

# Revue de presse américaine

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



Liberté • Égalité • Fraternité  
RÉPUBLIQUE FRANÇAISE

Mardi 31 janvier 2017, réalisation : Jérémie Gauthier



<b>FRANCE – EUROPE .....</b>	<b>3</b>
Variety : ‘Elle,’ ‘Divines’ Celebrated at France’s Lumieres Awards .....	3
One Of France’s Top Universities Is Canceling Anti- Putin Speakers.....	3
French Investigators Interview Presidential Candidate, Wife (online).....	4
French Presidential Hopeful Fillon Wants Quick Investigation.....	4

Quartz : France’s socialist presidential candidate stands for a basic income, a tax on robots, and legalizing weed .....	4
Underdogs complete sweep of French primaries, upending presidential race.....	5
The American Prospect : The French Disconnection.....	5
French Socialist Vision Sees Money for All, Funded by Robots .....	6
New York Magazine : It’s Not Just Us — French Politics Has Been Chaotic, Too .....	7
‘Why not?’ France’s far-right party says it could replicate Trump’s ban if Le Pen is elected (online) .....	7
CNBC : End of the EU? How France’s far right could halt the largest civilization project of the 20th century ...	8

Daily Caller : France Could Copy Trump's Immigration Ban If Le Pen Wins Election .....	9
EU chaos, division over Trump travel ban .....	9
CNBC : German inflation and French election push up borrowing costs across Europe .....	10
French Economy Accelerates, Stoking Debate on ECB Tapering .....	10
Eurozone Inflation Rising To 1.8% Is The Policy Point, Not A Problem.....	11
Eurozone Economy Grows at Faster Pace Than U.S. (online).....	11
Europe's Recovery Gains Speed in Turbulent Year.....	12
Mark Gilbert : Alarms Are Sounding in European Bonds .....	12
Trump's travel ban is having a spillover effect on European dual nationals.....	13
For Leaders of U.S. Allies, Getting Close to Trump Can Sting (UNE).....	14
Should Britain host Trump for state visit? More than 1 million people say no.....	15
Even as Trump seeks warmer ties with Russia, U.S. deploys troops across Eastern Europe.....	16

## INTERNATIONAL.....16

Some Refugees From Countries Not Named in Donald Trump's Order Have Until Thursday to Enter U.S.....	17
Syria Reclaims Damascus Water Source From Rebels	17
Trump's travel ban threatens U.S. partnership with Iraq against Islamic State .....	18
Michael O'Hanlon : Trump is recklessly reversing Americans' progress in Iraq.....	18
Anthony Blinken : To Defeat ISIS, Arm the Syrian Kurds.....	19
U.S. Travel Restrictions Put Saudi Arabia in a Bind....	20
Yemen's Houthi Rebels Launch Rare Suicide Attack on Saudi Frigate .....	20
Iran Missile Launch Detected, a Possible Violation of U.N. Resolution .....	21
Israel's Hard-Liners Want to 'Go Big': Annex a Settlement .....	21
Daniel Baer : If Trump Tries to Make a Deal With Putin, He's Already Lost .....	22
Student known for far-right sympathies charged in Quebec City mosque attack (UNE).....	24
North Korea at the top of the agenda as Mattis heads to Seoul .....	25
Rodrigo Duterte Says Drug War Will Go On as Police Plan Purge.....	26
A Climate Change Economist Sounds the Alarm.....	27
Leonid Bershidsky : The U.S. Was Hardly Wide Open to Muslims Before Trump.....	27
Trump's Trade War May Have Already Begun.....	28
David Leonhardt : Make China Great Again .....	29

## ETATS-UNIS..... 29

Trump's hard-line actions have an intellectual godfather: Jeff Sessions (UNE).....	29
White House Fires Acting Attorney General Sally Yates After Defying Immigration Ban (UNE).....	31
Dana Boente: Who Is the New Acting Attorney General? .....	32
From order to disorder: How Trump's immigration directive exposed GOP rifts (UNE).....	32
Homeland Security Chief and White House Clash .....	33
State Dept. Officials Should Quit if They Disagree With Trump, White House Warns (UNE).....	34
Editorial : Diplomats Decry Muslim Ban .....	35
Dana Milbank : Republicans are alarmed to discover Trump is doing exactly what he said he would.....	35
Bret Stephens :The Wrong Kind of Crazy .....	36
Ed Rogers : Running the government is like conducting an orchestra, not having a sword fight.....	37
Obama, in a rare move for an ex-president, breaks silence to criticize Trump on immigration .....	37
Edward-Isaac Doveire : How Obama will take on Trump .....	38
Eugene Robinson : Trump's travel ban isn't about making America safe. It's about kicking Muslims around.....	39
Seth Lipsky : Even Jimmy Carter Was Cautious About Admitting Refugees .....	40
Michael Gerson : Trump's half-baked travel ban is a picture of American shame .....	40
Editorial : Trump's executive order on immigration is a self-inflicted wound.....	41
Andrew Mccarthy : Is It a 'Muslim Ban'? .....	41
Jay Michaelson: Is Donald Trump's Travel Ban Legal? Months of Court Battles Will Decide.....	42
President Donald Trump to Add CIA Director to National Security Council (UNE) .....	44
Donald Trump to Name His Supreme Court Nominee Tuesday .....	44
White House says LGBT protections for federal workers will remain.....	45
Editorial : The White House's soft-core Holocaust denialism .....	45
Editorial : President Bannon?.....	46
A Republican Plan for Medicare Gets a Revival .....	47
Will Hurd, GOP congressman: A wall is the least effective way to secure the border.....	47
David Andelman : Messing with Mexico is a dangerous idea.....	48
Trump Vows Regulatory Rollback .....	48
Rosa Brooks : 3 Ways to Get Rid of President Trump Before 2020.....	49
U.S. Consumer Inflation Firmed, Spending Accelerated in December .....	50
Kevin Warsh : America Needs a Steady, Strategic Fed	51
Republicans' Paths to Unraveling the Dodd-Frank Act	51

## FRANCE – EUROPE

### Variety : ‘Elle,’ ‘Divines’ Celebrated at France’s Lumieres Awards

January 31, 2017 | 04:01AM PT

Paul Verhoeven's "Elle" and Houda Benyamina's "Divines" won the main prizes at this year's Lumieres Awards, France's equivalent to the Golden Globes.

"Elle," which competed at Cannes, won the Lumieres prizes for best film, director and actress for Isabelle Huppert. The French thesp, who just won the Golden Globe, will vie for an Oscar and a Cesar next month.

Verhoeven did not attend the ceremony, which was held Monday in Paris, as he is currently in the U.S. But in a prepared video, he thanked the Lumieres Academie, his producers Said Ben Said and Michel Merkt, and Huppert, whom he praised for her "talent, audacity and everything she brought to the film." Alluding to the current political turmoil in the U.S., Verhoeven also said he hoped to make his next film in France.

Ben Said called "Elle" a "French miracle" which "could not have been made in another country." "Me, the son of an

immigrant, I am so proud to be French today," added the producer, whose recent credits include "Aquarius" and "Maps to the Stars."

Huppert said she was particularly moved to receive the best actress prize from the foreign press in Paris because she has always been attracted to working with foreign filmmakers and in new territories all over the world. The actress added that she had dreamed of working with Verhoeven since discovering his Dutch films as a teenager.

Benyamina's "Divines," which world-premiered at Cannes' Directors Fortnight, won best first film, and its two lead actresses, Oulaya Amamra and Déborah Lukumena, shared the prize for best female newcomer.

Lukumena and Amamra, who are also nominated for Cesars, thanked Benyamina and producer Marc-Benoit Creancier for entrusting them with challenging roles even though they were unknown actresses.

Albert Serra's "The Death of Louis XIV" and Claude Barras' "My Life as a Zucchini" won two awards each.

"My Life as a Zucchini," which is nominated for an Oscar, won best animated feature and script for Celine Sciamma, a critically acclaimed filmmaker whose credits include "Girlhood."

"The Death of Louis XIV" nabbed the awards for best actor, for French New Wave icon Jean-Pierre Léaud, and cinematography, for Jonathan Ricquebourg.

Damien Bonnard won best male newcomer for his performance in Alain Guiraudie's "Stay Vertical," which competed at Cannes.

Mohamed Ben Attia's "Hedi" won best French-language foreign film, while Safy Nebbou's "In the Forest of Siberia" won best music (for Ibrahim Maalouf).

The Lumieres Academie also paid tribute to Thierry Fremaux, the artistic director and general delegate of the Cannes Film Festival, and to Oscar-winning actress Marion Cotillard.

Upon receiving the Lumieres Award (in association with Variety),

Fremaux quipped that "receiving an honorary award was like dancing a slow [dance] with your sister," because it's a non-contested prize. "But still, it's delightful."

Fremaux also took the opportunity to pay homage to Jean Hernandez, a well-respected distributor and arthouse theater programmer who recently died. "If cinema is as rich as it is today, it is thanks to people like Jean Hernandez."

Fremaux added that he was grateful to former Cannes president Gilles Jacob for giving him the position of artistic director, and to filmmaker Bertrand Tavernier, whom he "owes everything to, or almost everything."

Tavernier presides over the Lumiere Institute in Lyon and the annual Lumiere festival, which is headed by Fremaux and is dedicated to heritage films.

Tavernier, who was on hand at the ceremony, won the best documentary award with his film "Journey Through French Cinema."

**Buzz  
Feed**

### One Of France's Top Universities Is Canceling Anti-Putin Speakers

Paul Aveline

Guillaume Souvant / AFP / Getty Images

A prestigious international affairs university in Paris has canceled events by speakers critical of Russian President Vladimir Putin to protect exchange relationships with Russian universities, a source at the university told BuzzFeed France.

The Paris School of International Affairs, also known as Sciences Po, was slated to host a January 19 talk by American investigative journalist David Satter, who was banned from entering Russia.

Satter's latest book, *The Less You Know, the Better You Sleep*:

*Russia's Road to Terror and Dictatorship Under Yeltsin and Putin* claims that the Russian security services carried out a 1999 string of apartment bombings in three Russian cities with the intention of pinning them on Chechen terrorists. Hundreds of Russians died in the attacks, galvanizing the country around a tragedy sometimes called Russia's 9/11 and bringing Putin to power.

Paul Aveline / BuzzFeed News

Image fournie à BuzzFeed News

Satter said he was informed by a friend that he was no longer welcome at Sciences Po, which had hosted him in February 2014 to speak about the Kremlin at a conference titled "Kiev-Moscow-Sochi: The escalating dangers."

Sciences Po has relationships with three Russian higher education institutions, Moscow State University Lomonosov, the Higher School of Economics of Moscow and the Moscow State Institute of International Relations, according to the French university's website. Satter believes Sciences Po canceled his talk due to fears of reprisal from Russia.

"The most likely scenario is that they feared for the academic exchange agreements with Russia," the staff member said. "I think that they also feared that their on site students might be expelled," referring to Sciences Po students who are currently studying at partner institutions in Russia.

"A few months ago, the Center refused to welcome the Ukrainian

Prime Minister who is not in the good books of Moscow," they told BuzzFeed France. "After a conference on Chechnya [in May 2016], the Center received complaints from the Russian embassy. This time, they have censored themselves in advance. It was brutal."

"When I heard CERI's justifications, I couldn't believe it," he said. "The worst part is the whole thing is assumed. They clearly say that the conference risked compromising the exchanges with Russia. Did the Russian Embassy intervene? I don't think so. CERI censored themselves on their own."

After CERI's cancellation, Satter delivered his talk at the Paris office of the independent journal, *L'Esprit*.



"I have given talks at Oxford and Cambridge, my book is published by Yale University," he told BuzzFeed France. "Therefore, it is not my credibility that is in question; it is the topic that is embarrassing. This case

illustrates perfectly the title of my book."

Last September, Sciences Po canceled a talk by the Dalai Lama for fear of Chinese reactions. CERI's communications department and its

director did not return phone calls and emails from BuzzFeed France requesting comment.

*This post was translated from French.*



## French Investigators Interview Presidential Candidate, Wife (online)

The Associated Press

PARIS — Leading French presidential hopeful Francois Fillon and his wife, Penelope, were questioned Monday in an embezzlement probe centered on whether she actually worked while being paid as her husband's parliamentary aide.

Francois Fillon, the candidate of the conservative Republicans party, said in a statement afterward that he and Penelope "provided elements

useful for showing the truth so as to establish what work was carried out by Madame Fillon."

He did not comment further.

A source close to the investigation confirmed the questioning earlier Monday but refused to say what was discussed or where the meetings with investigators took place.

France's financial prosecutor opened a preliminary embezzlement and misappropriation of public funds probe of Fillon last week.

The investigation followed a report by Le Canard Enchaîné newspaper that Fillon's wife was paid a total of about 500,000 euros (\$537,000) for work she did not perform.

Fillon says her job "was real."

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

The allegations have been a major blow to Fillon, whom polls had favored ahead of the April-May presidential election.

At a campaign rally on Sunday in Paris, where a boisterous crowd gave Penelope Fillon a standing ovation and chanted her name, Fillon said, "We have nothing to hide."

"Through Penelope they are trying to break me," he said. "I will never forgive those who chose to throw us to the wolves."



Press

## French Presidential Hopeful Fillon Wants Quick Investigation

• By The Associated Press

PARIS — Jan 31, 2017, 7:05 AM ET

French presidential hopeful Francois Fillon's team says that he wants the investigation to advance as quickly

as possible over whether his wife actually worked while being paid as his parliamentary aide.

Fillon's campaign director, Patrick Stefanini, told reporters Tuesday that the candidate doesn't want the investigation to "interfere with the democratic process."

Fillon and his wife, Penelope, were questioned Monday in a preliminary embezzlement and misappropriation of public funds probe.

The investigation followed a report by Le Canard Enchaîné newspaper that Fillon's wife was paid about 500,000 euros (\$537,000) for work she didn't perform.

Fillon, the nominee of the conservative Republican party, said in a statement he and his wife "were able to provide elements useful for establishing the truth."

## Quartz : France's socialist presidential candidate stands for a basic income, a tax on robots, and legalizing weed

Eshe Nelson

After Brexit and the election of Donald Trump, all eyes are on France for another populist upset, with Marine Le Pen rising in the polls ahead of the country's upcoming presidential election. The growing popularity of the leader of the far-right, anti-immigration, anti-EU National Front party is in keeping with the rightward drift of politics recently.

Equally noteworthy is the existential crisis that confronts the out-of-favor left. In France, as elsewhere, the response has been to shift to the other extreme end of the political spectrum. France's socialists have lurched as far left as they can go, naming Benoît Hamon as their candidate for the presidency.

Hamon, a 49-year old former education minister, was the most left-wing of all seven initial

candidates in the Socialist party primary. He clinched the nomination on Jan. 29 with 60% of the second-round runoff vote, beating the more centrist former prime minister Manuel Valls. These are a few of the eye-catching policies that won Hamon the nomination:

- A universal basic income of €750 (\$803) a month for all citizens over 18
- A tax on robots, in which companies that use automation to replace workers face higher charges
- Legalizing marijuana to collect taxes on sales
- Reducing the 35-hour workweek and repealing labor laws that make it easier to hire and fire workers

Hamon's odds of winning the presidency are slim, but the implications for the socialists, in power since 2012, could be long-lasting. The outgoing socialist president, François Hollande, recently saw his approval rating drop to just 4%. (Yes, *four percent*.)

Hamon offers a distinct break from traditional center-left French politics, following a trend also seen with UK Labour Party leader Jeremy Corbyn and US Democratic primary challenger Bernie Sanders. Hamon has been compared to both men, who enthrall core grassroots supporters, alienate moderate party members, and remain far from power. France's socialists are "a broken party," says Antonio Barroso, an analyst at Teneo Intelligence, "and the presidential election will only accelerate the process of implosion that has been in the works for some time."

The French presidential election takes place in two rounds of voting, with the first held on April 23. If no candidate wins a majority, which is likely, a runoff between the two candidates with the most votes will be held on May 7. Hamon is not expected to make it into the second round, since he's currently running in a distant fourth place in recent opinion polls (link in French).

At the moment, Le Pen looks set to win the first round and will probably face off against either Republican party candidate François Fillon, a conservative former prime minister, or Emmanuel Macron, a former economy minister who split from the socialists to form a new centrist party (paywall). There is little overlap in the policies of the hard-left Hamon and the far-right populist Le Pen, conservative reformer Fillon, or pro-business liberal Macron, all of whom are attracting more support from voters.

## Underdogs complete sweep of French primaries, upending presidential race

The Christian Science Monitor

January 30, 2017 Paris—Now that the main political parties in France have selected their candidates for president – with the ruling Socialists picking Benoît Hamon in their party primary Sunday – it should be run-of-the-mill from here in the closely watched election, right?

Think again.

The march to the French presidency has been one of the most unpredictable races that many French say they can remember.

The prospect that far-right leader Marine Le Pen could win has had the world on tenterhooks, as the anti-establishment sentiment that swept Donald Trump into power in the United States and is pushing Britain out of the European Union threatens to knock out the political elite here, too.

But she's not the only force representing the riotous mood. Both mainstream parties dismissed their centrist contenders, choosing the more ideological underdog on both the right and left. There is even a chance neither will make it to Round 2 of the race expected this May.

Bruno Cautrès, a political analyst at Cevipof (Center for Political Research) at Sciences Po in Paris, says the first word that comes to his mind when characterizing this season is "crazy." "I have never seen such a volatile situation before, where you feel like everything is possible," he says.

**New left, new right**

Is that necessarily all bad?

Starting with the Socialists, the victory of Mr. Hamon is striking for two reasons. In a normal cycle, it would have been President François Hollande representing his party. But amid the worst approval ratings in modern history, he became the first modern president not to seek reelection when he stepped out of the race in December. Since then, Manuel Valls, Mr. Hollande's former prime minister and a centrist with a reform-minded, law-and-order platform, was the favorite. Instead, and seemingly out of nowhere, the left-wing Hamon, on his platform for universal basic income and legalized marijuana, took the race with more than 58 percent of the vote.

In theory, he will face François Fillon on the right. The candidate for the *Républicains* also came out of nowhere. Pollsters predicted the right-wing primary would be a showdown between longtime face on the center-right, Alain Juppé, and former president Nicolas Sarkozy. Instead, Mr. Fillon, who is dubbed the "Margaret Thatcher" of French politics and on family issues sits much further right than much of the French public, including Ms. Le Pen, surged ahead of both.

The drama didn't end there. Last week a French newspaper published a damning report alleging Fillon's wife was paid €500,000 (\$534,000) for essentially a phony job as his parliamentary aide, generating a preliminary judicial inquiry. If wrongdoing is found, he

has promised he'll step aside, throwing the race into chaos.

In the meantime, former Socialist Emmanuel Macron, a political newcomer who broke from the party to form his own, *En Marche!*, is creeping up in the polls as a free-market reformer to become a potential game-changer. Of course, Le Pen is right out front, and that has Europe bracing.

### A weakened presidency?

Much of what is happening here is driven by an electorate that looks familiar across the West: one fed up with the same faces, the sense that the political elites are just in it for themselves, that there is no difference between left or right anymore. And some of the wild ride toward the presidency is driven by particularly French pressures that could ultimately reshape the Fifth Republic – perhaps not all for the worse.

When Hollande decided not to run, it shook the French and their sense of the "Gaullist presidency," the strong role that French presidents since Charles de Gaulle have played.

Pressure started to mount under Mr. Sarkozy, reviled for a lifestyle that clashed with French notions of how a statesman should behave. Hollande, considered weak and ineffectual, was unable to rectify it.

"His utter failure to 'maintain' the status of the presidency actually puts the Fifth Republic in danger," says John Gaffney, director of the Aston Center for Europe at Aston University in Britain who wrote a

book on Hollande. "Now no one knows what to do, who to turn to, what to propose. ... I don't think the French know what they themselves think or want. Because all want a strong leader but recognize the real dangers of a populist turn."

The dynamics of the race is a wake-up for all leaders in the era: something is happening and no one knows where it will lead. Politicians can be dismissed as quickly as they are voted in (note Matteo Renzi's promise to change Italy and subsequent resignation when his reform was defeated at the polls; David Cameron faced a similar fate after losing his Brexit gamble).

In France specifically, the Fifth Republic has functioned as a multiparty system with two major poles. This race clearly indicates that dynamic has shifted. Some believe major institutional change will follow.

A confused state of affairs? Perhaps. And yet, new space has opened up that could revitalize the French political scene. Mr. Cautrès says Hollande's decision not to run generated "a liberation of different energies."

"What is very positive is that after this election at least we will see some new faces in French politics," he says, which could begin to address voter disillusionment, and is one of Le Pen's strongest selling points. "We will see some major new things in French politics."

## The American Prospect : The French Disconnection

Irina Kalashnikova/Sputnik via AP

Benoît Hamon, the French Socialist Party's presidential candidate, talks to voters and the press after the announcement of the results of the Socialist presidential primary's second round in Paris.

It is nearly 50 years since I first set foot in France, and I have been returning to the country regularly ever since. The sights and sounds of Paris still exhilarate me: the purposeful clackety-clack of the low-heeled boots of long-legged women hastening toward the "mouth" of the Metro; the clatter of china and hiss of the espresso machine mingled with the laughter and chatter of a busy café; the fragrance of a *truffade* simmering in a parabola of *cantal* and *crème fraîche* on the rue Mouffetard; the joy of small children,

*cartables* strapped to their backs, running down a cobblestone street as fast as their little legs will carry them to rejoin their classmates in the school courtyard before the raucous bell signals the start of the day. Just down the same street is a plaque indicating the place where Hemingway partook of the movable feast, a short walk from where, centuries earlier, Descartes pondered the *cogito* and around the corner from where Valéry Larbaud hosted James Joyce as he put the finishing touches on *Ulysses*.

Half a century ago, the French were concerned and anxious about the United States. Would we ever extricate ourselves from Vietnam? Could anyone predict what Richard Nixon would do?

Today, the anxiety is back, in spades. A shopkeeper, realizing that I was American, offered his commiseration on the outcome of the election. A cabdriver, driving me to the studios of France 24, where I was to comment in real time on Trump's inaugural speech, wondered how far the new president would go. Had America lost its mind—again? Later, in a very different venue—the hushed and padded dining room of one of France's best restaurants—an investment banker and a former senior military advisor to the French government raised the same question.

*Plus ça change, plus c'est la même chose*, as the saying goes. Yet in French politics, things *have* changed—quite a lot. Voters are more volatile than ever before. Party

lines have blurred. None of the people mentioned in the previous paragraph—the shopkeeper, the cab driver, the investment banker, or the senior military officer—will vote this year for the same party as 20 years ago. One has moved to his right, two to their left, and the fourth will abstain altogether.

The Socialist Party held its primary during the time I was in France, and the surprise winner was Benoît Hamon, one of the leaders of the dissident Socialist faction known as *les frondeurs* (a term derived from a rebellion that took place early in the reign of Louis XIV).

Hamon was not the only *frondeur* in the race. He was joined by Arnaud Montebourg, who early on was seen as the favorite to unseat former Prime Minister Manuel Valls. Older

(at 55 compared to Hamon's 49), more flamboyant, and better known thanks to assiduous cultivation of the media, Montebourg came to personify the left-wing opposition to president François Hollande's "neoliberal" turn after he was abruptly dismissed from his post as minister of industrial revival. Hamon, then minister of education, was cashiered along with Montebourg for resisting Prime Minister Valls's "I love business" (*j'aime l'entreprise*) line.

Montebourg made two mistakes, however. Confident that he, more than any other candidate, embodied the *gauchiste* disgust with Hollande's repudiation of the anti-finance capitalism platform on which he was elected, Montebourg sought to "presidentialize" his image before the first round of the primary. He soft-pedaled his rhetoric and muffled his flamboyance in unaccustomed sobriety. Yet he continued to croon the same tune that had made him such an irritant to Hollande's first prime minister, Jean-Marc Ayrault, whose replacement he had conspired with Valls and Hamon to bring about.

"Economic patriotism" (meaning subsidies for firms on the verge of collapse or threatened with removal outside of France, as well as resistance to foreign investment in strategic sectors) along with outspoken opposition to austerity had long been Montebourg's stock-in-trade. What Hamon recognized, however, was that even though the party's left wing continued to accept as gospel this economic critique of the Hollande-Valls line, repetition had robbed it of its power to mobilize.

The opposition between the government's "social liberal" stance and the position of its "anti-austerity" critics had become stale, and given continued German opposition to significant economic stimulus, few voters unhappy with the party line believed that merely electing an anti-austrian would suffice to change the status quo. They had

already tried that with Hollande, who had railed against austerity as a candidate only to reverse himself once in power.

Socialist primary voters therefore wanted a more definitive and dramatic break with the past—with both the previous majority "social liberal" line, espoused by Hollande, Valls, and most party leaders, and the previous minority line, most fully articulated by Montebourg.

Hamon therefore took a different tack. If the social liberals could present their program as a "modern" form of socialism adapted to the realities of the 21st century, he would go them one better by redefining the meaning of "socialist modernity." His first innovation was to borrow heavily from the ecologists (who were also represented in the primary by François de Rugy). The future will be defined, Hamon argued, not by continuing economic growth but by a reining in of capitalism's animal spirits *for the benefit of the environment*. In this low-growth, eco-friendly world, robots will relieve humans of the more unpleasant forms of labor and usher in an era of expanded leisure. No one should have to work more than 32 hours a week, and everyone should be guaranteed a minimum basic income even if idle.

Hamon originally proposed that this basic income of 750 euros a month should be paid to all adults, but when it was pointed out that the cost of this would equal roughly half of all current social spending, he scaled it back to 600 euros a month to be paid to youths 18-25 already receiving benefits. Despite this backsliding, his vision of a utopian future—what French Communists used to refer to as *les lendemains qui chantent* (tomorrows that sing)—seemed to catch on with voters, or at any rate with the sorts of voters who turn out to vote in a Socialist primary whose winner is given little chance of becoming president.

Although Hamon himself, citing Paul Valéry, warned of the need to be

wary of "*les mots qui chantent plus qu'ils ne parlent*" (words that sing more than they speak), he nevertheless took to heart the well-known adage that campaigning in poetry is the best way to arouse jaded voters from their torpor, even if long experience has taught them that in the end governments inevitably govern in prose.

To give both candidates their due, the final debate between Hamon and Valls on the Wednesday before last Sunday's runoff vote showed both men at their best. The exchanges were vigorous but polite, rhetorically polished, sustained by frequent references to academic studies and government reports, and conducted at a level of policy sophistication at which an American, accustomed to the debased exercises in infotainment that pass for debate in this country, can only marvel. On several points, including the vexed issue of how best to integrate France's Muslim minority, Hamon certainly had the better of the argument, even if there is good reason to doubt the realism of his core program.

The gulf between the Valls faction, to which most of the party's elected officials subscribe, and the Hamon faction seems more impossible to bridge than ever.

In the end, however, it was probably all for naught, or, rather, for the soul of tomorrow's Socialist Party rather than for the presidency. If indeed a Socialist Party remains after the election: The gulf between the Valls faction, to which most of the party's elected officials subscribe, and the Hamon faction seems more impossible to bridge than ever.

Although Hamon is unlikely to become France's next president, it is not out of the question that after May 7 there will be a party realignment on the left, with Hamon's followers joining supporters of the Greens and partisans of Jean-Luc Mélenchon, the candidate of the far-left *France insoumise*, to form a new eco-

socialist party, while Valls's party of government merges with the En Marche! movement founded by former economy minister Emmanuel Macron, whose position might be described as neoliberalism with a human face.

Of course, the Socialists have always labored under a threat of disintegration. Fissiparousness is in their DNA. Hamon, Montebourg, and the third anti-Valls Socialist in the primary, Vincent Peillon, were once allies in a splinter group called the New Socialist Party. That group itself broke up after the 2005 referendum on the European constitutional treaty. Montebourg and Peillon backed the presidential candidacy of Ségolène Royal in 2007, while Hamon backed Laurent Fabius, who had favored the "no" (Euroskeptic) position.

Europe did not figure prominently in the primary of the left, but it may become a wedge issue between Hamon and Macron. Polls currently show Macron with a significantly better shot at making the second round of the general election than Hamon, but Macron's positions on many issues remain vague. Hamon, who demonstrated his forensic skills in the debate with Valls, will therefore try to chip away at Macron's lead by obliging him to make his proposals more explicit. Since Macron is the most outspokenly pro-EU candidate in the race, this could become a key point of division.

