mexico border, protecting the most sensitive areas. Mexico isn't Gaza and doesn't require border militarization.

Despite Mr. Trump's bombast, Mexican criminals are not pouring over the border. Border apprehensions were 192,000 last year, but that's down from 981,000 a decade ago. Pew estimates that about 11.1 million unauthorized immigrants live in the U.S. (3.5% of the population), and 52% are Mexicans. That share is falling every year amid rising illegal entries from Asia, Central America and sub-Saharan Africa. Most of these aliens arrive legally but overstay their visas.

More wall will prevent some illegal crossings at the margins, but at high cost. The Government Accountability Office figures border fencing runs \$16 million per mile, with a price tag of \$15 billion to \$25 billion for the full project. The failed 2013 immigration bill devoted \$40 billion to a "border surge." There are better uses for scarce taxpayer dollars.

Mr. Trump also signed an order to ramp up internal immigration enforcement, especially against cities that refuse to help the feds enforce immigration laws. The order vows to deny federal funds to these

"sanctuary cities," which include New York, Chicago, Philadelphia and nearly every Democratic urban locale.

The Constitution bars the federal government from commandeering or coercing states or cities, so the practical effect will depend on whether Mr. Trump follows through in denying funds. This is essentially a political fight, and Mr. Trump's voters don't like the spectacle of mayors or police departments who refuse to enforce the law.

One encouraging note is that Mr. Trump seems to have stepped back from his promise to revoke President Obama's 2012 order that shielded the "dreamers" from deportation. These are young people who were brought to the U.S. as children and can apply for renewable two-year work permits if they're attending school or have graduated and pass a background check.

The most fervent restrictionists, in and out of the White House, are unhappy with Mr. Trump's forbearance. But his restraint is humane and good politics. The 750,000 young people who have qualified for this reprieve didn't break the law themselves, and many don't know the "home" country they would be deported to. The U.S. is their home. Nothing would undermine Mr. Trump's immigration agenda more than

stories of dreamers who've lived here for years or served in the military being snatched from college campuses and deported to uncertain fates.

The best we can say for Mr. Trump's actions is that, over time, they might take some of the nastiness out of the immigration debate. Most Americans don't consider immigration control a political priority, and even most Republicans favor a path to citizenship for illegals already in the U.S. Enforcement alone won't stop illegal immigration, and raids on meat-packing plants won't raise wages for native Americans.

But a large minority of Republicans are focused on border control and they have shown they can block any reform. A larger group are understandably worried about terrorists crossing the border, even if 9/11 plotters and domestic bombers like the Tsarnaev brothers entered legally.

Perhaps if Mr. Trump can prove that government is competent enough to reduce illegal entries, passions will ebb and Congress might be able to pass a better immigration policy that lets market forces meet labor needs with a guest-worker program. Or so we can hope.

Los Angeles Times

Editorial : Border security is important, but Trump's wall plan is as hare-brained as they come

The Times Editorial Board

Among the many manifestly bad ideas being promulgated by the newly minted Trump administration, the most hare-brained could well be building a barrier along the 2,000-mile border with Mexico — from the Pacific to the Gulf Coast — as a way to keep people from entering the country illegally. Even though there's no clear source of funding yet, President Trump signed an executive order Wednesday directing the [Department of Homeland Security](#) to get started,

with a vow by the White House that "one way or the other, Mexico will pay for it."

The cost will be determined by the type of barrier Trump ultimately decides to build. Another important factor is whether the roughly 700 miles of walls and fencing the government already maintains in populated areas and at border crossings will be replaced, enhanced or left alone. Trump has said the wall could be built for as little as \$8 billion, but other estimates put the cost [as high as \\$38 billion](#). And even Trump's own

new Homeland Security secretary, retired Gen. John F. Kelly, [said in his confirmation hearing](#) that a wall alone won't stop illegal border crossers — it will take manpower, surveillance and other security measures. The kinds of steps, in fact, that would probably make the wall less necessary.

Trying to bill Mexico for the project will be an exercise in either futility or inhumanity. Trump has proposed taxing the \$24 billion that people in the U.S. send in remittances to families in Mexico, most of whom desperately need the money. About

half of that money, [some experts say](#), is sent by people living in the U.S. legally — including American citizens. Why should they have to foot the bill for this? Besides, the tax would have to be onerous to raise anywhere near the amount of money it will take to build the wall, which means the remittances would most likely be driven underground. And cutting off the remittances would simply create another factor sending impoverished Mexicans north to find work.

And what's the point of the wall, anyway? Illegal immigration from Mexico dropped off during the last recession; in fact, the Pew Research Center reported in 2015 that [more Mexicans were leaving the U.S.](#) than were coming in. Detentions of people illegally crossing of the Mexican border have plummeted since the recession too. More and more, residents who are living in the U.S. illegally came in to the country with visas, often from nations other than Mexico, but then didn't leave. The wall will have no effect on people who come in that way, obviously. And while drug-trafficking across the border is significant, history shows

that blocking off one smuggling route just creates another as long as the demand remains strong. Mexican cartels have already made inroads [deep into the U.S.](#), an infiltration not likely to be affected by a wall.

Border security is important, and the U.S. doesn't do a good enough job at it, but changes should be a key part of a broader comprehensive reform. Instead, Trump is starting with a disruption, not a solution. He might be able to start building his wall, but the resistance he will face — beginning with California — means in all likelihood it will get delayed by lawsuits challenging everything from the seizure of

private property along the wall's route to [the environmental effects](#) of such a massive intrusion into sensitive habitats.

Trump also Wednesday ordered a crackdown on those already living here illegally. He directed that 5,000 new agents be hired for the Border Patrol and 10,000 for Immigration and Customs Enforcement to track down potential deportees in the interior. He ordered that new detention centers be built near the border, and already overwhelmed immigration judges be sent to detention centers to handle cases there rather than in immigration courts. And he revived the controversial Secure

Communities deportation program with the threat of defunding jurisdictions — such as San Francisco and, potentially, Los Angeles — that do not cooperate fully with federal immigration enforcement.

These are draconian steps that, taken together, will convert the border into a fortress, tear apart families and communities and harm sections of the economy that have come to depend on undocumented labor. And they would do little to make the nation safer, Trump's purported goal.

NATIONAL REVIEW ONLINE

A Solid Start for Trump's Border-Security and Immigration Policy

In September, Donald Trump laid out a ten-point plan for immigration, emphasizing border security, the enforcement of immigration laws, and the removal of criminal aliens. The president's latest executive orders — one directing the construction of a wall on the U.S.-Mexico border, the other stripping federal grant money from sanctuary cities — are a first step toward making good on those promises.

On Wednesday, the president ordered Executive Branch agencies "to deploy all lawful means to secure the Nation's southern border," which includes the "construction of a physical wall on the southern border." The rough terrain along parts of the U.S.-Mexico border likely militates against the "big, beautiful wall" that Trump envisions, but erecting physical barriers along further stretches of the 2,000 miles dividing the U.S. from its southern neighbor is an obvious and long-neglected tool to help clamp down on America's ongoing illegal-immigration problem.

The second order, focusing on "enhancing public safety in the interior of the United States," directs the attorney general and secretary of the Department of Homeland Security to deny federal grants to jurisdictions that refuse to comply with federal immigration law, insofar as they can do so within their legal authority.

These orders are a good start toward reorienting American immigration policy so that it favors the interests of American citizens over their foreign counterparts. However, they are only a start.

While the construction of a wall, and the potential deployment of technology such as below-ground sensors at the border, will be a helpful impediment to would-be lawbreakers, the crucial work will continue to be done by the Immigration and Customs Enforcement and Border Patrol agencies, which are woefully understaffed. Trump's executive orders suggest bolstering these organizations with 10,000 and 5,000 new hires, respectively, and Trump has also announced the end of the catch-and-release policy that characterized the Obama

administration's approach to border security. Congress should work with him to secure both of those plans.

Likewise, Trump himself has observed that about half of America's illegal immigrants overstayed legally acquired visas, so beefing up the Border Patrol is not sufficient. Expanding the use of E-Verify to prevent employers from exploiting illegal labor is crucial, as is reducing other economic incentives to abuse the immigration system — what Trump has called "turning off the jobs and benefits magnet."

The crucial work will continue to be done by the Immigration and Customs Enforcement and Border Patrol agencies, which are woefully understaffed.

A similar principle applies to legal immigration. Reshaping the immigration system to serve the interests of American workers will require reducing levels of low-skilled immigration, as well as ensuring that employers do not use the country's visa programs — for example, the H-1B visa program for

high-skilled workers — to undercut American workers.

Encouragingly, much of this was included in Trump's immigration plan from the campaign. If enacted, these policies would do much to reduce the number of illegal immigrants currently in the country (many of whom are very sensitive to changes in their economic situation) and to discourage further illegal immigration. That would make it significantly easier to deal with those illegal immigrants who remain.

Of course, most of these policies will have to be hammered out with Congress. President Trump would be wise to steer clear of the abuse of executive authority demonstrated by his predecessor — because such abuses are unconstitutional, but also because they can be immediately overturned by future executives.

President Trump has an opportunity to reshape American immigration policy for the better. He has made a good start — but the real tests are still to come.

The New York Times

Editorial : The Real Cost of Mr. Trump's Wall

The Editorial Board

President Trump speaking at the Department of Homeland Security on Wednesday. Doug Mills/The New York Times

President Trump on Wednesday unveiled the first proposals to make good on his promise to make America impenetrable to unauthorized immigrants and intolerable for those who are already here.

As expected, he promised to begin building a wall along the Mexican border, an enterprise that is far from

certain because Congress would have to approve billions of dollars in funding. He also outlined a series of ominous regulatory changes aimed at drastically expanding the detention of immigrants who enter without permission. He is also seeking to turn more local police and corrections officials into enforcers of immigration law, while threatening to withhold funding from jurisdictions that have sensibly refused to assume that role.

Stopped at the Border

Total annual apprehensions of migrants trying to cross any U.S. border illegally. Figures do not

include migrants found inadmissible at ports of entry.

The steps outlined in two executive orders set the stage for incarcerating thousands of immigrants who do not represent a threat, for widespread civil rights violations and for racial profiling. At the Department of Homeland Security on Wednesday, Mr. Trump said that immigration laws "will be enforced and enforced strongly."

Mr. Trump's anti-immigrant talk worked well on the campaign trail, as he convinced struggling Americans that foreigners were to blame for lost jobs and blighted

communities. To carry out his promise of ramped-up immigration enforcement and border security, he will need to convince Congress and American taxpayers that spending billions to execute his plan is a worthy investment.

As is so often the case with Mr. Trump, the facts are not on his side. Illegal immigration to the United States has [been on a downward trend](#) in recent years, even as [spending on border security has soared](#). Between 1983 and 2006, an average of 1.2 million people a year were apprehended trying to enter the country unlawfully. In

2016, just over 415,000 were caught trying to enter; most were Central Americans fleeing violence and poverty. Meanwhile, border security funding has increased from \$263 million in 1990 to \$3.8 billion in 2015.

Mr. Trump would add significantly to that spending. He has insisted that Mexico will ultimately pay for the wall — a vow that is either deceitful or delusional. Mr. Trump ordered federal agencies to tally the foreign aid Mexico receives from the United States, which

seems like a threat to withhold future assistance for initiatives such as narcotics enforcement and judicial programs.

Even if Mr. Trump was to cut off aid to Mexico, the savings would be modest; it got [roughly \\$142 million in 2016](#), which doesn't begin to pay for a wall along the 1,989-mile border. Besides costing billions, the type of barrier Mr. Trump has proposed would cause severe environmental damage and lead to lawsuits over private land.

The executive orders do not address the fate of hundreds of thousands of young immigrants brought to the country as children who were given a temporary reprieve from deportation by the Obama administration.

While Mr. Trump has the authority to order the detention of all immigrants apprehended while entering without permission and end the practice of releasing them pending court dates — which the executive order appears to call for — Congress should withhold the

funding needed to carry out this plan. Leaders in so-called sanctuary cities, like New York and Los Angeles, have rightly recognized that immigrants, including those here without permission, are more of an asset than a burden. Their defiance is likely now to be tested by renewed calls to turn local police officers into immigration enforcers. The courage of local leaders may help stymie Mr. Trump's misguided approach.

**The
New York
Times**

Hemel, Masur and Posner : How Antonin Scalia's Ghost Could Block Donald Trump's Wall

Daniel Hemel, Jonathan Masur and Eric Posner

But the 2006 law authorizes the secretary of homeland security only to take actions to secure the border that are "necessary and appropriate." These are the same words (in the opposite order) the Supreme Court interpreted in *Michigan v. E.P.A.* As Justice Scalia said, it would not be "appropriate" to "impose billions of dollars in economic costs in return for a few dollars" in benefits.

President Trump's proposed wall would certainly cost billions of dollars: He says \$8 billion, while [more realistic estimates](#) put the price tag at \$15 billion to \$25 billion (and [\\$500 million](#) per year for upkeep).

What about the benefits of the wall? First, it won't keep many aliens out. No matter how high the wall is, it won't stop smugglers from [tunneling underground](#), as many have already done to get past existing border fences. Moreover, the wall won't stop a [majority](#) of unlawful immigrants, who now enter the United States on visas that they overstay.

Indeed, [research](#) indicates that border barriers are more likely to

keep unlawful immigrants inside the country from exiting than to prevent people from entering. Even John Kelly, President Trump's pick to head the Department of Homeland Security, [said](#) during testimony that a wall "in and of itself will not do the job."

Second, even if the wall does lower the number of unlawful immigrants in the United States, the economic gains from reducing illegal immigration are not greater than the cost of the wall. In fact, the economic effects would quite likely be zero or negative. Illegal immigrants pay [billions of dollars](#) in taxes, purchase goods and services, and [enhance American productivity](#) in sectors such as agriculture. A 2012 [study](#) published by the Cato Institute concluded that the gross domestic product would *decline* by roughly 1.5 percent — or \$2.6 trillion over a decade — if we pursue a program of mass deportation and block undocumented immigrants from returning. Similarly, a [study](#) commissioned by The Wall Street Journal last year concluded that Arizona's economy was on average 2 percent smaller per year because of the large-scale departure of undocumented immigrants from 2008 to 2015.

One of President Trump's major claims is that a wall would keep out illegal immigrants who commit violent crimes. But there is [no evidence](#) that illegal immigrants commit crime at a higher rate than citizens, and so no reason to think that the crime-related benefits are substantial enough to justify the cost of the wall. No court could reasonably hold that it is "necessary and appropriate" to spend billions of dollars to achieve benefits this doubtful.

Mr. Trump says that Mexico will pay for the wall, implying that the actual cost to the United States will be zero. But the statute doesn't authorize Mr. Trump to charge Mexico, and Mexico says it will not pay. A judge would therefore give no weight to this argument.

A court challenge to President Trump's wall-building plans would need a plaintiff who meets the legal standing requirements. Plenty of people satisfy those criteria. Farmers in the Rio Grande Valley in Texas might sue on the ground that the wall would [disrupt their water access](#). Or the state of California might sue to stop a wall-building effort that it thinks will hurt its own citizens.

The problems that *Michigan v. E.P.A.* create for Mr. Trump's agenda extend beyond the wall. Numerous statutes contain similar language requiring agencies to take "necessary" and "appropriate" actions, or other language requiring agencies to take into account costs. While the legal details are arcane, Justice Scalia's ghost may also block Mr. Trump's efforts to eliminate climate regulations and deregulate the financial industry. Courts will look askance at regulators who tell them they want to eliminate regulations that, a few years ago, they insisted were cost-justified. The same rules that apply to regulation apply to deregulation as well.

President Trump promises to appoint a Supreme Court justice "very much in the mold" of Antonin Scalia. And yet Justice Scalia's cost-benefit jurisprudence may put Mr. Trump in a bind. Applause lines at campaign rallies would not have swayed Justice Scalia and will not impress current judges. If President Trump wants to enact his agenda, he will need to drop the bluster and explain why his policies do more good than harm.

**THE WALL
STREET
JOURNAL**

Sticking to Unsubstantiated Claim, Donald Trump Seeks Voter-Fraud Inquiry

Peter Nicholas, Carol E. Lee and Aruna Viswanatha

Updated Jan. 25, 2017 6:47 p.m. ET

President Donald Trump called for a major investigation into whether U.S. elections are tainted by fraud, following his unsubstantiated—and widely discredited—assertion that illegal ballots deprived him of a popular-vote victory over Democrat Hillary Clinton.

With a pair of Wednesday morning tweets, Mr. Trump, a Republican, ensured a third straight day of attention to an issue that is important to his conservative base but tangential to the bread-and-butter economic matters at the center of his campaign.

In his tweets, Mr. Trump wrote that he wanted to determine whether voter rolls include people who are dead, registered in two states or residing in the U.S. illegally. His call came despite the fact that state

election officials and independent reviews have undercut the notion that widespread illegal voting has tainted election results.

White House officials gave few details about how the investigation would unfold. Sean Spicer, the White House press secretary, said Wednesday that the inquiry would be broader than the 2016 election and would cover "the integrity of our voting system."

Meeting privately at the White House with congressional leaders

Monday night, Mr. Trump told them he would have won the popular vote if as many as five million people hadn't voted illegally.

Ohio's GOP secretary of state, Jon Husted, said: "I don't know where he [Mr. Trump] is getting that information. I'm not aware of any evidence at this point that backs up that claim."

Mr. Husted said his office reviewed elections in 2012 and 2014 and found 44 cases in Ohio in which

people who weren't citizens cast ballots.

Asked about Mr. Trump's assertion on Tuesday, Mr. Spicer pointed to studies of past elections that he said showed instances of illegal voting.

A 2012 report from the nonpartisan Pew Charitable Trusts found that 24 million voter registrations in the U.S. were no longer valid or were significantly inaccurate. The report said that could contribute to the perception that voting processes lack integrity or could be susceptible to fraud, but it didn't describe actual instances of fraud.

Meanwhile, U.S. intelligence agencies have concluded that Russia intervened in the election to help Mr. Trump, and Congress is poised to investigate that allegation. But lawmakers in both parties showed little appetite for a voting-fraud inquiry.