But whatever happens it is safe to say that the Socialist Party conceived by François Mitterrand at the Congress of Epinay—an unstable alliance of unreconstructed revolutionary Marxists, reform-minded trade unionists, social Catholics, and social-democratic intellectuals—is finished. Benoît Hamon won the Socialist nomination by offering one image of what a successor party might look like, but there is no guarantee that his vision will survive his candidacy, unless by some miracle he wins on May 7.



## French Socialist Vision Sees Money for All, Funded by Robots

@gviscusi More stories by

Gregory Viscusi

by

30 janvier 2017 à 23:00 UTC-5  
31 janvier 2017 à 07:41 UTC-5

- Benoit Hamon's signature pledge is a basic income for all
- Hamon was picked by socialist voters to run for president

Most politicians promise more jobs. France's Socialist presidential candidate is saying there may not be many in the future, but you'll get paid anyway.

Benoit Hamon won France's Socialist Party primary by proposing a basic income for all, an idea that every opponent said is unrealistic and unaffordable but which appealed to Socialist voters who've turned their back on party leaders.

Benoit Hamon

Photographer: Philippe Lopez/AFP via Getty Images

The signature issue of the 49-year-old former education minister would mean the introduction of a 750-euros (\$810) a month payment to all citizens. He says it will help alleviate poverty and make up for a shortage of work as the economy progressively automates. Challenged by his opponents over its cost, he says a tax on industrial robots could help to pay for it.

For more news and analysis of political risk in Europe, click here

The idea of a basic income has been kicking around for a good 500 years. Renaissance thinkers discussed it and the American revolutionary Thomas Paine proposed it, but the discussions in recent years were largely confined to academic circles. Hamon wants to introduce the payments in the world's sixth-largest economy.

"The key to Hamon's success is that in an insurrectionist climate, he



passed as the most insurrectionist candidate," said Jim Shields, a professor of French politics at Aston University in Birmingham, England. "Hamon imposed his universal basic income as the issue of the campaign, obliging other candidates to take positions on it."

#### Switzerland, Finland

In recent times, a handful of administrations have thought about the idea, but few have actually tried it out.

Finland this month is starting an experiment with 2,000 randomly chosen unemployed people receiving 560 euros a month. Canada's Manitoba province conducted a test in the 1970s that was shut down after a change of government while Ontario plans a trial this year. Utrecht and other cities in the Netherlands considered a pilot program in 2015 before deciding against it and Swiss voters actually rejected a basic income with a 77 percent majority in a June 2016 referendum.

#### Civilizing Capitalism

Former Greek Finance Minister Yanis Varoufakis is one of the most vocal supporters of basic income. "It is a necessity, a major part of any effort to civilize capitalism as

capitalism goes through a spasm caused by a new generation of technologies," he told a conference in Zurich last May.

The authors of the Swiss initiators had left it up to the government to decide how large the stipend should be, but they suggested 2,500 francs (\$2,500) for an adult and a quarter of that sum for a child. Those in favor of a basic income say that it encourages the jobless to take low-paid or temporary jobs because it means they don't stand to lose benefits, which in some European countries can be almost as high as entry level salaries.

"There are good arguments in favor of replacing existing unemployment and poverty programs with one simple payment that doesn't discourage people from looking for work," said Zsolt Darvas, a senior fellow at Bruegel, a Brussels-based research institute. "But there's a good reason that it's never been adopted on a large scale. The taxes that would be required to pay for it are just not feasible."

Read more on basic income: QuickTake

Hamon argued in the Socialist primary that basic income is needed to make up for lack of jobs in the

future as the economy progressively automates. He says he'd initially introduce it to replace existing targeted anti-poverty payments, then extend to those between 18 and 25, before holding a "citizens' conference" to decide how to finance and apply it to everyone.

His opponents such as former prime minister Manuel Valls and former economy minister Arnaud Montebourg argued that it was too expensive, and that more job training is the answer to a changing labor market. "A universal income isn't an additional cost, but a sharing of riches," Hamon responded in a Jan. 25 debate with Valls.

A study by OFCE, an economics research unit linked to Sciences Po political science institute, said the measure would cost a net 480 billion euros a year in France, 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. A separate study by the free market-leaning Institut Montaigne estimated Hamon's plan would cost 349 billion euros a year.

And his chances of actually implementing those ideas are slim: polls show that Hamon would finish a distant fourth or fifth and be eliminated in the first round of the presidential.

None of those doubts deterred Socialist primary voters. Hamon won the most votes in the first round of and defeated Valls 59 percent to 41 percent in the run-off on Jan. 29. In the final debate, Valls said Hamon was making "impossible and unfinanceable" promises.

For Hamon's supporters, his Utopian vision is an asset, not a liability.

"The others were just stuck on the technical issues of how do we manage a distribution of wealth, but he has a real vision of a future where work won't necessarily be what it is now," Amirouche Belkessam, 49, a manager at a pharmaceutical company, said during a Hamon rally in Lille. "He's actually the one anchored in reality, because he's the only one trying to figure out the society of the future."

Before it's here, it's on the Bloomberg Terminal.[LEARN MORE](#)

## New York Magazine : It's Not Just Us — French Politics Has Been Chaotic, Too

Jen Kirby

January 31, 2017 01/31/2017 6:37 a.m.

Winner of the left-wing primaries ahead of France's 2017 presidential elections, Benoît Hamon, leaves the Hôtel Matignon in Paris on January 30, 2017, after meeting with France's prime minister. *Photo: Philippe Lopez/AFP/Getty Images*

France is trying to challenge the United States for the most chaotic week in politics. In recent days, a potential right-wing presidential front-runner was embroiled in a corruption scandal, and a very progressive leftist candidate won the nomination for the Socialists, which was seen as a clear rejection of current Socialist president François Hollande's administration.

The unpopularity of the president is no big secret; Hollande declined to run for another term and has an approval rating in the single digits.

But many believed his prime minister Manuel Valls, a left-of-center candidate who marketed himself as pro-business and hawkish on law-and-order, would end up the front-runner (especially since the struggling economy and fear of terrorism were what helped to sink Hollande). Instead, Valls was defeated by Benoît Hamon, the most left-wing candidate in the Socialist race, whose economic policies include radical ideas such as a universal basic income, a robot tax, and reducing the workweek from 35 to 32 hours. He is also a proponent of legal weed.

Even though Hamon won the Socialist runoff by a large margin, he's a long shot for the presidency; the *Guardian* puts his odds at 30 to 1. Based on current polling, he's likely to come in last or close to last among the five candidates in the April elections.

There's even more drama on France's right. Last week, reports surfaced that leading conservative presidential contender François Fillon may have paid his wife \$500,000 from public funds for a job in Parliament, from about 1992 to 2002. This would theoretically be allowed under French law, if his wife, Penelope, actually worked — and there's scant evidence that she did. Fillon is a pretty far-right candidate on social issues and immigration, but he was the front-runner to win the election. His support has been flagging in recent weeks, and "Penelopegate" hasn't helped. Fillon denies any wrongdoing, but the investigation will likely continue throughout his campaign.

The potential fading of Fillon opens the door a smidge wider for Marine Le Pen, the candidate for France's controversial far-right Front National, who has a populist, anti-EU, anti-immigrant platform. Le Pen stands

to gain from Fillon's troubles, and appears to have edged him out in the most recent polls.

Yet Le Pen isn't the only one. The centrist, independent candidate Emmanuel Macron appeared to get a boost from Fillon's troubles too, pulling even with him in the polls, slightly behind Le Pen. Macron also gets some help from the fact that the Socialists will now run Hamon, an extremely progressive candidate. France has a very fractured presidential field — there's also a far-left candidate, Jean-Luc Mélenchon, who doesn't really have a shot — so for the first round of voting, a Le Pen victory isn't improbable. But she's such a polarizing figure that pulling out a victory in a head-to-head runoff still seems unlikely — especially since one would assume left-leaning voters would throw their weight behind even the less extreme conservative, Fillon, or maybe the centrist Macron. Then again.

**The  
Washington  
Post**

and Bastien Inzaurrealde

## 'Why not?' France's far-right party says it could replicate Trump's ban if Le Pen is elected (online)

By Amy B Wang

France could implement a travel ban similar to the one in the United States if far-right National Front candidate Marine Le Pen is elected

president this spring, a party leader said Monday.

President Trump on Friday signed orders to not only suspend admission of all refugees into the United States for 120 days but also

to implement "new vetting measures" to screen out "radical Islamic terrorists." Refugee entry from Syria, however, would be suspended indefinitely, and all travel from Syria and six other nations — Iran, Iraq, Libya, Somalia, Sudan and Yemen — is suspended for 90 days.

Steeve Briois, the National Front party's vice president and a member of Le Pen's campaign, told Agence France-Presse that they would certainly be open to copying Trump's ban in France.

Today's WorldView

What's most important from where the world meets Washington

Please provide a valid email address.

"And why not?" said Briois, who also is the mayor of Henin-Beaumont, a city about 125 miles north of Paris. "We are no longer in the world of the Care Bears. We are in a horrible world, so sometimes you have to take measures of authority, even if it shocks."

Trump also said he would give priority to Christian refugees over those of other religions, according to the Christian Broadcasting Network.

The president and his supporters have continued to insist it is not a ban on Muslims.

*[Marine Le Pen could win the French election — but first she must win a family feud]*

Throughout the weekend, the order sowed confusion at numerous airports as travelers from the affected countries were denied entry. The ban also drew lawsuits, massive protests and sharp rebukes from domestic lawmakers and leaders around the world.

"All is going well," Trump said.

Despite the chaos, Briois on Monday said it was Trump's prerogative to enact such a ban.

"It is true that the United States are a target for jihadists so if [Trump] wishes to protect himself by barring entry on his territory for people from those countries, that is his right," Briois told AFP. "It is unfortunate for those [caught up in the ban] who have nothing to do with it."

Le Pen has not spoken publicly about the travel ban, according to the Local. Since the beginning of her campaign, she has maintained that she wants to pull France out of the European Union, reinforce the

country's borders and crack down on immigration.

This month, during Trump's transition period, Le Pen was spotted at Trump Tower in New York, although she did not say whether she met with the then-president-elect while there.

Over the weekend, however, Le Pen posted a defense of Trump on Twitter.

"What bothers the media and politicians is that Trump respects his commitments and implements his programs," Le Pen tweeted Saturday.

A recent poll shows Le Pen with a slight lead in the election's first round in April, with 25 percent of the votes, Reuters reported.

Meanwhile, center-right candidate Francois Fillon, who won the national primaries in November, came in at 21 to 22 percent of the vote in that poll, ceding some votes as he is caught up in an employment scandal involving his wife. Fillon has said he may drop out of the presidential race if a judge decides to pursue a formal case against him.

Seen as Le Pen's toughest competitor, Fillon has also taken a hard-line stance on immigration. He reiterated that stance in a tweet Sunday, saying he wanted "strict administrative control over the Muslim faith" in France.

The poll showed that centrist candidate Emmanuel Macron would earn 20 to 21 percent of the vote.

On Sunday, Socialist Benoit Hamon won the country's leftist primary. Experts say the leftist party is very unlikely to win the presidential race, given the rise of populism and nationalism around the world.

France's unpopular president, François Hollande of the Socialist party, announced last month that he would not seek reelection despite being eligible for another term.

The two rounds of the election will take place in late April and early May.

## CNBC : End of the EU? How France's far right could halt the largest civilization project of the 20th century

Sam Meredith

Michal Fludra | NurPhoto via Getty Images

With Marine le Pen transforming her National Front (NF) into a party for the populist era, analysts have been carefully assessing how French elections in May could deal a "severe blow" to the European Union (EU).

"It's difficult to imagine how the European Union could function should such a Euroskeptic (as Le Pen) be at the helm of one of its major economies ... It would likely precede its fracturing," Michael Hessel, political economist at Absolute Strategy Research, told CNBC via telephone.

He said that that low voter turnout would be Le Pen's best hope of securing an unlikely election victory. He projected Le Pen had up to a one-in-five chance of becoming French president in May.

Le Pen has promised to renegotiate the terms of France's membership of the European Union if elected president in May. However, her chances of victory appear to be limited. Opinion polls suggest Le Pen would be defeated by the former conservative prime minister

and her most likely political rival, Francois Fillon, in the second and final round of voting.

A survey by Kantar Sofres released on Sunday placed Fillon on 21 percent of the vote, just behind social-democrat Emmanuel Macron on 22 percent. Meanwhile, Le Pen remains the leading candidate on 25 percent. The NF leader is well positioned to secure enough votes to reach the second round, however, the same survey expects her to lose out to either Fillon or Emmanuel Macron, France's former economy minister, in that next round by at least 20 percentage points.

Le Pen may yet harbor some hope of election success though. As was the case with President Donald Trump and the Brexit vote in the U.K., French citizens could defy expectations in the voting booth and polls may not truly reflect sentiment in the country.

Political leaders across Europe have voiced their concern that a Le Pen victory would cast significant doubt over the future of the EU. Spanish Prime Minister Mariano Rajoy told local radio station Onda Cero on Thursday that he did want to think about the possibility of a Le Pen presidency.

"It would simply mean the destruction of Europe," Rajoy concluded.

"After Brexit last year, if enemies of Europe manage again in the Netherlands or in France to get results then we face the threat that the largest civilization project of the 20th century, namely the European Union, could fall apart," Sigmar Gabriel, German economy minister told parliament on Thursday.

### EU at risk of disintegrating?

Sylvain Lefevre | Getty Images | Getty Images News

Despite Le Pen's charge towards a so-called "Frexit", the majority of French citizens reportedly wish to remain in the EU with its membership enshrined in the constitution. Therefore, Le Pen would be required to seek approval for constitutional amendments from the National Assembly and the Senate before being able to host a referendum which the majority of citizens are likely to reject.

"It is quite hard to quantify (Le Pen's) chances, but I would put them at around 10 percent - not impossible, but not very likely either," Larissa Brunner, analyst for

western Europe at think tank Oxford Analytica, told CNBC in an email.

"(Should Le Pen deliver 'Frexit'), it could put the future of the EU into question. I don't think the EU would collapse — after all, there would still be 26 countries left — but without one of its key founding members it would lose global influence and could slowly disintegrate."

"It could even turn into a merely economic union and become more similar to the European Economic Area (EEA) or the customs union. Assuming a 'Frexit' goes smoothly, other countries such as Italy could follow," Brunner added.

### Deep soul searching

Meanwhile, analysts at Citi also believe that a vote by France to leave the EU wouldn't necessarily spell its end.

"Probably not, since the union does not depend on any pre-determined list of member states. But it would likely deal a severe blow to the institution, with one of its founding and largest members no longer seeing much value in maintaining the four freedoms on the movement of people, goods, services and capital," the analysts said in a note on January 5.



Should Le Pen renegotiate France's position within the EU, it would likely result in one of two scenarios, according to the team at Citi. One option could be for France to leave the EU in the form of a Norway-like model, since immigration does not appear to be the main issue for its citizens.

Alternatively, the country could remain in the EU but leave the euro

and the Schengen passport-free travel zone.

"Both of these would still trigger an episode of deep soul searching for Europe and most likely lead to some refocusing on EU key priorities," Citi analysts concluded.

The party has only about two weeks to organise a new primary as a March 22 deadline approaches for

all candidates to officially register for the election, Anne Levaade, who oversaw the party's primary in November, told *Le Monde* newspaper at the weekend.

A source close to the case said businessman Marc Ladreit de Lacharrière had also been questioned on Monday because his Fimalac <LBCP.PA> holding company owns the literary review *La Revue des Deux Mondes*, which Le

Canard Enchaîné said had paid Penelope Fillon another 100,000 euros for very little work.

A Fimalac spokeswoman declined to comment on the questioning of Ladreit de Lacharrière, and there was no immediate response to an attempt to reach him by email.

Follow CNBC International on Twitter and Facebook.

## Daily Caller : France Could Copy Trump's Immigration Ban If Le Pen Wins Election

Jacob Bojesson Foreign Correspondent FILE PHOTO: Marine Le Pen, French far-right National Front (FN) party president, member of European Parliament and candidate in the French 2017 presidential elections, speaks to the media in Paris, France, January 4, 2017. REUTERS/Charles Platiau/File Photo A

5453352

France's populist National Front is considering copying U.S. President Donald Trump's immigration ban if Marine Le Pen is elected president in May.

Steeve Briois, a leading member on Le Pen's campaign team, said the party is open to following Trump's lead and temporarily ban immigration from select countries in the Middle East. **(RELATED: Several Western Countries Give Preference To Christian Refugees)**

"Why not? We not living in the world of Care Bears anymore. We are in a horrible world," Briois told AFP Monday. "It is true that the United States is also a target for jihadists, so if Trump wants to protect it by forbidding the arrival of these people from these countries,

he is free to do that. Obviously it is unfortunate for those who have nothing to do with that."

Le Pen hasn't commented on whether or not she would introduce similar laws. She defended Trump's executive order over the weekend, saying the only reason people are fed up with his policies is because he's following up on his campaign promises. **(RELATED: Marine Le Pen Spotted At Trump Tower During 'Private Visit' To NYC)**

A poll released Monday puts Le Pen in the lead with 25 percent support. Polls still put her far behind

conservative candidate Francois Fillon in a run-off battle.

Follow Jacob on Twitter

*Content created by The Daily Caller News Foundation is available without charge to any eligible news publisher that can provide a large audience. For licensing opportunities of our original content, please contact [licensing@dailycallernewsfoundation.org](mailto:licensing@dailycallernewsfoundation.org).*

## POLITICO EU chaos, division over Trump travel ban

Charlie Cooper, Matthew Karnitschnig and Nicholas Vinocur

Donald Trump's travel ban on nationals of seven Muslim-majority countries sparked confusion, division and consternation in European capitals Monday, as officials scrambled to clarify the implications for EU citizens.

U.S. embassies across Europe advised that the ban would affect citizens who are dual nationals of the affected countries — effectively banning thousands of EU citizens from the bloc's most important global ally.

But as the European Commission said Monday that it was receiving "conflicting" information about how the ban would be implemented, the U.K. — already heading for the EU exit door — risked further dismay in Brussels, Paris and Berlin by stealing a march and securing what Foreign Secretary Boris Johnson described as a specific "exception" from the ban for U.K. passport holders with dual nationality. Speaking in the House of Commons Monday evening, he called the concession the fruits of "working closely with the Trump administration."

**Appointments cancelled**

The U.K. exemption was secured in phone calls between Johnson and senior White House advisors Sunday, an official in the Foreign and Commonwealth Office said. It was announced that same day and won generous newspaper headlines for the foreign secretary in the right-leaning *Daily Telegraph* and *Sun* newspapers.

"This order was signed on Holocaust Memorial Day. For the sake of history, for heaven's sake have the guts to speak out" — British Labour MP Yvette Cooper

But soon enough on Monday, the FCO's own interpretation of Trump's guidance started to look misguided, at best, particularly its claim that "if you are a dual citizen of one of those [seven affected] countries travelling to the U.S. from OUTSIDE those countries then the order does not apply to you." Advice subsequently issued on the websites of U.S. embassies in London, Berlin and other European capitals said that all nationals and dual nationals of the seven affected countries should not apply for visas to the U.S.

In London, the prime minister's official spokesman was caught off guard by the new advice Monday morning during a daily briefing with journalists, who alerted him to it as it came through on their Twitter feeds.

Meanwhile the European Commission admitted it was receiving "conflicting" information about the how the ban was being implemented.

Germany's interior ministry said it believed the ban could apply to as many as 130,000 Germans with dual nationality, including about 80,000 German-Iranians. The U.S. embassy in Berlin posted a bulletin on Facebook, instructing dual nationals not to make a visa appointment, in wording identical to that used on the U.S. embassy in London's website.

U.S. President Donald Trump with his Vice President Mike Pence, who originally condemned the ban plan in 2015 | Timothy A. Clary/AFP/Getty Images

"If you already have an appointment scheduled, please DO NOT ATTEND your appointment as we will not be able to proceed with your visa interview," the notice said.

France's foreign ministry has also said that "several" dual nationality French citizens had been affected directly by the ban on January 29, without saying how or where.

Margaritis Schinas, the Commission's spokesman, was reduced to non-specific assurances that the Commission would

"analyze" Trump's executive order "to see how they can have an impact to EU nationals, something which is not clear."

The confusion on the ground in Europe appeared to stem from a disconnect in Washington between the White House and the State Department, with Johnson's guidance coming from the former, and the U.S. embassy's from the latter.

EU Migration Commissioner Dimitris Avramopoulos was reported by Euractiv to be considering calling the U.S. Homeland Security Secretary John Kelly to clarify the situation. A European Commission spokeswoman told POLITICO: "In the context of the travel ban, there will be contact with the U.S. administration, but we cannot confirm that a phone call will take place."

Angela Merkel, the German chancellor, said Monday she was consulting European partners and pledged to protect the interests of all German citizens traveling to the U.S.

**Some clarity in London**

But the fog lifted, in London at least, as Johnson arrived in the House of Commons chamber to update MPs on the situation Monday evening.

The foreign secretary joined the chorus of condemnation for the measures, expressing the U.K. government's "anxiety about measures that discriminate on grounds of nationality in ways that are divisive and wrong."

Prime Minister Theresa May was branded "Theresa the appeaser" by Labour MP Mike Gapes.

But to murmurs of approval from the Conservative benches, he confirmed that "all British passport holders" remained welcome to travel to the U.S. and that irrespective of country of birth or dual nationality, Trump's

executive order would not affect Britons.

"Because of the energetic action of this government ... we have an exception for U.K. passport holders whether dual nationals or otherwise," Johnson said. "I think most fair minded people would say that shows the advantages of working closely with the Trump administration...to get the vital protections for UK passport holders that we need."

In heated exchanges Johnson came under pressure for the government's

close embrace of the Trump administration.

Labour MP Yvette Cooper, who chairs the home affairs select committee, said that the ban was "not just about the impact on British citizens."

"Has he urged the U.S. administration to lift this order, to help refugees and to stop targeting Muslims?" she asked Johnson, before adding, her voice shaking with emotion, "This order was signed on Holocaust Memorial Day. For the sake of history, for heaven's sake have the guts to speak out."

Prime Minister Theresa May, meanwhile, who was criticized by MPs over the weekend for failing to condemn the travel ban despite repeated questions on Saturday, was branded "Theresa the appeaser" by Labour MP Mike Gapes. Dennis Skinner, the firebrand Labour veteran, was even blunter in his 1930s comparisons, branding Trump a "fascist."

Nahal Toosi in Washington contributed to this article.

## CNBC : German inflation and French election push up borrowing costs across Europe

David Reid

Getty Images

People walk on Pariser Platz square in front of the illuminated Brandenburg Gate in Berlin.

The cost of borrowing across Europe spiked up Monday as German inflation figures and French elections triggered concern over whether central bank stimulus could be cut short.

Official data from Germany's statistics office show consumer price inflation across the country has risen 1.9 percent year-on-year, the highest level since July 2013.

It slightly undershot forecasts of a 2.0 percent rise and sent the euro to an 11-day low.

The European Central Bank (ECB) has a core mandate to target

inflation at or around 2 percent and any hint of rising prices could pressure the central bank to end its easy monetary policy sooner rather than later.

Jan Randolph, Head of Sovereign Risk at IHS Markit, said in an email Monday that some investors have taken higher inflation in Germany as an excuse to shift out of bonds into equity.

He said the inflation print will add more fuel to the fire of those in Berlin who oppose Quantitative Easing (QE).

"Current ECB QE policy [along] with 2% inflation in Germany, will definitely ire the Germanic monetarists and other hawks.

"Mario [Draghi] can only point out that ECB policy is for the Eurozone

as whole where inflation is much lower, not just Germany," he said.

### French election

Francois Guillot | AFP | Getty Images

French government bond yields also rose sharply on Monday morning to reach 16-month highs.

The OAT (Obligations Assimilables du Trésor) sell-off was quickened by news that a hard-left candidate for the French presidential election, had been picked as the Socialist nominee.

Meanwhile on the other side of the political spectrum, Conservative leader Francois Fillon is struggling to regain momentum after a scandal involving payments to his wife.

Randolph said the market is now pricing a slimmer chance of an

established political party grabbing power in France.

"The appointment of radical-left winger Benoit Hamon yesterday, together with the possible scandal associated with Francis Fillon's wife as paid-secretary, together makes the establishment parties chances weaker and the presidential race much more open than before," the analyst said.

Randolph warned that victory for far-right candidate Marine Le Pen would put pressure on French bond's to the extent that the ECB could consider new action.

"That would be a nightmare Europe game-changer scenario, much more than Brexit or Trump combined."



## French Economy Accelerates, Stoking Debate on ECB Tapering

by Mark Deen @MarkJDeen More stories by Mark Deen

31 janvier 2017 à 01:30 UTC-5 31 janvier 2017 à 04:00 UTC-5

- Consumer spending, investment drive France's fourth quarter
- Spanish inflation surges to 3 percent, highest since 2012

French growth accelerated in the fourth quarter as part of a wider economic expansion in the region that is fueling a debate about how quickly the European Central Bank should trim stimulus.

Gross domestic product rose 0.4 percent in the October-December period, national statistics office

Insee said. That matches the median estimate in a Bloomberg survey and compares with 0.2 percent growth in the previous three months. Inflation accelerated to 1.6 percent in January, the most since November 2012, while a separate release showed price growth in Spain surged to 3 percent.

France's performance in the fourth quarter, along with solid growth in both Germany's and Spain, means the expansion in the euro area probably strengthened at the end of 2016. With inflation rates rising across the region, a discussion about the ECB's 2.28 trillion-euro (\$2.4 trillion) bond-buying program is set to intensify.

"The euro zone is getting good nominal growth and rising inflation, a scenario in which pressure on the ECB is going to increase," said Michel Martinez, an economist at Societe Generale SA in London.

"There are fewer and fewer people who will understand the need to continue doing quantitative easing."

In the euro area, growth probably accelerated to 0.5 percent in the fourth quarter from 0.3 percent, while the inflation rate rose to 1.5 percent in January from 1.1 percent the previous month, according to separate Bloomberg surveys. Eurostat will release those data at 11 a.m. Paris time.

The Austrian economy grew 0.6 percent in the final three months of 2016, up from 0.5 percent, the country's Institute of Economic Research said Tuesday. Inflation in Spain surged to 3 percent this month, the highest level since 2012, according to the nation's statistics office. German unemployment fell by 26,000 in January to 5.9 percent, the lowest rate since the country's reunification.

In France, household spending and corporate investment spurred the fourth-quarter expansion, allowing domestic demand to contribute 0.6 percentage point to growth. External trade added 0.1 percentage point, Insee said.

The French economy grew 1.1 percent in all of 2016, compared with 3.2 percent in Spain and 1.9 percent in Germany.

### Lagging Recovery

France's expansion was dented last year as multiple terrorist attacks caused a drop in tourism and unusual weather hit farm output. Yet by the final quarter, tourism was beginning to revive while low interest rates were spurring construction and tax cuts were driving investment, Martinez said.

As a result, sentiment among factory executives climbed to a five-year

high and consumer confidence is at its strongest since 2007.

"Despite global political risks, 2017 begins with good economic

conditions," Finance Minister Michel Sapin said in a statement.

Even so, the unemployment rate remains stuck close to 10 percent. The lack of job creation and the

lagging recovery forced President Francois Hollande to declare in December that he wouldn't seek re-election.

France's 2017 presidential election is scheduled for two rounds on April 23 and May 7.

Before it's here, it's on the Bloomberg Terminal. [LEARN MORE](#)

## Eurozone Inflation Rising To 1.8% Is The Policy Point, Not A Problem

Tim Worstall

We know that people can get confused by economic policy so perhaps a time to provide a little clarification? We have the news out of the eurozone this morning that inflation has "surged" to 1.8%. We should all rather hope that it has as getting inflation up is the prime purpose of the monetary policy of near the entire continent. Unfortunately, it is the wrong inflation rate which has so surged. Even so, the people hyperventilating about it having risen are clearly not thinking through the problem.

New growth figures show that the euro area grew by 0.5% in the last three months of 2016, up from 0.4% in the previous quarter.

That's an encouraging sign, suggesting the region's recovery is picking up pace.

But inflation has jumped by more than expected, to 1.8% in January.

That's the highest in almost four-years, driven by a steep rise in energy prices.

It's the "but" there which is in error. The standard analysis of the eurozone is that it has been flirting much, much, too closely with deflation for anyone's comfort. Thus the European Central Bank and their quantitative easing program where they buy just about any bond that stands still for long enough to be purchased. Purchased with money entirely made up on the ECB's computers. The whole point of this is try to get inflation up again. Up to around and about the ECB target of 2%.

Euro-area inflation accelerated more than forecast to effectively reach the European Central Bank's goal, which may intensify a debate among policy makers about their long-running stimulus programs.

The 1.8 percent annual increase in consumer prices in January was the

fastest since early 2013 and beat the 1.5 percent median forecast in a Bloomberg survey. That's in line with the ECB goal of just below 2 percent, though the less-volatile core rate remains at just half that level.

That's why the "but" is wrong. The very point of current policy is to try and get the inflation rate up, the inflation rate is up, but is therefore not the appropriate response:

Consumer prices in three big economies in the region, Germany, France and Spain, have risen sharply this month, suggesting inflation for the euro zone as a whole, due for release at 1000 GMT, is also likely to be high. Economists polled by Reuters expect 1.6 percent.

It was, as we know, a little bit higher.

However, some care needs to be taken here. Deflation is a general fall in prices across an economy.

Inflation is a general rise in prices across an economy. Obviously, one way to measure this is simply to measure the changes of all prices, weight them appropriately, and produce an average. However, we generally distinguish between prices which are notoriously volatile and those which are not. Opec getting its act together and raising the crude oil price is indeed inflation but it's not really a good guide to whether prices in general across the continent are rising or falling. Thus we distinguish between core inflation (everything minus energy and food) and regular inflation (everything). And inflation targets are almost always in terms of core inflation--this is still under half the ECB target.

In other words this rise in inflation is something we've been looking for, working towards, but it's still not enough and thus we should expect policy to be unchanged. We'll be doing more of what we currently are.

**THE WALL STREET JOURNAL**

## Eurozone Economy Grows at Faster Pace Than U.S. (online)

Paul Hannon and William Horobin

Updated Jan. 31, 2017 5:00 a.m. ET

PARIS—Eurozone economic growth accelerated at the end of 2016 while the jobless rate fell to its lowest level since 2009, putting the currency area on a steadier footing at the start of a year clouded by political uncertainty.

The fourth quarter pickup allowed the eurozone economy to grow more rapidly than its U.S. counterpart during 2016 as a whole, expanding by 1.7% compared with 1.6% for the U.S., the first time that has happened since the crisis-year of 2008.

But a number of headwinds make it far from certain the eurozone is set to embark on a more dynamic recovery after more than three years of modest growth.

Rising energy prices threaten to dampen consumer spending unless workers can secure similarly large wage rises. Figures released Tuesday by the European Union's statistics agency showed consumer prices were 1.8% higher in Jan. than a year earlier, the highest inflation rate since Feb. 2013.

But higher wages have become slightly more likely with a sharper fall in unemployment toward the end of last year. Figures also released Tuesday by the Eurostat showed the jobless rate fell to 9.6% in Dec. from 9.7% in Nov., its lowest since May 2009.

Economists also worry that growth could be damped by high levels of uncertainty ahead of a series of key elections that could lead to gains for parties hostile to the euro and the European Union, and the start of difficult talks that will pave the way for the U.K.'s exit from the bloc.

So while European Central Bank President Mario Draghi noted signs of a growth pickup at the turn of the year during a news conference earlier this month, he also warned that "the risks surrounding the euro area growth outlook remain tilted to the downside and relate predominantly to global factors."

Among those global factors, business leaders are concerned about the impact on Europe if President Donald Trump follows through on his antitrade rhetoric with protectionist policies.

"If the U.S. turns in on itself, it will be very, very bad news," Pierre Gattaz, the head of France's largest

business lobby Medef said in a television interview.

Buoyed by the ECB's stimulus programs and a weaker currency that appears to have aided exports, Eurostat said the eurozone's gross domestic product in the fourth quarter was 0.5% higher than in the three months to September, and 1.8% higher than in the final three months of 2015. On an annualized basis, growth picked up to 2.0% from 1.8% in the third quarter.

For 2016 as a whole, the economy expanded by 1.7%, compared with 1.6% for the U.S.. That marked a slowdown from 2015.

Figures also released Tuesday showed stronger consumer spending growth and a sharp rebound in business investment helped raise French GDP 0.4% quarter-on-quarter, a pickup from the 0.2% growth recorded in the third quarter.

In France, the leading presidential candidates are proposing significant departures from the current economic policy of President Francois Hollande's administration ahead of two rounds of voting in April and May.

National Front leader Marine Le Pen has centered her campaign on pulling France out of the euro and the EU, while the conservative candidate Francois Fillon says he would implement a deep austerity program coupled with tax cuts for business and tax hikes for consumers. Pro-business and pro-European centrist Emmanuel Macron—who has surged in the polls in recent weeks—has indicated he would concentrate on loosening labor laws to tackle unemployment.

Previously released figures indicate Germany's economic growth rate accelerated to 0.5% from 0.2% in the third quarter, while Spain's growth rate remained steady at 0.7%. But economists warn growth is likely to slow in the latter country after more than two years of strong recovery from a property and banking crisis.

"Spain is gradually on a path of deceleration," Daniele Antonucci, a Morgan Stanley economist, said.

—Jeannette Neumann contributed to this article.

**Write to** Paul Hannon at [paul.hannon@wsj.com](mailto:paul.hannon@wsj.com) and William Horobin at [William.Horobin@wsj.com](mailto:William.Horobin@wsj.com)





## Europe's Recovery Gains Speed in Turbulent Year

• By  
david  
mchug

h, ap business writer

FRANKFURT, Germany — Jan 31, 2017, 8:16 AM ET

Europe's economic recovery is on more solid ground ahead of what could be a turbulent political year.

Official figures showed clear signs of improvement in the 19 countries that share the euro currency. Statistics agency Eurostat said Tuesday that eurozone growth accelerated in the fourth quarter to 0.5 percent from 0.4 percent in the previous three-month period. As a result, the eurozone economy grew by 1.7 percent in 2016.

That solid — if unspectacular — growth helped unemployment drop 0.1 percentage point in December to 9.6 percent. That is the lowest since May 2009, before a financial implosion in Greece that year set off a debt crisis that almost shattered the eurozone.

The growth and unemployment figures offer a boost to supporters of the European Union and the euro currency after years of crisis management. Eurozone governments have had to bail out

Greece, Portugal, Ireland and Cyprus, and set up new banking regulations aimed at preventing future crises. A perceived emphasis on controlling deficits over promoting growth fueled resentment in bailed-out countries.

One of the most striking numbers from Eurostat showed inflation across the eurozone rising sharply in January to 1.8 percent from 1.1 percent the month before — a jump that will likely encourage critics who think it's time for the European Central Bank to start withdrawing its stimulus programs.

Inflation was the highest since February 2013 and now — on paper anyway — at the ECB's goal of just below 2 percent.

The upturn is unlikely to quell populist resentment of the EU in a year that will see challenges from nationalist and populist anti-EU parties. Elections in France, the Netherlands, Germany and possibly Italy will give such forces a chance to test their support.

French presidential candidate Marine Le Pen of the Front National, for example, wants a referendum on leaving the EU, which she has compared to the Soviet Union. Polls

suggest she could make it past the first round of voting in April but would lose in the May runoff.

Europe's recovery remains uneven. Germany, benefiting from strong exports and domestic demand, has an unemployment rate of only 3.9 percent, according to Eurostat.

Greece, which has struggled to get its finances under control despite three rounds of bailout loans from its euro partners and the International Monetary Fund, remains mired in economic misery. The latest unemployment figures there, from October, showed 23.0 percent of the workforce out of a job.

Spain has showed a stronger recovery from a collapsed real estate boom, but the jobless rate remains at 18.4 percent despite a substantial drop in December from 20.7 percent.

Unemployment for young people leaving school is even worse in the lagging countries still feeling the effects of the debt crisis: 44.2 percent for under-25s in Greece, 42.9 percent in Spain and 40.1 percent in Italy.

The inflation figure could present a headache for Mario Draghi, head of the European Central Bank. It's

likely to embolden critics, particularly in Germany, who say it's time for the bank to start withdrawing its extraordinary stimulus aimed at increasing inflation toward the bank's goal.

The ECB has held its short-term benchmark interest rate at zero and is purchasing government and corporate bonds with newly printed money, a step that pumps fresh cash into the financial system and drives down longer-term borrowing rates. Critics say the zero-interest rate policy punishes savers, who get no return on conservative holdings such as bank deposits, and supports indebted governments with cheap borrowing costs.

Draghi however has shown no signs of readiness to start scaling back. He says the spike in inflation is caused by volatile oil prices, not by underlying price pressures in the economy such as wage increases passed on to consumers. That means the inflation spike could fade over coming months, as the effect of sharply lower oil prices a year ago is left behind. Core inflation, which excludes oil and food prices, remained stuck at 0.9 percent, about where it has been for months.

**Bloomberg**

## Mark Gilbert : Alarms Are Sounding in European Bonds

Mark Gilbert

Jean-Claude Trichet, the European Central Bank's former president, used to argue that one of the euro's greatest achievements was driving government borrowing costs down to match those of Germany, the region's benchmark borrower. In recent weeks, however, fissures have emerged that reflect investor concern about the political and economic outlook for at least three of the common currency's members.

Bond yields for France, Italy and Greece are all spiking higher relative to benchmarks. French 10-year borrowing costs have surpassed 1 percent for the first time in more than a year on fears that its presidential election will result in a victory for National Front leader Marine Le Pen, whose policy ideas are hardly market-friendly. Italy, deeply divided after a referendum on constitutional reform that led to a change in government, has the added problem of a banking industry that defies remedial efforts. And Greece is back in the news for all the wrong reasons as its creditors wrangle over the latest bailout review.

During Trichet's tenure at the ECB between November 2003 and November 2011, the average value for the spread between French and German 10-year yields was about 20 basis points. The gap has been widening for several months; this week, it reached a three-year high of 61 basis points:

Rising Risk (Part I)

Gap between French and German 10-year yields

Source: Bloomberg

The French election is getting messy. Le Pen, who would attempt to drive France out of the European Union, leads the way with about 25 percent of the vote in recent polling. It doesn't matter that pundits are convinced she can't win in France's two-stage system; bondholders remember being told Donald Trump wouldn't become U.S. President and the U.K. wouldn't vote to quit the European Union.

Italian yields spent the first half of last year below those of Spain. After crossing at the end of June, Italy's 10-year borrowing cost has marched steadily higher compared with its

peer. This week, the gap climbed to its widest level in four years at 70 basis points:

Rising Risk (Part II)

Gap between Italian and Spanish 10-year yields

Source: Bloomberg

Italian unemployment is stuck at 12 percent, youth unemployment is more than 40 percent, consumer confidence and retail sales are declining, and an early election looks increasingly likely. Efforts to find a private solution to the woes of the ailing lender Monte dei Paschi di Siena failed, prompting the government to set aside 20 billion euros (\$21.4 billion) of public money to recapitalize banks struggling to cope with about 355 billion euros of bad loans.

And Unicredit, the country's biggest bank, expects to record a loss of 11.8 billion euros for 2016 -- almost equal to the 13 billion euros it's hoping to raise in a capital increase. With Unicredit shares down by more than 12 percent in the past three days, that capital raising exercise gets harder and harder.

In short, both the Italian economy and its banking system are failing to reach the post-crisis escape velocity that other euro members have achieved.

It's Greece, though, that remains the sickest man in the euro. Greece's two-year yield has soared by more than 2 full percentage points in the past week, climbing above 9 percent to its highest level since the middle of last year. The gap between 10-year Greek and German yields has also climbed, reaching its widest in 12 weeks:

Rising Risk (Part III)

Gap between Greek and German 10-year yields

Source: Bloomberg

The International Monetary Fund says Greece's government debt burden will reach a staggering 270 percent of its gross domestic product by 2060, up from about 180 percent currently. It wants European officials to grant more debt relief to avoid that scenario.

For its part, the European Stability Mechanism, which is providing



Greece's bailout loans, says there's "no reason for an alarmistic assessment of Greece's debt situation." Greece has yet to implement two-thirds of the conditions attached to the disbursement of the next tranche of aid, and with elections looming in France and Germany, European officials are warning the nation that the standoff needs resolving by the time euro region finance ministers meet on Feb. 20.

"We need a new cycle of economic

**The  
Washington  
Post**

## Trump's travel ban is having a spillover effect on European dual nationals

<https://www.facebook.com/anthony.faiola>

BERLIN — Thousands of citizens of U.S.-allied nations in Europe and beyond may be barred from entering the United States under President Trump's travel ban, sparking a wave of outrage and fresh confusion that threatened to open an early rift across the Atlantic.

Yet the administration also appeared to be doling out exceptions to nations such as Britain — playing favorites among allies at the possible expense of long-standing relationships.

Following instructions from the Department of Homeland Security, the U.S. embassies in Berlin and Paris warned Monday that German and French citizens who are also dual nationals of Iraq, Iran, Libya, Somalia, Sudan, Syria and Yemen — the seven mostly Muslim nations targeted by the ban — would fall under the travel ban, joining people who hold passports only from those countries.

Today's WorldView

What's most important from where the world meets Washington

Please provide a valid email address.

The measure's full effect appeared unclear — even to the U.S. embassies in Europe, where conflicting information circulated. The U.S. Embassy in Paris, for instance, warned that even existing U.S. visas granted to dual citizens would be revoked, while the U.S. Embassy in Berlin suggested only that new visas would not be granted.

The Trump administration, however, may be favoring the dual nationals of some Western nations — a turn of events that could further complicate the White House's already floundering relations with Europe. After talks with the White House, British Foreign Secretary Boris Johnson, for instance, reassured his nation Monday that

and social convergence," Portuguese Prime Minister Antonio Costa told reporters on Tuesday at a meeting of southern European leaders in Lisbon. "A better coordination of budget policies and of budget policies with the ECB's policy are essential conditions for growth and employment." Costa's own debt-to-GDP ratio is the third-highest in the euro region, behind Greece and Italy, and shows little sign of improvement.

dual British nationals of the flagged Muslim nations have received an "exemption" from the travel ban.

The U.S. Embassy in London initially contradicted that Monday but later confirmed that British dual nationals were indeed "exempt."

"We have received assurances from the U.S. Embassy that this executive order will make no difference to any British passport-holder, irrespective of their country of birth or whether they hold another passport," Johnson told Parliament.

The advisories sowed more confusion over a travel ban denounced by critics as a haphazard religious test targeting Muslims — criticism rejected by the Trump administration.

*[Amid protests and confusion, Trump defends executive order: 'This is not a Muslim ban']*

The administration has sought to portray the order — which also blocks entry to refugees from around the world for at least 120 days to allow for "extreme vetting" — as an attempt to weed out prospective terrorists. But German Chancellor Angela Merkel suggested that it targets Muslims and said she would seek to defend the travel rights of all German citizens.

"The necessary and also resolute fight against terror does not justify in any way a general suspicion against people of a certain faith, in this case against people of Muslim faith, or people of a certain origin," Merkel said Monday. Alluding to the uncertainty surrounding the ban, she added that Germany "is making all efforts to clarify the legal situation for the dual citizens affected and to strongly assert their interests."

*[Trump's first official calls to German, French leaders set to be awkward exchanges]*

The U.S. guidance appeared to catch the Europeans off guard. The French Foreign Ministry issued

Unfortunately, divergence seems the more likely scenario for the euro region in the coming months, both politically and economically. Add in the tricky task facing the European Central Bank as it negotiates between German demands to tighten monetary policy with the economic needs of the euro's weaker members, and it's clear that those bond-market alarm bells are a reminder that Brexit isn't the only cloud on Europe's horizon.

a warning about travel to the United States, mentioning the uncertainty of the regulations for dual nationals.

German Foreign Ministry spokesman Martin Schäfer began a news conference Monday by saying he did not know whether dual German citizens of the seven countries targeted by Trump would be affected. Several minutes later, he said that according to new information from the U.S. Embassy in Berlin, those citizens would indeed be affected.

The Foreign Ministry said tens of thousands of German citizens are potentially affected. The number of other people impacted could surge far higher across Western Europe. In addition, Schäfer said the order has raised further complications. If a citizen of one of the seven targeted nations has a U.S. green card and wants to visit Germany, "can we give him a visa?" he asked. "The condition for this would be that he can return."

Niema Movassat, a lawmaker from Germany's Left Party who holds dual German and Iranian citizenship, penned a sharp letter to the U.S. Congress denouncing the move.

"It's completely unbelievable that members of parliament and millions of other people are treated like terrorists," he wrote. "This is not about combating terrorism, but about right-wing populism and fascist action."

Other European citizens with dual nationality fretted that they would be unable to see relatives.

"Luckily I was there in 2015 to see my 97-year-old uncle, who died shortly after," actress Jasmin Tabatabai, a dual German-Iranian national, told the Frankfurter Allgemeine newspaper. "Half of my family lives in the U.S., and because I have an Iranian passport, I'm not allowed to enter anymore. ... Many families are torn apart; parents can't

This column does not necessarily reflect the opinion of the editorial board or Bloomberg LP and its owners.

To contact the author of this story: Mark Gilbert at [magilbert@bloomberg.net](mailto:magilbert@bloomberg.net)

To contact the editor responsible for this story: Therese Raphael at [traphael4@bloomberg.net](mailto:traphael4@bloomberg.net)

see their children anymore. Trump's decree is inhumane and unfair."

Omid Nouripour, vice president of Germany's German-American parliamentary committee, said Saturday that he feared he would not be allowed to visit the United States as long as the executive order remains in place. Nouripour was born in Iran and holds dual Iranian and German citizenship.

Long a strong advocate of closer German-American relations, he blasted the new order.

"It's dirty symbolism," Nouripour said of Trump's executive order. "It's the best boost jihadis could hope for. They can now pretend the West really is at war with Islam."

It remained unclear whether officials such as Nouripour could yet find an out, since many lawmakers hold special diplomatic passports. The U.S. Embassy in Berlin could not immediately provide additional comment, although its advisory noted certain exceptions, including travel related to official government or North Atlantic Treaty Organization business.

Other countries around the globe also scrambled to assess the impact of the ban on their dual nationals, and it remained unclear whether the administration was granting exemptions to some nations and not to others.

Late Sunday, authorities announced that Canadian citizens and permanent residents would continue to have access to the United States as usual. David MacNaughton, the Canadian ambassador to Washington, tweeted that dual citizens in particular would not be affected by the ban and that those traveling with a Canadian passport would go through a "normal entry [and] transit process." MacNaughton indicated that national security adviser Michael T. Flynn had confirmed this information to the Canadian Embassy in Washington.

In Australia, public broadcaster SBS reported Monday that an Australian Iranian teenager appeared to be the first dual national in the country affected by the ban. Pouya Ghadirian, 15, was attending a visa interview at the U.S. Consulate when he was advised that the new

executive order would affect his travel.

"They were a bit shocked, and they didn't know how to handle it," Ghadirian told SBS.

There were also widespread concerns about the ban in Israel. Israelis born in the countries listed

by the executive order were warned by experts to avoid travel to the United States.

"I recommend that Israelis born in these countries avoid traveling to the U.S. in the near future until we clear things up," Liam Schwartz, a lawyer who specializes in American and Israeli immigration, told

Ynetnews. "I don't think I'm exaggerating by saying this. The ban is unequivocal."

Rick Noack in London, James McAuley in Paris, Stephanie Kirchner in Berlin and Adam Taylor in Washington contributed to this report.

**The  
New York  
Times**

## For Leaders of U.S. Allies, Getting Close to Trump Can Sting (UNE)

Steven Erlanger

LONDON — It

had all been going so well.

Prime Minister Theresa May of Britain had just left Washington on Friday evening after a tense but successful first visit with President Trump for a 10-hour flight to Ankara, Turkey, for her next awkward encounter, with the increasingly autocratic Turkish president, Recep Tayyip Erdogan.

By the time she had landed in Turkey, however, Mr. Trump had signed his executive order halting entrance to the United States of all Syrian refugees and of most citizens from seven predominantly Muslim countries. Mrs. May was beginning to feel the backlash.

After she termed the executive order an American issue, criticism erupted even among her own members of Parliament. She was accused of appeasement by a former British diplomat. Protesters gathered outside Downing Street on Monday night, and more than 1.5 million signatures collected on an internet petition demanding that Mrs. May rescind her invitation for Mr. Trump to visit Queen Elizabeth II.

A close relationship with any American president is regarded as crucial by allies and foes alike, but especially by intimates like Britain, Canada, Japan and Mexico. Yet like moths to the flame, the leaders of those nations are finding that they draw close at their peril.

While Mrs. May is the latest prominent figure to suffer repercussions for her handling of Mr. Trump, the leaders of those other three close allies have also felt the sting of public anger soon after what seemed to be friendly telephone calls or encounters. They then find themselves facing a no-win situation, either openly criticizing the leader of their superpower ally or pulling their punches and risking severe criticism at home.

One Western leader to escape this fate so far is the German chancellor, Angela Merkel, who has kept a cool distance from Mr. Trump. In a telephone call on Saturday, she reminded him of Washington's obligations under the Geneva

Conventions to accept refugees fleeing war, a view underlined by her official spokesman.

The danger of playing nice with Mr. Trump should come as little surprise to his country's allies. Besides campaigning on an "America First" platform, he has regularly argued that allies have been taking the United States for a ride, in trade, security and financial terms.

While he has been cordial in public settings with the leaders of those allied nations, Mr. Trump has turned on them soon afterward.

"The problem for May is that Trump doesn't value relationships. He values strength and winning," said Jeremy Shapiro, the director of research at the European Council on Foreign Relations and a former senior State Department official. "If you rush to the White House to offer a weak hand of friendship, you guarantee exploitation."

While Mr. Trump's executive order was clearly not aimed at Britain, he signed it on Friday, just a few hours after Mrs. May left. "You can show up at his doorstep and hold his hand so he doesn't fall down a ramp, but that doesn't mean a few hours later when he's signing an order he thinks at all about how it affects you, your politics or your citizens," Mr. Shapiro said.

Particularly problematic for Mrs. May was her offering the invitation to Mr. Trump to undertake a state visit with Queen Elizabeth II this year, which was accepted. The internet petition to Parliament calling for the cancellation of the invitation says the visit "would cause embarrassment to Her Majesty the Queen."

### Britons Protest May's Support of Trump

Marchers in London voiced their displeasure for President Donald Trump and the backing he has received from Prime Minister Theresa May of Britain.

By ILIANA MAGRA and ROBIN LINDSAY on January 30, 2017. Photo by Iliana Magra/The New York Times.

By Monday evening in Britain, there had been more than 1.5 million

signatures, and some were enjoying themselves watching the numbers rise in real time. At a large protest outside Downing Street, people urged Mrs. May to cancel the state visit and said that while relations with Washington were important, they should be cooler toward Mr. Trump.

Amber Curtis, 21, a film student who is half-British and half-Iranian, said that she worried for her family and friends in America. "It sends a bad message if he comes here after this ban," Ms. Curtis said of Mr. Trump. "I wouldn't say that I want no relationship at all, but he cannot come here under the terms of this ban. The terms need to be renegotiated."

Negma Yamin, 50, a teacher of Pakistani origin, was in tears. "I'm so upset as a fellow Muslim; I hate the persecution," she said. Mrs. May "should absolutely have no relationship with him," she added. "You can't negotiate with a person like that. What is he going to do with the people? He's dividing the U.S., he's dividing the world."

On Monday, Downing Street insisted that the invitation stood. But who knows how Mr. Trump will react?

The Mexican president, Enrique Peña Nieto, has had a similar experience to Mrs. May's — twice. Last year, in the name of conciliation and dialogue, he invited Mr. Trump to Mexico, a somewhat questionable move given Mr. Trump's contempt for Mexico and his promises to renegotiate the North American Free Trade Agreement, raise tariffs, deport millions of Mexicans, and build (or finish) a border wall and make the southern neighbor of the United States pay for it.

The visit was widely viewed in Mexico as a national humiliation. It left Mr. Trump looking stronger and Mr. Peña Nieto looking weaker, especially when Mr. Trump, in an immigration policy speech in Phoenix the same day, insisted again that Mexico would pay for the wall.

Mr. Peña Nieto persisted after Mr. Trump's election, apparently aiming, like Mrs. May, to influence the new president and to moderate what many hoped was just hyperbolic

campaign talk. But just before the two men were to meet in Washington, Mr. Trump issued executive orders calling for the wall and greatly restricting immigration.

Mr. Peña Nieto called off the meeting only when Mr. Trump threatened on Twitter to cancel it unless Mexico agreed to pay for the wall.

Embarrassed and cornered, Mr. Peña Nieto moved first, an act of defiance that provided a rare moment of public approval for the unpopular president. But given the importance of bilateral ties, he did speak to Mr. Trump the next morning for an hour, without setting a new date to meet.

"This is neither a victory nor a defeat," said Fernando Dworak, an analyst in Mexico City. "It is the bell ringing in a boxing match."

Prime Minister Shinzo Abe of Japan has the distinction of being among the first to feel the sting of Mr. Trump's actions. In a meeting in November in New York, Mr. Abe urged Mr. Trump, then the president-elect, not to abandon a major trade deal, the Trans-Pacific Partnership.

One of Mr. Trump's first actions in office was to abandon the deal, which many considered a victory for China, even though the pact had already been blocked in the Senate. Mr. Trump has long questioned the United States' financial and military commitment to Japan's security, and he has criticized the automaker Toyota for planning to produce cars in Mexico.

Prime Minister Justin Trudeau of Canada moved swiftly to make contact with officials in the Trump administration and promoted ministers with experience in the United States. Chris Bolin/Reuters

An editorial in the Mainichi Shimbun, a center-right paper in Japan, questioned why Mr. Abe was not taking a stronger stand against Mr. Trump: "It is hard to understand why the prime minister is defending a president who destroyed the trade accord — formed after nearly six years of arduous negotiations — on his fourth day in office."

Given the stakes, Mr. Abe has refrained from open criticism of Mr. Trump and is scheduled to meet with him in Washington early in February.

The Trump effect has been felt even in Australia, where Prime Minister Malcolm Turnbull has come under criticism for saying it is not his job to comment on the domestic policies of other countries. This after securing a pledge from the president on Sunday to honor an Obama administration agreement to accept refugees detained on the Pacific islands of Nauru and Manus.

In Canada, too, the prime minister, Justin Trudeau, has had his Trump moments. Mr. Trump is deeply unpopular in the country, but as Mr. Trudeau's father,

former Prime Minister Pierre Trudeau, once said, proximity to America "is in some ways like sleeping with an elephant; no matter how friendly or temperate the beast, one is affected by every twitch and grunt."

So instead of provoking a fight, Mr. Trudeau moved swiftly to make contact with officials in the new administration and reshaped his cabinet to promote ministers with experience in the United States.

Mr. Trump made problems right away for the Canadian leader by giving the go-ahead to the Keystone XL pipeline, putting Mr. Trudeau in an uncomfortable position between environmentalists and oil producers.

If Mr. Trump goes after Canada on trade issues, as seems likely, Mr.

Trudeau is expected to become significantly more vocal and critical.

But to date he has avoided public criticism of the American president, a reticence that may have helped over the weekend, after Mr. Trump's executive order on immigration. Canada was able to get quick clarification from the White House that the directive would not affect the movement of Canadian citizens and dual nationals into the United States.

After fumbling its initial response, Britain got essentially the same clarification 15 hours later, which London hailed as a result of its special relationship with Mr. Trump. While Britain may have been influential, however, the White House was already narrowing the

initial interpretations of the executive order.

But not before Mrs. May was attacked for timidity in the face of outrage by her own legislators and by the opposition.

Still, the "special relationship" has never been an equal one, so some degree of humiliation often goes with the territory.

As one message on Twitter, posted by the user @Locke1689, a professed "progressive conservative," read: "Actively snubbing the world's only superpower would be gross diplomatic self-harm."

## The Washington Post

# Should Britain host Trump for state visit? More than 1 million people say no.

By Karla Adam

LONDON — A petition calling on Britain to cancel President Trump's state visit surged past 1 million signatures Monday, making the appeal the country's second-biggest grass-roots effort and pushing it onto the agenda of the British Parliament.

Amid the furor, Britain's foreign secretary revealed that he secured a deal with the Trump administration to clear travel for any British passport holder even in cases of dual citizenship with one of the seven blacklisted nations.