"We've moved on," said Sen. John Thune, a South Dakota Republican and a member of Senate GOP leadership. "The election's over with. We have a decisive winner in our constitutional system. And we're ready to go to work."

Democrats have suggested that Mr. Trump is acting out of personal pique, embarrassed that he trailed Mrs. Clinton by about 2.8 million votes but still captured the White House based on his Electoral College victory. At a news conference, House Democratic leader Nancy Pelosi of California called the president "insecure."

Democrats also are concerned that Mr. Trump could try to use the probe to tighten voter-registration procedures in ways that favor his party.

Others saw another calculation at work. Chris Ruddy, a longtime friend of Mr. Trump and chief executive of Newsmax Media, a conservative outlet, said, "He knows this is a big issue for the base. He knows that people who read Newsmax or watch Fox News feel there is serious voter fraud."

In arranging an investigation, Mr. Trump has at least two options. He can assemble an independent commission, like the one that followed the Sept. 11, 2001, attacks, or direct the Justice Department to look into the matter.

Presidents occasionally order Justice Department inquiries, but they have generally been based on widespread evidence of potential wrongdoing that doesn't personally affect the president. The agency has long fought to avoid even the appearance of serving the president rather than the public. In the Watergate era, Attorney General John Mitchell went to prison for crimes tied to President Richard Nixon.

Under President George W. Bush, the department ran into trouble over voting-fraud investigations. The department's inspector general found in 2008 that some of the nine U.S. attorneys fired by the Bush administration had been dismissed for political reasons, including their handling of voter-fraud cases. The

furor led to the resignation of Attorney General Alberto Gonzales.

Michael Waldman, president of the Brennan Center for Justice at New York University, warned that another investigation of voter fraud could follow a similar path. "A decade ago, high officials used the Justice Department to search for, and prosecute, baseless claims of fraud to advance a partisan agenda," Mr. Waldman said. "The attorney general had to resign. It would be unwise to go down that road again."

But some Republicans said probing voter fraud is entirely legitimate. George Terwilliger, a former deputy attorney general, said the government should be doing more to determine the extent of voter fraud.

"I know there's a lot of narrative out there that tends to pooh-pooh the idea that vote fraud has any effect or is really prevalent," he said. "I don't think we know that."

He also rejected the idea that Mr. Trump's call would be an inappropriate personal intervention in law enforcement. "I don't think there's anything wrong with the president saying to the attorney general, 'I'm concerned about voter fraud, and let's see if there's something we can do about it,'" Mr. Terwilliger said.

Mr. Trump's focus on voter fraud arguably conflicts with filings his lawyers made after Election Day to stop recounts by Green Party candidate Jill Stein in several states. Among other arguments, the

Trump lawyers said the recounts were unnecessary because there was no evidence of irregularities.

"All available evidence suggests that the 2016 general election was not tainted by fraud or mistake," they wrote in a filing in Michigan.

Mr. Spicer said Wednesday that may have been true in hotly contested states, but not in ones like California or New York where Mr. Trump didn't compete—raising the prospect that an investigation would focus on large Democratic states.

Documented evidence of voter fraud has been limited to isolated cases, not the systemic wrongdoing that could impact a national election. They have often involved "lone wolf" rogue voters or local candidates seeking to sway low-turnout elections, said University of Florida political science professor Michael McDonald.

Few fraud cases have arisen from last November's election, and some of those were brought against Trump voters, including against a woman in Illinois who allegedly sent in an absentee ballot on behalf of her recently deceased husband.

—Devlin Barrett, Brent Kendall, Natalie Andrews and Byron Tau contributed to this article.

Write to Peter Nicholas at peter.nicholas@wsj.com, Carol E. Lee at carol.lee@wsj.com and Aruna Viswanatha at Aruna.Viswanatha@wsj.com

**The
New York
Times**

After His Claim of Voter Fraud, Trump Vows 'Major Investigation'

Michael D. Shear and Peter Baker

WASHINGTON — President Trump intends to move forward with a major investigation of voter fraud that he says cost him the popular vote, White House officials said Wednesday, despite bipartisan condemnation of his allegations and the conclusion of Mr. Trump's own lawyers that the election was "not tainted."

In his first days in the Oval Office, Mr. Trump has renewed his complaint that millions of people voted illegally, depriving him of a popular-vote majority. In two [Twitter posts](#) early Wednesday morning, the president vowed to open an inquiry to reveal people who are registered to vote in multiple states or who remain on voting rolls long after they have died.

"We have to understand where the problem exists, how deep it goes, and then suggest some remedies to

it," said Sean Spicer, the president's press secretary. He said the White House would reveal more details this week.

But voting officials in both parties across the country said the answer to those questions is already clear: Fraudulent voting happens in tiny, sporadic episodes that have no impact on the outcome of elections. It is virtually impossible, several state election officials said, that millions of people voted illegally in last year's presidential contest.

In fact, that was the conclusion of Mr. Trump's own lawyers last year as they [sought to stop recount efforts](#) in Michigan, Pennsylvania and Wisconsin.

"All available evidence suggests that the 2016 general election was not tainted by fraud or mistake," Mr. Trump's lawyers [wrote in their response](#) to recount petitions by Jill Stein, the Green Party presidential candidate. Mr. Spicer said the

lawyers were referring only to states where Mr. Trump campaigned extensively.

In Ohio, Secretary of State Jon A. Husted, a Republican, said Wednesday in an interview that there was "no evidence" that voter fraud was happening on a large scale. Edgardo Cortés, Virginia's election chief, a Democrat, said there was "no basis" for the claims. And California's Democratic secretary of state lashed out at the president for undermining confidence in the election system.

"Free and fair elections are the bedrock of our democracy, and he's taken a jackhammer to it with his irresponsible tweets," said Alex Padilla, the state's top election official. "Whatever proof or evidence he said he had, he clearly didn't have. His allegations since November are clearly lies, not alternative facts."

Mr. Trump has repeatedly shifted his view of the election system. As a candidate, he frequently [railed against what he called a "rigged" election](#). When he became president-elect, he [complained about "serious voter fraud,"](#) but later reversed himself and [mocked Ms. Stein's recount efforts as "a scam"](#) and a waste of time and money.

This week, he flip-flopped again, telling lawmakers at a White House reception that Hillary Clinton won the popular vote because millions of immigrants in the country illegally voted for her. Mr. Spicer declined to elaborate on what Mr. Trump meant but did not back away from the assertion.

"The president does believe that," Mr. Spicer said. "It's a belief that he's maintained for a while, a concern that he has about voter fraud. And that's based on information that's provided."

It remains unclear what form a federal investigation may take. While the F.B.I. has the authority to look into voter fraud, that appears not to be what the president has in mind. Mr. Spicer said it was too early to know, but mentioned the possibility of a task force or commission.

He cited studies that he said showed that voter rolls contained the names of millions of people who should not be there because they had moved, were not citizens or had since died. But the author of one of those major studies said Wednesday that Mr. Spicer and the president appeared to be misunderstanding the numbers.

David Becker, who for six years was in charge of the election initiative for the Pew Center on the States, said that voter rolls often had out-of-date information, but that there was virtually no evidence that many of those names were used to vote illegally.

"It does exist, but it happens in very, very small numbers and nothing like what is claimed by the president," Mr. Becker said. He said systems across the country to prevent voter fraud would have caught any huge effort to vote

illegally. "We would have seen that well before the election," he said. "We would have seen a swelling of the voter rolls and records."

In Ohio, for example, a review of the state's elections in 2012 and 2014 found that out of millions of votes cast, there were 667 allegations of fraud, of which just 149 were referred to law enforcement for investigation, Mr. Husted said. The Ohio review, which happens after every election, also found that 436 unauthorized immigrants were registered to vote and that 44 had voted.

The legal team representing then President-elect Donald J. Trump, including Donald F. McGahn II, the current White House counsel, argued in a brief that no voter fraud had occurred in the general election.

"Voter fraud exists. It's not widespread or systemic," said Mr. Husted, who said he had voted for Mr. Trump. "There's no evidence that that is happening on a wide-scale basis."

Mr. Husted said he would be happy to share Ohio's review of the 2016 election with the federal government when it was completed. And he said

Mr. Trump could aid states by sharing government databases that could help them clean their voter rolls.

In his Twitter message Wednesday, Mr. Trump suggested that a federal review could lead to improvements in voting procedures.

But Democrats and voting experts criticized the president for focusing his allegations on voter fraud while [resisting the intelligence community's conclusions](#) involving Russian hacking of the Democratic National Committee and officials connected to Mrs. Clinton during last year's election.

"It's more important that we investigate the known instances of election fraud, rather than imagined ones," said Kim Alexander, the president of the California Voter Foundation, a nonprofit, nonpartisan organization dedicated to improving the voting process. "We have had an election that was compromised by foreign interests. That's the real danger that has come out of this election."

Senator Lindsey Graham, Republican of South Carolina, said the president should "knock this off" and move on. "This is going to

erode his ability to govern this country if he does not stop it," he [said on CNN](#).

And several Democratic lawmakers and state election officials said they suspected that Mr. Trump's allegations were part of a plan by Republicans looking for reasons to justify new restrictions on voting to benefit their party, particularly targeting immigrants and African-Americans.

"There has been a sustained effort across the country, rooted in similar conspiracies about voter fraud, to make it harder for Americans to vote," Senator Dianne Feinstein of California said in a statement. "We can't allow this attack on voting rights to continue, and it's shameful to see such debunked conspiracy theories emanating from the White House."

Mr. Padilla, the California secretary of state, said he also worried that Mr. Trump's repeated allegations about fraud would undermine the confidence that Americans had in the integrity of the voting system. "Stoking fear and concern is undermining people's faith in our elections," he said.

THE WALL STREET JOURNAL

6:28 p.m. ET

President Donald Trump's calls for a "major investigation" into voter fraud would be unprecedented in scope, say voting-rights experts and former federal election officials.

Mr. Trump said Wednesday he plans to [ask for an investigation looking into votes cast by "those who are illegal"](#) and people improperly registered in more than one state, as well as at fraudulent ballots cast by dead people listed on the rolls.

The Justice Department has brought hundreds of voter-fraud cases in recent decades, but none has put a national election contest under such prosecutorial scrutiny as a Trump administration case would.

"There has never been a systematic organized effort to investigate voter fraud and problems with election integrity," said Hans von Spakovsky, an election law specialist at the Heritage Foundation, a conservative think tank in Washington, D.C.

Federal law makes it a crime for a noncitizen to vote in an election when a federal candidate is on the ballot. And every state requires voters to be U.S. citizens. At least

two states, Maryland and Illinois, allow noncitizens to vote in local elections, according to the National Conference of State Legislatures.

States have primary authority over the election process, and the prosecution of election offenses is typically left to local law enforcement. When fraud is suspected, the Justice Department can step in if a locality isn't able to or refuses to launch a probe, or if the fraud is connected to political corruption or other crimes.

Some conservative activists, such as Mr. von Spakovsky, say federal oversight over ballot integrity has been too light.

Some Democrats say voter suppression is a bigger election problem, and that Mr. Trump's probe would only worsen it. And some election fraud experts are skeptical about what an investigation into Mr. Trump's unsubstantiated claims might turn up. "Most of what I heard as being described as voter fraud is not criminal," said Craig Donsanto, who served as director of the Justice Department's election-crimes branch from 1978 to 2010.

Merely finding dead people on voter rolls or people registered to vote in more than one state doesn't alone establish fraud, he said. "It becomes

criminally actionable—i.e. fraud—only if the individual who is improperly registered votes," he said.

He said during his tenure he found "very few" instances of people who are illegally here who registered and voted.

Voter-fraud prosecutions have often targeted various abuses of absentee balloting, like the 1997 Miami ballot scandal that toppled the city's mayor, or voter bribery as in the 1990s election-rigging case in Greene County, Ala., which led to several convictions.

Other cases also involve vote-buying. A number of prominent local politician, for example, were convicted in a widespread voter-bribery scheme in Clay County, Ky., in the past decade.

Cases involving charges of illegal voting by noncitizens are much more unusual. In the 1990s, a Republican-led House Oversight Committee looked into claims that a Latino-rights organization had conspired to register noncitizens to help defeat a Republican congressional incumbent from Orange County, Calif. The House committee found that hundreds of ballots had been improperly cast but not enough to tilt the race, and no charges were filed.

Mr. Donsanto said the Justice Department monitored the Florida election process as the 2000 presidential contest recount unfolded, but it never opened a formal fraud probe.

"There is fraud. I have seen cases where people who weren't citizens voted," said Paul DeGregorio, who was chairman of the U.S. Election Assistance Commission during the administration of George W. Bush.

"Is it widespread where it would affect the outcome of a national presidential election? No," he said.

It has been more than a century since a presidential race has been so closely scrutinized for claims of voter fraud. Rampant rumors of voter fraud in the contested 1876 presidential election prompted Congress to create an elector commission to sort out the dispute and pick a winner. Ultimately, Republican Rutherford B. Hayes prevailed over Democrat Samuel J. Tilden. The then-Democratic-controlled House of Representatives later launched an investigation into the fraud allegations.

"The investigation, however, only served to discredit several state election officials and to uncover conflicting and inconclusive evidence of electoral fraud,"

according to an account in the Florida Historical Quarterly.

Write to Jacob Gershman at jacob.gershman@wsj.com



Editorial : The sore winner in chief

President Donald Trump is doubling down on his dubious claims of voter fraud, ordering an investigation take place. Nathan Rousseau Smith (@fantasticmrnate) examines the facts. Buzz60

President Trump on Jan. 25, 2017. (Photo: Chip Somodevilla, Getty Images)

And on the sixth day, the Trump administration continued its assault on the truth with an attack that mars the new president's already precarious credibility and strikes at the nation's confidence in fair elections.

Just as a pointless flap over the size of the Inauguration Day crowds started to subside, the president repeated another false assertion: that he lost the popular vote only because of 3 million to 5 million illegal votes. He made the comment to congressional leaders Monday,

and doubled down on Twitter Wednesday, promising to ask for a "major investigation" of voter fraud.

Certainly, if there were any truth to the fraud charge, it should be investigated as one of the biggest scandals in U.S. history. But Trump offered no evidence of massive fraud. When White House spokesman Sean Spicer scrambled to cite some factual backup during a news briefing, he [conflated two studies](#), one of them largely debunked, and mangled the findings of the second.

Both these battles of the numbers are harmful, and both make the president seem insecure.

The vote fraud issue is the more ominous of the two. Last October, when candidate Trump was [behind in the polls](#) and tweeted about "large scale voter fraud ... on and before Election Day," it sounded like he was warming up to be a poor loser. Bad enough.

Now, as president, he sounds like a poor winner. His baseless charge is heard around the world casting doubt on the integrity of American democracy, and it could pave the way for new efforts in the states to suppress turnout.

Trump appears to be conflating fraud with problems in the voter registration rolls. According to a [2012 report by the Pew Center on the States](#), researchers found 2.75 million voters registered in more than one state and at least 1.8 million deceased individuals still on the rolls. But it did not find evidence of any significant number of people impersonating dead voters or voting twice.

Yes, some voter fraud exists. For example, in [two Colorado counties](#), seven cases of voter fraud were successfully prosecuted between 2009 and 2015. [A CBS station](#) in Loveland, Colo., also found votes cast by about a half-dozen people impersonating

deceased voters and a dozen cases of people voting twice. Investigations by [newspapers in Florida and New York](#) found more than 2,000 people who voted in two states in at least one election.

But the numbers are minuscule — a world away from the millions Trump has cited. And there's this: The [president's own lawyers](#), arguing against a recount in Michigan, stated in a court filing: "All available evidence suggests that the 2016 general election was not tainted by fraud or mistake."

For Trump to be right, virtually every adult undocumented immigrant in the USA would have had to risk felony charges and deportation to vote for Hillary Clinton. The nation surely doesn't need any sort of major, taxpayer-paid investigation to prove that didn't happen.



Trump's Impulses Now Carry the Force of the Presidency

Peter Baker

WASHINGTON — Impetuous and instinctive, convinced of broad but hidden plots to undermine him, eager to fight and prone to what an aide called "alternative facts," President Trump has shown in just days in office that he is like few if any occupants of the White House before him.

He sits in the White House at night, watching television or reading social media, and through Twitter issues instant judgments on what he sees. He channels fringe ideas and gives them as much weight as carefully researched reports. He denigrates the conclusions of intelligence professionals and then later denies having done so. He thrives on conflict and chaos.

For a capital that typically struggles to adjust to the ways of a new president every four or eight years, Mr. Trump has posed a singular challenge. Rarely if ever has a president been as reactive to random inputs as Mr. Trump. Career government officials and members of Congress alike are left to discern policy from random Twitter posts spurred by whatever happened to be on television when the president grabbed the remote control.

While that habit generated conversation and consternation when Mr. Trump was a candidate,

he now serves as commander in chief and his 140-character pronouncements carry the power of an Olympian lightning bolt. In the course of 24 hours alone, he threatened to send federal forces into Chicago and vowed to investigate his own false claim that three million to five million votes were cast illegally in November, costing him the popular vote. The trumpet blasts come even as he issues daily executive actions overturning longstanding policies across the board.

Mr. Trump's advisers say that his frenzied if admittedly impulsive approach appeals to voters because it shows that he is a man of action. Those complaining about his fixation with fictional voter fraud or crowd counts at his inauguration, in their view, are simply seeking ways to undercut his legitimacy.

Yet some of his own advisers also privately worry about his penchant for picking unnecessary fights and drifting off message. They talk about taking away his telephone or canceling his Twitter account, only to be dismissed by a president intent on keeping his own outlets to the world.

On the blueprint mapped out by the White House, Wednesday was supposed to be a day devoted to national security. The president signed executive action intended to begin the process of building his

promised wall on the Mexican border, and he prepared other orders to curb refugees from Middle Eastern countries.

Even these planned actions had the feel of someone rushing toward the sound of gunfire. Like other orders signed in recent days, they were hurriedly prepared with many questions left unanswered, such as [where the money for the wall will come from](#) assuming Mexico does not cut a check as Mr. Trump has demanded. And the leak of a draft order reinstating black-site prisons and harsh interrogation techniques consumed more attention despite White House disavowals.