Trump provoked a worldwide backlash after signing an executive order to temporarily prevent people from seven predominantly Muslim countries — Iran, Iraq, Libya, Somalia, Sudan, Syria and Yemen — from entering the United States. It also stopped the U.S. refugee program for 120 days. Trump has insisted that the order is not about religion but an interim measure to enhance security vetting.

Today's WorldView

What's most important from where the world meets Washington

Please provide a valid email address.

British Prime Minister Theresa May announced during a joint news conference with Trump on Friday — before the ban was ordered — that Trump had accepted an offer by Queen Elizabeth II for a state visit this year.

The petition to rescind the state visit began two months ago, but

signatures began to pour in after the travel restrictions were announced.

(Reuters)

More than 1 million people have signed a petition urging Britain to withdraw an invitation for President Donald Trump to visit London and dine with Queen Elizabeth. Over one million sign petition to halt Trump visit to U.K. (Reuters)

The petition is the second-most-signed initiative on Parliament's website. (The most-signed petition was for a debate to consider a second referendum on E.U. membership after voters in June backed leaving the bloc.)

*[Iraqi lawmakers call for retaliatory visa block on Americans]*

Graham Guest, 42, of Leeds, said he launched the petition because he did not want Trump to embarrass the queen. Trump should not be allowed to "bask in the queen's reflective glory," he told the Independent newspaper.

The petition argues that Trump should be allowed into Britain but not receive a full state visit. "Donald Trump's well documented misogyny and vulgarity disqualifies him from being received by Her Majesty the Queen or the Prince of Wales," it reads.

Lawmakers will decide on Tuesday if they will debate the petition. If a petition receives more than 100,000 signatures, then Parliament automatically considers it for debate.

When asked if the petition has any impact on the state visit, a spokesman for Downing Street said

of Trump: "He has been invited and he has accepted."

May has faced criticism from across the political spectrum for plans to roll out the red carpet for Trump.

Nobody does pomp and pageantry like the British, and it is on full display during state visits, which usually include a carriage procession and a lavish state banquet at Buckingham Palace.

Scottish Conservative leader Ruth Davidson said that the state visit should not proceed while "a cruel and divisive policy which discriminates against citizens of the host nation is in place."

"I hope President Trump immediately reconsiders his Muslim ban," she added.

Jeremy Corbyn, the leader of the opposition Labour Party, has said that May should cancel the state visit and "stand up to Trump's hate."

London Mayor Sadiq Khan, the first Muslim to hold the post, said the ban was counterproductive and could do more harm than good.

"It will play straight into the hands of the terrorists and extremists who seek to divide and harm our great nations," he wrote in the Evening Standard newspaper. "I fear it will be used to act as a recruiting sergeant for so-called IS [Islamic State] and other like-minded groups."

May has also come under fire for not condemning the ban as quickly or forcefully as other European leaders. After initially refusing to condemn the measure, May's office released a statement saying that it "does not agree" with the approach.

A spokesman for German Chancellor Angela Merkel, by contrast, said that she "is convinced that the necessary, decisive battle against terrorism does not justify a general suspicion against people of a certain origin or a certain religion."

Demonstrations were held in cities across the United Kingdom on Monday evening, including in London outside of May's Downing Street office.

In the House of Commons, Boris Johnson, Britain's foreign secretary, called Trump's measures "divisive and wrong." But he also stressed that the Anglo-American relationship was of "vital importance."

As evidence, he said Britain's standing in Washington allowed a special access deal for any British passport holder regardless of a possible second nationality — a move that could anger Britain's European Union partners.

Nadhim Zahawi, a Conservative member of Parliament who was born in Iraq, told the BBC he thought the ban was "demeaning" and "sad." His twin sons are studying at Princeton University and he initially thought he would be blocked from entering the U.S. because he has dual citizenship in Iraq and Britain.

While many on the left have attacked May for appearing to cozy up to Trump — epitomized by a photograph showing the two leaders holding hands outside of the White House — others have argued that she is only doing her job and it would be foolish not to engage with the elected leader of the United States.

## Even as Trump seeks warmer ties with Russia, U.S. deploys troops across Eastern Europe

<https://www.facebook.com/michael.birnbaum1>

ZAGAN, Poland — On a snowy field in southwest Poland, U.S. tanks and troops gathered on Monday to defend against a resurgent Russia that President Trump wants to befriend.

The major new deployments of tanks and other heavy equipment will fan out to nations on the Russian frontier this week, part of the largest infusion of U.S. troops to Europe since the 1991 breakup of the Soviet Union. But the long-planned effort comes at the most unsettled time for U.S.-European relations since World War II, with Trump questioning old alliances and seeking to build bridges to the Kremlin.

When President Barack Obama committed the troops, about 3,500 in all, to Europe last February, then followed up with additional commitments to NATO over the summer, they were a bipartisan expression of support for U.S. allies at a moment of heightened fear about Russia.

Today's WorldView

What's most important from where the world meets Washington

Please provide a valid email address.

Now, however, they are coming despite the White House, not because of it. Eastern European nations say they fully trust Washington's commitments — but the jubilation of the summer has been replaced by concern over Trump's overtures to Russian President Vladimir Putin. NATO leaders acknowledge that the alliance will be rocked if Trump abandons the troop deployments.

The uncertainty has led to an unusual gap between Trump's rhetoric and that of nearly the entire military establishment underneath him.

"It was the Russian invasion of Ukraine and the unlawful annexation of Crimea" that forced the deployments, said Lt. Gen. Ben

Hodges, the commander of U.S. Army ground forces in Europe, ahead of a frigid Monday ceremony on a military exercise range outside the Polish town of Zagan, where a Polish military band played "The Star-Spangled Banner" to welcome the American troops.

"The last American tank left Europe three years ago because we all hoped Russia was going to be our partner. And so we had to bring all this back," Hodges said.

Trump has offered mixed messages on NATO. He called the alliance "obsolete" in an interview days before the inauguration. But Defense Secretary James Mattis called NATO Secretary General Jens Stoltenberg on his first full day on the job last week, praising "the fundamental and enduring value of NATO for the security of both Europe and North America," according to NATO.

*[Trump orders Islamic State plan and talks with Putin]*

Later in the week, British Prime Minister Theresa May stood by Trump's side and attempted to force the issue, saying he had "confirmed that you're 100 percent behind NATO."

But Trump has been far warmer to Putin since his election than the leaders of bedrock U.S. allies, saying that the Kremlin is a key partner in the battle against the Islamic State and describing the authoritarian Russian as a strong leader.

Trump and Putin spoke for an hour Saturday, initiating a new era in U.S.-Russian relations. But the leaders barely mentioned the primary irritant between the West and Russia, its 2014 annexation of Ukraine's Crimean Peninsula and subsequent fueling of a separatist war in eastern Ukraine, according to officials briefed on the call.

The uncertainty has weighed on Eastern European leaders who have welcomed the international deployment of several thousand troops to their nations.

Any reversal of deployments "would be an issue of concern to us," said Ojars Kalnins, head of the foreign affairs committee in Latvia's Parliament. Privately, European politicians, diplomats and security officials say that a rollback of U.S. troop commitments would be a seismic shift for NATO that could upend the alliance. But most say they do not think Trump will reverse the flow, saying that what truly counts are the boots that are currently touching down on European ground.

"This is a substantial deployment, with heavy formations for the type of warfare one could expect if there was a crisis in Europe," said Fabrice Pothier, a former senior NATO official who is a senior research fellow at the Atlantic Council, a Washington-based policy center.

But if Trump decides to alter the deployments, that would fundamentally change European defense calculations, Pothier said.

"Everybody is going to run for cover," he said. "It would lead to a more fragmented, more unstable Europe. It's a lose-lose both for the U.S. and the Europeans."

Monday's exercises involved the U.S. Army's 3rd Armored Combat Brigade Team, 4th Infantry Division, which arrived in Germany this month with 87 Abrams M1A1 tanks, 20 Paladin artillery systems and 136 Bradley Fighting Vehicles. The troops will spread across Eastern Europe, fanning into the Baltic nations, digging into Poland and also deploying to Romania, Bulgaria and Hungary.

When the brigade finishes its deployment in nine months, it will be followed by another group of similar size, a rotation that the Pentagon currently expects to maintain on a near-permanent basis.

Separately, Britain, Canada and Germany are sending battalions to Estonia, Latvia and Lithuania as part of a commitment made at a NATO summit in Warsaw in July. Those troops, along with a U.S.-led battalion in Poland, will take up their positions this spring.

In Zagan, the site of a vast Communist-era artillery training field, there was little explicit acknowledgment of the new questions over NATO's future. But phrases that would have been unexceptional before Trump's November election victory took on new meaning after his inauguration.

"An attack on any of us is an attack on all of us," said Paul Jones, the U.S. ambassador to Poland and the senior representative of the Trump administration at the event.

Polish leaders said they were delighted to be able to choose their friends, something they said was not possible during more than four decades of communist rule.

"Thirty years ago, which is not that long in history, we had units here in Zagan which we were forced to treat as allies," said Polish President Andrzej Duda, referring to Soviet army troops. "And today we have in Zagan allies who symbolize freedom."

After the celebratory speeches, Polish and U.S. tanks and heavy artillery were part of live-fire exercises intended to show that they could work together to fend off a common, unnamed enemy. Explosions and gunfire rang out across a deforested training plain, covered in the snow and mud of a Polish winter.

*[Gorbachev is worried about a world war, hopes Trump and Putin can stop it.]*

But there was an easy way to distinguish the nations' units: Polish tanks and artillery units were painted forest green, while the U.S. tanks were desert sand, a symbol of American military preoccupations over the past 15 years.

No matter the winds of change in Washington, the U.S. military appears to be making plans for a long-term shift in focus toward Europe.

"I've asked the Army to send over some green paint," Hodges said.

## INTERNATIONAL

s."



Miriam Jordan

Updated Jan. 30, 2017 11:59 p.m.  
ET

Refugees already in transit from nations not subject to an executive order that restricts entry from certain countries will be admitted into the U.S. through Thursday, according to agencies charged with receiving them in partnership with the government.

According to a Department of Homeland Security official, 872 refugees are arriving this week because by the time the order was signed, they were already cleared and considered in transit, the official said.

"They will be allowed to enter until Feb. 2, and we are expecting arrivals," said Jennifer Sime, senior vice president for U.S. programs at the International Rescue Committee, one of the agencies that partners with the government to settle refugees across the U.S. "After Friday, there will be no arrivals regardless of whether they are from the seven countries."

Ms. Sime and others from additional agencies said they had received guidance on the Feb. 2 date from government officials on Monday.

Reached by phone, a spokesman for the White House said he didn't have an immediate answer.

Mr. Trump's executive order, signed Friday, halted for 120 days all refugee resettlement in the U.S.

## Some Refugees From Countries Not Named in Donald Trump's Order Have Until Thursday to Enter U.S.

It bans entry into the U.S. of nationals from seven predominantly Muslim countries for 90 days: Iran, Iraq, Libya, Somalia, Sudan, Syria and Yemen. It also indefinitely bars Syrian refugees from entering the country.

The order caused confusion over the weekend as it was implemented by airport officials in an inconsistent manner and continued to evolve after White House statements as well as a series of court rulings.

A major question was the fate of refugees who had already completed the vetting process and were expected to arrive in the U.S. this week.

Refugees bound for the U.S. weren't swept up in the weekend upheaval because their arrivals are scheduled for weekdays. But about 2,000 refugees from all over the world were set to arrive in the U.S. this week.

The resettlement agency officials didn't immediately know exactly how many out of that total weren't from banned countries but said nearly half could fall into that group.

Melanie Nezer, vice president for policy and advocacy at the Hebrew Immigrant Aid Society also said that refugees, many of them already in transit, would be allowed to enter this week as long as they weren't nationals from any of the banned countries.

"Since most don't live near a major international airport they may have

started their journeys before the ban or this weekend," she said. "But we really don't know what will happen. Refugees that were supposed to come this week were from all over."

Among refugees the U.S. has been absorbing who don't come from the seven banned countries are nationals of the Democratic Republic of the Congo and Myanmar and Nepalese minorities from Bhutan.

On signing the order Friday, Mr. Trump said the goal was to keep "radical Islamic terrorists" out of the country.

The executive order said that exceptions would be made to the ban on a case-by-case basis. "They reserved the right to make exceptions for religious minorities. But we have not seen any evidence of that," said Ms. Sime.

Ms. Sime said 95% of Iranians resettled by the International Rescue Committee in the U.S. are religious minorities. "Yet nobody can come," she said, citing Christians and those of the Bahai faith.

The president, who has the authority to determine how many refugees the U.S. admits, reduced to 50,000 from 110,000 the number of displaced people the country will accept in the current fiscal year.

Traditionally, the U.S. formally admits the most refugees of any country in the world.

Unlike European countries, which have been inundated with refugees fleeing persecution and war and crossing borders without official permission, the U.S. has an orderly process to admit them, said Ms. Nezer. "We have a careful selection process," she said. "We choose who can enter."

It takes as long as two years for individuals who apply to enter the U.S. as refugees to complete the security screening, a process that involves several international and U.S. agencies.

In the fiscal year that ended Sept. 30, the U.S. received nearly 85,000 refugees. The largest number of arrivals, or 16,370, came from the Democratic Republic of the Congo, accounting for 19% of the total. The second-largest group, numbering 12,587, came from Syria, followed by Myanmar, with 12,347, each representing about 15% of total arrivals.

President Barack Obama raised the U.S. commitment to 110,000 for the fiscal year that began on Oct. 1. About 37,000 refugees have entered the U.S. in the current fiscal year, meaning that only about 13,000 more would be allowed to come under Mr. Trump's directive.

Faith-based and secular organizations are contracted by the U.S. government to receive and assist the newcomers in communities across the country.

**Write to** Miriam Jordan at [miriam.jordan@wsj.com](mailto:miriam.jordan@wsj.com)

## Syria Reclaims Damascus Water Source From Rebels

Rick Gladstone

The al-Feijeh spring, which supplies Damascus with drinking water, in Barada Valley, on Sunday. An insurgent evacuation from the area could signal an end to the water crisis in the capital. European Pressphoto Agency

Syrian armed forces appear to have retaken the contested Barada Valley area north of Damascus, the capital's main source of water, signaling a possible end to a war-induced shortage that has left millions of inhabitants thirsty and dirty for six weeks.

Syrian government news media reported on Monday that hundreds of rebel fighters and their families had evacuated the Barada Valley, under an agreement reached on Sunday.

The Syrian Observatory for Human Rights, an outside monitoring group, corroborated the government account, saying ambulances and buses had been seen taking evacuees to other rebel-held areas, and that government soldiers and allied militia fighters were in control.

The Barada Valley agreement expanded areas of Syria adhering to a tenuous nationwide cease-fire negotiated by Russia, the Syrian government's chief ally, and Turkey, which supports some rebel groups that have been fighting to oust President Bashar al-Assad.

The agreement also further winnowed the amount of territory occupied by insurgents after their evacuation last month from eastern Aleppo, the northern Syrian city, after a lengthy siege.

Russia and Turkey have since taken a far more active role in diplomacy aimed at ending the conflict, convening talks last week in Astana, Kazakhstan. Another round is tentatively scheduled for late February.

It was not immediately clear how soon the re-establishment of government control in the Barada Valley would ease the severe water shortage in the Damascus area, where roughly 5.5 million people live.

The main water-pumping facilities in the valley were damaged in fighting, slowing or stopping water flow since late December. Syrian officials were quoted in state news media on Sunday as saying they hoped to restore the flow soon.

The government has tried to ease the water crisis by trucking supplies

to communal collection points from wells around Damascus. The United Nations helped by overhauling 120 wells to meet about one-third of the city's daily needs.

Nonetheless, the shortage was acute for many residents of Damascus, which had largely been spared from the worst of the war that has ravaged the country for nearly six years.

Word of the developments in Barada Valley came in recent days as rumors swirled about the health of Mr. Assad, 51, who has remained a relatively reclusive figure. The speculation, spread by some Arab news sites, suggested the Syrian leader may have suffered a stroke.

The Syrian government called the rumors unfounded and said Mr. Assad has been working normally.

As if to emphasize the denial, the official Syrian Arab News Agency reported that Mr. Assad had a friendly phone conversation on Monday with President Nicolás

Maduro of Venezuela, who shares Mr. Assad's antipathy for what both regard as arrogant Western powers, particularly the United States. The news agency said Mr. Assad

"appreciated Venezuela's stances and President Maduro for supporting Syria."

The  
Washington  
Post

## Trump's travel ban threatens U.S. partnership with Iraq against Islamic State

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

IRBIL, Iraq — A backlash against President Trump's new immigration rules intensified Monday, threatening Washington's relationship with its main partner in battling the Islamic State as Iraq's parliament voted for a reciprocal ban on visas for Americans.

The Iraqi lawmakers' decision is subject to ratification by the government, but it underscores growing resentment over a U.S. executive order that imposed visa restrictions on Iraqis and the citizens of six other Muslim-majority nations.

Foreign Minister Ibrahim al-Jaafari issued a terse statement describing the ban as unreasonable, given that Iraq is sacrificing the "blood of its sons" in the front-line fight against the militant group. He urged the United States to reconsider.

National News Alerts

Major national and political news as it breaks.

Please provide a valid email address.

About 5,000 U.S. troops are stationed in Iraq to train and assist Iraqi forces, which are close to pushing Islamic State militants out of Mosul, their last major urban stronghold in Iraq.

Given the two countries' close military cooperation, Trump's decision to impose visa restrictions has drawn particular ire in Iraq. Exacerbating that anger, many Iraqis hold the United States responsible for their lack of security because of its 2003 invasion.

*[Militants see Trump's order as potent recruiting tool]*

In the years since then, Iraqis have taken huge personal risks to support the U.S. military and fight alongside it. But many of those who are in the process of being resettled have been caught up in Trump's 90-day ban on visas and 120-day

suspension of refugee entries, adding a new layer of uncertainty after years of arduous security vetting, medical checks and onerous paperwork.

"After all I've done for the Americans, entering battles side by side with them, now I'm a terrorist in their eyes," said Salih al-Issawi, 30, who worked as an interpreter with the U.S. Marines in Fallujah between 2006 and 2011, when he applied for resettlement. "They are ungrateful and left me stuck here to die."

Six years later, Issawi is still in Fallujah. He fled when the Islamic State took over in 2014, because an association with U.S. forces meant an effective death sentence. But after running out of money to pay rent in northern Iraq, he returned to the city after it was retaken last year. He said he is still at risk from Islamic State sleeper cells and is viewed with suspicion by neighbors.

"People still look at me as a spy," he said. He was in the final stages of the resettlement process when Trump signed his order. Now, he doubts he will ever be able to leave.

"I regret that I worked with them in the first place and risked my life and my family's lives," he said.

*[Denied Entry: Stories of refugees, immigrants and travelers barred from the U.S.]*

While Trump's executive order is ostensibly meant to protect America's national security, some say it will have the opposite effect. The 57-nation Organization of Islamic Cooperation — whose members include all seven nations hit by the travel ban — expressed "grave concern" Monday.

In a statement, the group said that "such selective and discriminatory acts will only serve to strengthen the radical narratives of extremists and will provide further fuel to the advocates of violence and terrorism." It urged the United

States to "reconsider this blanket statement and maintain its moral obligation to provide leadership and hope at a time of great uncertainty and unrest in the world."

In Ethiopia, the head of the 54-nation African Union predicted "turbulent times" for the continent because of Trump's action. Three African countries — Sudan, Libya and Somalia — were on the list, which also contains Iraq, Syria, Iran and Yemen.

The African Union chief, Nkosazana Dlamini-Zuma, told leaders meeting in Addis Ababa, Ethiopia, that the "very country to which many of our people were taken as slaves during the transatlantic slave trade has now decided to ban refugees from some of our countries."

In Tokyo, a group of about 40 Americans protested near the U.S. Embassy against Trump's travel ban and his plan to build a wall on the Mexico border, waving signs declaring "I stand with Muslims" and "Injustice anywhere is a threat to justice everywhere."

"We are all just despondent," said Jesse Glickstein, the American lawyer and grandson of Nazi concentration camp survivors who organized Tuesday's protest. "We all felt that we needed to speak up."

Rabbi David Kunin, head of the Jewish Community of Japan, held a sign saying "No Muslim Ban." "This ban is unconstitutional and it goes against all the values that the United States stands for, and people of all faiths need to stand up and say no to the Muslim ban, no to the wall, no to this kind of violence that stems from hate but also stems from fear," he said. "Fear won't build a better world, only love and peace will build a better world."

If they are implemented, retaliatory visa restrictions against Americans could affect thousands of contractors supporting U.S. troops in Iraq.

The U.S. military relies heavily on contractors for logistical support and

security for some installations. Nearly 4,000 contractors work for the Defense Department in Iraq. At least 2,035 of them are U.S. citizens. Thousands more support other U.S. government operations.

*[Trump stands by order: 'This is not a Muslim ban']*

Government officials from the semiautonomous Kurdish region in northern Iraq have refused to comment on the ban, which also affects Iraqi Kurds. Trump has expressed support for the Kurds; he told the New York Times before November's election that he was a "big fan" of their forces.

"We, as Kurds, are fighting against terrorism, and the U.S. government is aware of that," said Saadi Ahmed Pira, head of the foreign relations office for the Patriotic Union of Kurdistan political party. He said he did not view the executive order as a decision against Kurds, but he said it was too general.

"We don't think it will prevent terrorism," he said. "We think what prevents terrorism is cooperation after defeating terrorism militarily, by dealing with the sources of terrorism, in terms of ideology and finances."

A grievance repeatedly cited by Iraqi officials is that Trump included Iraq in the ban but left out countries such as Saudi Arabia, whose nationals have been responsible for attacks on U.S. soil. Saudis made up the majority of the hijackers in the Sept. 11, 2001, attacks, which were referenced in Trump's order.

Trump has rejected all criticism, insisting the policy is essential to root out terrorists.

"There is nothing nice about searching for terrorists before they can enter our country. This was a big part of my campaign," Trump tweeted Monday. "Study the world!"

Salim reported from Baghdad. Aaso Ameen Shwan in Irbil, Anna Fifield in Tokyo, Lousia Loveluck in Beirut and Brian Murphy in Washington contributed to this report.

The  
Washington  
Post

## Michael O'Hanlon : Trump is recklessly reversing Americans' progress in Iraq

By John Allen and Michael O'Hanlon

John Allen, a retired Marine Corps general who led the international

coalition to counter the Islamic State from 2014 to 2015, and Michael

O'Hanlon are senior fellows at the Brookings Institution.

Though he campaigned with the urgent goal of defeating the Islamic State and reasserting American greatness, President Trump has embarked on a policy that could in fact lead to the loss of U.S. influence in Iraq and the worsening of the Sunni-Shiite divide there. Whatever happens in the short term in the fight to liberate Mosul and other parts of the country from the Islamic State, this policy could lay the groundwork for the emergence of another similar Salafist group there. Trump would have taken us backward, not forward, in the fight against terrorism and seriously eroded our role in a key Arab state that so many Americans gave so much to free and then to help stabilize under two presidents.

The immediate cause of our concern is the executive order Friday that prevented the movement of most Iraqis to the United States — including some who served and sacrificed alongside U.S. forces in the war there — along with citizens of six other nations in the region. But in fact the problem is broader and deeper.

First, there were the frequent whiffs of Islamophobia from the Trump campaign and national security adviser Michael Flynn's harsh critiques of Islam. Both Trump and Flynn are using more moderate rhetoric now — and the more moderate words may in fact reflect their true attitudes. Certainly, in working with Flynn over the years, neither of us saw Islamophobia in his thinking when

he was in uniform. Indeed, his measured analysis of the Salafist threat made important contributions to the defeat of al-Qaeda in Iraq and in our operations against the Taliban. But the harsher words from the campaign, and Flynn's book, are widely known. They help to create a highly combustible atmosphere in which new decisions such as last week's executive order will be interpreted. This bell cannot be unrung without determined outreach by the White House to Muslims in the United States and around the world.

[Read These Comments](#)

The best conversations on The Washington Post

Please provide a valid email address.

Second was Trump resurfacing his position last week that the United States should seize Iraqi oil because it underwrote the Islamic State's war-making capabilities. He is apparently tone-deaf to the global reaction to this kind of "to the victor goes the spoils" talk, much less the Iraqi reaction.

Moreover, on the specifics of the argument, Trump is incorrect. Iraqi oil fields contributed almost nothing to the Islamic State's revenue stream, as the vast majority of oil-related funds have come from Syrian fields, and in particular sales of oil back to the regime of Syrian President Bashar al-Assad. Moreover, pillage (this is the legal term for it) of Iraqi oil is simply

illegal under international law. Last week, Iraqis were furious over this repeated call by Trump, with some even girding themselves to fight to defend their sovereign natural resource. If Trump decided to literally seize the oil, the U.S. troop requirements would be more akin to the large Iraq and Afghanistan operations of years past than the much more sustainable troop levels that characterize our Mideast presence today. One thing such a mission would likely manage to do, beyond utterly inflaming the region, is unite Iraqis in a common cause heretofore elusive: We'd be fighting Sunnis, Shiites and Kurds all at once.

Then comes the executive order itself. Trump's travel ban was responded to over the weekend by the Iraqi parliament, many of its members already upset by Trump's proposed shift of the U.S. Embassy in Israel from Tel Aviv to Jerusalem. The presence of our 6,000 troops helping Iraqi forces in the fight against the Islamic State could be imperiled.

U.S. officials report that Trump's travel ban and his call for seizing the oil fields have severely undercut the credibility of Iraqi Prime Minister Haider al-Abadi and could cause his government to fall. There is no telling what could come after Abadi, but with the critical Mosul battle reaching the final furlong, Iraqi Shiite leaders may decide they can clear all that remains of the Islamic State from Iraq without U.S. help, leaning instead on Iran and Russia

— as they've seen occur in Syria. This may not work. Even if it does, it is exactly what many of the Shiite Iraqi nationalists have wanted all along. A tactical success against the Islamic State could, as noted, immediately begin to sow the ground for the return of a future extremist, Salafist force given the likely resentment among Sunnis that would ensue.

It does not end there. Iran also says it will retaliate against the United States for the travel ban. At a practical level, this could easily play out in Iran simply unleashing the extremist Shiite militias to attack Americans in Iraq.

At the very moment that Trump has sought to up the game against the Islamic State, his words and actions treat Iraq and Iraqis as though they're irrelevant to the defeat of this organization. Indeed, the worst blows potentially preventing the defeat of the Islamic State have been landed by Trump himself and could lead to the end of the U.S. mission and American influence there. For all the ups and downs in Iraq over the past 14 years, we do currently have a friendly government of national unity (more or less) in Iraq right now, and it is controlling most of its own territory against various extremist forces while gradually restoring stability to the nation. All of that is now at new acute risk not from the Islamic State, Syria or Moscow, but from Washington.

**The  
New York  
Times**

## Anthony Blinken : To Defeat ISIS, Arm the Syrian Kurds

When President Trump presides over his first meeting of the National Security Council, possibly this week, he is likely to confront a decision whose urgency is matched only by its complexity: whether to arm Syrian Kurdish fighters poised to liberate the Islamic State's Syrian stronghold in Raqqa.

Taking back Raqqa, along with Mosul in Iraq — where Iraqi forces backed by the United States-led coalition have freed about half of the city — will effectively eliminate the Islamic State's self-declared caliphate. The consequences for the Islamic State will be devastating. It will no longer control significant territory within which to train and harbor foreign fighters or exploit resources. It will lose the foundation of its most compelling narrative: the construction of an actual state.

As the noose around the Islamic State tightens, it has tried to adapt by plotting, inspiring or taking responsibility for indiscriminate

attacks around the world: a nightclub in Orlando, Fla., a promenade in Nice, France, a cafe in Dhaka, Bangladesh, a square in Istanbul. Recruits are being told to stay home and attack there. Foreign fighters are being pushed out of Iraq and Syria, back to where they came from. The Islamic State directs its external operations from Raqqa. Hence, the urgency of Raqqa's liberation.

The only fighters capable of seizing Raqqa belong to our most effective partner on the ground — the Syrian Democratic Forces, a mixture of Arabs and Kurds dominated by the People's Protection Units, a Kurdish militia. The S.D.F. can succeed only if it is armed to overcome the Islamic State's ferocious urban resistance of snipers, suicide bombers and improvised explosive devices.

In the last days of the Obama administration, the Pentagon said it would immediately seek permission from President Trump to do just that. It rightly wants to take

advantage of the S.D.F.'s momentum in isolating Raqqa.