Amid this flurry of activity that has attempted to reverse the Obama administration's policy on health care, the environment, trade, immigration, national security and housing in just five days came the president's spontaneous forays into controversy, provoked by the chyrons on his television screen.

During his 8 p.m. show on Fox News on Tuesday, for example, Bill O'Reilly aired a segment on the crime crisis in Chicago and interviewed an expert talking about whether the president could intervene. The guest called the violence in Chicago "carnage."

At 9:25 p.m., Mr. Trump sent out a Twitter post, using the same statistics that Mr. O'Reilly had

flashed on the screen. "If Chicago doesn't fix the horrible 'carnage' going on, 228 shootings in 2017 with 42 killings (up 24 percent from 2016), I will send in the Feds!" [the president wrote](#).

Similarly, after reporters pressed Sean Spicer, the White House press secretary, on Tuesday about why, if he really believed there was widespread vote fraud, the president did not order an investigation, Mr. Trump on Wednesday morning blasted out a Twitter message saying he would do just that.

More than any president before him, Mr. Trump is a creature of television and social media, a reality show star obsessed with Nielsen ratings who vaulted himself to the highest office in the land on the back of a robust Twitter account.

President Lyndon B. Johnson kept three televisions in the Oval Office so he could watch all three network nightly news broadcasts at the same time. But with the advent of the 24-hour cable television era, other presidents have made a point of shielding themselves from the nonstop chatter to avoid becoming too reactive.

President George W. Bush always said he avoided watching television news. ("Sorry," he would tell television correspondents with a sheepish grin.) Mr. Obama opted

instead for ESPN's "SportsCenter" late at night.

Mr. Trump, on the other hand, while not much of a book reader, is a voracious consumer of broadcast and social media, and it clearly guides his actions. Examples abound.

One morning in November after the election as he was preparing to become president, Fox News aired a segment at 6:25 a.m. on college students burning the American flag.

At 6:55 a.m., [Mr. Trump wrote](#): "Nobody should be allowed to burn the American flag — if they do, there must be consequences — perhaps loss of citizenship or year in jail!"

Similarly, posts about the high cost of a new [Air Force One](#) and the [F-35 fighter jet](#) came soon after news reports rather than policy briefings.

So far at least, Mr. Trump has shown that he does not believe in the restraints other presidents put

on themselves. After the Dow Jones industrial average surpassed the 20,000 mark on Wednesday, Mr. Trump's staff-managed official Twitter account sent out a message declaring it "Great!" even though other presidents made it a policy not to comment on daily market gyrations.

The Chicago declaration provided a case in point. A threat to send federal forces into one of the nation's largest cities — Mr. Trump did not specify whether he meant

the National Guard, the F.B.I. or any other agency — is usually not one issued lightly. During [Hurricane Katrina](#), Mr. Bush spent crucial days privately debating with aides whether to federalize the National Guard in Louisiana.

Mr. Trump sees little need for such deliberations before weighing in. This is, as he put it in his Inaugural Address, "the hour of action." Whether the action will now follow the words remains uncertain less than a week into his presidency.

POLITICO Trump's sister weighs in on Supreme Court pick

By Shane Goldmacher

The idea that Trump's sister, Judge Maryanne Trump Barry, is among the president's judicial counselors makes some Republicans nervous. | AP Photo

The president's older sibling serves on a federal appeals court with Judge Thomas Hardiman, one of the two leading contenders to fill the vacant Supreme Court seat.

One of President Donald Trump's two leading finalists to fill the vacant seat on the Supreme Court, Judge Thomas Hardiman, has a quiet but influential ally in the high-stakes legal drama: Trump's sister.

Judge Maryanne Trump Barry, who serves with Hardiman on the U.S. Court of Appeals for the 3rd Circuit, has spoken to her brother in favor of elevating him to the high court, according to two people familiar with the conversations.

Story Continued Below

"Maryanne is high on Hardiman," said one adviser who has spoken directly with the president about the matter.

That he would rely on input from his family for a key decision is hardly surprising. He's installed his son-in-law, Jared Kushner, as a senior adviser with a West Wing office. He's taken cues on childcare policies from his daughter Ivanka Trump, who's married to Kushner. And Trump gave all his adult children speaking slots at the Republican National Convention, and has entrusted his two oldest sons, Donald Jr. and Eric Trump, with his most prized possession during the presidency: his company.

Since November, Trump has narrowed his

Supreme Court choices down from a list of 21 potential picks he announced during the campaign. He interviewed at least three finalists in New York prior to moving into the White House, including Hardiman, 10th Circuit Judge Neil Gorsuch and 11th Circuit Judge Bill Pryor.

People familiar with the search process have said that Hardiman, 51, and Gorsuch, 49, have [emerged as the frontrunners](#) to replace the late Justice Antonin Scalia, with Pryor's chances fading in recent weeks due to opposition from the evangelical community. Trump has said he plans to name a justice next week.

A second Trump adviser said that while Barry has unquestionably backed Hardiman, her support has not been determinative: "I don't think it is fair to say the only reason he's got juice on the list is because of her."

A third official who's been involved in the process said winning support from Trump's family has been one of the key elements of the search.

Barry, 79, is a well-respected judge who was first appointed to a federal district court more than three decades ago by President Ronald Reagan. President Bill Clinton elevated her to the appeals court in 1999, and she assumed senior status there in 2011. Hardiman joined the 3rd Circuit in 2007.

"They are regularly sitting together, deciding cases together, participating together in oral arguments," said appellate lawyer Matthew Stiegler, who also writes a blog about the Third Circuit.

Stiegler was among those who see Barry's hidden hand behind the steady ascent of Hardiman, who

was among the [lesser-known judges under consideration](#).

"Judge Gorsuch is a judge who was on a lot of conservative radar screens a year ago and I don't know if the same could necessarily be said of Judge Hardiman," he said. Of Hardiman's new place on the Supreme Court shortlist, he added: "I think one good explanation for that is that [Trump's] sister regards him very, very highly."

The idea that Trump's sister — who was [attacked](#) by Sen. Ted Cruz during the 2016 primaries as "a radical pro-abortion extremist" — is among the president's judicial counselors makes some Republicans nervous. Even if they're happy with the finalists he is currently considering, they don't view her as a reliably conservative judge.

"I'm hoping she's not part of the team making the decision," said Carrie Severino, chief counsel of the Judicial Crisis Network, a group that plans to spend millions of dollars getting Trump's choice confirmed.

Yet Severino said she'd be satisfied if Hardiman is Trump's pick. "There are no wrong answers among the people he's choosing between," she said. "If she wants to throw in 'Tom Hardiman is a wonderful colleague,' fine."

Gwenda Blair, a Trump biographer who interviewed both Barry and Trump in the early 1990s, said the two siblings "seemed close" and called Barry "very solid, feet on the ground — nothing like him."

"He certainly seemed to respect her," Blair added, noting Trump would point out her judgeship with "great pride."

Hardiman has plenty of conservative and legal credentials. He won over gun-rights supporters with a notable 2013 dissent about handgun permits. Leonard Leo, who's advised Trump on Supreme Court selection told POLITICO earlier this week that Hardiman is "an extraordinarily talented and smart jurist" who has "a very direct and understandable writing style."

Senate Minority Leader Chuck Schumer has threatened to block any Trump Supreme Court pick he doesn't like. He voted to confirm Hardiman, who was elevated to the appeals court in a 95-0 vote. Sen. Dianne Feinstein, the ranking Democrat on the Judiciary Committee, also voted in favor of confirming him.

Gorsuch was confirmed by a voice vote. In contrast, Pryor was confirmed in a contentious 53-45 roll call.

While Gorsuch has the traditional Supreme Court pedigree — a clerk for two justices, Harvard Law School, a stint at the Justice Department, service as a federal appellate judge — Hardiman has a more unusual path that could appeal to Trump's more populist streak.

It has been widely reported that Hardiman was the first in his family to go to college, at Notre Dame, and his law degree is from Georgetown, not Yale or Harvard, as is typical for the court. He also drove a taxicab to help put himself through school.

"He loves a gripping personal story," one of the people involved in the court search said of Trump.

The New York Times
Savage

Leaked Draft of Executive Order Could Revive C.I.A. Prisons

Mark Mazzetti and Charlie Savage

WASHINGTON — It contained crossed-out phrases and typos. It said that the Sept. 11 attacks occurred in 2011, rather than a

decade earlier. It was clearly not meant for public consumption.

But the draft of a Trump administration executive order that spilled into public view early Wednesday — a document that

raised the prospect of reviving C.I.A. "black site" prisons like those where terrorism suspects were once detained and tortured — has the potential to further fracture a national security team already divided over one of the most controversial policies of the post-9/11 era.

The White House disclaimed the document, which was leaked to The New York Times and other news organizations, but three administration officials said the White House had circulated it among National Security Council staff members for review on Tuesday morning. And many of its proposals — which also include halting transfers out of the Guantánamo Bay prison and sending new detainees there, which President Barack Obama refused to do — echo years of Republican national security policy and President Trump's own speeches.

But Mr. Trump's most extreme campaign proposal for terrorism suspects — bringing back torture, which the draft order does not call for but hovers over in its direction to review reinstating a C.I.A. interrogation program — has been disavowed by senior members of his team, most notably Defense Secretary James N. Mattis. Mr. Mattis has long opposed some of the aggressive interrogation methods used during President George W. Bush's administration, and in his recent confirmation hearing, he said that the military should use only interrogation methods contained in the Army Field Manuals.

At a Democratic caucus retreat on Wednesday, Senator Mark Warner of Virginia, the top Democrat on the Intelligence Committee, told colleagues that both Mr. Mattis and Mike Pompeo, the [newly installed C.I.A. director](#), had told him they had no knowledge of the draft order before it became public, according to another senator present at the retreat.

For his part, Mr. Trump said on Wednesday, as he had several times during the presidential campaign, that he thought torturing terrorism suspects was justified. But in an [interview with ABC News](#), the president also said he would defer to Mr. Mattis and Mr. Pompeo.

"I will rely on Pompeo and Mattis and my group," Mr. Trump said. "And if they don't want to do, that's fine. If they do want to do, then I will work toward that end. I want to do everything within the bounds of what you're allowed to do legally.

But do I feel it works? Absolutely, I feel it works."

Lasting Scars

Articles in this series examine the American legacy of brutal interrogations.

Asked about the draft order during a press briefing on Wednesday, Sean Spicer, the White House press secretary, said that it was "not a White House document" and that he had "no idea where it came from." He complained about "reports" being published attributing documents to the White House that are not White House documents."

But the three administration officials familiar with the document, who discussed internal deliberations on the condition of anonymity, portrayed that account as false. They said the White House had circulated the draft order among national security staff members in the same way that a flurry of other pending executive orders had been distributed for review: with no warning and scant time to provide comments.

One of the officials said an email chain showed that at 8:41 a.m. on Jan. 24, a clerk had sent the draft order as an attachment to several National Security Council policy staff members, who forwarded it to others. The clerk works on the administrative staff of retired Lt. Gen. Keith Kellogg, the chief of staff and executive secretary of the National Security Council.

The subject line referred to the memo as Package 0048. Addressed to the council's legal, counterterrorism and defense units, the email said: "Please review the attached draft EO. Comment/concurrence due by 10 A.M. Thank you." Neither the email nor the draft order said who, or which office, had drafted the order.

Defense Secretary James N. Mattis has also disavowed torture as an interrogation tactic. Stephen Crowley/The New York Times

Asked whether that sequence of events was accurate, a supervisor to the clerk referred a reporter to the White House press office. But Mr. Spicer did not respond to an email that laid out the draft order's movements through the White House bureaucracy, and that sought clarity about why he had said it was not a White House document.

[BuzzFeed reported](#) later in the day that the draft order appeared to have been derived from one prepared in 2012 by legal and policy

advisers to Mitt Romney, the Republican presidential nominee, that presented options on detainee policies. But the wording had been revised to account for subsequent legal and geopolitical developments and to add explicit references to radical Islam.

The apparent internal debate over the language and substance of the executive order reflects a political struggle, more than a decade old, over the proper rules for American detention and interrogation.

Until the Sept. 11 terrorist attacks, official American policy in both Republican and Democratic administrations prohibited the use of physical pain and coercion in interrogations and banned secret detention. The United States regularly condemned other countries for using such methods.

Got a confidential news tip?

The New York Times would like to hear from readers who want to share messages and materials with our journalists.

But after the attacks, the Bush administration decided that the threat from Al Qaeda justified dropping those standards and working on "the dark side," as Vice President Dick Cheney famously put it. The result was secret detentions at overseas "black sites" run by the C.I.A. There, interrogation teams tortured prisoners through extreme sleep deprivation, exposure to cold, forced nudity, confinement in coffinlike boxes, wall-slammings, chaining in painful stress positions and waterboarding, all of which administration lawyers claimed was lawful under a disputed legal theory.

After interventions by Congress and the Supreme Court, the Bush administration backed away from most of its extreme measures and transferred C.I.A. detainees to the prison at Guantánamo. Mr. Obama formally closed the unused black sites and shut down the program, requiring all government interrogators to adhere to the Army Field Manuals.

Mr. Obama's decision drew recurring criticism from hawkish Republicans, who said it put the United States at greater risk of terrorist attacks. Many, including Mr. Trump, also attacked him for declining to characterize the enemy in religious terms. This sentiment was reflected in the draft executive order, which said that in the "fight against radical Islam, the United States has refrained from exercising certain authorities critical to its defense."

From there, it noted Mr. Obama's decision to ban C.I.A. interrogation techniques and his efforts to shutter the Guantánamo prison — a pledge he was not able to carry out because of opposition from Republicans.

Still, just as detainee transfer restrictions enacted by Congress blocked Mr. Obama from carrying out his plan to close the prison, anti-torture laws enacted by Congress — including a 2015 act that requires adherence to Army Field Manual interrogation techniques and gives the International Committee of the Red Cross access to all wartime detainees — pose obstacles to any effort by Mr. Trump to return to using torture.

In a nod to those laws, the draft order would rescind Mr. Obama's executive branch directives, like those barring the C.I.A. from operating prisons, but it would not immediately reinstate the C.I.A. detention and interrogation program. Instead, it would direct executive branch officials to review detention and interrogation policy and make recommendations, including on whether to propose changes to the law.

During his recent confirmation hearing, Mr. Pompeo was unequivocal when asked whether he would comply with an order by Mr. Trump to reinstate the C.I.A.'s brutal interrogation methods.

"Absolutely not," he answered. "Moreover, I can't imagine that I would be asked that."

But in written answers to the committee after the hearing, Mr. Pompeo did not rule out the possibility of asking Congress to relax interrogation limits "if experts believed current law was an impediment to gathering vital intelligence to protect the country."

On Wednesday, some Republicans and many Democrats reacted angrily to the draft executive order, saying they would not stand for any attempt to circumvent or weaken laws against torture.

"Even the suggestion that we may bring back these discredited policies does serious damage to our international standing and will make our allies in the fight against terror wary about cooperating with us," said Representative Adam B. Schiff of California, the top Democrat on the House Intelligence Committee. "I will do everything in my power to ensure that these grievous mistakes of the past are never repeated."

White House draft order calls for review on use of CIA 'black site' prisons overseas

<https://www.facebook.com/profile.php?id=729171040>

An executive order apparently drafted by the Trump administration calls for a policy review that could authorize the CIA to reopen "black site" prisons overseas and potentially restart an interrogation program that was dismantled in 2009 after using methods widely condemned as torture.

[The document](#), a copy of which was obtained by The Washington Post, would revoke former president Barack Obama's decision to end the CIA program and would require national security officials to evaluate whether the agency should resume interrogating terrorism suspects.

The unsigned draft represents the clearest signal from President Trump that he intends to at least explore ways to fulfill campaign vows to return the CIA to a role that supporters claim produced critical intelligence on al-Qaeda but that ended in a swirl of criminal investigations, strained relationships with allies, and laws banning the use of waterboarding and other brutal interrogation tactics.

[\[What are 'black sites'? 6 key things to know about the CIA's secret prisons overseas.\]](#)

The proposal also puts a renewed focus on the military detention center at Guantanamo Bay, Cuba, saying it should be used for newly captured prisoners. No detainee has been sent there since Obama took office in 2009 and attempted to close the facility.

(Whitney Leaming/The Washington Post)

The Trump administration has apparently drafted an executive order calling for a policy review that could authorize the CIA to reopen "black site" prisons overseas and potentially restart an interrogation program that uses torture. On Wednesday, White House press secretary Sean Spicer said he doesn't know where the document came from. The Trump administration has apparently drafted an executive order calling for a policy review that could authorize the CIA to reopen "black site" prisons overseas and potentially restart an interrogation program that uses torture. On Wednesday, White House press secretary Sean Spicer said he doesn't know where the document came from. (Whitney Leaming/The Washington Post)

White House press secretary Sean Spicer cast doubt on the provenance of the draft document Wednesday, saying that "it is not a White House document" and "I have no idea where it came from."

The document was provided to The Post by a person who said it had been circulated among agencies in Washington for comment. The immediate feedback, this person said, helped convince the White House counsel that the document needed wider distribution and review before being finalized. It was unclear which agencies received the document, but those with the most direct stake would include the CIA, the Pentagon, and the State and Justice departments.

It's not yet clear whether Trump will sign the draft order, or whether senior members of his administration who have been skeptical of such plans, including Defense Secretary James Mattis and CIA Director Mike Pompeo, were consulted.

Democratic lawmakers at a caucus retreat, including Sen. Mark R. Warner (Va.), ranking Democrat on the Senate Intelligence Committee, said that Mattis and Pompeo were caught off guard by the draft order.

Members of Congress denounced the draft order, which was first reported by the New York Times on Wednesday. Sen. John McCain (R-Ariz.) said that Trump "can sign whatever executive orders he likes. But the law is the law. We are not bringing back torture in the United States of America."

Human rights organizations expressed outrage.

The draft order "authorizes the CIA to restart their detention program, which was the source of so much of the torture that undermined our national security," said Elisa Massimino, president of Human Rights First. Those policies "made fighting the war harder and strengthened the resolve of our enemies. That's what's at stake here."

At a news conference Jan. 25, House Minority Leader Nancy Pelosi (D-Calif.) criticized a Trump administration order to review potentially reopening "black site" prisons overseas and restarting an interrogation program widely condemned as torture. Nancy Pelosi criticized a Trump administration order to review potentially reopening "black site" prisons overseas. (Reuters)

(Reuters)

The draft, labeled "Detention and Interrogation of Enemy Combatants," notes that the United States has "refrained from exercising certain authorities critical to its defense" in the war against terrorism, including "a halt to all classified interrogations by the Central Intelligence Agency."

[\[Read the draft of the executive order on CIA 'black sites'\]](#)

The document stops short of instructing the CIA to rebuild prisons or resume interrogating terrorism suspects. Instead it calls for reviews leading to recommendations to the president on whether he should "reinstate a program of interrogation of high-value alien terrorists to be operated outside the United States and whether such a program should include the use of detention facilities operated by the Central Intelligence Agency."

The order would vacate Obama's decisions to dismantle the CIA program during his first days in office and would restore a 2007 order issued by President George W. Bush that sought to salvage the CIA's ability to capture and hold terrorism suspects after it had abandoned waterboarding and other extreme tactics.

Any attempt to resume the CIA's use of coercive methods at overseas prisons would face major obstacles. Among them is whether another country would be willing to allow such a facility after those that did so more than a decade ago — including Lithuania, Poland and Thailand — faced international condemnation for their complicity.

CIA veterans have said the agency has no desire to return to an assignment that continues to have damaging repercussions. A lawsuit against the architects of the program has forced the agency to release embarrassing documents, including [internal memos showing that some employees were deeply troubled by the interrogation program from the outset](#).

"I just have to think there would be huge resistance and pushback," said John Rizzo, the former acting general counsel of the CIA. "I think, personally, it would be a huge mistake for CIA to get anywhere near a new detention and interrogation program given the years of histories and controversies and investigations."

The order would also presumably face opposition from senior figures in the Trump administration. Mattis, in particular, has argued against deviating from the techniques outlined in the Army Field Manual, a position that Trump said had caused him to reexamine his views after discussing the issue with Mattis in November.

The draft executive order, which states that it shall be implemented "consistent with applicable law," would not overturn any law banning torture. The 2016 National Defense Authorization Act reaffirmed laws limiting interrogation techniques to those used in the Army Field Manual and barring "the use or threat of use of force."

Some legal experts cast the draft order as part of moves by Trump, including his [plan to limit visas](#) from Muslim countries, as cynical political gestures designed to energize his most ardent supporters while changing little in practice.

"The president would get a huge symbolic boost with his base while not violating the law and while changing nothing of substance," [Jack Goldsmith](#), a former head of the Justice Department's Office of Legal Counsel and a Harvard Law School professor, said in an interview. "He would get maximum symbolic value while doing nothing. Trump's a genius at this."

But Goldsmith, who as the OLC chief rescinded some of the Bush administration's torture memos, also predicted that Trump would "regret" this executive order, if it is issued, and that the "symbolic bang that Trump sought would backfire" on the administration.

The document acknowledges that existing laws provide "a significant statutory barrier to the resumption of the interrogation program."

Congress's authorization of the fiscal 2016 defense budget turned into law sections of Obama's 2009 executive orders on detention and interrogation. It prohibits the use of any interrogation techniques not authorized or listed in the Army Field Manual on anyone in the custody of or controlled by any agency or employee of the U.S. government.

The law requires that the manual itself must be available to the public and that the International Committee of the Red Cross be notified and given "prompt access" to anyone detained in an armed conflict by any agent of the U.S.

government, including contractors and subcontractors.

[\[The rise and fall of the CIA's secret overseas prisons\]](#)

The draft order copy obtained by The Post contains editing marks and significant errors, including a reference to “the atrocities of September 11, 2011,” missing the

actual date of the 2001 attacks by a decade.

Some of the edits seem driven by a political impulse to distance Trump's administration from those of Obama and Bush. Trump frequently accused Obama of being reluctant to call certain attacks “radical Islamic terrorism.” Edits to the draft add references to “Islam.”

The phrase “global war on terrorism,” coined by the Bush administration, is also struck out and replaced with “fight against radical Islamism.”

There are other problematic assertions in the draft. It states, for example, that more than 30 percent of the detainees released from Guantanamo Bay “have returned to

armed conflict.” But statistics from the Office of the Director of National Intelligence, which tracks detainee matters, suggest that figure is closer to 18 percent.

Karen DeYoung, Ellen Nakashima, Missy Ryan, Ed O'Keefe and Julie Tate contributed to this report.

**The
New York
Times**

Editorial : ‘I Think Islam Hates Us’

The Editorial Board

Another draft executive order would allow the C.I.A. to revive the once-secret program under which terrorism suspects were interrogated in “black site” prisons overseas, which were shut down by Mr. Obama in 2009. The order would also re-examine the use of torture, which was widely condemned in the Bush era and is opposed by Mr. Trump's own defense secretary.

Mr. Trump would also keep open the prison at [Guantánamo](#) Bay, which Mr. Obama tried to close, and reportedly is considering designating the Muslim [Brotherhood](#), which is involved in Muslim politics in a number of countries, as a terrorist organization. Some experts see the move as a chance for the Trump administration to limit Muslim political activity in the United States. But since President Recep Tayyip Erdogan of Turkey, a NATO ally, sympathizes with the Muslim Brotherhood, such a step would further complicate that fraught alliance.

Taken together, Mr. Trump's plans would damage America's credibility as guardian of human rights, anger allies and undermine civil liberties at home. They will also inspire fear in law-abiding Muslims everywhere, but especially

those in America, whose help is crucial to identifying and pre-empting young people tempted by extremism.

At the C.I.A. meeting, Mr. Trump hinted at a yet more radical step. During the campaign, he often lamented that America did not take possession of Iraq's oil after the 2003 invasion. On Saturday, he went further and said “maybe we'll have another chance,” suggesting he may be considering another invasion to seize Iraq's oil, a violation of international law. Such a move, against an ally no less, could incite extremist attacks against the United States. Mr. Trump seemed not to realize that ISIS gets most of its oil revenue from Syria.

Sources of Inspiration

To understand Mr. Trump's thinking, one might look to his national security adviser, retired Lt. Gen. Michael Flynn, author of the book “The Field of Fight.” Mr. Flynn was fired from his job as head of the Defense Intelligence Agency in the Obama administration. He has trafficked in fake news and been part of the world of conspiracy theorists who trade in fantasies that [Shariah law](#) is being imposed on Americans.

A fearful tone permeates Mr. Flynn's book, which warns, “We're in a world war against a messianic mass movement of evil people,

most of them inspired by a totalitarian ideology: Radical Islam.” For Mr. Flynn and fellow radicals, the fight isn't against a small number of religious fanatics who seek to attack the West and its Arab allies, but an entire religion.

Mr. Obama and former President George W. Bush generally agreed that terrorists had perverted the teachings of Islam, not that Islam was the problem. For them and most national security experts, containing terrorism meant focusing on individuals and groups that were intent on doing harm to America — namely Al Qaeda and groups like ISIS — while not turning all Muslims into the enemy.

Not so Mr. Trump, who said last year, “I think Islam hates us,” and Mr. Flynn, who has decried Islamism as a “vicious cancer.” Both Mr. Flynn and Sebastian Gorka, the national security editor at the alt-right website Breitbart News, who may be considered for a position in the Trump administration as a counterterrorism adviser and wrote a book titled “Defeating Jihad,” characterize “radical Islam” to be as grave a threat as Hitler in [World War II](#) and the Soviet Union in the Cold War.

In his book, Mr. Flynn labels as extremist enemies a wide range of groups, including not just Sunni Muslim groups like ISIS and Al Qaeda, but countless others and

many countries, like North Korea, Shiite-majority Iran, China, Syria, Venezuela and Russia. Mr. Flynn seems to be advocating a shotgun approach toward a target that requires precision.

Mr. Flynn also hints that the battlefield could expand beyond current conflicts in the Middle East, writing that “we must engage the violent Islamists wherever they are” and promising “severe consequences” for Saudi Arabia and other countries if they continue aiding terrorist groups. He is especially alarmed about Iran and argues that Washington “should consider how to change Iran from within.”

The president has a responsibility to defend the country against extremist threats, but the ideas of Mr. Flynn and others, if adopted, seem like a recipe for endless world war. It is especially hard to see how destabilizing Iran, one of the few intact countries in the Middle East, would advance American interests at a time the region is in chaos.

The United States undoubtedly must find more effective ways to defeat terrorists, including by undermining their message. If Mr. Trump can do that, it will be to his credit. But to a great extent success will depend on long-term cooperation from Muslim leaders and allies.

**The
Washington
Post**

Draft executive order would begin ‘extreme vetting’ of immigrants and visitors to the U.S.

By Abigail Hauslohner and Karen DeYoung

The Trump administration plans to start vetting would-be immigrants and visitors to the United States based partly on their opinions and ideology, and will immediately cease the resettlement of Syrian refugees in the United States, according to a [draft executive order](#) leaked Wednesday to civil rights advocates and obtained by The Washington Post.

The order, if enacted, would signal the beginning of the “extreme vetting” that President Trump

promised on the campaign trail, as well as partial implementation of the “Muslim ban,” according to civil rights advocates.

The order calls for an immediate 30-day halt to all immigrant and nonimmigrant entry of travelers from certain countries whose citizens “would be detrimental to the interests of the United States.” Once signed, it would allow those with visas to be turned away at U.S. airports and other entry points.

The countries — designated under several provisions of law that have already singled them out for

terrorism links — include Iraq, Iran, Syria, Yemen, Sudan, Libya and Somalia. While all are Muslim-majority countries, the list — and the ban — do not include Saudi Arabia, Egypt, Jordan and numerous other Muslim-majority countries.

(Zoeann Murphy/The Washington Post)

After fleeing war in Syria and living in Jordan for two years, the Jbawi family came to America through the U.S. Refugee Resettlement Program. They are optimistically building a new life in Baltimore while

keeping an eye on the national conversation about Muslim refugees. After fleeing war in Syria and living in Jordan for two years, the Jbawi family came to America through the U.S. Refugee Resettlement Program. They are optimistically building a new life in Baltimore while keeping an eye on the national conversation about Muslim refugees. (Zoeann Murphy/The Washington Post)

Additionally, all refugee admission and resettlement would be halted for 120 days — and until further notice, from Syria — while vetting procedures are reviewed. Once

restarted, annual refugee admissions from all countries would be cut from the currently authorized level of 100,000 to 50,000.

Asked Wednesday about the draft, White House press secretary Sean Spicer said actions dealing with refugees and other U.S. admissions would be signed later in the week, and “as we get into implementation of that executive order, we will have further details.” Trump’s “guiding principle,” he said, is to prevent entry to “people who are from a country that has a propensity for doing harm.”

Civil rights and refugee advocates immediately expressed alarm over the policies, and said that the news has thrown groups that handle refugee resettlement and immigrant rights — including U.N. agencies — into disarray.

“These actions taken by Donald Trump are tantamount to a Muslim ban,” Abed A. Ayoub, the legal and policy director for the American-Arab Anti-Discrimination Committee, said during a Wednesday conference call with refugee and immigrant advocates and journalists. “Regardless of how they try to frame it . . . this is the Muslim ban that was promised by him on the campaign trail.”

In justifying its actions, the order states that “hundreds of foreign-born individuals have been convicted or implicated in terrorism-related crimes since September 11, 2001.”

Most terrorist or suspected terrorist attacks since 9/11 have been carried out by [U.S. citizens](#). The 9/11 hijackers

hailed primarily from Saudi Arabia, as well as the United Arab Emirates, Egypt and Lebanon — all U.S. allies, and none of which would be affected by the immediate ban.

Since the emergence of the Islamic State in 2014, federal prosecutors have also charged [106](#) people in connection with the group, many of them for planning to travel from the United States to Syria or Iraq to join it. It is unclear how many were foreign-born.

Along with ending all Syrian refugee resettlement “until such time as I have determined that sufficient changes” have been made to vetting programs, Trump’s order directs the secretaries of state and defense to deliver within 90 days a plan to provide “safe areas” inside Syria and “in the surrounding region” where displaced Syrians can await “firm resettlement, such as repatriation or potential third-country resettlement.”

Waivers to the ban on refugees and overall priority for admission would be given to those claiming religious persecution, “provided that the religion of the individual is a minority religion in the individual’s country of nationality.”

Some Republican lawmakers have called for special protection for Christians, Yazidis and other religious minorities fleeing the Islamic State, although the vast majority of those killed and persecuted by the militants are Muslims.

Additional provisions under the order, entitled “Protecting the Nation from Terrorist Attacks by Foreign Nationals,” would require all

travelers to the United States to provide biometric data on entry and exit from the country, instead of current entry-only requirements. It would immediately suspend a waiver system under which citizens of certain countries where U.S. visas are required do not have to undergo a face-to-face interview at a U.S. consulate.

The entry-exit requirement resembles provisions previously in place under the National Security Entry-Exit Registration System (NSEERS), the registry program that targeted mostly Muslim men and which the Department of Homeland Security ultimately found to be redundant with existing protocol, and ineffective for identifying terrorists.

As president, Barack Obama dismantled the legal framework for the NSEERS program. But Shoba Wadhia, a clinical professor of law at Penn State University and the director of its Center for Immigrants’ Rights Clinic, described the draft executive order’s provisions as “NSEERS on steroids.”

“It definitely far exceeds what we saw with NSEERS,” she said. “NSEERS itself was a complete disaster. It had no security value; it really overwhelmed government offices and officials who were unprepared.”

A key question for U.S. courts, if the order is challenged, will be whether the new policies exceed the reasonable boundaries of the president’s executive authority on immigration or violate portions of the Constitution, legal experts say.

The draft order instructs the U.S. government to screen visa applicants for their ideologies. “In order to protect Americans, we must ensure that those admitted to this country do not bear hostile attitudes toward our country and its founding principles,” the draft order reads.

The order says the United States should screen visa applicants to block access to those “who would place violent religious edicts over American law” and those who “engage in acts of bigotry or hatred” including “honor” killings, violence against women, and persecution on the basis of religion, race, gender and sexual orientation, a description that human rights groups say also appears to be geared toward Muslims, without naming Islam explicitly.

Joanne Lim, the senior legislative counsel to the American Civil Liberties Union, said the wording “raises the prospect of ideological tests for admission to the U.S.” It could potentially be used to screen out critics of U.S. policy, and could violate Americans’ First Amendment right “to hear from speakers that oppose the government’s official views.”

In addition to questions about what they will do, whom they will see and how they will pay for a U.S. visit, visa applicants can be asked if they seek U.S. entry to engage in terrorism or other illegal activities, and whether they have committed or been convicted of crimes. Those requesting immigrant or permanent residence status are also asked about Communist Party membership.



Editorial : Trump’s politicized immigration acts are at odds with American values

<https://www.facebook.com/washingtonpostopinions>

IN A brief [appearance Wednesday](#) at the Department of Homeland Security, President Trump went out of his way to paint illegal immigrants as dangerous predators, making no distinction between the relative few who have committed serious crimes and the vast majority of an estimated 11 million who have led peaceful and productive lives in this country, in most cases for more than 15 years. Intoning the names of family members whose loved ones were killed by undocumented immigrants, he asserted their plight had been ignored, and ordered that an office be established at DHS to help the victims of such crimes, thereby adding social services to the department’s core security mission.

By that act of political theater, and by hailing the leaders of two DHS unions that endorsed him, the new president managed to politicize public safety, [even as he declared](#) that “when it comes to public safety, there is no place for politics.”

Mr. Trump also made clear he is willing to throw billions of dollars at a problem that has mostly been fixed, paying for ostensible solutions that won’t do much good: construction of a wall and the hiring of 5,000 new Border Patrol officers, as well as many additional Immigration and Customs Enforcement officials.

Today’s Headlines newsletter

The day’s most important stories.

Please provide a valid email address.

In fact, the nation’s southern border is already well staffed with Border Patrol agents, whose numbers have [more than doubled](#), under Presidents George W. Bush and Barack Obama, since the Sept. 11 attacks. The number of illegal crossings is [near a 40-year low](#). If the goal is really to make the border even more secure, better technology would be the way to go. If Congress goes along, a lot of money will be wasted, given cost estimates for the wall alone well in [excess of \\$10 billion](#) — but it won’t be the first time the U.S. government has managed to mispend vast sums.

Far more damaging, to American principles and the nation’s standing in the world, would be actions outlined in a [draft executive order](#), apparently awaiting Mr. Trump’s

signature, that would drastically curtail the United States’ commitment to accept refugees from Muslim-majority countries in the Mideast, especially Syria, most of whom are fleeing terrorism. Such refugees should be subject to extensive background checks and other vetting before being granted U.S. visas — as they already are. But a blanket ban would compromise this nation’s long-standing position as a sanctuary for desperate and innocent people. As a backdoor way for Mr. Trump to partially make good on his [proposed Muslim ban](#), it also would be an affront to this country’s status as an example of religious tolerance.

Kerwin and Aldel : Trump's vetting plan would weaken U.S. security

By Donald
Kerwin and
Edward Aldel

By Donald Kerwin and Edward Aldel January 25 at 7:33 PM

Donald Kerwin is executive director of the Center for Migration Studies and editor of the Journal on Migration and Human Security. Edward Aldel is a senior fellow at the Council on Foreign Relations and author of ["The Closing of the American Border: Terrorism, Immigration and Security Since 9/11."](#)

"There is always a well-known solution to every human problem," [H.L. Mencken wrote](#). "Neat, plausible, and wrong." Such is the case with President Trump's plans to temporarily halt the flow of refugees to the United States and bar travelers from certain Muslim countries. What could be neater and more plausible than cracking down on people from terrorism hot spots to ensure that no terrorists are admitted to the country?