It is also determined to get the several hundred Special Operations forces President Barack Obama ordered into Syria the most effective partners possible.

So what's the rub? Turkey — a NATO ally and key player in Syria — passionately opposes any American support to the Syrian Kurds, especially the protection units. It is angered by the militia's links to the Kurdistan Workers' Party, known as the P.K.K., a terrorist group that has plagued Turkey for decades.

The end of a cease-fire between the Turkish government and the P.K.K. has produced repeated attacks by the Kurdish group and a scorched-earth campaign by the government. Ankara argues that any aid the United States gives the People's Protection Units militia will end up in the hands of the P.K.K. and be used to murder Turkish civilians.

As deputy secretary of state, I spent hours with my Turkish counterparts trying to find a *modus vivendi* for continuing American support to the Syrian Democratic Forces. At every juncture — from the liberation of Manbij in northeastern Syria to the isolation of Raqqa — they protested angrily and threatened repercussions, including denying the international coalition access to Incirlik air base and slowing counterterrorism cooperation. Anti-American rhetoric surged in the Turkish media. Each time, it took President Obama's direct engagement with Turkey's president, Recep Tayyip Erdogan, to smooth the way just enough to keep going.

If President Trump approves the Pentagon's recommendation to arm the S.D.F., it will fall to him to keep Mr. Erdogan onboard — a first, highly charged test of his diplomatic skills. There is an art to this deal.

First, Mr. Trump should make clear that he has no more urgent priority than defeating the Islamic State —

and that Raqqa cannot wait. Pushing the pause button in the illusory search for an alternative liberation force more amenable to Turkey would delay any move on Raqqa for months.

Second, any support we provide the Syrian Democratic Forces should be mission-specific — just enough to do the job in Raqqa, not enough to risk spillover to the P.K.K. United States Special Operations forces will have to ensure the S.D.F. is using resources only for its intended purpose.

**THE WALL  
STREET  
JOURNAL**

Margherita Stancati in Dubai and Ahmed Al Omran in Riyadh, Saudi Arabia

Updated Jan. 30, 2017 12:30 p.m. ET

Saudi Arabia, the birthplace of Islam and home to the religion's two holiest sites, has long used its religious clout to project its role as a regional leader. Now that same clout has caught the kingdom in a prickly dilemma.

The monarchy's desire to cultivate a better relationship with the Trump administration than it had with the U.S. under Barack Obama is exposing Saudi Arabia to criticism that it is unwilling to stand up for its Muslim allies, particularly those caught in an executive order that restricts entry to the U.S. for citizens of seven predominantly Muslim countries.

"The ban puts Saudi Arabia in an awkward position," said Ibrahim Fraihat, a professor of conflict resolution at the Doha Institute for Graduate Studies. "Saudi Arabia will be expected to take a position against it because some of the countries included in the ban like Sudan and Yemen are key allies and because it projects itself as leader of the Muslim world."

Saudi Arabia's Ministry of Foreign Affairs didn't respond to a request for comment.

President Donald Trump spoke on Sunday with Saudi Arabia's King Salman about Middle East refugees, the deal to keep Iran from obtaining nuclear weapons, and improved security relations between

We should insist that it commit to not use any weapons against Turkey, to cede liberated Raqqa to local forces, to respect Syria's territorial integrity and to dissociate itself from the P.K.K.

Third, keeping the S.D.F. focused on Raqqa keeps it away from the Turkish-Syrian border — and any effort by Syrian Kurds to join the area they control in a contiguous Kurdish region or state. Turkish troops entered Syria to prevent the emergence of such a state. President Trump should clearly

reiterate our own opposition to such a development.

Fourth, Turkey wants to take back the Islamic State-controlled town of Al Bab before the Syrian Kurds do. President Trump should back strong American air support for the Turkish operation there and reiterate our determination to help Turkey consolidate a broader buffer zone in northern Syria.

Fifth, Mr. Trump should double down on support for Turkey's fight against the P.K.K., including helping

find the group's leadership holed up in Iraq's Qandil Mountains.

Finally, the president must rethink last week's executive order on immigration. At the very moment the Islamic State is on its heels, the order risks becoming a recruitment bonanza for jihadists while shutting America's doors to the very people taking the fight to the Islamic State on the ground.

## U.S. Travel Restrictions Put Saudi Arabia in a Bind

the two countries, the White House said.

"The president requested and the King agreed to support safe zones in Syria and Yemen, as well as supporting other ideas to help the many refugees who are displaced by the ongoing conflicts," the White House said.

A statement carried on the official Saudi Press Agency said "the view of the two leaders were identical" on issues that included confronting terrorism and extremism, along with countering "those who seek to undermine security and stability in the region and interfere in the internal affairs of other state," a reference to Iran and to the activities of its regional proxies.

The White House also said they agreed on the "importance of rigorously enforcing" the nuclear deal Iran struck with other world powers including the U.S. in 2015. Mr. Trump and Saudi officials have repeatedly criticized the agreement, which lifted sanctions on Iran in exchange for curbs on its nuclear program.

Saudi leaders enthusiastically greeted Mr. Trump's election, voicing hope that the new president's hard-line stance on rival Iran meshed with the kingdom's strategic goals. Iran is among the seven Muslim-majority countries covered by the 90-day visa moratorium, but so are countries Saudi Arabia regards as allies.

The ban applies to citizens of Sudan, a member of the coalition of Muslim countries assembled by Saudi Arabia to combat terrorism. Also included is Yemen, where

Saudi Arabia intervened militarily in 2015 against Iran-backed Houthi rebels with the aim of restoring President Abed Rabbo Mansour Hadi to power. The ban applies to Syrians fleeing their country's war, too, and Riyadh is a key supporter of Syrian rebels fighting President Bashar al-Assad as well as his Iranian and Russian backers.

Saudi Arabia has produced more extremists that went on to carry out attacks on U.S. soil than any of the countries directly affected by the ban. Osama bin Laden, the late head of al Qaeda, was from one of the kingdom's most prominent business families and 15 of the 19 Sept. 11, 2001, hijackers were Saudi. Only Tunisia has contributed more foreign fighters to Islamic State, according to a 2015 study by the Soufan Group, a security consultancy.

Appearing on NBC on Sunday, White House Chief of Staff Reince Priebus left open the possibility that Saudi Arabia as well as Egypt and Pakistan—all close U.S. allies—could be added. But former New York City Mayor Rudy Giuliani, who helped draft the executive order, told Fox News on Saturday that Saudi Arabia wasn't included because "it is going through a massive change," adding, "It is not the old Saudi Arabia."

A ban on travel from Saudi Arabia would have far-reaching consequences, disrupting a commercial and military alliance that has long helped shape U.S. involvement in the region. It would also affect the tens of thousands of Saudi students enrolled in U.S.

colleges under government-funded scholarships.

Saudi officials have kept mum on the new U.S. visa restrictions. But when Mr. Trump first floated the idea of a Muslim ban, Saudi Foreign Minister Adel al-Jubeir described the proposal as "very very dangerous," saying it would deepen divisions between people of different faiths. But during a press conference in Riyadh last Tuesday, said he was "very very optimistic about the Trump administration." He praised Mr. Trump's cabinet choices, including Jim Mattis as Secretary of Defense and Rex Tillerson as Secretary of State.

In putting its faith in Mr. Trump's presidency, Saudi Arabia had hoped the White House would reverse Mr. Obama's policy of outreach to Iran, which culminated with the nuclear deal. Riyadh says the deal has empowered Tehran to interfere in Arab affairs, sowing instability in the region.

But some analysts say that assuming the Trump presidency will be good for the region when so little is known about his Middle East policy is overly optimistic.

"They are putting their heads in the sand about the anti-Muslim bigotry," said Brian Katulis, a senior fellow at the Center for American Progress, who blamed "a mixture of wishful thinking and willful blindness."

—William Mauldin in Washington contributed to this article.

**Write to** Margherita Stancati at [margherita.stancati@wsj.com](mailto:margherita.stancati@wsj.com) and Ahmed Al Omran at [Ahmed.AIOmran@wsj.com](mailto:A Ahmed.AIOmran@wsj.com)

**THE WALL  
STREET  
JOURNAL**

Ahmed Al Omran in Riyadh and Asa Fitch in Dubai

Jan. 30, 2017 5:40 p.m. ET

## Yemen's Houthi Rebels Launch Rare Suicide Attack on Saudi Frigate

Yemen's Houthi rebels launched a rare suicide attack on a Saudi frigate in the Red Sea on Monday, killing two crew members and leaving three others wounded, according to the Saudi Arabia-led

military coalition fighting against them.

The Houthis, who practice an offshoot of Shiite Islam, have been fighting a war since 2015 against the coalition led by Saudi Arabia,

the region's leading Sunni Muslim power and a close U.S. ally. The rebels are supported politically by Shiite-majority Iran, Riyadh's regional power rival, though Tehran has denied sending them weapons.



Three Houthi suicide boats attacked the frigate as it patrolled off the Hodeida port on Yemen's western coast, the coalition said in a statement. The Houthis don't commonly deploy suicide attackers in the battle against the Saudis and their allies. One Houthi boat hit the frigate's tail, causing an explosion and ensuing fire, the coalition said. Saudi air force units took on the other two boats before they could strike, it said.

The frigate continued operating after the fire was extinguished, it added.

The Houthis' official Saba news agency gave a different version of events, describing a guided missile hitting the vessel, which it claimed was carrying 176 soldiers and a helicopter.

Unverified footage shown on the Houthi-owned Al Masirah television station showed an explosion hitting

a gray military boat. A plume of smoke rose from the vessel.

The Houthis have fired at ships off the Yemeni coast before, including in early October, when the rebels fired missiles twice at the USS Mason, an American destroyer. The U.S. responded by striking Houthi radar sites along the coast.

"Houthi militias' use of Hodeida port as a base to launch terrorist attacks is a serious development that could affect international maritime

navigation and the delivery of humanitarian and medical aid to the port and Yemeni citizens," the coalition said.

**Write to** Ahmed Al Omran at [Ahmed.AIOmran@wsj.com](mailto:Ahmed.AIOmran@wsj.com) and Asa Fitch at [asa.fitch@wsj.com](mailto:asa.fitch@wsj.com)

## THE WALL STREET JOURNAL

### Iran Missile Launch Detected, a Possible Violation of U.N. Resolution

Jay Solomon

Updated Jan. 30, 2017 7:14 p.m. ET

WASHINGTON—Iran staged a missile test launch, U.S. officials said Monday, posing a possible violation of United Nations Security Council resolutions and an early challenge to the Trump administration's campaign pledge to confront Tehran.

U.S. defense officials, who confirmed the test, declined to identify its specific date, location or range. But Israel's government and U.S. senators demanded Monday that the U.N. impose new financial sanctions on Iran in response.

Iran's government is believed to have conducted nearly a dozen ballistic-missile tests since a landmark nuclear agreement between world powers and Tehran was implemented a year ago. Although the estimated timing was indefinite, U.S. officials suggested the latest test happened over the

weekend.

"Iran again defied #UNSC resolutions with missiles tests," Israel's ambassador to the U.N., Danny Danon, said in a Twitter message on Monday. "The international community again [must not] bury its head in the sand in the face of Iranian aggression."

The White House and State Department said they were investigating the alleged Iranian launch and gauging whether it violated international law.

The U.N.'s language prohibiting Tehran from developing ballistic missiles was softened under the nuclear deal, which was completed in mid-2015. The U.N. resolution now says the Security Council is against Iran developing missiles, but no longer explicitly bans it.

"We're aware of reports that Iran conducted a medium-range ballistic missile test in recent days," State Department spokesman Mark Toner said. "We are, however, well aware

of and deeply troubled by Iran's longstanding provocative and irresponsible activities and we call on Iran to cease such provocations."

A diplomat at Iran's mission to the U.N. declined to comment on Monday.

President Donald Trump was a sharp critic of the Iran nuclear deal during last year's campaign and has suggested he may seek to renegotiate its terms. Many of his top national-security aides, including Secretary of Defense Jim Mattis, have said they would seek to aggressively constrain Iran's military operations in the Persian Gulf and in such countries as Syria and Iraq.

Trump administration officials have played down the possibility of unilaterally scrapping the nuclear deal. But Republicans in Congress have been drafting new sanctions against Iran, particularly targeting its elite military force, the Islamic Revolutionary Guard Corps.

Congressional officials said this new legislation could be imposed as early as March.

Fox News reported the Iranian missile launch on Sunday. The news channel quoted U.S. officials saying a medium-range Iranian ballistic missile flew 600 miles over the weekend before exploding.

The White House announced on Monday that Israeli Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu would visit Washington on Feb. 15 for a summit meeting with Mr. Trump. Israeli officials said constraining Tehran and renegotiating the nuclear agreement is the Israeli leader's No. 1 priority.

"Iranian aggression must not go unanswered," Netanyahu tweeted on Monday.

—Ben Kesling contributed to this article.

**Write to** Jay Solomon at [jay.solomon@wsj.com](mailto:jay.solomon@wsj.com)

## The New York Times

### Israel's Hard-Liners Want to 'Go Big': Annex a Settlement

Ian Fisher

The Israeli settlement of Ma'ale Adumim, near Jerusalem in the West Bank. Dan Baily for The New York Times

MA'ALE ADUMIM, West Bank — The first babies of Ma'ale Adumim, a hilly city on the eastern outskirts of Jerusalem, are now middle-aged. A cemetery finally opened last year, and 40 residents are buried there, most dead of natural causes after long and peaceful lives.

That is to say, there is nothing temporary about this place, one of the closest settlements to Jerusalem in the occupied West Bank, which Israel seized from Jordan 50 years ago. "It's part of Jerusalem," said Sima Weiss, 58, who has lived here 30 years, raised three children and works a cleaning job just 20 minutes away by bus in the holy city proper. "I don't feel like a settler."

The world has focused more critically recently on Israel's settlements in occupied territory, after last month's United Nations declaration — which the United States tacitly supported — that they are killing the dream of one state for Jews, one for Palestinians.

Many Israelis argue that Ma'ale Adumim — a city of 41,000 with filled schools, a largely secular civic pride and skittish stray cats — is a special case: Its closeness to Jerusalem has put it near the top of the list of settlements Israelis say they could swap for other land in a peace deal.

Yet Ma'ale Adumim has become a flash point of the conflict between Palestinians and Israelis. Right-wing politicians, emboldened by a more sympathetic Trump administration, want to annex it to Israel proper — the first formal annexation of a settlement. Supporters of the move argue that in the long absence of

negotiations, Israel cannot stand still, and Ma'ale Adumim would likely be a part of Israel in any case.

A view onto a balcony in Ma'ale Adumim, one of the closest settlements to Jerusalem in the occupied West Bank. Dan Baily for The New York Times

"Clearly it's time for a quantum change," Naftali Bennett, the education minister, who plans to introduce the annexation bill, said in an interview. "The incremental approach has not worked. We have to understand it's a new reality. We have to go big, bold and fast."

The Parliament seems poised to approve a law that few thought had any chance of passage just a few months ago: It would ultimately legalize settlement homes built illegally on private Palestinian land. Critics call this yet another form of creeping annexation.

Many Palestinians agree this is a critical moment. They fear Ma'ale Adumim will be just the beginning of the annexation of settlements in the West Bank, now home to roughly 400,000 Jews, and the end of the two-state dream.

"We believe in two states for two nations, but if they took that" — Ma'ale Adumim — "there will be no longer two states," said Yousef Mostafa Mkhemer, chairman of the Organization of Jerusalem Steadfastness, which focuses on issues like Muslim holy sites, refugee camps and Israeli settlements. "There will be one state called Israel."

Many Palestinians and peace activists argue that the line has already been crossed — that any annexation of Ma'ale Adumim, after so many years, would be a technicality.

Palestinian laborers working at a construction site in Ma'ale Adumim last week. Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu has allotted 100 new building units to the city. Dan Balilty for The New York Times

"We are living in one state now," said Ziad Abu Zayyad, a Palestinian lawyer and writer. Mr. Zayyad, a former Palestinian minister, said that unlike most Palestinians he supported Donald J. Trump for president, in part because he felt his apparently greater sympathy for Israel would begin to provide a clarity to a long-stuck conflict.

"I want to see a change," he said. "I'm fed up."

"He could be a big devil. He could be something good. My point is he will make a change, for the good or for the bad."

There are signs, in fact, that the conflict here is already shifting, with Ma'ale Adumim near the center, no matter how quiet and workaday its residents think themselves (70 percent of residents commute to Jerusalem proper for their jobs).

After eight years of little building, Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu just allotted 100 new building units to Ma'ale Adumim, part of 2,500 new proposed housing units around the West Bank settlements, and another 560 in East Jerusalem. Mr. Netanyahu has proclaimed this as just the beginning of a new wave of building.

After eight years of little building, Israel is planning 2,500 new housing units around the West Bank settlements, and another 560 in East Jerusalem. Dan Balilty for The New York Times

Less than a month after the United Nations resolution, the city's mayor, Benny Kashriel, and another settlement leader proudly attended Mr. Trump's inauguration. That would have been unthinkable for past incoming American presidents,

out of fear it could be interpreted as an endorsement of settlements, which most of the world considers illegal.

"It's a different policy," Mr. Kashriel, mayor for 25 years, said just a day back from Washington. He believes that the new administration sees places like Ma'ale Adumim more benignly than did former President Barack Obama, whose administration blocked much building here and in the nearby E1, an especially contentious area closer to Jerusalem.

"We didn't steal the land from anybody," he said. "It was built on empty hills. You can see there — the desert, rocks and sand. Now you have a living city."

Much of the outside world's attention has focused on more religious settlements deeper into the West Bank or on land with Palestinian titles in more direct conflict with Palestinians. But here, scrutiny has been intense on Ma'ale Adumim.

It is partly symbolic: Israel has not annexed 1967 land beyond East Jerusalem and the Golan Heights. Opponents of the move fear it would be the start of a process that would not end until politicians like Mr. Bennett achieved their dreams of annexing large swaths of the West Bank and leaving the Palestinians with what Mr. Netanyahu recently called "a state-minus."

A shopping mall in Ma'ale Adumim. The city also has a library, a theater, 15 schools and 78 kindergartens. Dan Balilty for The New York Times

It is partly strategic: The settlement is at the heart of entrenched plans to expand Jerusalem, linking it to the city proper, along with other nearby settlements that also function in practice as Jerusalem suburbs. One issue with Ma'ale Adumim, critics argue, is its place in the West Bank, between north and

south, that combined with other building plans could both hamper transit of Palestinians and threaten the contiguous borders of any future Palestinian state.

The area is also not as empty as Ma'ale Adumim's supporters say.

Eid Abu Khamis, the leader of some 8,000 Bedouins in the area, says harassment by Israel has increased recently. More of their makeshift housing has been torn down and land for their goats and sheep — they sell meat, yogurt and cheese to survive — declared off-limits.

Most of the Bedouins live in the E1 area, which is technically a part of Ma'ale Adumim and is slated for some 3,700 new housing units. The Obama administration staunchly opposed any development in E1 as a possible point of no return for a viable Palestinian state.

Palestinian children playing in the street Sunday in the E1 section of Ma'ale Adumim, an especially contentious area where some 8,000 Bedouins live. It is slated for some 3,700 new housing units. Dan Balilty for The New York Times

"If the Bedouin are kicked out of this land where we have lived for 30 years, it will be the end of negotiations with the State of Israel," Mr. Khamis said.

Many Palestinians argue that the annexation could ignite another round of violent revolt. A Palestinian flag was recently planted in a park in Ma'ale Adumim here, a worrying sign for residents that the less expensive, less harried life in their suburb may change.

"I didn't come because I believe we should take all the land between the Mediterranean and the Jordan River," said a 71-year-old resident, a driver who would give his name only as Max S. "It was cheap. That's why I came. If I could change my apartment to an apartment in Tel Aviv, in a minute I would do it."

People here are proud of what they have built since it was founded in 1975, with 15 religious Jews. There is a library, a theater, 15 schools and 78 kindergartens. It is mostly secular, but gets along with its more religious residents, about a quarter of the population. An industrial park, while the occasional target of the worldwide campaign to boycott goods made in settlements, is thriving and employs some 4,000 Palestinians — at much higher wages, the mayor notes, than they could earn in Palestinian areas.

The Israeli settlement of Ma'ale Adumim was founded in 1975, with 15 religious Jews. Today it is a city of 41,000. Dan Balilty for The New York Times

Ronit Jackov, 55, who works in the local mall (which is getting a new floor with five cinemas), said she favored annexation, largely so the city can begin to grow again after years of a building freeze.

She said she would never move back to Jerusalem, in part because the city has become too religious and rigid. "I'm not comfortable in a place where people tell you how to live," she said. "People want to live their lives."

And she places much hope in Mr. Trump, that he will side more forcefully with Israelis.

"I'm not a very political person," she said. "But I'm waiting for him to carry out what he said, and I'll say, 'You are great.' Because the whole world is against us. We need someone on our side."

An Israeli man looking over Ma'ale Adumim last week. Supporters of the annexation of the West Bank settlement see it as a near inevitability. Dan Balilty for The New York Times



## Daniel Baer : If Trump Tries to Make a Deal With Putin, He's Already Lost

Paul McLeary | 52 mins ago

The international order is based on values, institutions, and moral leadership — not transactional politics.

President Donald Trump believes that he can transfer his main professed skill in the private sector — deal-making — to the world of foreign policy. But foreign policy, and the diplomacy that supports it, cannot be reduced to cutting businesslike deals alone. When making short-term deals trumps

long-term strategy, America loses. And this will create problems for the new president and his administration as they seek to implement their "America First" agenda.

Perhaps nowhere is Trump's dangerous approach to foreign policy more concerning than in his apparent desire to accommodate Vladimir Putin's Russia. It's unclear whether Trump's views are the product of foolishness or of Russian coercive leverage over him. But it's not only his views on Putin and the

Kremlin's motives that should disturb all Americans. It's that he has repeatedly talked about making deals as the way to improve the relationship.

What kind of deals would these be? We should all be concerned by what the president would be ready to give up to his Russian counterpart in order to reach an easy agreement. So far, Trump's comments suggest that he'd be willing to trade away the two intertwined aspects of U.S. foreign policy since the end of World War II: strategic investment in

a rules-based system of international politics and moral leadership grounded in a commitment to human dignity and freedom.

Never short on self-confidence, Trump may think he's ready to sit down with Putin, put everything on the table, and come out a winner. Sadly, Trump appears to be moving forward with this flawed idea. At his Jan. 27 news conference with British Prime Minister Theresa May, Trump — after awkwardly reading his scripted remarks about the

importance of the special relationship with the United Kingdom based on universal values — reaffirmed his desire to make nice with Putin, suggesting that the United States, on his watch, might have relationships with Russia and China that were just as strong as that with Britain. How quickly he forgot that our relationship with London is based on shared values and investment in the post-World War II system.

On Jan. 28, Trump pressed on during a phone call with Putin, just a day after Trump's senior advisor told a morning show that removing sanctions on Russia was "under consideration." According to readouts of the call, Trump and Putin had a pleasant back-and-forth and agreed to further talks on counterterrorism cooperation. And the two presidents agreed to discuss "restoring business ties" — code for, among other things, removing sanctions — Dmitri Novikov, a leading member of Russia's Parliament, told Interfax.

Don't be fooled. This isn't statesmanship — it's selling America's hard-won leadership in the world, and selling it cheap.

Don't be fooled. This isn't statesmanship — it's selling America's hard-won leadership in the world, and selling it cheap. And to do that for a handshake with an autocrat like Putin isn't just a shameful deal, it's a bad deal.

Trump may think he's being clever by baiting Putin with the notion of the United States accepting the illegal invasion and attempted annexation of Crimea, or with ending the sanctions for Russia's actions on the peninsula and its manufactured conflict in eastern Ukraine. But what Trump and his team seem to have missed is that the moment they sit down to do deals — the sort of deals that Putin wants (like throwing out the principle that states should be free to choose their own security arrangements or accepting Russian limitations on NATO's defensive posture) — America will already have lost.

This is because it doesn't matter what price Trump and his team extract from the Kremlin. By doing deals with Putin that undermine the principles of international law, such as lifting sanctions prematurely or changing U.S. policy on Crimea, the White House will have bought into a system based on deals rather than on rules. And it's exactly this kind of deal-making devoid of principles that Putin and other authoritarian leaders want, and that those working on behalf of world peace, global prosperity, and human

freedom have toiled so hard to leave behind.

This isn't to say that the Trump administration should not engage in dialogue and negotiations with Moscow. The United States should be ready to negotiate on concrete initiatives that can advance international peace and security — as my team at the U.S. Mission to the Organization for Security and Co-operation in Europe did to achieve the mandate and budget for the organization's Special Monitoring Mission to Ukraine — and agreements to counter foreign terrorist fighters, make progress on good governance, and fight anti-Semitism, among other things. These initiatives set a common agenda, with benchmarks and action items for which we can hold other countries — and they can hold us — accountable. But to negotiate with the Kremlin over the fundamental principles of the international system in which generations of U.S. political leaders and diplomats have invested so much is to lose before talks even begin.

American leadership, in concert with close partners and allies, and backed by American hard power and the NATO alliance, helped to build a system where the kind of deal-making (and inevitable deal-breaking) that had bloodied Europe for centuries would be left behind. Although Putin would like a "Yalta 2" — a 21st-century grand bargain dividing Europe into spheres of influence — to engage in such deal-making would be an unconscionable abandonment of American moral leadership, and one that leaves the world more dangerous.

The consequences of abandoning these principles wouldn't be limited to Europe. The Chinese are certainly watching the U.S. commitment to defend the principle of sovereignty and territorial integrity in Ukraine as Beijing plots its next moves in the South China Sea. In effect, this would create a new age of uncertainty and usher in a world where anything goes. It's a world where countries must jockey for the upper hand, including by deploying military capabilities, so that they can be the ones cutting deals rather than be the subject of deals.

This is one of the many things that Trump's call for an "America First," isolationist foreign policy gets wrong. One of the great strategic cornerstones of U.S. foreign policy has been the recognition that even in a world where the United States is by far the most powerful country, the interests of the American people are best served by a system that

doesn't depend on transactional encounters and instead creates long-term expectations of state behavior that allows for win-win arrangements.

The peace and prosperity that have flowed from such a system has benefited Americans and U.S. allies around the world.

The peace and prosperity that have flowed from such a system has benefited Americans and U.S. allies around the world.

After Trump's election in November, the diplomats I interacted with on a daily basis had two reactions: The Russian diplomats were gleeful and gloating — not only because the U.S. elections constituted perhaps the most successful Kremlin intel operation since the end of the Cold War, but also because they saw Trump's desire to appease Putin as a harbinger for the end of American-led solidarity in holding the Kremlin accountable for its violations of international law. They saw a future where Moscow's willingness to exercise destructive power would facilitate deal-making with the United States at the expense of Europe and its citizens.

The other diplomats — from all across Europe — were shaken and alarmed. First, they worried that the United States, which has been the guarantor of the European security system since World War II, was abandoning them and the rules intended to protect them from external aggression. In Helsinki in 1975, at the height of the Cold War, U.S. President Gerald Ford and Soviet General Secretary Leonid Brezhnev, along with 33 other heads of state and government, signed the Helsinki Final Act — which included commitments to open societies and markets, as well as to peacefully resolve disputes and respect sovereignty and territorial integrity. Ford wisely observed then that the leaders would be measured "not by the promises we make, but by the promises we keep." For more than four decades, the United States has been Europe's chief partner in upholding the promises made in Helsinki, thereby helping to preserve European security.

But in addition to their very real security concerns, my European counterparts despaired at the loss of an America they respected — an America, imperfect though it was, that could inspire people around the world. Even those diplomats who represented countries where the elites have loved to hate the United States admitted unabashedly that they loved America in the days after Nov. 8. These were diplomats from across Europe and Eurasia: Some represented NATO allies, some

represented former Soviet states, some represented neutral or non-aligned countries, some represented our closest friends, and others represented more difficult partners. Within 48 hours, I got text messages and emails from more than a dozen ambassadors. "We all mourn with you" and "We need you, and American values, more than ever," they wrote. It is not only the economic and military might, but also values — and the degree that our country consistently upholds them — that makes the United States a superpower.

Of course, the new administration must find effective channels of communication with Moscow, and the United States should be prepared to engage with Putin, especially to welcome and encourage actions that show he is ready to remedy some of the damage done by Russia's attacks on the international order. But America's objective should always be to reinforce the rules, not rewrite them.

Speaking at his inauguration 36 years ago, former U.S. President Ronald Reagan reminded the American people, "No arsenal, or no weapon in the arsenals of the world, is so formidable as the will and moral courage of free men and women." The generations-long quest to build a system of international politics that is anchored in this truth has been the moral and strategic bedrock of American foreign policy since World War II, throughout the Cold War and after the collapse of the Soviet Union. America has led the world by standing up for the moral courage of free men and women. We should not stop now.

While Putin and Trump push for bigger arsenals, Beijing has all the nukes it'll ever need.

While U.S. President Donald Trump and Russian President Vladimir Putin preen and compare the size of their nuclear arsenals, China has been quite modest on the subject. This macho dance doesn't interest Beijing. Why? Isn't bigger always better? For decades, when it comes to nuclear weapons, the answer from China has been a resounding no. The rest of the world would do well to consider their reasons why.

In his last defense speech of 2016, Putin argued that his country needed to "enhance the combat capability of strategic nuclear forces, primarily by strengthening missile complexes that will be guaranteed to penetrate existing and future missile defense systems." It wasn't clear from the speech whether Putin seeks to improve nuclear warhead delivery systems in order to confuse

American missile defense, or whether he will seek to increase the number of weapons deployed to overwhelm them, or even deploy cyber-capabilities to weaken the ability to respond. Perhaps it's a strategy, perhaps it's just rhetoric. U.S. ballistic missile defense efforts — particularly in Europe and Asia — have been a sore spot for both Russia and China.

Not to be out done, within hours Trump tweeted: "The United States must greatly strengthen and expand its nuclear capability until such time as the world comes to its senses regarding nukes." Like Putin, his intentions were not clear, and much debated. But like Putin, when questioned, he tends to double down. Mika Brzezinski of MSNBC asked him to clarify his tweet, and he told her: "Let it be an arms race. We will outmatch them at every pass, and outlast them all."

So why hasn't Chinese leader Xi Jinping stripped off his shirt and flexed his strategic forces? Why not take to Twitter — or Weibo, at least — to brag about how long he can last in an arms race? Well, he doesn't need to and he knows it. Decades of Chinese leaders have known it. The Chinese think about nuclear weapons in a fundamentally different way than their Western counterparts — one that could give China an edge in the contest to become the defining power of the 21<sup>st</sup> century.

As Jeffrey Lewis noted in his book *Paper Tigers*, China has always maintained a small nuclear force. From their first announcement of a successful nuclear test on Oct. 19, 1964, China officially advocated the complete prohibition and disarmament of nuclear weapons, and even went so far as to declare that Beijing would never be the first to use nuclear weapons, no matter the circumstances — a policy maintained to this day. Former Chinese leader Mao Zedong thought of nuclear weapons as appearing powerful, but nothing to be afraid of in reality — the eponymous paper tigers of Lewis's title.

While the number of nuclear weapons in the United States and the Soviet Union swelled to over 50,000 in the mid-1980s, and they produced warheads and delivery devices far deadlier than those used in Hiroshima and Nagasaki, China was content to stick with dozens, not thousands, of warheads. Even today, the United States and Russia believe nuclear deterrence requires thousands of warheads each, and at least three ways to deliver them. But the truth of the matter is that you can annihilate your adversary (or the planet) only so many times. In fact, some in the U.S. Air Force have argued that 311 warheads would provide nine-and-a-half times the destructive power needed to incapacitate the Soviet Union by former Defense Secretary Robert McNamara's count.

For China, it's not the size of the arsenal that counts, it's how you use it.

For China, it's not the size of the arsenal that counts, it's how you use it. About 200 nuclear warheads are "enough." China's primary goal has always been to prevent the use of nuclear weapons against them. Beijing figured out that you don't need 30,000 nuclear warheads to achieve that end — you only need enough that the risk of losing a major city in retaliation holds your opponents back. They have enough for escalation control, they have enough for deterrence, and they only need to mate their warheads to delivery vehicles to signal.

So they keep their strategic forces small and agile. With about 200 weapons, you already have increased the cost of nuclear war enough that nobody wants to start one with you. You don't even have to spend a fortune to keep those weapons ready to go at a moment's notice, as Russia and the United States do with their arsenals. Instead, China can invest in its conventional and not-so-conventional weapons, including a growing naval force, hyper-glide vehicles, and systems for both cyberspace and outerspace. Last, China is happy to sit back and wait until escalation is called for, so it keeps its warheads separated from

the missiles it predominantly relies on as delivery systems.

Does this make them weak? No. In fact, while Trump is threatening to shower his enemies with a stream of destruction, China has already realized the limitations of nuclear weapons. First, they are not very useful. It's not just the moral, economic, and environmental reasons that prevent states from using nuclear weapons — they are bad on the battlefield. Real military leaders don't want more nukes. They want shiny new conventional weapons they can actually use. Officers' careers stall when they are assigned to staffing the U.S. nuclear arsenal.

Nuclear weapons are also expensive. Militaries can't afford the next-generation conventional technology they want while footing the bill for nuclear weapons. It will cost the United States an estimated \$1 trillion over the next 30 years to maintain the *existing* nuclear arsenal. Why is it so expensive? These weapons are special, and they come with special risks. You have to keep them safe and secure in addition to operational. These weapons are also old. Parts of these systems will simply age-out unless they are replaced. You need a very skilled workforce to keep them going, and there is a huge age gap as millennials are drawn to the snack bars and salaries of Silicon Valley instead of the dusty corridors of the nuclear arsenal. Other costs haven't even been calculated yet. What is the cost of accidental use? We've had several close calls in the few decades that we've had these complex weapons. How much longer will we stay lucky? By keeping their numbers small, China reduces maintenance costs and the odds of an accident.

Finally, nuclear weapons, once the definitive weapon, are now out of date. Advances in remote sensing, unmanned vehicles, and cyber-capabilities hold nuclear weapons at risk. What use is the weapon if everyone knows where it is and can even disrupt its readiness? Biological weapons are becoming cheaper, and they are more feasible members of the weapons of mass

destruction family for states and nonstate actors to obtain. New technology like artificial intelligence, autonomous weapons, and hypersonic boost-glide vehicles are making conventional weapons more attractive to militaries.

Nuclear weapons are not going to disappear yet, but their role in strategic stability is declining.

Nuclear weapons are not going to disappear yet, but their role in strategic stability is declining.

China is thinking smart, not big. Though they are not impressed by the bravado of a large nuclear arsenal, Chinese scholars do call for equally modern nuclear weapons and delivery systems so as not to lose their ability to retaliate in the face of U.S. conventional weapons and ballistic missile defenses. In 2015, the United States assessed that China may have already added multiple independently targetable re-entry vehicles to its intercontinental ballistic missiles.

With its smaller, more cost-effective arsenal, China has had the time and money to project greater sea power than ever before. Proudly launching its own aircraft carrier and multiple nuclear submarines, it is not above showing off. Beijing is also developing cutting-edge conventional technologies, such as anti-ballistic missile defenses, quantum satellites, drones, hyper-glide vehicles, and cyberweapons. After all, there is more than one way to make a conquest — which China may pull off while Trump and Putin are distracted by the size of each other's nuclear arsenals.

*Subscribe to FP Premium for 20% off now!*

**The  
Washington  
Post**

## Student known for far-right sympathies charged in Quebec City mosque attack (UNE)

<https://www.facebook.com/lindseyb ever>

(Jenny Starrs/The Washington Post)

A gunman attacked a mosque in Canada's Quebec City, killing at least six worshippers and injuring 19 others as they finished their evening prayers on Jan. 29. Police deemed the shooting a terrorist attack. A gunman attacked a mosque in Canada's Quebec City, killing at least six worshippers and injuring

eight others as they finished their evening prayers on Jan. 29. (Jenny Starrs/The Washington Post)

QUEBEC CITY — Canadian authorities on Monday charged a 27-year-old university student known for his far-right sympathies with six counts of first-degree

murder in a mass shooting the day before at a local mosque.

Alexandre Bissonnette, described by neighbors and acquaintances as a socially awkward introvert who had recently adopted virulent political views, was also charged late Monday afternoon with five



counts of attempted murder with a restricted firearm. The five surviving victims were still in the hospital, with two of them in critical condition, although hospital officials said their injuries were not life-threatening.

Handcuffed, his feet manacled and wearing a white prison jumpsuit, Bissonnette reportedly looked at the floor throughout the court hearing, aside from casting a brief glance at his lawyer. The prosecutor, Thomas Jacques, indicated that terrorist charges could be added later to the murder and attempted murder charges.

Today's WorldView

What's most important from where the world meets Washington

Please provide a valid email address.

The attack, which took place just as about 50 worshipers at the small mosque in the suburb of Sainte-Foy near Laval University had completed evening prayer, sent shock waves through Canada. Accustomed to seeing violence as a phenomenon taking place in the United States, Europe and the Middle East, Canadians found themselves in the headlines for all the wrong reasons.

Prime Minister Justin Trudeau was clear that his government considered the shooting a terrorist act. "This was a group of innocents targeted for practicing their faith," Trudeau told the House of Commons. "Make no mistake. This was a terrorist attack."

"These were people of faith and of community," he said. "And in the blink of an eye, they were robbed of their lives in an act of brutal violence."

Bissonnette was described in media reports as an ardent nationalist and a strong supporter of the French far-right politician Marine Le Pen. He was known to activists in Quebec for taking positions against feminism and refugees, said François Deschamps, of the pro-refugee group Bienvenues aux Réfugiés, on his Facebook page.

The suspect was captured by police about 15 miles from the scene of the attack after he called 911 and offered to surrender. The police initially said they had also arrested a 29-year-old engineering student at the Quebec Islamic Cultural Center. By Monday afternoon, they released him and called him a witness to the event.

It turned out the witness, Mohamed Belkhadir, had left the mosque at the end of prayers and was near the building when he heard shots. Returning inside, he called 911 and began helping a friend who had been shot. When he saw armed police arrive, he panicked and ran off and was quickly stopped. He said the police had treated him well.

On Rue du Tracel, a quiet crescent of modest houses in suburban Cap-Rouge about a 15-minute drive from the mosque, Rejean Bussières knew something was up when several police cars descended on his street Monday morning. Having heard of the shooting, he said, he immediately thought it could be Bissonnette.

"He used to like to break things as a kid," said Bussières, who has been a neighbor of the family for 30 years. "He was turbulent."

Bussières, a retired municipal blue-collar worker, said that Bissonnette and his twin brother Mathieu were always introverted.

(Reuters)

Canadians hold vigils after six people were killed in a shooting at a Quebec City mosque. Canadians hold vigils after six people were killed in a shooting at a Quebec City mosque. (Reuters)

Bussières's 23-year-old daughter, Rosalie, said the twins had reputations as "nerds" who were obsessed with violent computer games and were bullied at school. "They were always just with each other. It's sad. They were always home alone."

According to Toronto's Globe and Mail website, Vincent Boissoneault, a friend of the suspect's who also

studied at Laval University, said that Bissonnette had been uninterested in politics until Le Pen visited Quebec City last year. Soon Boissoneault was clashing with his friend over his support for Le Pen and Trump.

"I wrote him off as a xenophobe," Boissoneault told the newspaper. "I didn't even think of him as totally racist, but he was enthralled by a borderline racist nationalist movement."

But the Globe and Mail also quoted friends from Bissonnette's days in junior college as saying he was apolitical and more interested in chess than right-wing politics.

While mosques in Canada and the United States have been the targets of vandalism and other hate crimes in recent years, the Quebec City attack appears to be one of the first mass shootings at an Islamic house of worship in North America.

Jack Jedwab, president of the Association for Canadian Studies, whose research is focused on Canadian attitudes toward immigrants and religious minorities, said that the far right is a marginal movement in Quebec but that it does not stop "unstable people" from being attracted to its propaganda.

He told The Washington Post that Bissonnette was "clearly a person with problems" who was drawn to far-right ideology.

But Jedwab noted that there were no prominent elected politicians in Quebec who backed far-right positions, and he praised Trudeau and other leading Canadian politicians for reaffirming the government's position of openness and support for the acceptance of Syrian refugees.

Jedwab said he did not link the attack to Trump's election win or his ban on refugees and visitors from several Muslim-majority countries last week. "I don't think this was planned in 24 hours. This was planned over a period of time," he said, noting that Canadian firearm

laws make it difficult to procure weapons in short order.

The attack is a particular shock for Quebec City, a prosperous city of 800,000 that prefers to be known for its winter carnival and charming Latin Quarter. Unlike the multicultural centers of Vancouver, Toronto and Montreal, Quebec City remains overwhelmingly white, Catholic and French Canadian.

Nevertheless, the city has seen recent growth in its Muslim population, particularly immigrants from French-speaking North and sub-Saharan Africa. The mosque located a short distance from the university was a microcosm of that growing community.

Among the victims identified by the Quebec coroner late Monday was Azzedine Soufiane, a 57-year butcher, whose halal meat market and grocery store was shut on Monday afternoon, a few forlorn bouquets left at the front door.

"He was nice, social and well-liked by his customers," Amine Noui, a longtime friend of Soufiane, told Radio-Canada, the French service of the Canadian Broadcasting Corp. Noui said it was Moroccan-born Soufiane who was one of the first people to lend him a helping hand when he moved to the community a decade ago.

Khaled Belkacemi, another victim, was an Algerian-born professor at Laval whose work focused on "green" chemistry and functional foods. Calling it "horrible news," university rector Denis Briere said Belkacemi was a colleague who would be greatly missed.

Two of the remaining victims were from Guinea. Both were married and leave a total of six children. The other victims were born in Tunisia and also had young families.

Bever and Hawkins reported from Washington. Marissa Miller in Quebec City contributed to this report.

**The  
Washington  
Post**

## North Korea at the top of the agenda as Mattis heads to Seoul

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

SEOUL — Plans to deploy an American antimissile battery to South Korea and the growing North Korean threat will be at the top of James Mattis's agenda this week when the new defense secretary visits South Korea and Japan on his first foreign trip.

Mattis, a retired Marine general nicknamed "Mad Dog," will meet with Han Min-koo, the South Korean defense minister, in Seoul on Thursday before heading to Tokyo. Han is expected to reiterate South Korea's commitment to hosting the Terminal High Altitude Aerial Defense system, or THAAD.

But with China exacting economic revenge on South Korea over its decision to host the missile battery

and the South Korean government in crisis, some in Seoul now have jitters about the plan.

Today's WorldView

What's most important from where the world meets Washington

Please provide a valid email address.

Moon Jae-in, an opposition candidate running at the top of the presidential polls, has said

decisions on the THAAD deployment should wait until the next South Korean administration is in place.

That could take months, with the Constitutional Court now deciding whether to uphold the National Assembly's motion to impeach President Park Geun-hye, who made the decision to host THAAD, for her role in a sensational political scandal. If the court forces her from

office, elections must be held within 60 days. Otherwise, they will take place in December as scheduled.

*[U.S. policy on North Korea relies on China — and provokes it at the same time]*

In the meantime, the Chinese government — which has made no secret of its opposition to the THAAD plan — is trying to persuade South Korean political leaders to change their minds.

Although Washington and Seoul insist that its purpose is to guard against the threat of North Korean missiles, Beijing views the system as another attempt to curtail its military expansion.

In recent weeks, China has slapped a number of trade sanctions on South Korea in an apparent effort to dissuade Seoul from going ahead with the deployment.

“China is one of the biggest reasons why people are opposing THAAD, and I would say that it’s based on reasonable concerns,” said Kim Dong-yub of the Institute for Far Eastern Studies in Seoul. “Just go into a department store and you can feel the change,” he said, referring

to the sudden drop in Chinese tourists coming to South Korea.

In the past month, China has banned imports of South Korean bidet toilet seats and South Korean cosmetics, which are hugely popular among young women who love Korean dramas. Classical musicians have joined “K-pop” stars in having visas denied and concerts canceled.

*[North Korea runs nuclear test, claims it has ‘higher strike power’ warheads]*

(Jason Aldag/The Washington Post)

Kim Jong Un has tested nuclear weapons and ballistic missiles at an unprecedented rate since he came into power. Yet, the country is under some of the toughest sanctions ever. This is how the regime is able to funnel billions of dollars into its nuclear program. Economy of deceit: How North Korea funds its nuclear weapons program—Part 1 | Loopholes (Video: Jason Aldag/Photo: Linda Davidson/The Washington Post)

Meanwhile, department stores in China run by Lotte, the South Korean retail group, have been

subject to a sudden flurry of safety and hygiene inspections and tax audits, although Beijing rejects any suggestion that this is related to THAAD.

Lotte owns the country club 200 miles from Seoul earmarked for the THAAD battery. It will swap with the government for another parcel of land.

Lotte appeared to be taking it slow with the internal procedures needed to be completed before the swap can take place, a possible sign that it is worried about the impact on its business in China. It has more than 150 stores in China and is building a huge retail and amusement park complex in the southwestern city of Chengdu.

Chinese tourists accounted for more than 70 percent of Lotte Duty Free’s sales in the first quarter of last year. “It is true that we are sandwiched between our role as a South Korean enterprise, South Korea’s relations with China and possible economic loss,” the Yonhap News Agency quoted a senior Lotte official as saying.

*[ North Korean missile lands perilously close to Japan ]*

Small South Korean companies are suffering, too. There has been a sharp decrease in Chinese tourists, said Kim Seo-kyung, who owns a clothing store in Myeongdong, a fashion district in Seoul usually teeming with Chinese shoppers.

“Maybe it’s because of THAAD and because the relationship between South Korea and China has soured,” Kim said. She estimated that her revenue had fallen about 40 percent since last year.

Businesses around South Korea reported a sharp drop in tourist numbers over the Lunar New Year holiday this past weekend.

American proponents of THAAD say they hope South Korean authorities will not waver.

“The THAAD is a far more effective ballistic missile defense system than anything South Korea has or will have for decades,” said Bruce Klingner, a Northeast Asia specialist at the Heritage Foundation. “To not deploy THAAD is to choose to put South Korea and U.S. forces stationed there at grave risk to North Korean nuclear, chemical and biological attack.”

## The New York Times

### Rodrigo Duterte Says Drug War Will Go On as Police Plan Purge

Felipe Villamor

President

Rodrigo Duterte of the Philippines, left, with Ronald dela Rosa, the national police chief, during a news conference in Manila on Monday. Noel Celis/Agence France-Presse — Getty Images

MANILA — The top police official in the Philippines said Monday that he would suspend police participation in the nation’s bloody drug war while he conducted a purge of rogue officers.

But President Rodrigo Duterte said earlier on Monday that the crackdown would continue until “the last day of my term,” raising questions about whether a suspension would do anything to halt the violence.

At least 3,600 people, and possibly thousands more, have been killed by the police or by vigilantes since Mr. Duterte came to power. Human rights groups have said the extrajudicial killings of drug dealers and users may have been ordered by the police, a charge officials have denied.

The head of the Philippine National Police, Ronald dela Rosa, said at a news conference on Monday that the Drug Enforcement Agency

would instead have the authority to pursue drug cases. He was responding to criticism after a South Korean businessman was strangled at Police Headquarters last year by officers who later extorted ransom money from his family under the pretense that he was alive.

“Ready yourselves, you bad cops,” Mr. dela Rosa said. “We no longer have a war on drugs, but we now have a war on scallawags. We will clean house now.”

His order came hours after President Duterte rejected calls to fire the police chief, who is one of his most loyal allies.

Mr. dela Rosa said the suspension would last about a month, during which the antidrug units in the police, which has about 120,000 officers, would be dissolved and overhauled. He said he had already ordered the internal affairs service to submit a list of rogue police officers who had been cleared and for their cases to be reviewed again. He said that the purge would start in the capital, Manila, and the main island of Luzon.

Activists outside the headquarters of the Philippine National Police in Manila on Friday. Noel Celis/Agence France-Presse — Getty Images

Mr. Duterte told an earlier news conference on Monday that rogue officers in the police force were committing crimes “on the pretext of doing the drug war.”

He added: “They are now a new strain of the original big-time drug syndicates. And out of this was born corrupt officers who use warrants on the pretext that they are arresting you or searching you for drugs.”

Some rights groups suggested that the suspension amounted to a public relations exercise and did not seek accountability for the thousands of deaths linked to the crackdown on drug dealers and addicts.

An execution victim in Mandaluyong, Philippines. Since President Rodrigo Duterte took office, 2,000 drug suspects have been killed in police operations and 4,000 others have died in murkier circumstances. Daniel Berehulak for The New York Times

Phelim Kine, deputy director for Asia of Human Rights Watch, said of Mr. dela Rosa: “His willful blind eye to those deaths constitutes a disgraceful betrayal of the public trust and is a telling indicator of his personal contempt for rule of law

and the right to life of his fellow citizens.”

Amnesty International said in a news release that the suspension, coupled with Mr. Duterte’s declaration that the crackdown would ultimately continue, ignored the root of the problem. “These contradictory statements offer little hope that the wave of extrajudicial executions that has claimed more than a thousand lives a month will end,” it said.

Rights groups tied the killing of the South Korean businessman, Jee Ick-joo, 53, to Mr. Duterte’s antidrug campaign, saying that the officers had been emboldened by his promise to shield those involved in the crackdown from prosecution.

During his election campaign, Mr. Duterte vowed a tough stance on crime, promising to kill 100,000 criminals in his first six months in office and dump so many bodies in Manila Bay that the “fish will grow fat.”

But on Sunday, he indicated that he had underestimated the extent of the drug problem and that he would continue the campaign until the end of his tenure in 2022.

## A Climate Change Economist Sounds the Alarm

Mark Buchanan

Some people who study climate change believe that addressing it later -- when economic growth has made humanity wealthier -- would be better than taking drastic measures immediately. Now, though, one of this group's most influential members appears to have changed his mind.

In the early 1990s, Yale's William Nordhaus was among the first to examine the economics of reducing carbon emissions. Since then, he and colleagues have mixed climate physics with economic modeling to explore how various policies might play out both for global temperatures and growth. The approach attempts to weigh, in present-value terms, the costs of preventative measures against the future benefit of avoiding disaster.

Nordhaus has mostly argued for a small carbon tax, aimed at achieving a modest reduction in emissions,

followed by sharper reductions in the medium and long term. Too much mitigation now, he has suggested, would damage economic growth, making us less capable of doing more in the future. This view has helped fossil fuel companies and climate change skeptics oppose any serious policy response.

In his latest analysis, though, Nordhaus comes to a very different conclusion. Using a more accurate treatment of how carbon dioxide may affect temperatures, and how remaining uncertainties affect the likely economic outcomes, he finds that our current response to global warming is probably inadequate to prevent temperatures from rising more than 2 degrees Celsius above their pre-industrial levels, a stated goal of the Paris accords.

Worse, the analysis suggests that the required carbon-dioxide reductions are beyond what's politically possible. For all the talk of

curbing climate change, most nations remain on a business-as-usual trajectory. Meanwhile, further economic growth will drive even greater carbon emissions over coming decades, particularly in developing nations.

Nordhaus deserves credit for changing his mind as the results of his analyses have changed, and for focusing on the implications of current policies rather than making rosy assumptions about the ability of new technologies to achieve emission reductions in the future. Many other analyses -- including those of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change -- don't demand such realism.

Nonetheless, the shift in his assessment is stark. For two decades, the advice has been to do a little but mostly hold off. Now, suddenly, the message is that it's too late, that we should have been doing a lot more and there's almost no way to avoid disaster.

Perhaps the main lesson is that we shouldn't put too much trust in cost-benefit calculations, the standard economic recipe for making policy decisions. In the case of climate change, they are inherently biased toward inaction: It's easy to see the costs of immediate emissions reductions, and much harder to quantify the benefits of avoiding a disaster likely to materialize much farther in the future. By the time the nature and impact of that disaster become clear, it may be too late to act.

This column does not necessarily reflect the opinion of the editorial board or Bloomberg LP and its owners.

To contact the author of this story:  
Mark Buchanan at  
buchanan.mark@gmail.com

To contact the editor responsible for this story:  
Mark Whitehouse at  
mwhitehouse1@bloomberg.net

## Leonid Bershidsky : The U.S. Was Hardly Wide Open to Muslims Before Trump

Leonid Bershidsky

President Donald Trump's immigration order was so boorish, purposely hostile and ill-conceived that it has obscured an inconvenient truth for many of those who oppose it: The U.S. was refusing entry to many Muslims long before he took office.

In a statement Sunday night, Trump said his choice of seven countries -- Iran, Iraq, Syria, Libya, Somalia, Sudan and Yemen -- matched those singled out by the Visa Waiver Program Improvement and Terrorist Travel Prevention Act, which was passed under President Barack Obama. Far short of a ban -- and far from stranding green card holders and dual citizens at the border -- that legislation required dual citizens of those countries and anyone who traveled there to apply for a visa to enter the U.S. But the fact remains that these countries were first formally singled out as potential threats under Obama, not Trump.

Trump was hammered for keeping other nations off his list despite the similar threats posed by them. For example, Saudi Arabia, whose citizens perpetrated the 9/11 attacks, or Tunisia, which, on a per capita basis, provides the Islamic State with more fighters than any other country in the world. That, too, is in keeping with U.S. practice before he took office. Just look

at visitor visa rejection statistics. In 2016, Saudi Arabia had a 4 percent refusal rate for U.S. non-immigrant B visas, compared with an average of 31.4 percent for all countries not included in the visa waiver program; Tunisia's rejection rate was 16 percent.

All in all, however, the U.S. visa issuance statistics, with Visa Waiver Program countries excluded, is skewed slightly against Muslim nations.

Were Muslims Welcome in the U.S.?

Refusal rates for U.S. B-category visas, 2016, percent

Source: U.S. State Department, author's calculations

It's possible that a large part of the anti-Muslim bias is explained by the Muslim world's relative poverty. After all, wealthy Persian Gulf nations enjoy stellar admission rates. But there are plenty of poor countries in Africa and Asia whose citizens are more welcome in the U.S. than Muslims. Refusal rates for nationals of Zimbabwe, Timor-Leste or India are below average.

Europe's passport-free Schengen area also shows a similar, slight anti-Muslim slant in its visa policy, but the refusal rates there are far lower than in the U.S. Based on 2014 data, the average Schengen visa rejection rate for a Muslim

country was 14.5 percent, compared with about 9 percent for other countries (excluding those entitled to visa-free travel).

The high refusal rates for Muslim nations in the U.S. have been rather stable for the last 10 years, though they have fluctuated both ways for individual countries. So during the George W. Bush presidency, Muslim visitors were just about as stringently vetted as under the Obama administration.

Another part of Trump's executive order imposed a blanket 120-day ban on the resettlement of refugees. But even before Trump came to power, Europe bore the brunt of the global refugee crisis. In 2016, the U.S. received 84,994 refugees. Germany alone -- with just a quarter of the U.S. population -- granted refugee status to 246,802 people.

To some extent, Europe is paying for its more open policy: Lately, it has seen more deaths from terrorism than the U.S. But the difference is too small to justify the huge divergence in U.S. and European travel and refugee policies.

That divergence emerged long before Trump. The enormity of 9/11 may partially explain it, but, whatever the reasons, the U.S. hasn't been the wide-open country both Trump supporters and opponents imagine. Those who

protest Trump's rough action today may not realize what kind of reputation the U.S. already has among international travelers who need a visa to go there. Long waiting times and the need to travel, sometimes hundreds of miles, to a consulate for a visa interview and fingerprinting -- which will be repeated at the U.S. border, anyway -- are the norm. So are the rejections, which are never explained: The U.S. reserves the right to keep out whomever it doesn't want for whatever reason.

If traveling to the U.S. is a privilege and most of the world's population is treated as nuisance supplicants, then Trump's order is just another step -- a particularly ugly and arrogant one, to be sure -- down that road. Otherwise, having run into staunch resistance from the courts with his order, Trump will keep his election promises in a quieter way -- by tightening visa eligibility criteria and ratcheting up visa refusal rates. No one may even notice.

This column does not necessarily reflect the opinion of the editorial board or Bloomberg LP and its owners.

To contact the author of this story:  
Leonid Bershidsky at  
lbershidsky@bloomberg.net

# Trump's Trade War May Have Already Begun

Peter S.  
Goodman

LONDON — America's traditional allies are on the lookout for new friends.

They have heard the mantra "America First" from the new president, divining a Trump doctrine: global cooperation last. Europeans have taken note of Mr. Trump's denigration of the European Union and his apparent esteem for the Russian president, Vladimir V. Putin. In Asia and Latin America, leaders have absorbed the deepening possibility that Mr. Trump will deliver on threats to impose punitive tariffs on Mexican and Chinese imports, provoking a trade war that will damage economic growth and eliminate jobs around the world.