Yet as Trump and the country may painfully relearn, effective screening to protect homeland security requires good intelligence and close cooperation with allies to identify genuine threats. The crude alternatives the president advocates will weaken that cooperation, damage U.S. diplomacy and leave the United States more exposed to terrorism.

The United States has made this mistake before. After Sept. 11, 2001, the Bush administration launched a series of initiatives to block the entry of people from Muslim-majority countries as a security measure

to prevent follow-on attacks. The most sweeping was the National Security Entry-Exit Registration System, or [NSEERS](#), in which nearly all male immigrants and travelers from two dozen Muslim-majority nations and North Korea faced what could be called "extreme vetting"; each time they tried to enter the United States, they were pulled aside for hours of secondary screening and forced to undergo intrusive questioning by border officials. Those already living here had to register with the government, face similar questioning and prove their lawful status.

Read These Comments

The best conversations on The Washington Post

Please provide a valid email address.

If he follows through with [a draft executive order](#), titled "Protecting the Nation from Terrorist Attacks by Foreign Nationals," [obtained by the press](#) on Wednesday, Trump's approach would be similarly indiscriminate. The draft order calls for shutting down all refugee processing for several months, barring refugees from Syria and then cutting admissions in half over the next year. It also would temporarily bar all travelers from countries thought to pose a high security risk, reportedly including Syria, Iraq, Iran, Libya, Somalia, Yemen and Sudan, and would place restrictions on sensible risk-management measures such as waiving visa interviews for low-risk travelers. It includes a threat to withhold visas from countries deemed insufficiently cooperative.

Like NSEERS, these new restrictions, if carried out, would target many legitimate travelers and upset relations with important allies in the war on terrorism. Secretary of state nominee [Rex Tillerson testified](#) this month that "one of our greatest allies in this war is going to be the moderate voices of Muslims." Colin Powell, who was secretary of state as NSEERS was implemented after 9/11, spent many hours soothing the bruised feelings of allies who felt wrongly targeted.

Should the orders go forward, Tillerson will face the same sort of protests, and they will come not just from the targeted countries themselves. Close allies such as Germany and even Canada, which has opened the door to Syrian refugees, will rightly feel that the United States is not sharing the burden of the humanitarian crisis in the Middle East.

The proposed measures would also impair the ability of intelligence and law-enforcement agencies to gain cooperation from targeted communities in the United States. Closer cooperation between the FBI and American Muslims, for example, is one reason the United States has not faced another major terrorist attack since 9/11. The revival of crude initiatives to block entry to the United States by other Muslims would jeopardize those relationships.

The example of NSEERS should weigh heavily. For all the disruption it caused, NSEERS did not lead to a single terrorism-related prosecution. The best the 9/11 Commission could say was that its counterterrorism benefits were ["unclear"](#) and it may have had some

deterrent effect. Former Immigration and Naturalization Service commissioner James Ziglar [said the program](#) "caused us to use resources in the field that could have been much better deployed" and "we got nothing out of it."

The approach apparently being prepared by the Trump team would be especially wrongheaded given the enormous advances in security screening over the past decade. Scrutiny of visa applicants is far better than it was before 9/11. Overseas visitors are now fingerprinted and photographed, in order to check their identities against terrorist databases. The government further ensures identity through secure travel documents, runs robust checks against immigration, criminal and terrorism databases, and targets people with suspicious travel or other patterns. And, the multiyear U.S. vetting and screening process for refugees, many of them fleeing terrorism, is more thorough and exhaustive than any other admissions process to the United States.

All these systems were developed to create maximum safety with minimum disruption to lawful travel. Instead of recognizing and building on those advances, Trump is calling for country-by-country bans on travel to the United States that would cause maximum disruption and compromise U.S. safety.

By bringing back these kinds of measures, Trump would be embarking on a path that failed before and would only weaken America's diplomacy and its security. The White House should learn the lessons of that history and change course.

Chicago Welcomes Federal Help on Violence, But Balks at National Guard

Shibani Mahtani

Jan. 25, 2017 2:36 p.m. ET

CHICAGO—Chicago and Illinois officials said they would welcome more federal help in [addressing the city's violence](#), including in prosecuting repeat gun offenders, but noted their existing partnerships with federal agencies and ruled out extreme measures such as sending in the National Guard.

Chicago Police Superintendent Eddie Johnson said Wednesday that his department is "more than willing" to work with the federal government to build on existing partnerships with agencies including the Justice

Department, Federal Bureau of Investigation, Drug Enforcement Administration and the Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, Firearms and Explosives to "boost federal prosecution rates for gun crimes."

The superintendent was responding to [a Tuesday night tweet by President Donald Trump](#) vowing to "send in the Feds" if Chicago's violent crime rate continues to rise. Before being sworn in as president, Mr. Trump also tweeted that Chicago Mayor Rahm Emanuel "must ask" for federal help if crime doesn't drop in the city, which saw 762 murders last year and over 4,000 shootings.

Chicago police already work with the various agencies, particularly in gun and drug raids, a spokesman for the department said, often when federal charges are involved or in cases where crimes cross state lines. The department also works with the U.S. attorney's office to bring charges in more cases and receives technical assistance from the Justice Department in implementing violence-reduction strategies.

White House spokesman Sean Spicer said in a media briefing Wednesday that the president has extended an offer of help and support to the city and that he could make federal resources

available to Mr. Emanuel, but "the return call for help hasn't occurred."

It is unclear what specific action Mr. Trump was suggesting in the tweet. Mr. Spicer said in the briefing that federal help could "span a range of things," including aid through the state's governor, Bruce Rauner, or the region's U.S. attorney. The president hopes "to get a dialogue started with Mayor Emanuel and try to figure out what a path forward will be," Mr. Spicer added.

The federal government can take a range of steps to reduce violent crime, including deploying FBI agents to help investigate homicides, [as was done in Oakland, Calif., and Baltimore](#), and increasing

funding to police departments to upgrade technology and hire additional officers.

Both the president and governors have the authority under federal law to call up National Guard troops in a variety of circumstances, according to a spokeswoman for the National Guard Bureau in Washington. But it would be an extraordinary step to do so without cooperation from the city and state—both of which have called it a bad idea.

Mr. Emanuel's office declined to comment beyond an interview he gave Monday evening to local television station WTTW. Mr. Emanuel said there was "a lot the federal government can do," including assisting police officers, working on gun control and helping on prosecution to secure tougher sentences for repeat gun offenders.

The federal government, he added, should also be committing resources to after-school programs,

summer jobs and mentoring programs to give those in minority neighborhoods "positive alternatives." African-American men have overwhelmingly been the offenders and the victims of the city's gun violence.

The Obama administration sent additional federal agents to Chicago in 2014 with the goal of curbing the number of killings, but murders have risen since then.

Much of the problem, according to experts, lies in the Chicago Police Department's struggle to solve murders. Chicago detectives are solving only about one out of four killings—a "clearance rate" far below the national average.

George Terwilliger, a former No. 2 official at the Justice Department, said Mr. Trump's tweet could lead the federal government to more aggressively prosecute gun suspects in the U.S. system, as a means of giving them longer prison

sentences, and that, in turn, [could encourage witnesses to come forward to solve crimes](#).

"When it comes to gang violence right now, witnesses have no incentive to cooperate," Mr. Terwilliger said. "They have legitimate reasons to fear for their safety. When the really dangerous people start getting locked up, then witnesses can have the confidence to come forward."

Chicago's surge in violence has been among the most dramatic of any major American city in recent years, reaching levels not seen since the crack wars of the mid-1990s. None of the five largest American cities have witnessed a single-year homicide increase over the past quarter-century that rivals that of Chicago's 58% rise in homicides in 2016 from the year before.

Still, [Chicago doesn't have the highest murder rate](#) in the country.

Other cities, including Baltimore, St. Louis and Detroit, have more people killed per 100,000 residents.

Mr. Trump's tweet came a day after Mr. Emanuel criticized the new administration for its focus on the crowd size at the president's inauguration, saying that his election should be about "lives" and "jobs," not about crowd sizes.

Mr. Emanuel has also said there is no need for police departments to return to tactics like "stop-and-frisk"—police stopping people in high-crime areas to pat them down even if they aren't suspected of a crime—which Mr. Trump has advocated as a solution to gun violence.

—Devlin Barrett contributed to this article.

Write to Shibani Mahtani at shibani.mahtani@wsj.com

THE WALL STREET JOURNAL

Mac Donald : In Chicago, 'the Feds' Are Part of the Problem

Heather Mac Donald

Updated Jan. 25, 2017 7:52 p.m. ET

President Trump repeated his vow Tuesday to "send in the Feds" if the authorities in Chicago are unable to quell the violence there. His sense of urgency about what he rightly labels the "carnage" in Chicago is welcome. By contrast, President Obama last year dismissed the rising homicides nationwide as a mere "uptick in murders and violent crime in some cities."

Some uptick. Fifty-four people were shot in Chicago last weekend alone, six fatally. That brings the homicide total so far this year to 42, up from 34 during the same time last year, according to the [Chicago Tribune](#). Comparing 2016 with 2015, homicides were up 58% and shootings were up 47%. Last year's shooting victims included two dozen children 12 or under, including a 3-year-old boy now paralyzed for life.

Mr. Trump is right to draw attention to the growing toll, but he is wrong about what the federal government can do to fix it. His call to "send in the Feds" is ambiguous, but the phrase seems to suggest mobilizing the National Guard. Doing so would require the declaration of a national or state emergency. However gruesome the bloodshed, there is little precedent for mobilizing the National Guard to quell criminal gang violence.

Civil order has not broken down in the Windy City; local authorities

continue to deliver basic services in the gang-infested South and West sides. The homicide rate, relative to population, is higher in Detroit, New Orleans and St. Louis. If Mr. Trump or his defense secretary, James Mattis, is going to declare Chicago a national emergency, those other cities deserve the same. And although Mayor Rahm Emanuel has asked Mr. Trump for money, it's unlikely he'd welcome troops.

If Mr. Trump's reference to "the Feds" means federal law-enforcement officers, they're already there. Local police in Chicago work on joint task forces with agents from the FBI, Drug Enforcement Administration and Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, Firearms and Explosives. The Trump administration could—and should—direct the U.S. attorney in Chicago to rigorously prosecute federal gun crimes, a focus that withered under President Obama's denunciations of "mass incarceration" for minorities. But such a reorientation is a longer-term matter.

Policing is overwhelmingly a local function. As much as Mr. Trump, to his credit, wants to ensure that children living in inner cities enjoy the same freedom from fear and bloodshed as those in more stable neighborhoods, Washington has few law-enforcement levers to achieve that goal directly.

What Mr. Trump can do is end the federal government's unjustified intrusions into local crime-fighting. He can start by announcing that his Justice Department will suspend

negotiations with Chicago over a federal consent decree for the city's police department.

A week before Inauguration Day, President Obama's Justice Department released a shoddy report declaring the Chicago police guilty of a pattern of unlawful force. That report lacked the most basic statistical integrity and transparency; it failed to disclose any data that justified its conclusion. The feds recycled fabricated calumnies about the department, such as the outrageous claim that officers in Chicago do not care about solving black-on-black crime. It found police racism through the usual trick of ignoring crime rates.

Yet Mayor Emanuel has said, based on that ungrounded report, that he intends to sign a federal consent decree to put the Chicago police under a Justice Department monitor. Doing so would redirect scores of officers from fighting crime to writing reports. Federal monitors have an insatiable appetite for paperwork. Chicago taxpayers would likely face hundreds of millions of dollars in compliance costs, money that could be better spent hiring more cops and drilling them on tactics and communication skills.

Mr. Trump and his prospective attorney general, Jeff Sessions, should tear up the Chicago report and declare that the federal government stands behind proactive policing. The right message: The Justice Department will be vigilant in monitoring police abuses, but it understands that

officers respond to the community's demands for safety and order. Those demands come most fervently from high-crime areas, whose law-abiding residents beseech the police for freedom from drug dealers and unruly youth gangs. Messrs. Trump and Sessions should make clear that police officers need no longer fear that stopping and questioning people engaged in suspicious behavior will draw the condemnation of the federal government.

Thanks to the constant charge from the media and the previous administration that proactive policing is racist, 72% of law enforcement officers in a nationwide Pew [poll](#) last year said they had become less willing to question people engaged in suspicious conduct. In Chicago, pedestrian stops fell more than 80% in 2016, while narcotics arrests, a good measure of proactive policing, dropped 43%. The result of that reluctance in 2015 was the largest national homicide increase in nearly 50 years. Once the data are fully analyzed, a similar increase for 2016 seems likely.

Candidate Trump denounced the false narrative that policing was lethally racist. The best thing for now that President Trump can do for violent cities is to halt negotiations for a consent decree with Chicago and thereby show that the federal government rejects the false narrative.

Higgins and Kerpen : The President Opens the ObamaCare Escape Hatch

Heather R. Higgins and Phil Kerpen

Jan. 25, 2017 7:25 p.m. ET

Just hours after taking office, President Trump signed an executive order directing federal agencies to "waive, defer, grant exemptions from, or delay" any provision in ObamaCare that burdens individuals, families and insurers—and nearly anyone else who could be affected. This order takes full advantage of the vast discretion built into the law, which enabled President Obama to rewrite ObamaCare on the fly. Mr. Trump's move is much more than a symbolic gesture, and it is the first step toward repealing ObamaCare.

While the details will likely wait until after Tom Price is confirmed as health and human services secretary, the Trump administration has already moved toward making it easier for Americans to buy health-insurance plans prohibited by ObamaCare.

The executive order's language—stopping anything in the law that creates "a fiscal burden on any State or a cost, fee, tax, penalty, or regulatory burden"—should be music to the ears of congressional Republicans. They have been

struggling with Senate procedural rules regarding reconciliation, which likely preclude repealing ObamaCare's cost-increasing insurance regulations without Democratic support, while still allowing the repeal of the law's mandates and subsidies.

Why does this matter? Insurance companies cannot presently afford to sell the policies people actually want. The law imposes a \$100-a-day penalty on insurers for every person to whom they sell a noncompliant policy. That effectively limits the individual market to nothing but ObamaCare-compliant plans, with premiums and deductibles driven sky-high by the law's regulatory burdens. For many, even ObamaCare subsidies can't keep up with these increasing costs.

Enacting a partial repeal—that is, ending features like the individual mandate and the subsidies to insurance companies—risks accelerating the collapse of ObamaCare before an alternative is available. It also does nothing to provide any near-term relief to those currently hurting under the law.

Mr. Trump's executive order allows Congress to move confidently forward with repeal, knowing that

the prohibitive \$100 penalty will be waived, and therefore vestigial regulations will not be an impediment to the immediate buying and selling of ObamaCare-exempt plans. The Trump administration has effectively signaled that it will use the Obama administration's precedent of allowing noncompliant plans—remember "keep your plan" transition relief?—to create a parallel market where consumers can finally find plans they want and can afford.

Congress would be wise to add two components to the baseline repeal bill. First, a statutory change codifying the suspension of penalties for selling ObamaCare-exempt plans. That would calm the compliance departments at insurance companies, which may otherwise be hesitant to enter a line of business on the basis of executive nonenforcement alone.

Congress should also fund state health-innovation block grants. This would give the Trump administration a powerful carrot in encouraging states to create more-responsive insurance markets, including authorizing ObamaCare-exempt plans under state law. The funds would also address the need to spread the burden of high-cost

individual pre-existing condition coverage among all taxpayers, rather than forcing their costs to be borne only by those in the individual market, a feature which has helped drive premiums sharply higher.

The Trump administration has made very clear it will act—regardless of whether Congress does. Transition relief allowing the creation of ObamaCare-exempt individual markets is only one step toward solving the country's many health-care problems. The broader debate over replacing ObamaCare and reforming the health-care system will continue for some time. But these early moves are crucial to providing ObamaCare's hardest hit victims quick relief. States and insurance companies should move with the same urgency that the Trump administration has shown. It's time to allow the choices that people want also to be the choices they have.

Ms. Higgins is president of Independent Women's Voice. Mr. Kerpen is president of American Commitment.



Sen. Isakson: Price is right

Johnny Isakson
Published 5:33 p.m. ET Jan. 25, 2017 | Updated 12 hours ago

Laughter erupts at Price's hearing as heal...

Laughter erupted during a tense Senate confirmation hearing when President Donald Trump's health nominee was asked if it's true that the new administration is close to having a final health care plan, as Trump himself has hinted. (Jan. 24) AP

Tom Price, right, and Sen. Johnny Isakson testify on Jan. 24, 2017. (Photo: Andrew Hamik, AP)

When President Trump announced his selection of Dr. Tom Price to serve as secretary of the Department of

Health and Human Services (HHS), I applauded the choice.

Who better to lead one of our nation's top health agencies than a physician and a public servant who has a real plan to replace a failing health care law that is hurting Americans?

Tom Price has devoted himself to working on a better health care plan that will bring relief to millions of Americans, and that's on top of his decades of public service as a former state legislator, a member of Congress representing Georgia's sixth district since 2005 and chairman of the House Budget Committee. In terms of his qualifications and preparation for the job of HHS secretary, his fitness to serve is indisputable.

Tom Price knows health care, knows how to work through the legislative process, and has enjoyed bipartisan success with his proposals.

Tom's experience as chairman of the House Budget Committee will be invaluable as he manages the \$1.1 trillion budget at HHS.

And after 30 years of friendship and working together, I can say that Tom is absolutely trustworthy and accountable.

Every day, I hear from people in my state who are struggling because of Obamacare's high premiums, high costs and lack of choices. Sadly, Obamacare's defenders are trying to distract the American people from this failure by smearing the character of a good man who is ready to offer real solutions.

It is a shame that a man who has offered himself up for public service and complied with every ethics rule and disclosure requirement was singled out as a target for partisan political games from practically the moment he was nominated. This type of over-the-top attack and insinuation, to create perceptions that simply aren't reality, is precisely the kind of "politics as usual" that Americans are tired of, and it's why so many good people refrain from public service.

Dr. Tom Price is the right man, at the right time, for the right job.