Some allies are shifting focus to other potential partners for new sources of trade and investment, relationships that could influence political, diplomatic and military ties. Many are looking to China, which has adroitly capitalized on a leadership vacuum in world affairs by offering itself — ironies notwithstanding — as a champion for global engagement.

"We've always said that America is our best friend," Jeroen Dijsselbloem, president of the Eurogroup — comprising finance ministers from countries sharing the euro currency — said in an interview with The New York Times on the sidelines of the World Economic Forum in Davos, Switzerland, this month. "If that's no longer the case, if that's what we need to understand from Donald Trump, then of course Europe will look for new friends."

"China is a very strong candidate for that," he added. "The Chinese involvement in Europe in terms of investment is already very high and expanding. If you push away your friends, you mustn't be surprised if the friends start looking for new friends."

On Wednesday, Chancellor Angela Merkel of Germany spoke by telephone with Premier Li Keqiang of China. "The two spoke in favor of free trade and a stable world trade order," a German government spokesman later said in a written statement.

The swift reassessment of trade relations — a realm in which Mr. Trump is directly threatening the order that has prevailed since the end of World War II — only

amplifies the potential for a shake-up of the broader geopolitical framework.

Mr. Trump has already criticized NATO as obsolete while demanding that member states pay more, calling into question the alliance that has maintained security across much of Europe for more than six decades. He has provoked fears of a clash with China beyond issues of commerce by taking a congratulatory call from the president of Taiwan, the self-governing island that Beijing claims as part of its territory. In shutting American borders to people from predominantly Muslim countries, Mr. Trump risks inflaming tensions with Middle Eastern nations while widening a void with democratic allies over basic values.

Through the fractious campaign, weary sophisticates dismissed the extreme talk from the Trump camp as political bluster. Even if he won, he would never follow through on his threats, particularly in trade where his business sensibilities would prevail.

But that conventional wisdom looks to be crumbling. First, Mr. Trump delivered on a promise to withdraw from the Trans-Pacific Partnership, a trade agreement forged by the Obama administration in part as a counter to China's growing influence.

Then, on Thursday, his administration appeared to embrace a Republican proposal to impose a 20 percent tax on all imported goods while asserting the proceeds would pay for a wall along the Mexican border. Word of the tax emerged as President Enrique Peña Nieto of Mexico canceled a visit to Washington to protest the promised wall — resonating as the potential first salvo in a trade war.

"I'm incredibly concerned that the Trump people mean what they say," said Chad P. Bown, a trade expert at the Peterson Institute for International Economics. "One would hope that they are using this as a negotiating tactic. But even if you are, that's an extraordinarily dangerous game to play, because, right now, the communication to the world is not flowing clearly."

The communication on Thursday came through Mr. Trump's press secretary, Sean Spicer, who during the administration of George W. Bush, promoted the job-creating magic of free trade as a spokesman for the United States Trade Representative.

Pressed to explain how Mr. Trump would force Mexico to pay for the wall, Mr. Spicer said an import tax would do the trick. He soon clarified the tax was merely one option on a crowded buffet table.

At a news conference on Friday, Mr. Trump reported having had "a very good call" with the Mexican president. But he did not sound conciliatory. Mexico "has outnegotiated us and beat us to a pulp through our past leaders," he said. "I'm not going to let that happen."

Within the business world, the prospect of substantial tariffs seems so damaging that many assume it will never happen.

Chancellor Angela Merkel of Germany with President Xi Jinping of China and his wife, Peng Liyuan, in September. Ms. Merkel on Wednesday spoke with Premier Li Keqiang of China "in favor of free trade and a stable world trade order," a German government spokesman said. Stephen Crowley/The New York Times

Three decades ago, Alan Russell, a former commercial airline pilot, set up the Tecma Group of Companies, which runs factory operations for multinationals in Mexico. Today, the company employs some 7,000 Mexican laborers, most of them in factories clustered around Ciudad Juárez. They make components for the automotive, electronics, aerospace and medical device industries.

Mr. Trump's words have provoked fear among the members of Mr. Russell's work force. "They hear the administration is going to shut down NAFTA and deport everyone, and it scares them," he said, referring to the North American Free Trade Agreement.

But in the end, he said, business will carry on.

"In 31 years, I've been through rapid inflation, devaluations, three major recessions, the violence period and multiple presidential administrations, and every year trade has increased," he said. "We've been through worse. Trade is like life itself. It will figure a way."

Most experts have similarly assumed the responsibilities of governance would temper Mr. Trump's trade posture. Given that nearly one-third of all American trade is conducted with China and Mexico, a rupture risks severe economic damage.

The three countries are intertwined in the global supply chain. China makes components that go into auto parts manufactured in the United States. Those parts are delivered to factories in Mexico that produce finished vehicles sold to Americans. Calling such vehicles Mexican imports misses that much of the value is produced in the United States, employing American labor.

"The idea of trade wars these days, what politicians have in mind is really a 19th-century or early 20th-century conception of trade," said Gianmarco I.P. Ottaviano, a trade economist at the London School of Economics. "You don't even know who you're going to hurt with these kind of things. You're probably going to destroy American jobs in the end."

Mr. Trump owes his office in no small measure to factory workers who have come to view global trade as a mortal threat to their livelihoods. But their sentiments are grounded not in ideology, but in a desire for jobs at decent wages. If Mr. Trump impedes imports, he could put some of these voters out of work.

Beyond the economic effects, Mr. Trump's refashioning of trade has already altered global alignments.

In emphasizing "America First," Mr. Trump has generated a widespread sense that the country is surrendering its global leadership position. Britain's abandonment of the European Union has enhanced the view that a period of international integration has devolved to a new era in which nationalist concerns are paramount.

On Friday, as Mr. Trump hosted British Prime Minister Theresa May, he only increased the sense that he disdains Europe.

"Brexit's going to be a wonderful thing for your country," he told Ms. May at a news conference, before recounting his frustrations with the union's bureaucracy. "Getting the approvals from Europe was very, very tough."

With both countries pursuing nationalist aspirations and multilateral institutions seemingly endangered, the world suddenly seems short of responsible supervision.

China is working to assume the mantle. President Xi Jinping of China last week used an address in Davos, to submit his nation's bid as



a reliable champion of expanded trade.

China does not have free elections. China jails labor organizers, while lavishing credit on state-owned enterprises. All of this makes Mr. Xi

an ironic choice as an icon for free trade. Yet Mr. Xi's speech was so successful that it won the embrace of business people and world leaders alike.

At a lunch in Davos two days after Mr. Xi's address, a Berlin-based private equity fund manager, André Loesekrug-Pietri, stood in a dining room full of more than 100 people

and predicted the dawning of a new era.

"We heard a Chinese president becoming the leader of the free world," he said.

**The  
New York  
Times**

## David Leonhardt : Make China Great Again

David Leonhardt

America's rivals

and enemies have enjoyed a very good 10 days.

One clear beneficiary has been ISIS, which has spent years trying to persuade Muslims that the United States is at war with Islam. ISIS wants to eliminate the world's "gray zone," the places where Muslims, Christians, Hindus and Jews live in harmony.

No wonder that ISIS-affiliated social media gleefully posted President Trump's executive order this weekend, as Rukmini Callimachi of The Times reported. Trump's call for a Muslim ban, like his unsubtle attempt to implement one, plays right into ISIS' desire to eliminate the gray zone. The president of the United States himself now seems to agree that Muslims and non-Muslims can't live together.

Besides the immorality and apparent illegality of Trump's order, it's worth weighing the strategic effects as well. Yes, it is conceivable that barring visitors from Iran, Iraq, Libya, Somalia, Sudan, Syria and Yemen would keep out a future terrorist. But it's highly unlikely.

They are already intensely vetted, and previous attackers have generally come from other countries. "The end result of this ban will not be a drop in terror attacks," as dozens of American diplomats wrote, in a dissenting draft memo that leaked. Instead, "it will be a drop in international good will towards Americans and" —

because of the chilling effect on travel — "a threat towards our economy."

So any strategic benefits are tiny while the costs are substantial: Trump has just helped ISIS recruiters. He has angered Iraq, France and others battling ISIS. He's started a new argument in the Middle East, which long distracted the United States. Most alarmingly, he has undercut our claim to stand for larger principles — freedom, rule of law, even basic competence.

This undermining of both American values and interests has been an early theme of the administration. And the ultimate beneficiary is not likely to be ISIS. Although it poses serious threats, it is not a serious rival to the United States. The ultimate beneficiary is instead likely to be America's biggest global rival: China.

China remains far less powerful than the United States. But it has come a long way. Its economic progress and its ambitions, combined with the size of its population, mean that China has become the world's only other potential superpower.

Some degree of a rising China is inevitable — and welcome, given the continued reduction in poverty that will happen. The big unknown is whether China will change as it rises, to become freer and more respectful of the rule of law, or whether China will mold the rest of the world in its current closed and authoritarian image.

Here, too, the Trump administration has set back American interests.

In another executive order, Trump pulled the United States out of the Trans-Pacific Partnership. Whatever you think about the deal's economic effects (and there has been a lot of silliness on both the left and the right), they were likely to be modest. The United States already has few barriers to Asian imports, which is why some combination of your car, television, computer, phone and clothing comes from Asia.

The pact was more about geopolitics than economics. It was, as the Australian academic Salvatore Babones wrote in Foreign Affairs, "primarily a tool for spreading U.S. interests abroad." Much of the Pacific Rim, including Australia, Vietnam and Malaysia, welcomed it, too.

They welcomed it because they want a strong American presence to offset Chinese power in Asia. These countries have close commercial ties with China, but they are afraid of becoming merely moons that orbit Beijing. They tend to prefer the American model to the Chinese model.

That's why they were willing to adopt American-style rules on intellectual property, pollution and labor unions, even though those rules created some political tensions in those countries.

Now that Trump has rejected our would-be Asian allies, China is trying to put together a different trade pact with some of the same countries. If China succeeds, it will

gain more sway in Asia, as will a more bare-knuckle economic system in which copyrights, worker rights, product safety and the environment aren't taken very seriously.

Meanwhile, Beijing will be able to point to Trump's extralegal stances as proof that the United States is just another self-interested, transactional nation. After all, the United States also threatened a trade war when it was unhappy with one of its neighbors and also mistreats its ethnic minorities.

The early pattern of Trump foreign policy is to take actions that have the veneer of strength but are actually weak. It's a kind of anti-Teddy Rooseveltism. Instead of speaking softly and carrying a big stick, the White House is screaming loudly to hide insecurity about the strength of its stick.

The people with the most ability to limit the damage are Republicans who see themselves as advocates of a strong America. Bob Corker, John McCain, Marco Rubio and other members of Congress have enough leverage over the administration, in any number of ways, to influence it.

The question they should be asking themselves is: How do our enemies and rivals feel about the Trump administration so far?

## ETATS-UNIS

**The  
Washington  
Post**

## Trump's hard-line actions have an intellectual godfather: Jeff Sessions (UNE)

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

In jagged black strokes, President Trump's signature was scribbled onto a catalogue of executive orders over the past 10 days that translated the hard-line promises of his campaign into the policies of his government.

The directives bore Trump's name, but another man's fingerprints were also on nearly all of them: Jeff Sessions.

The early days of the Trump presidency have rushed a nationalist agenda long on the fringes of American life into action — and Sessions, the quiet Alabamian who long cultivated those ideas as a Senate backbencher, has become a singular power in this new Washington.

Sessions's ideology is driven by a visceral aversion to what he calls "soulless globalism," a term used on the extreme right to convey a perceived threat to the United States from free trade, international alliances and the immigration of nonwhites.

And despite many reservations among Republicans about that worldview, Sessions — whose 1986 nomination for a federal judgeship was doomed by accusations of racism that he denied — is finding little resistance in Congress to his proposed role as Trump's attorney general.

(Thomas Johnson/The Washington Post)

President-elect Donald Trump announced Friday that he plans to nominate Sen. Jeff Sessions (R-Ala.) as attorney general. President-elect Donald Trump announced Friday that he plans to nominate Sen. Jeff Sessions (R-Ala.) as attorney general. (Thomas Johnson/The Washington Post)

Sessions's nomination is scheduled to be voted on Tuesday by the Senate Judiciary Committee, but his influence in the administration stretches far beyond the Justice Department. From immigration and health care to national security and trade, Sessions is the intellectual godfather of the president's policies. His reach extends throughout the White House, with his aides and allies accelerating the president's most dramatic moves, including the ban on refugees and citizens from seven mostly Muslim nations that has triggered fear around the globe.

The author of many of Trump's executive orders is senior policy adviser Stephen Miller, a Sessions confidant who was mentored by him and who spent the weekend overseeing the government's implementation of the refugee ban. The tactician turning Trump's agenda into law is deputy chief of

staff Rick Dearborn, Sessions's longtime chief of staff in the Senate. The mastermind behind Trump's incendiary brand of populism is chief strategist Stephen K. Bannon, who, as chairman of the Breitbart website, promoted Sessions for years.

Then there is Jared Kushner, the president's son-in-law and senior adviser, who considers Sessions a savant and forged a bond with the senator while orchestrating Trump's trip last summer to Mexico City and during the darkest days of the campaign.

*[Trump lays groundwork to change U.S. role in the world]*

In an email in response to a request from The Washington Post, Bannon described Sessions as "the clearinghouse for policy and philosophy" in Trump's administration, saying he and the senator are at the center of Trump's "pro-America movement" and the global nationalist phenomenon.

"In America and Europe, working people are reasserting their right to control their own destinies," Bannon wrote. "Jeff Sessions has been at the forefront of this movement for years, developing populist nation-state policies that are supported by the vast and overwhelming majority of Americans, but are poorly understood by cosmopolitan elites in the media that live in a handful of our larger cities."

He continued: "Throughout the campaign, Sessions has been the fiercest, most dedicated, and most loyal promoter in Congress of Trump's agenda, and has played a critical role as the clearinghouse for policy and philosophy to undergird the implementation of that agenda. What we are witnessing now is the birth of a new political order, and the more frantic a handful of media elites become, the more powerful that new political order becomes itself."

Trump, who is never shy about showering praise on his loyalists, speaks of Sessions with reverence. At a luncheon the day before his inauguration, Trump singled out someone in the audience: "the legendary Jeff Sessions."

Trump said in an email to The Post that Sessions is "a truly fine person."

"Jeff was one of my earliest supporters and the fact that he is so highly respected by everyone in both Washington, D.C., and around the country was a tremendous asset to me throughout the campaign," Trump wrote.

Sessions helped devise the president's first-week strategy, in

which Trump signed a blizzard of executive orders that begin to fulfill his signature campaign promises — although Sessions had advocated going even faster.

The senator lobbied for a "shock-and-awe" period of executive action that would rattle Congress, impress Trump's base and catch his critics unaware, according to two officials involved in the transition planning. Trump opted for a slightly slower pace, these officials said, because he wanted to maximize news coverage by spreading out his directives over several weeks.

Trump makes his own decisions, but Sessions was one of the rare lawmakers who shared his impulses.

"Sessions brings heft to the president's gut instincts," said Roger Stone, a longtime Trump adviser. He compared Sessions to John Mitchell, who was attorney general under Richard M. Nixon but served a more intimate role as a counselor to the president on just about everything. "Nixon is not a guy given to taking advice, but Mitchell was probably Nixon's closest adviser," Stone said.

*[In Trump's Washington, rival powers and whispers in the president's ear]*

There are limits to Sessions's influence, however. He has not persuaded Trump — so far, at least — to eliminate the Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals program, under which children brought to the United States illegally are allowed to stay in the country.

Sessions has also been leading the internal push for Trump to nominate William H. Pryor Jr., his deputy when Sessions was Alabama's attorney general and now a federal appeals court judge, for the Supreme Court. While Pryor is on Trump's list of three finalists, it is unclear whether he will get the nod.

In his senior staff meetings, Trump talks about Sessions as someone who "gets things done," calmly and without fanfare, said Kellyanne Conway, the White House counselor.

"He does it in a very courtly, deliberative manner," she said. "There's never a cloud of dust or dramatic flourish."

Newt Gingrich, a former speaker of the House and informal Trump adviser, said, "Sessions is the person who is comfortable being an outsider to the establishment but able to explain the establishment to Trump. There is this New York-Los Angeles bias that if you sound like Alabama, you can't be all that bright, but that's totally wrong, and

Trump recognized how genuinely smart Sessions is."

Sessions was especially instrumental in the early days of the transition, which was taken over by Dearborn after a purge of New Jersey Gov. Chris Christie's associates. Sessions became a daily presence at Trump Tower in New York, mapping out the policy agenda and making personnel decisions.

Once former New York mayor Rudolph W. Giuliani was out of consideration for secretary of state, Trump considered nominating Sessions because he was so trusted by the inner circle, including Kushner, although Sessions's preference was to be attorney general, according to people familiar with the talks.

Since his nomination, Sessions has been careful to not be formally involved even as his ideas animate the White House. In a statement Sunday, he denied that he has had "communications" with his former advisers or reviewed the executive orders.

Sessions has installed close allies throughout the administration. He persuaded Cliff Sims, a friend and adviser, to sell his Alabama media outlet and take a job directing message strategy at the White House. Sessions also influenced the selection of Peter Navarro, an economist and friend with whom he co-authored an op-ed last fall warning against the "rabbit hole of globalism," as director of the National Trade Council.

Sessions's connections extend into the White House media briefing room, where press secretary Sean Spicer took the first question at his Jan. 24 briefing from a journalist at LifeZette, a conservative website run by Laura Ingraham, a Trump supporter and populist in the Sessions mold. The website's senior editor is Garrett Murch, a former communications adviser to Sessions.

Another link: Julia Hahn, a Breitbart writer who favorably chronicled Sessions's immigration crusades over the past two years, was hired by Bannon to be one of his White House aides.

More mainstream Republicans have been alarmed by Sessions's ascent. John Weaver, a veteran GOP strategist who was a consultant on Sessions's first Senate campaign and is now a Trump critic, said Sessions is at the pinnacle of power because he shares Trump's "1940s view of fortress America."

"That's something you would find in an Allen Drury novel," Weaver said. "Unfortunately, there are real

consequences to this, which are draconian views on immigration and a view of America that is insular and not an active member of the global community."

*[Trump's pick for attorney general is shadowed by race and history]*

Inside the White House and within Sessions's alumni network, people have taken to calling the senator "Joseph," referring to the Old Testament patriarch who was shunned by his family and sold into slavery as a boy, only to rise through unusual circumstances to become right hand to the pharaoh and oversee the lands of Egypt.

In a 20-year Senate career, Sessions has been isolated in his own party, a dynamic crystallized a decade ago when he split with President George W. Bush and the

business community over comprehensive immigration changes.

In lonely and somewhat conspiratorial speeches on the Senate floor, Sessions would chastise the "masters of the universe." He hung on his office wall a picture of He-Man from the popular 1980s comic book series.

As he weighed a presidential run, Trump liked what he saw in Sessions, who was tight with the constituencies Trump was eager to rouse on the right. So he cultivated a relationship, giving Sessions \$2,000 for his 2014 reelection even though the senator had no Democratic opponent.

"Sessions was always somebody that we had targeted," said Sam

Nunberg, Trump's political adviser at the time.

Act Four newsletter

The intersection of culture and politics.

Please provide a valid email address.

In May 2015, Nunberg said, he reached out to Miller, then an adviser to Sessions, to arrange a phone call between Trump and the senator. The two hit it off, with Trump telling Nunberg, "That guy is tough."

The next month, Trump declared his candidacy. In August of that year, Sessions joined Trump at a megareally in the senator's home town of Mobile and donned a "Make America Great Again" cap. By January 2016, Miller had formally

joined the campaign and was traveling daily with the candidate, writing speeches and crafting policies.

"Senator Sessions laid a bit of groundwork ... on matters like trade and illegal immigration," Conway said. "It was candidate Trump then who was able to elevate those twin pillars in a way that cast it through the lens of what's good for the American worker."

As Trump kept rising, so did Sessions.

"It's like being a guerrilla in the hinterlands preparing for the next hopeless assault on the government," said Mark Krikorian, executive director of the Center for Immigration Studies, a conservative research institute. "Then you get a message that the capital has fallen."

## THE WALL STREET JOURNAL

# White House Fires Acting Attorney General Sally Yates After Defying Immigration Ban (UNE)

Devlin Barrett and Damian Paletta

Updated Jan. 31, 2017 12:08 a.m. ET

WASHINGTON—The White House on Monday fired acting Attorney General Sally Yates for telling government lawyers not to defend an executive order signed by President Donald Trump suspending immigration from seven countries out of concerns that terrorists from those countries might enter the U.S.

Ms. Yates learned of her firing Monday evening, in a letter from the White House hand-delivered to her office, according to a person familiar with the matter.

In a statement, the White House said Ms. Yates "has betrayed the Department of Justice by refusing to enforce a legal order designed to protect the citizens of the United States."

Dana Boente, the U.S. attorney for the Eastern District of Virginia, will be acting attorney general until Mr. Trump's attorney general nominee, Jeff Sessions, is confirmed by the U.S. Senate, which could happen next week.

Mr. Boente was sworn in at 9 p.m. Monday, according to White House officials, and just before midnight he issued new instructions: "I hereby rescind former acting attorney general Sally Q Yates' January 30, 2017 guidance and direct the men and women of the Department of Justice to do our sworn duty and to defend the lawful orders of our president."

The selection of Mr. Boente also solves another logistical problem posed by firing Ms. Yates: As a Senate-confirmed nominee, he is authorized to sign surveillance requests to the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Court, which oversees the government's most sensitive terrorism and espionage probes.

The White House statement fiercely criticized Ms. Yates as "weak on borders and very weak on immigration. It is time to get serious about protecting our country. Calling for tougher vetting for individuals traveling from seven dangerous places is not extreme. It is reasonable and necessary to protect our country."

Senate Democrats signaled the firing of Ms. Yates would intensify their efforts against Mr. Trump's attorney general nominee.

"The firing of Sally Yates underscores how important it is to have an attorney general who will stand up to the White House when they are violating the law," said Senate Minority Leader Charles Schumer (D., N.Y.). "Many people have doubts about whether Jeff Sessions can be that person, and the full Senate and the American people should at the very least know exactly how independent he plans to be before voting on him."

The Justice Department standoff was the latest in a series of extraordinary events since Mr. Trump signed his order Friday night, sparking confusion and protests at airports around the U.S., as well as condemnation from executives at blue-chip companies such as Goldman Sachs Group Inc., Coca-

Cola Co., Amazon.com Inc. and Ford Motor Co. "Being diverse is not optional; it is what we must be," said Goldman Sachs Chairman Lloyd Blankfein, quoting from Goldman's business principles. "Now is a fitting time to reflect on those words and the principles that underlie them."

At the State Department, employees signed a draft document formally protesting the order. And former President Barack Obama also weighed in for the first time since leaving office.

A spokesman for Mr. Obama, Kevin Lewis, said Mr. Obama "is heartened" by the protests of Mr. Trump's policies and opposes the new administration's effort to impose religious tests for entry to the U.S.

In an email to lawyers in the Civil Division on Monday, Ms. Yates instructed the attorneys not to defend the order, saying she had serious concerns about its legality. She said the Justice Department's Office of Legal Counsel had reviewed the order to see if it was "lawful on its face." But Ms. Yates said that review was limited and failed to address the implications of the travel ban.

The firing and quick replacement of the nation's top law-enforcement official is the latest escalation in the political debate unleashed by Mr. Trump's executive order.

Even within the government, many senior officials, including Ms. Yates, didn't know the order was coming, according to people familiar with the matter.

Ms. Yates didn't immediately respond to requests for comment.

People close to Ms. Yates said she struggled over the weekend deciding how to handle the travel-ban issue, as Justice Department lawyers were called into court to speak in emergency hearings sought by lawyers for green-card holders detained at airports.

By Monday, these people said, Ms. Yates decided she had enough concerns about Mr. Trump's order that she couldn't instruct lawyers in the civil division to defend it. She wrote the letter knowing the likely outcome would be her removal from the job, these people said.

Ms. Yates, a career prosecutor, became the acting head of the Justice Department when Loretta Lynch stepped down as attorney general this month.

The administration has said the travel ban doesn't represent a religious test, noting there are dozens of Muslim countries that aren't affected. Critics have denounced it as targeting Islam because the seven countries—Iraq, Iran, Somalia, Sudan, Syria, Libya and Yemen—have majority populations of Muslims. The administration notes that the seven countries were initially identified by the Obama administration as posing significant security risks.

Mr. Lewis, the former president's spokesman, said: "With regard to comparisons to President Obama's foreign policy decisions, as we've heard before, the President fundamentally disagrees with the notion of discriminating against

individuals because of their faith or religion."

—Nicole Hong contributed to this article.

**Corrections & Amplifications**  
Acting Attorney General Sally Yates learned of her firing Monday evening, according to a person familiar with the matter. An earlier

version of this article incorrectly stated that she learned of her firing on Wednesday.

**Write to** Devlin Barrett at devlin.barrett@wsj.com and Damian Paletta at damian.paletta@wsj.com

## The New York Times

Liam Stack

Dana J. Boente, United States attorney for the Eastern District of Virginia, in 2015. Mark Wilson/Getty Images

President Donald J. Trump appointed Dana J. Boente, the United States attorney for the Eastern District of Virginia, to be acting attorney general on Monday night after he dismissed Sally Q. Yates from that role over her refusal to defend his executive order on immigration in court. The abrupt dismissal of Ms. Yates and the appointment of Mr. Boente were the latest twists in a fast-moving crisis over the executive order.

Mr. Boente is expected to serve as acting attorney general until Mr. Trump's nominee for attorney general, Senator Jeff Sessions, an Alabama Republican, is confirmed. The Senate Judiciary Committee is expected to vote on his nomination as soon as Tuesday, which means Mr. Boente may be in his new role for a only matter of days.

So, who is Mr. Boente?

### Career Civil Servant

Mr. Boente, 62, has worked for the Justice Department since 1984 under both Republican and

Democratic administrations. He served in the department's tax division and held several positions in the Eastern District of Virginia. He also served as the United States attorney for the Eastern District of Louisiana from December 2012 to September 2013.

In October 2015, Mr. Boente was nominated by President Barack Obama to be the United States attorney for the Eastern District of Virginia and was confirmed by the United States Senate that December.

The district sprawls across a wide swath of the state. It covers six million people and often handles cases that touch on national security because its territory includes facilities like the Pentagon and the headquarters of the Central Intelligence Agency.

Before joining the Justice Department, Mr. Boente clerked for a chief United States district judge, J. Waldo Ackerman, in the Central District of Illinois in 1982.

### 'Reliable Middle Child'

Mr. Boente may have become acting attorney general amid turmoil centered on the new Republican president, but he has been praised

by members of both parties during his career.

Former Attorney General Loretta E. Lynch affectionately praised Mr. Boente last February when he was sworn in as United States attorney for the Eastern District of Virginia.

She called him one of the Justice Department's "consummate utility players" and pointed to a string public corruption prosecutions he lead in Virginia and Louisiana. He oversaw the prosecution of former Gov. Robert F. McDonnell of Virginia, a Republican whose conviction was ultimately overturned by the Supreme Court, and of former United States Representative William J. Jefferson and former Mayor Ray Nagin of New Orleans, both Louisiana Democrats.

"He is that reliable middle child, the one you could always count on to be there for you," Ms. Lynch said, according to The Washington Post.

### 'Seniority and Loyalty'

Mr. Trump appears to have found Mr. Boente to be similarly reliable.

Joshua Stueve, a spokesman for the United States attorney's office in Alexandria, Va., said Mr. Boente had no hesitation about accepting

the acting attorney general's job, given his "seniority and loyalty" to the department.

Mr. Stueve also said Mr. Boente told the White House he was willing to do something that Ms. Yates would not: sign off on Mr. Trump's executive order.

In an interview with The Washington Post on Monday night, Mr. Boente pointed out that his office had already been defending the president's executive order against a lawsuit brought in a Virginia federal court.

"I was enforcing it this afternoon," Mr. Boente told The Post. "Our career department employees were defending the action in court, and I expect that's what they'll do tomorrow, appropriately and properly."

Indeed, shortly before midnight on Monday, Mr. Boente rescinded the guidance Ms. Yates had given department lawyers earlier in the evening and formally ordered them to defend the president's immigration ban.