Sen. Johnny Isakson, R-Ga., is chairman of the Senate Select Committee on Ethics and the Senate Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

Collins : Mike Pence Pulls President Trump's Strings

Gail Collins

So when it comes to combating the Zika virus in South America, we'll

only be helping organizations that are willing to order their staffs never to bring up the fact that abortion exists. We're talking about a

potential loss of billions of dollars in American aid.

I know some of you are having trouble giving the president credit for anything right now. But this doesn't sound like him.

If a woman Trump knew was pregnant and learned she had a virus that could cause terrible brain damage to the fetus, his immediate reaction would not be barring everybody from mentioning the word abortion. The only politician who would behave like that would be someone who had spent his entire career trying to impose his deeply held conservative religious values on people who had different beliefs.

That would be Mike Pence. This is the guy who, as a member of Congress, co-sponsored a bill that would allow hospitals to deny abortions to pregnant women who would die without the procedure. Whose war against Planned Parenthood when he was governor of Indiana [led to](#) the closing of five clinics. (None of them did abortions. They did, however, provide testing for sexually transmitted diseases, and one of the counties where a clinic was closed suffered a big H.I.V. outbreak.)

**The
Washington
Post**

Lane: Trump can't break the Supreme Court

By Charles Lane

President Trump [plans to nominate](#) a replacement of Justice Antonin Scalia next Thursday, so Americans of all political stripes have a week to work themselves into a frenzy over the Supreme Court's future — or to keep a sense of perspective.

I vote for the latter. To be sure, it won't be easy for Democrats. Liberal bitterness is both palpable and justifiable, because the vacancy Trump is about to fill might not exist if Senate Majority Leader Mitch McConnell (R-Ky.) had not announced within seconds (or so it seemed) of Scalia's death last February that he would [not permit consideration](#) of anyone then-President Barack Obama named prior to the election.

McConnell didn't budge [even when Obama chose](#) the eminently qualified and eminently moderate Judge Merrick Garland.

McConnell's gambit was a raw power play — to put it charitably — with scanty precedent at best. That it paid off infuriates progressives even more: Before November, Democrats could look forward to years, maybe decades, of at least a five-vote majority of Obama and Hillary Clinton appointees on the court, given the likelihood that liberal Justices Ruth Bader Ginsburg (83) and Stephen G. Breyer (78) would retire in a first Clinton term. A sixth liberal to replace 80-year-old moderate conservative Anthony M. Kennedy was possible, too.

Pence, by the way, also voted against the Lilly Ledbetter act for equal pay for women. He once argued that having two working parents would lead to "stunted emotional growth" in children. In 2006, he said same-sex couples were a sign of "societal collapse." I am just mentioning this for you to remember the next time you hear people say they hope President Trump is impeached.

Trump was once very vocally pro-choice. When he became politically ambitious, his attitude went through a dramatic change — in terms of evolution, it was as if a little amoeba floating in the ocean suddenly turned into a killer whale. In 2016 he went all the way over the deep end and told Chris Matthews on MSNBC that he thought once abortion was illegal, women who got them should be punished.

He backtracked on that one. "I've been told by some people that was an older line answer and that was

an answer that was given on a, you know, basis of an older line from years ago on a very conservative basis," he explained.

Obviously that doesn't make any sense, but you do get the general idea that Trump was getting his talking points from someplace other than his deepest heart.

The early Trump administration, however, looks as if it's being run by somebody who can't wait to jump into the abortion fray. Republicans in Congress are working away on defunding Planned Parenthood — an organization Trump once said he admired. And the Affordable Care Act, which guarantees women's right to get birth control coverage in their health insurance, is of course target one.

"Women who are economically stressed and counting on those benefits are so frightened," said Cecile Richards, the president of [Planned Parenthood](#). Richards said

Planned Parenthood clinics are fielding desperate calls from women who want to get birth control while they can — many of them opting for IUDs under the theory that they'll need something that could last four years.

They also ask what they can do to fight back. She's telling them to call their senators, or member of Congress, and show up if their legislator holds a town hall — possibly wearing one of those pink hats.

All that makes perfect sense. But given the kind of guy Donald Trump is, I propose you also spread the word that the president has only gone on this anti-reproductive rights bender because he's under Mike Pence's thumb.

How do you think he'd feel about being referred to as Lap Dog Trump? Let's go for it.

A 5-4 — or 6-3 — liberal-majority Supreme Court could have reigned over federal courts that have already tilted left after eight years of Obama appointments. A second Warren court was at hand: Foreseeable results included abolition of the death penalty, solidified transgender rights, strengthened gun control, increased power for federal environmental regulators and, in response to Black Lives Matter, stricter constitutional scrutiny of the police.

President Trump planned to meet with Senate leaders on Tuesday, Jan. 24, to discuss his nominee to serve on the Supreme Court and said he planned to announce his choice next week. President Trump planned to meet with Senate leaders on Tuesday, Jan. 24, to discuss his nominee to serve on the Supreme Court and said he planned to announce his choice next week. (Reuters)

(Reuters)

So when Senate Minority Leader Charles E. Schumer (D-N.Y.) [threatens to](#) fight "tooth and nail" against an "out of the mainstream" Trump pick, perhaps keeping the court split between four Democratic and four Republican appointees, he is expressing both his party faithful's fear of what a Trump pick would do, and their grief over what might have been.

The stakes aren't necessarily apocalyptic, though, at least not immediately. If confirmed, a Trump-anointed conservative would simply restore the *status quo ante* Scalia's

death: an evenly divided court with Reagan appointee Kennedy as a persuadable swing vote.

As long as it lasts, such a court probably wouldn't move the law abruptly right. Kennedy's a staunch friend of gay rights; he's on record, albeit grudgingly, in favor of two essential liberal goals, upholding *Roe v. Wade* and affirmative action in college admissions.

And it might last a while. Certainly Ginsburg, Breyer and Kennedy could make it through a first Trump term. In 2020, Democrats get another shot at the presidency and, with it, the power to pick justices.

There's also the possibility — which, to be sure, the right will do its best to prevent — that a Trump appointee deviates from conservative orthodoxy on the bench. That's been true of GOP picks from Harry Blackmun, the Nixon appointee who wrote *Roe*, to — yes — Scalia, who famously upheld a constitutional right to burn the American flag in protest and occasionally proved a stickler about certain rights of criminal defendants.

Chief Justice John G. Roberts Jr. sided with the court's liberals in refusing to strike down Obamacare amid the 2012 presidential campaign, an act of judicial statesmanship that earned him undying opprobrium on the right — if not much in the way of offsetting appreciation from the left.

Roberts tried to keep the court aloof from the brutal politics of the past year. He declined to weigh in on the

Garland controversy; he and his colleagues defused various controversial cases and [minimized tie votes](#), which affirm the lower court's ruling but set no precedent. That can't go on indefinitely, however.

Politically comprehensible and — given the party base's feelings — inevitable though they may be, Democratic efforts to block Trump from getting at least one Supreme Court pick through the GOP-controlled Senate are probably doomed.

Whether they fail after an attempted Democratic filibuster provokes the GOP to eliminate that procedural obstacle for Supreme Court nominations is pretty much up to Schumer.

What's not guaranteed to fail, however, are any and all progressive arguments presented to the court during what could be a Trump appointee's long life tenure on the bench.

Life tenure is part of the court's problem, in that it raises the stakes of each vacancy. On the plus side, it can promote political independence.

The Supreme Court has never achieved perfect independence, actual or perceived; and it certainly doesn't possess it now.

Still, our constitutional system can't function without such independence as the court can retain. Preserving it is a long-term struggle, in which the pending nomination fight may be crucial but not necessarily final.



E. J. Dionne Jr : What's the method in Trump's madness?

<http://www.facebook.com/ejdionne>

Is Trumpism a scam? And if so, whom is Donald Trump scamming?

Or is the country confronting something even more troubling: a president unhinged from any realities that get in the way of his impulses, unmoored from any driving philosophy and willing to make everything up as he goes along, including ["alternative facts"](#)?

Of course, there's another possibility: that there's a method in all of this.

[Read These Comments](#)

The best conversations on The Washington Post

Please provide a valid email address.

In his first days, Trump has been riding policy horses that seem to be moving in quite different directions. On the one hand, he has continued to make himself out as a "populist" standing up for workers by [scrapping the Trans-Pacific Partnership](#) and bringing verbal pressure on American companies to keep or create jobs in the United States.

On the other, he has been promising corporations the moon. He has already delivered a [freeze on regulations](#), imposed a [gag order](#) on many federal agencies that businesses see as getting in their way (notably the Environmental Protection Agency) and promised steep tax cuts.

President Trump told leaders of companies

ranging from Lockheed Martin Corp. to Under Armour that he believes his administration can cut regulations governing companies by 75 percent or more, at a meeting on Jan. 23 at the White House. Trump promises to cut business regulations in meeting with executives (Reuters)

(Reuters)

At a meeting with industry leaders Monday, he sounded like a standard-issue conservative Republican on steroids, [insisting that](#) "we are going to be cutting taxes massively" and promising to cut regulations by 75 percent or "maybe more."

Yet he also said he would impose a "very major" border tax to discourage companies from moving jobs outside the United States.

In principle, it's possible that Trump is returning to the days of William McKinley and Calvin Coolidge. From the 1890s to the Great Depression, Republican presidents pursued policies that were simultaneously pro-business and protectionist.

McKinley won votes from industrial workers in his reelection campaign of 1900 by arguing that he had delivered ["The Full Dinner Pail."](#) Trump could be following McKinley's lead, as Coolidge did. "Cheap goods," [Silent Cal said](#), "meant cheap men."

But it's also possible that he will offer mostly words on one side of this equation and a lot of benefits on the other. Given the proclivities of the Republican Congress, his agenda on taxes and regulation is far more likely to sail through

Washington than are his plans for moving jobs home. And so far, his announcements about jobs "kept" in the United States under his pressure have been largely symbolic, involving relatively small numbers in an economy where [152 million people](#) are working.

The world of finance seems to be wagering that Trump's pro-corporate side will dominate. On Wednesday, the [Dow Jones industrial average broke 20,000](#) for the first time in its history.

Still, all of this assumes coherence and discipline, two words not readily associated with Trump. He has now put his presidency behind a lie, that [3 million to 5 million illegally cast ballots](#) cost him the popular vote. He went further Wednesday, despite widespread criticism, even from within his own party. In a morning tweet, he said he'd ask for ["a major investigation into VOTER FRAUD,"](#) using those Trumpian capital letters.

Here again, Trump set off a debate between madness and method. The most obvious conclusion is that we are confronting yet another case of his bizarre insecurity. He's furious that even though he is president, his enemies are denying him a popular mandate because he lost to Hillary Clinton by 2.9 million votes. But voting rights advocates fear that he is laying the groundwork for extensive voter-suppression efforts aimed at making voting far more difficult for Latinos, African Americans and others hostile to him.

Similarly, some of his new [executive orders on immigration](#), including one pledging to build the border wall

that has become his trademark, could be read as more show than substance. But his moves against "sanctuary cities," along with his at times harsh rhetoric Wednesday at the Department of Homeland Security, had more ominous implications.

If there is any consistency here, it lies in the right-wing nationalism of his senior adviser Stephen K. Bannon. He hopes to marry broadly conservative economic policies with protectionism, restrictions on immigration, and new infrastructure and military spending.

It's not exactly reassuring that this is the best spin that can be put on Trump's opening days. And the president's apparent belief that he can make up realities of his own choosing parallels the practice of authoritarian leaders, past and present. It's no accident that [George Orwell's "1984" hit the top of Amazon's best-seller list](#) on Wednesday.

In his State of the State message this week, California's Democratic Gov. [Jerry Brown may have offered](#) the thought most subversive to Trumpism. "Above all," Brown declared, "we have to live in the truth."

Read more from [E.J. Dionne's archive](#), [follow him on Twitter](#) or [subscribe to his updates on Facebook](#).



Kristof : President Trump's War on Women Begins

Nicholas Kristof

Should we journalists use the word "lie" to describe President Trump's most manifest falsehoods?

That debate has roiled the news world. The Times this week used the word "lie" in a [front-page headline](#), and I agreed with that decision, but there's a counterargument that lying requires an intention to deceive — and that Trump may actually believe his absurd falsehoods.

So in 2017 we reach a mortifying moment for a great democracy: We must decide whether our 45th president is a liar or a crackpot.

Yet the costliest presidential falsehoods and delusions are not the ones that people are talking about, such as those concerning the inauguration crowd or electoral fraud. The most horrific chicanery involves Trump's new actions on women's health that will cause deaths around the globe.

It followed the weekend's stunning women's marches: At least [3.2 million people](#) apparently participated in all 50 states, amounting to 1 percent of the U.S. population. In a slap at all who marched, Trump this week signed an order that will cut off access to contraception to vast numbers of women, particularly in Africa.

It will also curb access to cancer screenings and maybe even undermine vaccination campaigns and efforts against H.I.V. and the Zika virus. The upshot: Thousands of impoverished, vulnerable women will die.

Americans have focused on the executive actions about building a wall, or expediting oil pipelines, but nothing is more devastating than the edict on women's health (signed in front of a group composed almost entirely of smiling men in suits).

In fairness, Trump probably thought he was doing a good thing; that's a measure of his delusion. He reinstated what's called the Mexico City policy, which stipulates that

family planning funds cannot go to foreign aid groups that ever discuss abortion. (Federal funds already don't go for abortions.)

Presumably Trump thought this policy would reduce abortions, and was thus "pro-life." In fact, this is a "pro-death" approach that actually increases abortions, as well as deaths among women.

How can that be? Many groups, like Marie Stopes International and Planned Parenthood International, lose funding in poor countries from this policy. In 2001, when President George W. Bush imposed a more limited version, 16 developing countries [lost shipments](#) of contraceptives from the U.S.

[Stanford University researchers found](#) that the Bush version of the policy reduced contraceptive use in Africa — and increased abortion rates.

This all sounds wonkish and antiseptic, but in poor countries, the most dangerous thing a woman can do is become pregnant. I've seen too many women dying or suffering in filth on stained cots in remote villages because of childbirth.

I wish Trump could see them: a mother of three in Cameroon dying after her birth attendant sat on her stomach to hasten delivery; a woman in Niger collapsing from a common complication called eclampsia; a 15-year-old girl in Chad whose family dealt with her labor complications by taking her to a healer who diagnosed sorcery and burned her

THE WALL STREET JOURNAL

Daniel Henninger

Updated Jan. 25, 2017 8:06 p.m. ET

During his candidacy, Donald Trump seemed to have not so much an agenda as a set of impulses, such as the wall. Other than [Twitter](#), there was little about Donald Trump that offered solid predictive value—no plan or ideological road map. His past tweets and comments about Vladimir Putin fogged up Rex Tillerson's nomination as secretary of state.

On its face, the Trump enterprise has looked chaotic. It may yet prove to be so. But less than a week into the Trump presidency, these impressions need revision.

The Rorschach-test period, with everyone reading their own interpretation into Mr. Trump's tweet blots, is ending. Mr. Trump's first week in office has been a torrent of policy announcements on ObamaCare, the Keystone and Dakota pipelines, the Asia free-trade deal and immigration.

It is time to set aside the numbing and exhausting preoccupation with Donald Trump, celebrity president, and start the hard work of seeing the substantive intent inside the Trump presidency—and deal with it. There is never going to be a clear lens into America's 45th presidency. We are all staring into the Trump kaleidoscope.

The Trump kaleidoscope has at least two reflecting surfaces. One is

arm as she lay in a coma.

With this new order, Trump will inadvertently cause more of these horrific scenes. Maybe "war on women" sounds hyperbolic, but not if gasping, dying women are seared in your memory.

President Trump signed a memorandum on Monday, freezing federal funding to health providers abroad who discuss abortion. Doug Mills/The New York Times

Worse, Trump expanded this "global gag rule" — as critics call it, because it bars groups from mentioning abortion — so that it apparently will cover all kinds of health services, including efforts to tackle polio or Zika or H.I.V., even programs to help women who have been trafficked into brothels. (The White House didn't respond to my inquiries.)

Henninger : The Trump Kaleidoscope

Trump Himself, a phenomenon that changes at every turn. The other is the Trump government, which is not going to break free of the American system's more stable institutional realities and constraints.

Those who believe Mr. Trump is unqualified or illegitimate will remain obsessively transfixed by Trump Himself, the man who delights in violating norms of politics and taste. The Democrats, or at least those who conduct their politics in the streets, appear fatally drawn to these Trump distractions.

A shrewder Democrat, say Chuck Schumer, understands that the Trump threat has less to do with Muslim bans, a wall or women but instead with discrete, identifiable policies that may weaken long-established sources of Democratic power and authority.

While the media focuses microscopically on the literal veracity of the Trump tweets, Mr. Trump and the real executors of his policy—Mike Pence, Reince Priebus, Steve Bannon, Kellyanne Conway—met Monday at the White House with a half-dozen private-sector union leaders. Representation by the modern Democratic Party's primary allies, public-sector unions, was zero.

Mr. Trump's virtually unnoticed new administrator for the Centers for Medicare and Medicare Services, the Indiana reformer Seema Verma, is a potentially serious disrupter of the reigning status quo. By contrast,

I hope all of the marchers call the White House, 202-456-1111, or their members of Congress, 202-224-3121, to protest.

Marie Stopes alone estimated that if it cannot find replacement funding, the new policy will result in 6.5 million unintentional pregnancies, 2.2 million abortions and 21,700 women dying in pregnancy or childbirth.

The victims invariably are among the most voiceless, powerless people in the world. When Bush imposed his version of the policy, it meant that no contraceptives reached a village in northern Ghana. As a result, a young woman named Kolgu Inusah [became pregnant](#).

She tried to abort the pregnancy herself using herbs, but something went wrong and she suffered

terrible abdominal pains. She was rushed to a clinic, but doctors couldn't save her. Her two children now have no mom.

President Trump, you may think you are "pro-life" and preventing abortions, but that's a lie or a delusion. In fact, you are increasing the number of abortions and of dying women.

And to those women and men who marched last weekend, remember that this isn't about symbols, speeches or pussy hats. It's about the lives of women and girls.

Please, please, keep on marching, keep on calling.

the demand for a voter-fraud "investigation" is a distraction.

The realization that the Trump agenda and its potential policy reforms (or failures) are becoming clearer is an opportunity for people to find an alternative to their yearlong preoccupation with Trump Himself.

Donald J. Trump and the Trump presidency, parallel universes, will always be putting a lot in motion. This week's output could be the new normal. There is no other option now than to recalibrate daily between the many, often confusing facets of this presidency, between the ever-present Trump Twitter feed and the daily drudge work of policy debate and implementation.

For scorched-earth Never Trumpers like actress America Ferrera or filmmaker Michael Moore the response to this complex challenge is simple: Resist everything.

For everyone else, from Doubtful Trumpers to Hopeful Trumpers, more productive ways of engaging with this presidency are opening up.

The media's mostly Manichaeian political model—bad forces arrayed against forces for good—is largely useless. The more productive if difficult path forward will require willing participants to pull out pieces of the Trump agenda and support them, refine them or, when necessary, resist. Full engagement with the Trump presidency doesn't mean simple assent or rote opposition.

The details inside Wednesday's announcement by White House Press Secretary Sean Spicer that the "wall" with Mexico of the Trump campaign will now be "a large physical barrier" reflects the myriad realities that are going to mediate constantly between Mr. Trump and the imperatives of producing a successful U.S. presidency.

Similar refinements from what we all first thought we saw on ObamaCare, Russia, trade policy, entitlements and the rest are also inevitable. There will be Trump wins, draws and losses.

It almost sounds normal, except that traveling through any of these issues will never be normal with the Trump presidency, for better or worse.

Better is considered to be Mr. Trump tweeting the auto industry into submission on overseas plants. Worse could come in foreign affairs if Trump Himself sets off a cascade of less controllable events on the Russian or Chinese peripheries.

This is going to be messy not because Donald Trump is messy but because our system, even when it's functioning, was designed to be difficult. For those who want to spend four years quaking before Mr. Trump's kaleidoscopic tweets, the future is predictable. For everyone else, the more familiar struggles of American governance have just begun.

Write henninger@wsj.com.

THE WALL STREET JOURNAL

Rove : Who Are the 'Obstructionists' Again?

Karl Rove

Jan. 25, 2017 7:32 p.m. ET

When Chuck Schumer, the Senate Democratic leader, complained that

"this cabinet selection has been a disaster," he was referring to

President Trump's choices. Mr. Schumer's words, however, better describe how congressional Democrats have mishandled the confirmation process.

The minority party always hopes to notch a victory or two. But rather than concentrating their fire on a few of Mr. Trump's more vulnerable picks, Democrats have gone after virtually every nominee. The result has been a clutter of messages that diluted the attacks and revealed the effort as nothing more than a massive political hit job.

Some overzealous Democrats damaged themselves in the process. One example is the salvo by Sen. Cory Booker (D., N.J.) against Sen. Jeff Sessions, nominated for attorney general. In 2015 Mr. Booker said that he was "blessed and honored to have partnered with Sen. Sessions" to sponsor the Congressional Gold Medal for the Selma civil-rights marchers. But now Mr. Booker has adopted a far different tone.

Mr. Sessions, formerly a U.S. attorney and Alabama attorney general, desegregated his state's schools and successfully prosecuted a Klan leader for murder. No matter. In confirmation hearings this month Mr. Booker asserted that Mr. Sessions would refuse to "pursue justice for

women," defend gays and lesbians, or stand up for voting rights. Mr. Booker offered not a shred of evidence in support. This smear was an ugly way for him (unofficially) to begin his 2020 presidential campaign.

Then there was the circus in the Senate Finance Committee over Steven Mnuchin's nomination for Treasury secretary. The usually thoughtful and mild-mannered Sen. Ron Wyden (D., Ore.) proved he makes a pathetic attack dog. To "assess your qualifications," Mr. Wyden demanded that Mr. Mnuchin lay out specific steps for strengthening Medicare and fighting terrorist financing. When the nominee demurred, but promised to scrupulously follow the law and work with the committee on needed changes, Mr. Wyden feigned outrage.

Contrast this with [Mr. Wyden's treatment](#) of President Obama's last Treasury nominee, Jack Lew, during his 2013 confirmation hearing. The senator asked Mr. Lew if he agreed Congress should stop making piecemeal changes to the tax code. "I hadn't actually thought about whether there was an approach like the one you described," Mr. Lew responded. "I'd be happy to have discussion with you about it." Mr. Wyden seemed satisfied.

Then the senator asked about an IRS determination on eligibility for ObamaCare tax credits. Mr. Lew sidestepped that, too, saying it was the IRS's decision but he would be "delighted" to discuss legislative changes with Mr. Wyden. The senator replied, "I appreciate your saying that you're going to work with me," and then moved on. Sen. Wyden's double standard is obvious.

Firebrand Sen. Sherrod Brown (D., Ohio) badgered Mr. Mnuchin over criticisms of his former bank by community groups, regulators and the office of the California attorney general. Mr. Brown read allegations and then asked Mr. Mnuchin to answer—"yes" or "no"—not whether the accusations were true, but whether they had been made.

Mr. Mnuchin, though rattled, took the sting out of the attack by taking time to put each statement in context. At one point, he undermined the hectoring: "These are complicated questions," he said. "Let me at least explain them, otherwise there is no point of shooting them all at me." Sen. Brown looked high and mighty.

Republicans didn't obstruct Mr. Obama's selections this way eight years ago. Seven cabinet members were approved the day he was sworn in, and four more within the

first week. Most of these were approved on voice votes, often unanimous.

By comparison, Mr. Trump appears likely to have only four nominees approved by the end of his first week in office. The confirmation of one, Mike Pompeo to lead the Central Intelligence Agency, was delayed over this past weekend after Democrats broke an agreement for a Friday vote. Mr. Schumer blamed this on his inability to control his caucus.

Absent a major scandal or a nominee's massive deficiency, a new president deserves to have his cabinet confirmed. Nothing disqualifying has surfaced about Mr. Trump's picks. Yet Democrats, traumatized by their November losses, suffer from Trump Derangement Syndrome and are refusing to give deference to his choices. They are lashing out, an approach that is emotionally cathartic but politically stupid, since they are appearing to obstruct simply for obstruction's sake.

Mr. Rove helped organize the political-action committee American Crossroads and is the author of "The Triumph of William McKinley" (Simon & Schuster, 2015).

THE WALL STREET JOURNAL

and Akane Otani

Updated Jan. 25, 2017 9:30 p.m. ET

The Dow Jones Industrial Average closed above 20000 for the first time Wednesday, fueled by a remarkable rally that began in 2009 as a bounce from the depths of the financial crisis, grew into a steady ascent and was then turbocharged by November's presidential election.

President Donald Trump's moves during his first week in office to promote infrastructure projects and cut regulation helped propel the 120-year-old index of 30 stocks over its latest milestone, as investors bet that he would follow through with business-friendly plans like cutting taxes and increasing government spending.

The Dow industrials raced past 20000 when the market opened Wednesday and held on to the gains throughout the session, closing up 155.80 points, or 0.8%, at 20068.51. The S&P 500 and Nasdaq Composite also reached records Wednesday.

Dow Closes Above 20000 for First Time

Aaron Kuriloff,
Corrie Driebusch

Applause, whoops and cheers erupted on the floor of the New York Stock Exchange as the market closed. "It's been a long time coming," said Peter Tuchman, a veteran floor broker at the NYSE, who wore a cap with "Dow 20,000" emblazoned on it for the occasion. "We're all excited, but exhausted."

The Dow took almost 103 years to reach 10000 in March 1999. Reaching 20000 required nearly 18 years more.

And the last part of that climb was swift: It took the blue-chip index just 42 trading days to jump from its first close above 19000 to 20000—the second-fastest thousand-point gain in the index's history, after its 24-day climb from 10000 to 11000 during the dot.com boom in 1999.

The Dow industrials notched their [first close above 19000](#) on Nov. 22, amid the postelection rally that has sent the index up 9.5% since Nov. 8.

The Dow has come a long way to get to 20000. Investors watched the U.S. stock market lose trillions of dollars in value twice—when the tech bubble burst in 2000 and during the financial crisis in 2008.

Even as indexes now soar, many investors urged caution. Interest rates are still relatively low, reflecting sluggishness in the global economy. Volatility has waned, and stocks are expensive compared with their historical levels—three signs that some investors say could herald a pullback.

It hasn't been a straight path upward for the Dow. The index rose 7% from the close on Election Day through Dec. 8, but then gains slowed as investors questioned the likelihood and timing of Mr. Trump's policies. A postelection climb in the dollar and Treasury yields also stalled in recent weeks.

The Dow made several attempts at 20000, including when it [touched 19999.63 on Jan. 6](#) but fell short each time—until Wednesday.

Investors piled into manufacturing stocks this week, providing some of the momentum that carried the index over the top, after Mr. Trump's moves to [revive oil-pipeline projects](#) and ease regulations signaled the first steps toward clearing the way for a surge in infrastructure spending.

Recent data showing an acceleration in U.S. economic

growth and an improvement in corporate earnings have also bolstered investors' outlook. Earnings for S&P 500 companies are expected to grow in the fourth quarter from a year earlier, according to analysts polled by FactSet. That would mark the second straight quarter of earnings growth after five quarters of contraction, according to FactSet.

"The gains are every bit as much that the economy is doing better and earnings are improving as it is a boost from hope for fiscal policies under Mr. Trump," said Bob Doll, senior portfolio manager with Nuveen Asset Management LLC, an investment firm based in Chicago.

Soaring shares of [Boeing Co. led Wednesday's gains](#) in the Dow industrials, with the aerospace company rising \$6.81, or 4.2%, to \$167.36 after beating expectations for earnings in the final quarter of the year.

Boeing's gain alone contributed more than 901 points of the Dow's last 10,000-point gain, surpassed only by [3M Co.](#) whose gains added more than 1156 points. [International](#)

[Business Machines](#) Corp. added 813 and [Caterpillar](#) Inc. 740.

But [bank shares are responsible](#) for much of the Dow's rise since Election Day. Many consider the health of the sector to be intertwined with that of the economy because of the fundamental role banks play in facilitating the flow of money and say the recent gains indicate that the nearly eight-year bull market can keep going.

The KBW Nasdaq Bank Index of large U.S. commercial lenders has soared 24% since Election Day, reflecting the prospect of higher interest rates and less-stringent regulation, which could ease some of the pressure lenders have faced since the financial crisis. The yield on the benchmark 10-year Treasury note is back above 2.5% after it fell to 1.366% on July 8, the lowest level on record, though rates are still low by historical standards. Yields fall as bond prices rise.

Gains in [Goldman Sachs Group](#) Inc. and J.P. Morgan Chase & Co. together accounted for more than a quarter of the postelection point gain made by the Dow, a price-weighted measure that means the bigger the stock price, the larger the sway for a component.

Goldman joined the index in 2013, making it a relatively new entrant to the average that made its debut in 1896 with 12 "smokestack" companies, including Tennessee Coal & Iron, U.S. Leather and [General Electric](#) Co. (which was removed and restored along the way but is the only original component in the current index). Technology companies including [Microsoft](#) Corp.

and [Intel](#) Corp. were added in the 1990s, while companies such as Bethlehem Steel and Woolworth dropped out.

Wall Street Journal editors participate in selecting the stocks in the Dow, as they always have, though the index itself is now part of [S&P Global](#) Inc.

At stock brokerages across the country, traders said there were few cheers when the Dow hit 20000 on Wednesday morning. That mood was markedly different from 1999, when the Dow crossed 10000. Back then, the economy was booming, day traders abounded and stocks were roaring after Federal Reserve Chairman Alan Greenspan spoke of "irrational exuberance" in the market in 1996.

"Back in 1999, when we hit 10000, you couldn't stand here—you would've gotten run over," said Richard Barry, NYSE floor governor, who pointed to the trading floor where a few dozen traders stood executing orders Wednesday.

Some investors say milestones like 20000 deserve little attention.

"If you're in the market for a lifetime, which is the way people should be in it, it's a pleasant little thing, but no more than that," said John C. Bogle, founder of Vanguard Group, the Malvern, Pa.-based pioneer of low-cost, passively managed investment products.

The Dow Jones Industrial Average has risen 207% from March 2009, its low point during the financial crisis.

The 20000 mark has [left some analysts and investors cautious](#).

A gauge that tracks expectations for volatility in stocks closed at its lowest level since July 2014—a bearish indicator to those that view low levels as a sign of investors' complacency. The CBOE Volatility Index, based on prices of S&P 500 options that investors tend to buy when they fear stock declines, fell to 10.81 on Wednesday.

"The three components for the Trump plan we think are most meaningful for companies are tax policy, regulation and infrastructure investment," said Joseph Amato, chief investment officer of equities at asset manager Neuberger Berman. "As the prospects of policy changes in those three areas waxes and wanes, enthusiasm for stocks will build up or enthusiasm will recede," said Mr. Amato.

Many investors worried stocks were expensive even before the postelection run-up, given several recent quarters of weak earnings growth. Companies in the S&P 500 traded at roughly 21 times their past 12 months of earnings as of Tuesday, above their 10-year average of about 16, according to FactSet.

Mr. Trump's protectionist approach on trade has also raised concerns that such policies could hurt growth. On Monday, bonds rallied and stocks fell after Mr. Trump said the U.S. would impose a border tax on companies that move some operations overseas and he withdrew the U.S. from the Trans-Pacific Partnership, a trade deal he attacked during the campaign.

A strengthening dollar could also hurt earnings at multinational companies by making their goods

more expensive to buyers outside the U.S. The WSJ Dollar Index, which measures the U.S. currency against 16 others, fell 0.3% Wednesday but is up more than 3% since Election Day.

"The dollar is a real issue," said Russ Koesterich, co-portfolio manager of the BlackRock Global Allocation fund. "The protectionism is still an open question. We don't know how much of that we'll have and what form it will take."

The wait for 20000 paid off for Nicholas Tyburski, 37, and Jeff Coons, 51, neighbors from Bella Vista, Ark., who were selling red trucker hats on eBay with "Dow 20,000" back in early December.

When the Dow barreled through 20000 on Wednesday, Mr. Tyburski said the orders streamed in. At a little after noon Eastern Time, Mr. Tyburski said he had received about 100 orders at a rate of one every five minutes or so. He said the buyers were from all over the world: He will be shipping hats to Australia, England, Sweden and Malaysia.

"It's a remarkably strong market, but we knew that at 19999," said Mr. Bogle of Vanguard.

—Sarah Krouse contributed to this article.

Write to Aaron Kuriloff at aaron.kuriloff@wsj.com, Corrie Driebusch at corrie.driebusch@wsj.com and Akane Otani at akane.otani@wsj.com

THE WALL STREET JOURNAL

Editorial : The Promise of Dow 20000

Updated Jan. 25, 2017 7:48 p.m.

ET 19 COMMENTS

After weeks of flirtation, the Dow Jones Industrial Average finally broke through the 20000 barrier Wednesday, continuing this week's burst of investor confidence. The milestone is one more sign of animal spirits returning since Election Day, but Republicans will have to deliver on their pro-growth

policy promises to keep the rally going.

The Dow, bless its heart, climbed 0.78% on the day to close at 20068.51. More notable is that it took only 42 trading days for the Dow to climb the next 1000 points from 19000—a 5.26% rise. Less inspiring is to recall that the Dow reached 10000 way back in the ebullient days of 1999. It took some 17 years for the Dow to double,

which underscores how lousy the 21st century has been for economic growth and prosperity. That's what a financial panic, a deep recession and 2% expansion gets you, with all of their disappointments for 401(k)s, pension funds and the general sense of national well-being.

Stock prices are at bottom a bet on future earnings, so investors are clearly anticipating that the U.S. economy will break free of its

Obama 2% growth blues. Investors seem encouraged this week by President Trump's early moves, perhaps as much about his determination to move fast as about any specific policies. The withdrawal from Pacific trade was baked into prices, but the breakthroughs on pipelines and deregulation are perhaps coming faster than expected. Dow 20000 is a promise of growth to come, not a guarantee.

Bloomberg

Editorial : Dow 20,000 Is No Vote of Confidence

The Editors

There's always a fuss when the Dow reaches a nice, new, big, round number, as it did on Wednesday. The excitement is almost always overblown -- the market is more than the Dow Jones Industrial Average, the economy is

more than the market, etc. -- and this particular milestone comes with the potential for additional misinterpretation: Dow 20,000 does not necessarily amount to a vote of confidence in President Donald Trump's ability to deliver economic growth.

The Dow has gained about 10 percent since Trump was elected, and for good reason: His proposed [policies](#) would augment the stream of cash flowing to investors. Reduced corporate tax rates, for example, would leave more money to pass on to shareholders, while cuts in capital-gains rates would

allow them to keep more for themselves. The mere possibility of such a windfall offers investors ample motivation to bid up stocks.

More money for investors, though, doesn't automatically translate into more prosperity for everyone. Economic growth has been weak

since the recession of 2007 to 2009, in part because of very low levels of [capital investment](#). Companies would be more likely to increase this spending if Trump offered some specific enticements, or if they saw more demand for their goods and services.

On those fronts, the future is less clear. Stock investors tend to be relatively wealthy and hence less likely to spend each added dollar

they make, so their gains probably won't do much for demand. Companies, for their part, are getting conflicting signals: Lower taxes would of course be attractive, but Trump's public meddling in hiring and investment decisions might push in the other direction.

True, Trump's plan to increase government spending on roads, bridges and other infrastructure could boost growth more broadly

and even enhance productivity. Much will depend, though, on [execution](#). Uncontrolled deficit spending could spook markets and leave the country deeper in debt without providing much long-term benefit. There's still a lot of confusion about what will happen: Measures of [economic policy uncertainty](#) are hovering around their highest levels since Britain's vote to leave the European Union.

Dow 20,000 is certainly a welcome milestone for investors. But it's not the measure American workers will use to judge whether the president has delivered on his promise to improve their lot.

To contact the senior editor responsible for Bloomberg View's editorials: David Shipley at davidshipley@bloomberg.net.

The New York Times Felony Charges for Journalists Arrested at Inauguration Protests Raise Fears for Press Freedom

Jonah Engel Bromwich

Anti-Trump protesters being pepper-sprayed in Washington on Jan. 20. Jewel Samad/Agence France-Presse — Getty Images

At least six journalists were charged with felony rioting [after they were arrested](#) while covering the violent protests that took place just blocks from President Trump's inauguration parade in Washington on Friday, according to police reports and court documents.

The journalists were among 230 people detained in the anti-Trump demonstrations, during which protesters smashed the glass of commercial buildings and [lit a limousine on fire](#).

The charges against the journalists — [Evan Engel](#), [Alexander Rubinstein](#), Jack Keller, [Matthew Hopard](#), [Shay Horse](#) and Aaron Cantu — have been denounced by organizations dedicated to press freedom. All of those arrested have denied participating in the violence.

"These felony charges are bizarre and essentially unheard of when it comes to journalists here in America who were simply doing their job," said Suzanne Nossel, the executive director of Pen America. "They weren't even in the wrong place at the wrong time. They were in the right place."

Carlos Lauria, a spokesman and senior program coordinator for the Committee to

Protect Journalists, called the charges "completely inappropriate and excessive," and the organization has asked that they be dropped immediately.

"Our concern is that these arrests could send a chilling message to journalists that cover future protests," Mr. Lauria added.

The arrests and charges were reported by [The Guardian](#).

Witnesses reported that sweeping arrests during the parade targeted rioters, protesters and journalists indiscriminately. A lawyer representing dozens of people arrested, Mark Goldstone, [told The Associated Press](#) that the police had "basically identified a location that had problems and arrested everyone in that location."

The Metropolitan Police Department in Washington declined to comment Wednesday on why the journalists had been charged along with protesters.

Mr. Engel, a Brooklyn-based journalist who writes for [Vocativ](#), a media and technology outlet, was among those charged with felony rioting and released. He said by email on Wednesday that he was unable to comment on the case since it was active, but that he was looking forward to the day he could say more.

The document charging Mr. Rubinstein, who wrote for RT America, an affiliate of the Russian

state-run television network, is identical to that charging Mr. Engel: While it says that protesters carrying "anarchist flags" were observed smashing large plate-glass windows at businesses and setting a limousine on fire, it does not accuse any individual journalist of criminal activity.

Court documents for Mr. Keller — who works on the documentary series "[Story of America](#)" — and for Mr. Hopard, Mr. Horse and Mr. Cantu — who are independent journalists — included similar information.

Jeffrey Light, a lawyer based in Washington who has been working on civil rights and first amendment related cases for about a decade, has filed a lawsuit on behalf of 51 plaintiffs arrested that day against officers from the police department and the park police. The suit accuses the police of surrounding and arresting "not only protesters who had engaged in no criminal conduct, but also members of the media, attorneys, legal observers and medics."

Mr. Lauria, of the Committee to Protect Journalists, said it was all the more alarming that journalists had been arrested. "A car set on fire, windows broken in downtown businesses: I think that this is important information that the public needs to be informed about," he said.

He said his organization was concerned about what he called "the sharp deterioration of press freedom in the U.S.," which he linked to Mr. Trump's campaign, noting that the candidate had "obstructed major news organization, vilified the press and attacked journalists by name with unrelenting hostility."

All those actions were seen to contribute to a threatening climate for journalists covering the election.

The committee had sought to meet with Vice President Mike Pence during the transition, Mr. Lauria said, but that meeting never took place. "We've been in touch with aides, and we're talking about the possibility of having this meeting in the future," he said.

Ms. Nossel, of Pen America, also linked the charges to a climate fostered by Mr. Trump.

"Obviously we were girded for worrisome and troubling developments," she said. "But the speed, pace and ferocity of the attacks on journalists, the purveying of falsehoods, the silencing of government and agencies that interface with the public — for all that to happen in a matter of days puts us on notice that some of the worst fears may not have been so far-fetched."

Representatives of Mr. Trump did not immediately respond to an email seeking comment on Wednesday.

The Washington Post Editorial : Does the punishment for Inauguration Day protestors fit the crime?

<https://www.facebook.com/washingtonpostopinions>

"ZERO ARRESTS." That, according to interim D.C. police chief Peter Newsham, was the goal of law enforcement agencies going into last week's presidential inauguration. Preparing for the inevitable protests, officials had envisioned the use of citations to deal with infractions such as

crowding or failure to obey a police order. Instead, [more than 200 people were arrested](#) on felony rioting charges, raising the question of whether police acted appropriately.

All the facts are not known, and so the final answer must await the outcome of court hearings for those charged as well as review of official after-action reports and a federal

lawsuit brought against D.C. police and U.S. Park Police by some of the demonstrators. Any assessment, though, should not overlook that the number of people arrested was dwarfed by the [hundreds of thousands of people who came to the nation's capital](#) over two days and peacefully exercised their First Amendment rights without incident. That is a credit to the protesters and to police.

Nonetheless, legitimate concerns have been raised by free-speech advocates about Friday's mass arrest of demonstrators in the city's downtown and whether the tactics used were harsh and indiscriminate. Critics [have likened the arrest of 230 protesters](#) to the problematic sweep at Pershing Park in 2002 that ended up costing the city [millions of dollars in settlement payments](#) to

people whose rights had been trampled.

Evening Edition newsletter

The day's most important stories.

Please provide a valid email address.

Police counter that there are key differences between the two incidents, the foremost being the acts of violence that, according to Mr. Newsham, "[forced our hand](#)." Store windows were smashed, fires set and vehicles damaged in a rampage that caused destruction estimated in

excess of \$100,000. The U.S. Attorney's Office reviewed Friday's arrests, including studying videos from surveillance and police body cameras, and decided to proceed with felony charges under a city law that makes it unlawful for anyone to riot or incite or urge others to do so.

That there was a group intent on doing damage is undisputed. They came with hammers and crowbars and rocks. "I think there should have been more violence yesterday," [was the chilling confession](#) of one arrested person to a Post reporter. Police needed to act, and the fact that six of them

were injured, including some who were pelted with rocks and bricks, speaks to the difficulty of their jobs.

Could they, though, have been more strategic in identifying individual lawbreakers rather than corralling a whole group? Did their approach allow wrongdoers to escape while unnecessarily sweeping up those who were blameless, including journalists and legal observers? Was the use of force, including pepper spray, necessary? And is a charge punishable by up to 10 years in prison and a fine of up to \$25,000 appropriate, or simply a way to get

leverage for plea bargains on lesser offenses?

These are some of the questions that must be addressed in the after-action reports of the agencies that were involved in Inauguration Day protests. It is important that the information collected be shared with the public and that there is an independent review by the D.C. Council.

The New York Times

Yellin : How to Save CNN From Itself

Jessica Yellin

I became a devoted viewer of CNN in 1989, during its coverage of the standoff in Tiananmen Square. I remember my father telling me that the only reason the Chinese government didn't massacre those kids right away was because CNN had cameras on the scene.

From Tiananmen Square to the fall of the [Berlin Wall](#), from the [Exxon Valdez oil spill](#) to [Hurricane Katrina](#), CNN provided exhaustive live, on-the-ground reporting. Its saturation coverage has had such a profound impact that there's even a term for it: "the CNN effect," the power to shift policy and inspire empathy by keeping eyes on unfolding events.

Consider how far CNN departed from this model in the last election. Even though CNN has many able journalists prepared to report stories and talk to voters in communities across the country, its programs were dominated by pundits in Washington and New York squabbling over tweets and polls.

From a journalistic perspective, this model poses real problems. Surrogates are

held to a different standard from reporters and often given airtime even when they've proven to be [reckless with the truth](#). CNN's expert input is often of questionable value, as evidenced by the panel last Saturday night, which at one point consisted of one woman and eight men discussing the Women's March.

But from CNN's perspective, a pundits-on-panels model offers several benefits. To start with, it's cost effective. On-the-ground reporting requires expensive crews, satellite trucks and travel. With far less effort, news executives can present polarized, high-drama debates that spike viewers' outrage and short-term ratings. Most of that recent drama was centered on [Donald J. Trump](#), who, during the early months of the campaign, got coverage from CNN that [dwarfed](#) that of the other 16 Republican contenders.

All this was about one thing, and it's not better journalism. It's bigger profits. Insiders have [reported](#) that CNN made more than \$1 billion gross profit in 2016, at least \$100 million more than the company projected.

While CNN made its numbers, it missed the story. After the election, CNN's own media critic, Brian Stelter, rightly [told the audience](#), "Some of you watching right now are having a very hard time trusting this channel." And yet Time Warner's chief executive declared 2016 a "[killer year](#)" for CNN.

Is there any reason to believe the pressure to maximize profits will decrease after AT&T spends \$85 billion to buy Time Warner?

Freed of the relentless pressure to drive up profits, an independent CNN could rededicate itself to "journalism first." Reporters could focus on informing the audience and exposing wrongdoing. This would create opportunities for journalistic rigor, risk and innovation.

There are instructive comparisons. Nonprofits like PBS and NPR often cover issues with more complexity and nuance than corporate-owned networks. The Center for Public Integrity, ProPublica and the Center for Investigative Reporting are more fearless about holding power to account.

In my 15 years as a TV reporter, seven of them at CNN, almost every time I visited a newsroom, an office on Capitol Hill or an official in the White House, CNN was on. This hasn't changed. The network still has an outside impact on the world of politics and media, perhaps one reason President Trump has singled out CNN in his attacks on the press.

Thanks to CNN's innovative technology, seasoned journalists and global reach, it can again be the world's most trusted TV news brand. But only if the coming years are different than the last.

A healthy democracy needs trusted news sources to which all citizens can turn. Given the new administration's hostility to dissenting voices and willingness to strong-arm corporations, we need independent and responsible media outlets more than ever before. I believe that CNN could once again be the place Ted Turner envisioned and built years ago. A strong independent CNN that answers to no one but the public would be a powerful force to safeguard our democracy.

POLITICO

Democrats launch scorched-earth strategy against Trump

By Gabriel

Story Continued Below

Debenedetti

What began as a high-minded discussion about how to position the Democratic Party against President Donald Trump appears to be nearing its conclusion. The bulk of the party has settled on a scorched-earth, not-now-not-ever model of opposition.

In legislative proposals, campaign promises, donor pitches and even in some Senate hearings, Democrats have opted for a hard-line, give-no-quarter posture, a reflection of a seething party base that will have it no other way.

According to interviews with roughly two dozen party leaders and elected officeholders, the internal debate over whether to take the conciliatory path — to pursue a high-road approach as a contrast to Trump's deeply polarizing and norm-violating style — is largely settled, cemented in place by a transition and first week in office that has confirmed the left's worst fears about Trump's temperament.

"They were entitled to a grace period, but it was midnight the night of the inauguration to 8 o'clock the next morning, when the administration sent out people to lie

about numerous significant things. And the damage to the credibility of the presidency has already been profound," said Washington Gov. Jay Inslee. "They were entitled to a grace period and they blew it. It's been worse than I could have imagined, the first few days."

That conclusion comes after two months of intra-party debates about how to outwardly treat the Trump White House, a process which played out not only in public but in private meetings and conference calls between leading party operatives, elected officials, and message crafters.

"I predict the coming divide in the Democratic Party won't be ideological so much as it will be between those who resist and oppose and those who accommodate and appease," strategist David Brock told roughly 120 donors gathered in Florida to plot a path forward over the weekend.

That mindset has permeated every outpost of the party from governor's mansions to Congress. Whether it's in state attorneys general offices or statehouses, the DNC, or the constellation of outside left-leaning political groups, Trump's benefit of the doubt is gone.

At a forum this week for candidates running to be the next Democratic National Committee chair, the very idea that the party should try to work with the new president was dismissed as absurd.

"That's a question that's absolutely ridiculous," said New Hampshire party chairman Raymond Buckley, when asked if the Democratic Party should try to work with Trump where it can find opportunities.

"If you saw the millions of people who marched in the streets this weekend and participated in it, they are looking to the Democratic Party. We have an opportunity as a party to be that place of resistance. So we have to form a solid resistance as a party. And no, it is not about working with Donald Trump," offered television commentator Jehmu Greene.

Some party leaders are wary of the implications of teeth-baring, no-holds-barred opposition. They worry about the difficult position it puts vulnerable Democratic senators in — 10 of them will be up for reelection in 2018 in states that Trump carried.

There are also concerns about the dangers of appearing overly obstructionist, and the possible blowback it could create for party officeholders up and down the ballot in 2018. An explicitly aggressive approach also stands to shape the 2020 presidential field, incentivizing potential candidates to compete in expressing their level of anti-Trump vitriol.

"We need to remember that one of the reasons young voters, especially, were uninspired is you can't have a message of, 'I'm not him,'" cautioned DNC vice-chairman R.T. Rybak, the former Minneapolis mayor.

"Focusing too much on what he says — every absurdity, every misrepresentation of fact, every lie that comes out of his mouth or his tweets — makes no sense to me," said former Los Angeles Mayor Antonio Villaraigosa, a candidate for California governor. "The best way to fight Trump is to chart what represents the values, the priorities that we're for. I don't think it makes sense to spend all of our time responding to every tweet, I think that will just reinforce a notion that many people have in our country that we put party before country."

Brock's Florida conference outlined some of the philosophical fault lines.

In one closed-door session, Chicago mayor and former Barack Obama chief of staff Rahm Emanuel advocated a measured approach to Trump opposition, one in which Democrats choose only specific fights with a tight game plan. Sitting opposite Emanuel, former Joe Biden chief of staff Ron Klain shared his rules for a "100 Day Fight Club" — a battle royale he advocated to mark Trump's opening stretch, according to people in the room.

Other sessions detailed a massive pushback operation that featured expansive litigation plans and opposition research efforts.

"Three days ago Donald Trump went from being a private citizen who tweets and criticizes to the establishment," said Ted Lieu, a Los Angeles-area congressman who has been vocally anti-Trump, to the point of introducing legislation to stop the new president from launching a nuclear first strike without passing it by Congress. "He and the Republicans have unified control, and they own it. It is Trump's foreign policy, Trump's economy, Trump's healthcare plan. So he has to govern and in less than two years voters will go to the polls, and he has to own it."

"We are very wary that this administration is trying to flood the zone with a whole lot of stuff that is very objectionable all at once, and make it very difficult by creating a cacophony of terribleness so that not one thing gets through. It's a tactic that they used on the campaign and they were fairly successful at doing so, so in a lot of ways we look at our jobs is focusing in on what we think are the most objectionable things," added Zac Petkanas, the director of the DNC's anti-Trump war room, which is currently taking on Trump's cabinet nominees, ties to Russia, and potential conflicts of interest.

Even so, strident anti-Trump Democrats worry that dealmakers like Senate Minority Leader Schumer will try to find agreements with the new president — concerns that have been heightened by the cabinet confirmation process, in which Schumer has prioritized eight nominees rather than trying to gum up all of the picks at once.

In their view, a true opposition party in the Senate should grind all Republican movement to a halt. But that creates a problem for the senators leading the charge, who insist choosing their battles is the

most effective way to kneecap Trump's agenda.

"Opposing every nominee was not seriously on the table, it never has been. That's not a test of whether or not you're resistant," said Hawaii Sen. Brian Schatz, noting that the party simply doesn't have the votes to stop many of them.

Democratic lawmakers have still found ways to embarrass Trump, by pushing to get Trump's nominees to disagree with the president, and introducing legislation aimed at disempowering him or forcing him to disclose personal information like tax returns. And by letting some of Trump's less objectionable picks through without a fight, like Housing and Urban Secretary nominee Ben Carson, senators believe they can inoculate themselves from the criticism of obstructionism often leveled at McConnell during Obama's presidency.

"We've spoken from our collective gut, and that has rung true with a lot of our supporters because they see us finding our spine, and likewise we see millions of Americans spontaneously marching and we find courage and strength," said Schatz, speaking of Senate Democrats' strategy to consider Trump's nominees. "So what I like about what's happening out there across the country and within the Senate is it's not centrally planned, it's not run by a communications shop. This is the 48 of us doing our job because we understand that for a lot of people who are terrified by what's happening in the country, for them we're the tip of the spear."

While some building unions — a small element of the traditional Democratic coalition — have shown particular willingness to collaborate with Trump due to his talk about infrastructure investment, for the most part there are few cracks in the Democratic facade.

"I haven't slept a good night since November 8, but the things that don't keep me up at night are: 'Will Trump offer up things that Democrats will be tempted to support?'," said Klain, a top advisor to Hillary Clinton.

"Something we see is the question, 'Is Donald Trump going to propose reasonable policies that people can get behind?' That doesn't feel like a problem we're going to have," said Jessica Mackler, president of American Bridge, Democrats' main opposition research group. "So far we've seen no evidence that this is

a choice we're going to have to make."

Even governors, the realistic executives who understand the challenges of governance and management, are lining up to insist they won't fall for Trump's enticements in the form of infrastructure investments.

"I've never been a proponent of cutting off your nose to spite your face. There are going to be some things we can agree on," said Connecticut Gov. Dannel Malloy. "I'm not precluding the possibility, but we're not going to agree to discriminate, we're not going to agree to make poor people poorer, we're not going to agree to turn our back on our international obligations."

"Early in our resistance to his potential damage to our states, we're going to be vocal. In the middle we're going to be persistent, and at the end we're going to be resistant. If the federal government wants to send several billion dollars to my office to help infrastructure, you can't say no," added Inslee. "But we will say no very loudly, very vocally, very consistently to the idea that's going to be some leverage for not protecting people based on race or ethnicity."

By delivering a massive slight to the president on the first day of the Trump era — roughly a third of the House Democratic Caucus refused to attend his inauguration — Democrats sent a strong signal about their intentions both to the White House and to the American public.

While few in the party took issue with the inaugural strategy, leading party strategists and officials caution that an oppose-at-all costs strategy may not leave enough room for the flexibility Democrats may need at some point.

After all, they're dealing with a singularly mercurial president.

"We've never seen anything like him. This isn't ideological. He's taken this to places we've never been. He's said things we've never heard from a commander-in-chief," said Villaraigosa. "So all I can tell you is any game plan you have for Donald Trump should have a fair amount of audibles."