## The Washington Post

# From order to disorder: How Trump's immigration directive exposed s (UNE)

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

The fallout Monday from President Trump's sweeping immigration order exposed painful rifts within the Republican Party, alarmed members of his Cabinet and fueled suspicions among his top advisers.

That left the defiant commander in chief stewing over who was to blame — capped by Trump's remarkable decision late Monday to fire the acting attorney general because she refused to enforce the order as potentially unlawful.

For all the promises of Republican bonhomie, Trump and his aides kept GOP congressional leaders almost completely in the dark about the most consequential act of his young presidency: a temporary ban

on refugees and on anyone from seven majority-Muslim nations.

Defense Secretary James Mattis and Homeland Security Secretary John Kelly fumed privately to associates over the weekend because they had been caught unaware by a travel ban that was drafted and set into action largely in secret by the White House, according to three people who have spoken with them.

Inside the West Wing, tensions flared as differences in management style emerged between two factions: one led by chief strategist Stephen K. Bannon and senior policy adviser Stephen Miller, who wrote the immigration order, and the other composed of Chief of Staff Reince Priebus and his deputies, who are accustomed

to operating with a more traditional chain of command.

(Peter Stevenson/The Washington Post)

White House press secretary Sean Spicer addressed the media on Jan. 30, three days after President Trump signed an executive order halting the flow of refugees to the United States. Sean Spicer's daily briefing on Trump's travel ban, annotated (Video: Peter Stevenson/Photo: Jabin Botsford/The Washington Post)

Miller, 31, was the public face of the order and the populist wing of the White House over the weekend, directing department and agency chiefs as well as explaining and defending the move in television interviews.

As it became evident that the rollout of the executive order bordered between clumsy and dysfunctional, people in Trump's orbit divided over who was at fault, with some blaming Miller. Others said it was Priebus who should have taken charge of better coordinating with the departments and communicating with lawmakers and the public.

"The problem they've got is this is an off-Broadway performance of a show that is now the number one hit on Broadway," said former House speaker Newt Gingrich, an informal adviser to Trump.

*[The first days inside Trump's White House: Fury, tumult and a reboot]*

The infighting spilled into public view Monday morning on MSNBC's "Morning Joe." Host Joe Scarborough, who spent part of



Sunday visiting Trump at the White House, looked into the camera and directly challenged Miller.

"This weekend was a disgrace and it's all on your shoulders," Scarborough intoned.

His commentary was all but certain to be noticed by the president himself; Trump is such an avid watcher of the show that when Sen. Joe Manchin III (D-W.Va.) recently appeared, he received a congratulatory call from Trump just moments later.

Scarborough's monologue encapsulated many of the hallmarks of the new White House: It was direct, passionate and provocative, and it played out on live television.

Scarborough's analysis aligned with a faction of the West Wing that has grown concerned about the ascent of Miller and Bannon, close partners in driving Trump to make good on his most populist and nationalistic campaign promises, however incendiary.

One area of heated debate is the Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals program, which grants legal protection to undocumented immigrants who are brought to the United States as children — commonly known as "dreamers." Hardline conservatives have been urging Trump to rescind DACA, while other advisers, including Gingrich, are counseling him to keep it in place and avoid a politically treacherous confrontation, according to people involved in the deliberations.

"Why pick a fight over this group of people who have a lot of emotional stories to tell? It's not realistic. It's not practical," Gingrich said. "I strongly agree with the general direction we're going, but I think this particular fight doesn't emotionally make any sense."

In many ways, Trump's leading advisers are simply operating within the power parameters the president established. Some officials — Bannon and Miller chief among them — are actively shaping policy and guiding the president's decisions. Others — such as Priebus, the deputy chiefs of staff and White House press secretary Sean Spicer — function in a more reactive capacity, left trying to find order in chaos and explain away slapdash actions.

The Priebus-Bannon relationship has had its warm

moments. When Priebus's wife was recently baptized into the Greek Orthodox Church, Bannon attended the reception.

The competing power dynamic appears to have made Priebus, in particular, suspicious of his colleagues' motives, especially as Bannon asserts his influence, according to several people with knowledge of the situation.

"A little bit of under-competence and a slight amount of insecurity can breed some paranoia and backstabbing," one White House official, who was granted anonymity to speak candidly, said of Priebus. "We have to get Reince to relax into the job and become more competent, because he's seeing shadows where there are no shadows."

During the transition phase, for instance, Priebus maneuvered to sideline perceived threats. He suggested that Anthony Scaramucci, a prominent New York financier who is close to Trump and Bannon, serve outside the administration, as finance chairman of the Republican National Committee, according to two people aware of the discussions.

But Scaramucci demurred, opting for a senior White House job directing the Office of Public Liaison and Intergovernmental Affairs, a similar role to the one played by Valerie Jarrett in the Obama White House.

White House officials reject the notion that chaos has overshadowed the early days of Trump's presidency. They say the media refuse to acknowledge his achievements and intentionally tried to stoke public dissent, even hysteria, with reports about the immigration order.

"While false narratives circulate, the White House staff is busy working, together, to implement President Trump's agenda for the betterment of our country," said a White House spokesman who was not authorized to speak on the record.

Trump fired off angry tweets attacking the media and lawmakers who criticized his ban, from mocking Senate Minority Leader Charles E. Schumer (D-N.Y.) for his "tears" to labeling Sens. John McCain (R-Ariz.) and Lindsey O. Graham (R-S.C.) "sadly weak."

Late Monday evening, Trump fired acting attorney general Sally Yates,

who had instructed Justice Department lawyers not to defend Trump's immigration order. The White House said in a statement that Yates had "betrayed" the Justice Department and called her "very weak on illegal immigration."

Privately, the president seethed, venting about what he saw as unfair news coverage on a second straight weekend of mass protests, and quizzing confidants about their impressions of how his senior staffers were performing.

*[Donald Trump waits in his tower — accessible, yet isolated]*

As the controversy swirled, Trump, who has taken to giving visitors mini-tours of his new residence, found comfort in a trio of loyalists who share a room just steps from the Oval Office — Hope Hicks, the spokeswoman who has been at Trump's side since before his campaign launch; Johnny McEntee, a former college football quarterback who is now the president's personal aide; and Keith Schiller, a retired New York police officer and head of Trump's personal security detail who now directs Oval Office operations.

Nonetheless, some of Trump's friends as well as his critics fear that his agenda may be compromised by mismanagement.

"Frankly, when I look at this, I think he was ill-served by his staff," said Ohio Gov. John Kasich, one of Trump's primary rivals. "If I were the president, I'd be very upset with the staff — that they didn't say, 'Hey, wait, hold on a second.' Because that's what executives do. They have people around them that help them to understand, 'Hey, your message is fine but here is what's going to come from it.'"

On Capitol Hill, many Republicans close to leadership were frustrated that they received little to no guidance, or advance notice, about Trump's immigration and refugee directive. One top House office said it was able to glean the president's plan only through unofficial back channels to the Department of Homeland Security.

Asked if he was consulted in drafting the order, Senate Majority Whip John Cornyn (R-Tex.) replied simply, "I wasn't" — an echo of Senate Foreign Relations Committee Chairman Bob Corker (R-Tenn.), who told reporters Monday that the White House had

not briefed him before signing the order.

The first substantive guidance to congressional Republicans came late Saturday — well after protesters had descended on the nation's airports — in a two-page memo that offered some details on the policy but, to the chagrin of several Capitol Hill aides, very little political guidance. At the end was a pledge for the secretary of state to report regularly on "victims of female genital mutilation or honor killing by foreign-born nationals."

Politics newsletter

The big stories and commentary shaping the day.

Please provide a valid email address.

It was not only Trump's immigration order that rankled official Washington. His presidential memorandum that restructured the National Security Council to elevate Bannon to a seat on the Principals Committee, alongside the secretaries of state and defense, worried many in the national security community. Also concerning was language suggesting that the director of national intelligence and the chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff could only attend certain Principals Committee meetings.

But Spicer told reporters Monday that Trump was revising the directive to also include the director of the Central Intelligence Agency. And he insisted that the DNI and Joint Chiefs chairman would be included in any Principals Committee meeting they wish to attend.

The confusion out of the White House about the president's intentions left some of the government's most decorated officials scrambling to assert their relevance. Gen. Joseph F. Dunford Jr., chairman of the Joint Chiefs, took the unusual step of issuing a statement to emphasize that he will "fully participate" in giving the president military advice.

"I remain honored and humbled to represent the extraordinary men and women of the Joint Force in serving the president and our nation," Dunford wrote.

Karen DeYoung, Kelsey Snell and Sean Sullivan contributed to this report.

THE WALL  
STREET  
JOURNAL  
Viswanatha

## Homeland Security Chief and White House Clash

Damian Paletta  
and Aruna

Updated Jan. 30, 2017 11:46 p.m.  
ET

WASHINGTON—Homeland Security Secretary John Kelly has clashed with the White House over

staffing and other decisions in recent days, people familiar with the matter said, leaving the agency

without a second-in-command as it tried to institute a new travel ban during a chaotic weekend at the nation's airports.

When President Donald Trump selected Mr. Kelly, the pick won broad support from Republicans and Democrats in part because they believed the retired Marine general would be willing to speak up and challenge Mr. Trump.

That tension didn't take long to materialize. Mr. Kelly hasn't been able to name the deputy he wants at the agency, people familiar with the matter said, and he fought off attempts by the White House to put Kris Kobach, the Kansas secretary of state known as a hard-liner on immigration, into the position.

Mr. Kelly was also frustrated at not knowing the details of the travel ban earlier, so he could prepare his agency to respond, according to people familiar with the matter. Mr. Trump signed the executive order that created the ban late Friday afternoon. Mr. Kelly was only informed of the details that day as he was traveling to Washington, even though he had pressed the White House for days to share with him the final language, the people said.

Late Monday, the White House announced Mr. Trump intended to nominate a former agency official from the George W. Bush administration, Elaine Duke, to the deputy post. Earlier, it declined to comment on when Mr. Kelly was briefed on the executive order. White House Press Secretary Sean Spicer said, "The people that

needed to be kept in the loop were kept in the loop."

A DHS spokesman declined to comment.

On Monday night, the Trump administration removed Daniel Ragsdale as acting head of Immigration and Customs Enforcement, an agency within DHS. Mr. Ragsdale had come to be viewed in the building as a supporter of the Obama administration's immigration policies, and the move had been expected well before the furor over Friday's executive order on immigration.

Mr. Trump named Thomas Homan, a senior ICE official, as the acting director of the agency.

The tensions between DHS and the White House have led to uncertainty at the top of an agency charged with keeping Americans safe within U.S. borders. Over the weekend, the agency struggled to respond to demonstrations and scenes of confusion at various airports.

Even though he wasn't involved in the order's preparation, Mr. Kelly was peppered with questions about it over the weekend. Senate Minority Leader Charles Schumer (D., N.Y.) spoke with Mr. Kelly twice at the time to press for details.

The problems at DHS reflect a growing unease among government workers with a series of abrupt policy changes dictated by a close-knit group inside the West Wing of the White House.

## The New York Times

# State Dept. Officials Should Quit if They Disagree With Trump, White House Warns (UNE)

Mark Landler

WASHINGTON — The White House on Monday warned State Department officials that they should leave their jobs if they did not agree with President Trump's agenda, an extraordinary effort to stamp out a wave of internal dissent against Mr. Trump's temporary ban on entry visas for people from seven predominantly Muslim countries.

Career officials at the State Department are circulating a so-called dissent cable, which says that Mr. Trump's executive order closing the nation's doors to more than 200 million people with the intention of weeding out a handful of would-be terrorists will not make the nation safer, and might instead deepen the threat.

"These career bureaucrats have a problem with it?" Sean Spicer, the White House press secretary, told reporters. "They should either get with the program or they can go."

It was yet another stark confrontation between the new president, who is moving swiftly to upend years of policies, and a federal bureaucracy still struggling with the jolting change of power in Washington. There is open hostility to Mr. Trump's ideas in some pockets of the government, and deep frustration among those enforcing the visa ban that the White House announced the order without warning or consulting them.

On Monday night, Mr. Trump fired acting Attorney General Sally Q. Yates for refusing to enforce the visa ban. In her place, Mr. Trump named Dana J. Boente, United States attorney for the Eastern

On Monday, more than 100 State Department officials signed a draft protest of the executive order that created the travel ban and suspension of the refugee program for Syrian nationals.

The White House brushed off their concerns, saying Mr. Trump has been very transparent with his agenda.

Many administrations experience tension between the White House staff, who are close to the president and loyal to his agenda, and people at the agencies, who must implement policy and deal with the results. But Mr. Trump's orders have come so quickly, and have upended previous policies in so many ways, that those tensions appear sharper than usual.

Mr. Kelly had hoped to staff DHS in a quasi-military fashion, with a chain of command that included people who have experience in their subject areas and can take responsibility for their portfolios, said people familiar with the process.

The White House tried to persuade Mr. Kelly to accept Mr. Kobach as his deputy secretary, but Mr. Kelly wanted to go a different route, picking someone with a background in homeland security, these people said.

Mr. Kobach is a favorite of some in the White House and is well-regarded by groups favoring a crackdown on immigration. In November, he presented Mr. Trump with a plan to institute "extreme vetting" of people entering the U.S.

That plan included posing "extreme vetting questions" to people considered "high risk" who were entering the country. The proposed questions included queries about their support for "Sharia law, jihad, equality of men and women, [and] the United States Constitution," according to a copy of paperwork Mr. Kobach was photographed holding as he exited from a meeting with Mr. Trump.

Mr. Kobach didn't respond to a request for comment on Monday.

Rather than Mr. Kobach, Mr. Kelly instead suggested that Christian Marrone be named to the deputy secretary job, according to the people familiar with the matter. Mr. Marrone is former chief of staff to Jeh Johnson, the DHS secretary under President Barack Obama, and also worked for years in the Bush administration, including with Mr. Kelly at the Defense Department.

Mr. Marrone declined to comment.

DHS is the agency that oversees the U.S. Customs and Border Protection (CBP), Immigration and Customs Enforcement (ICE), and the Transportation Security Administration (TSA), all of which have been affected by the new travel rules.

The head of CBP, Mark Morgan, announced last week he was stepping down after just a few months in the top post.

Write to Damian Paletta at [damian.paletta@wsj.com](mailto:damian.paletta@wsj.com) and Aruna Viswanatha at [Aruna.Viswanatha@wsj.com](mailto:Aruna.Viswanatha@wsj.com)

District of Virginia, to serve as acting attorney general until Senator Jeff Sessions of Alabama is confirmed. A spokesman said Mr. Boente had told the White House that he was willing to sign off on the executive order.

The reverberations extended beyond Washington. Corporate chieftains from Detroit to Silicon Valley sharply criticized the ban, saying it was inconsistent with their values. Mr. Trump also faced mounting legal challenges, as two Democratic-leaning states, Massachusetts and Washington, signaled they would attack the policy in court and a Muslim advocacy group filed a lawsuit calling it an unconstitutional religious test.

At the White House, where questions about the ban overshadowed all other issues on

Monday, Mr. Spicer acknowledged the State Department's dissent channel has long been a way for its staff to register objections over administration policies. But he displayed little patience for it.

"The president has a very clear vision," Mr. Spicer said. "He's been clear on it since the campaign, he's been clear on it since taking office — that he's going to put the country first."

"If somebody has a problem with that agenda," he added, "that does call into question whether or not they should continue in that post."

The visa ban has rattled other agencies, as well: the Defense Department, which says it hurts the military's local partners in conflict zones like Iraq; the Department of Homeland Security, whose customs officers are struggling to enforce the

directive; and the Justice Department, whose lawyers are charged with defending its legality.

But Mr. Spicer's blunt warning posed an especially difficult choice for the more than 100 State Department officials who indicated they would sign the memo. They can sign a final version, which would be put on the desk of Rex W. Tillerson, Mr. Trump's designated secretary of state, on his first day in office. Or, they can choose not to identify themselves, and rely on the leak of the letter to make their point without identifying themselves.

Under State Department rules and whistle-blower laws, it is forbidden to retaliate against any employee who follows the procedures and submits a dissent memorandum. One of the signatories, in a text message, said State Department signatories were trying to figure out what to do.

#### Affected by Trump's order?

Are you affected by President Trump's executive order on immigration, or do you know someone who is? If you have information, please contact us at [immigration@nytimes.com](mailto:immigration@nytimes.com).

The memorandum began to take shape late last week, as word of Mr. Trump's executive order leaked out. The sponsors quickly gathered more than 100 signatures, an unusually large number, but a draft of the memo was

still being refined over the weekend.

Last summer, 51 State Department officials signed one protesting President Barack Obama's policy in Syria, which they asserted had been "overwhelmed" by the violence there. They handed the cable to Secretary of State John Kerry.

The State Department confirmed the existence of the memo on Monday, and it affirmed the right of its staff to dissent.

"This is an important process that the acting secretary, and the department as a whole, respect and value," said a spokesman, Mark Toner.

The speed with which the memo was assembled and the number of signers underscore the degree to which the State Department has become a center of the resistance to Mr. Trump's order. More broadly, it represents objections to his efforts to cut back on American participation in international organizations and to issue ultimatums to allies.

Not surprisingly, the diplomats and Civil Service officers of the State Department are among the most internationally minded in the government; they have lived around the world and devoted their careers to building alliances and promoting American values abroad.

That was reflected in parts of the draft of the dissent memo circulating in the State Department. It warned

that the executive order "will increase anti-American sentiment," and that "instead of building bridges to these societies," it would "send the message that we consider all nationals of these countries to be an unacceptable security risk."

Among those whose views will be changed are "current and future leaders in these societies — including those for whom this may be a tipping point toward radicalization." It also warned of an immediate humanitarian effect on those who come "to seek medical treatment for a child with a rare heart condition, to attend a parent's funeral."

"We do not need to alienate entire societies to stay safe," the memo concludes.

Overseas, Iraqi officials said they were surprised by the directive, which they learned about through the American news media; they had not been consulted first. Objections from Baghdad are notable since Iraq is a front-line partner in the campaign against the Islamic State.

At the Pentagon, senior officials plan to send the White House a list of Iraqi citizens who have served with American forces with the recommendation that they be exempt from the visa ban. Officials said the Iraqis who would be put on the Defense Department list already had undergone a stringent form of vetting because they had served

with the United States military in combat.

"There are a number of people in Iraq who have worked for us in a partnership role, whether fighting alongside us or working as translators, often doing so at great peril to themselves," Capt. Jeff Davis, a Pentagon spokesman, said. "Those who support us there and do so at risk to themselves, we will make sure those contributions of support, those personal risks they've taken, are recognized in this process."

Captain Davis said department officials were compiling names of Iraqis who had served as drivers, interpreters, linguists and in other jobs with American military personnel in Iraq over the years. He declined to say how many Iraqi citizens might be included in the list or what Defense Secretary Jim Mattis's personal recommendations to Mr. Trump were on the matter.

The Pentagon list is intended to address a major criticism of Mr. Trump's executive order: that it will stop the flow of former Iraqi interpreters and cultural advisers who have sought special visas to move to the United States for their own protection.

**The  
New York  
Times**

Board

Outside the State Department's headquarters last week. Win McNamee/Getty Images

More than 100 State Department employees have indicated they will sign a memorandum in coming days registering their opposition to President Trump's travel ban through the department's "dissent cable" system, an official mechanism created to voice dissent to policies.

A draft of the memo, written by a midlevel officer in the State Department's consular bureau, predicted that the ban on citizens of seven nations, and the indefinite suspension of the resettlement of Syrian refugees, would be

**The  
Washington  
Post**

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

## Editorial : Diplomats Decry Muslim Ban

The Editorial

"counterproductive" to its stated goal of enhancing national security.

"This ban stands in opposition to the core American and constitutional values that we, as federal employees, took an oath to uphold," the memo said, warning that the ban has the potential to increase anti-American sentiment among Muslims worldwide. The acting attorney general, Sally Yates, an Obama administration holdover, backed that view in a letter Monday to Justice Department lawyers, instructing them not to defend the order in court. Hours later, Mr. Trump fired Ms. Yates.

Outside the State Department's headquarters last week. Win McNamee/Getty Images

"We have a special obligation," the draft memo said, "to maintain an

immigration system that is as free as possible from discrimination, that does not have an implied or actual religious tests, and that views individuals as individuals, not as part of stereotyped groups."

The memo warned that the ban would also alienate key allies in the Middle East, which could result in the United States losing access to "the intelligence and resources need[ed] to fight the root causes of terror abroad, before an attack occurs within our borders." The writer noted that there were alternative ways to make traveler screening more comprehensive by strengthening existing protocols and information-sharing systems.

The administration would be reckless to dismiss this warning from public servants who have

spent their careers safeguarding American interests abroad. Their concerns are shared by lawmakers from both parties, several European leaders and top United Nations officials.

In just a few days, the misguided order has disrupted the lives of hundreds of refugees, scholars and professionals, while providing jihadist groups with a propaganda bonanza. The members of the administration who set this initiative in motion may have thought it would make the country safer. By now, it has to have become apparent even to them that it is having the opposite effect.

## Dana Milbank : Republicans are alarmed to discover Trump is doing exactly what he said he would

Hey, Republicans: Ready to take him literally yet?

Two days after the election, I spoke with Grover Norquist, a conservative tax activist who had

made peace with the prospect of a Trump presidency. Expressing confidence that Donald Trump

wouldn't attempt the crazier promises made during the campaign, Norquist said Trump's supporters knew to take him "seriously, but not literally."

Wrong! That hope comforted Republican officeholders and members of the establishment when they reluctantly embraced Trump during the general election. They averted their collective gaze when Trump made scapegoats of minorities, yielded to reckless impulses and exhibited authoritarian tendencies. Now Trump is president and — who knew? — he is making scapegoats of minorities, giving in to reckless impulses and governing with an authoritarian style.

Read These Comments

The best conversations on The Washington Post

Please provide a valid email address.

Trump said as a candidate that he would ban Muslims from traveling to the United States. Now he has done it, even if he doesn't use the term. Rudy Giuliani, explaining the new executive order, told Fox News that Trump assigned him the task of finding a "legal" way to have a "Muslim ban." And the son of national security adviser Mike Flynn praised the "Muslim ban" on Twitter this weekend before deleting his account.

*[Trump defiantly says 'all is going well' on immigration order]*

President Trump signed an executive order to halt U.S. entry for refugees, migrants and foreign nationals for 120 days starting Jan. 27. Fiery protests and lawsuits made for a tumultuous weekend. Here's what you need to know. President Trump signed an executive order to halt U.S. entry for

refugees, migrants and foreign nationals for 120 days starting Jan. 27. Fiery protests and lawsuits made for a tumultuous weekend. Here's what you need to know. (Video: Dalton Bennett, Erin Patrick O'Connor, Katherine Shaver, Monica Akhtar, McKenna Ewen/Photo: Jewel Samad, Agence France-Presse via Getty Images/The Washington Post)

(Dalton Bennett, Erin Patrick O'Connor, Katherine Shaver, Monica Akhtar, McKenna Ewen/The Washington Post)

Likewise, Trump displayed a disregard for the courts during the campaign, threatening to take revenge on a judge, to sic the Justice Department on his opponents. Meeting with senators, he didn't know how many articles the Constitution contained. And now? The Trump White House is raising doubts about whether it needs to obey court orders. After parts of the travel-ban order were blocked by federal judges, Trump policy adviser Stephen Miller declared that the order "remains in full, complete and total effect."

During the campaign, Trump often disparaged intelligence agencies for their "bad decisions." He said "I know more about ISIS than the generals do" and claimed generals had been "reduced to rubble." Now he has orchestrated what amounts to a coup at the National Security Council. Out: the director of national intelligence and the chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, who no longer will attend all meetings of the committee that handles top-level decisions. Instead, political adviser Steve Bannon will serve on the committee.

Trump at every opportunity said he would build a border wall and force

Mexico to pay for it. He spoke often of tariffs on Mexico and specifically suggested a 35 percent tariff on certain imports. Last week — surprise! — the White House floated a 20 percent tariff on goods from Mexico to pay for a border wall.

The Trump campaign frequently sounded anti-Semitic dog whistles. Now? The Trump White House just issued a Holocaust Remembrance Day statement that made no mention of Jews. A spokeswoman said the omission was deliberate, noting non-Jewish victims.

Trump during the election dismissed concerns about Russia's meddling in the campaign, even urging Russia to hack Hillary Clinton's email. Now we have Sputnik news, controlled by the Russian government, comparing Trump to puppets of the Soviet Union and proposing Moscow help Trump respond to protests by "deploying professional Russian journalists as temporary replacement for the Western employees."

Trump is also proving himself to be the same temperamentally unsound figure who appeared on the campaign trail.

He makes up extravagant falsehoods about voter fraud and crowd size and offers the absurd claim that his travel ban is "similar to what President Obama did." He has shown contempt for safeguards in the government, purging the State Department of top nonpartisan leadership. His White House kept Department of Homeland Security lawyers in the dark on the travel ban and then overrode their objections. He has continued to raise suspicion that he's driven by his financial interests, omitting from his travel ban several

Muslim-majority countries where he does business.

And he still shows disregard for detail, as seen in the administration's confusion about whether the travel ban covers those with green cards, and in an executive order on Obamacare that even opponents of the law warn could cause health-insurance markets to collapse before a replacement is available.

Business leaders, including some previously friendly to Trump, have protested the travel ban, and some Republicans in Congress are opposing Trump on it, at least rhetorically. The Washington Post had counted 24 as of Monday who have opposed the order and 36 more with concerns. But when Senate Democrats attempted Monday to overturn the ban, Sen. Tom Cotton (R-Ark.), a supporter of it, blocked the effort.

Meanwhile, as The Post's Matea Gold and James Hohmann reported, conservative donors at the Koch network gathering over the weekend condemned Trump's travel ban, and Charles Koch, who didn't get involved in the presidential campaign, warned of a "tremendous danger" of authoritarianism.

Oh, so now they're worried? Many of these donors, like Republicans in Congress, chose not to take Trump literally during the campaign, looking away when presented with repeated warning signs. Now they have a serious problem — as do we all.

**Twitter: @Milbank**

Read more from Dana Milbank's archive, follow him on Twitter or subscribe to his updates on Facebook.

**THE WALL  
STREET  
JOURNAL**

## Bret Stephens :The Wrong Kind of Crazy

Bret Stephens

Jan. 30, 2017

7:10 p.m. ET

Leonard Garment, White House counsel in the Nixon administration, once got some useful advice from then-National Security Adviser Henry Kissinger about how best to deal with nosy Soviet diplomats trying to divine the inner workings of the 37th president's mind.

"If the chance comes your way," Mr. Kissinger advised Garment in 1969, "convey the impression that Nixon is somewhat 'crazy'—immensely intelligent, well-organized and experienced, to be sure, but at

moments of stress or personal challenge unpredictable and capable of the bloodiest brutality."

What would later come to be known as Nixon's "madman theory" of international relations is not mad. An easy-to-predict president will also be easy to outmaneuver. An adversary who knows the limits of an administration's policy, or of its appetite for risk, will quickly establish his own zone of impunity. Just think of Ho Chi Minh and LBJ, Khomeini and Carter, Putin and Obama.

One of the promises of Donald Trump's presidency is that it might restore some of the right kind of

crazy to U.S. foreign policy, just as the Nixon administration did with the 1973 nuclear alert, which stopped the Soviets from intervening in the Yom Kippur War. A good early sign was Mr. Trump's phone call with Taiwan's president in December, followed by his public musings about the negotiability of the one-China policy. If Beijing wants to use ambiguous means to dominate the South China Sea, why shouldn't Washington hit back with ambiguous devices of its own?

Perhaps the new administration will find its way back to this type of apparent guilefulness. Because so far all we've seen from President

Trump is the wrong kind of crazy: capricious, counterproductive, cruel and dumb.

So much was evident with the president's refugee ban on Saturday. And with Steve Bannon's elevation to the National Security Council, and the chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff's demotion from it. And with the announcement Wednesday that Mexico would pay for the wall. And with the withdrawal from the Trans-Pacific Partnership trade deal on Monday and the aggressively protectionist themes of his inaugural. And with his performance at CIA headquarters.



And with his incontinent fixations on crowd size and alleged voter fraud.

Come to think of it, nearly the only thing the president did in the past week that conveyed any appearance of measure and moderation was his phone call Saturday with Vladimir Putin—itself another instance of the wrong kind of crazy.

The problem here starts with the failure to appreciate Mr. Kissinger's point that the madman theory must be predicated on an assumption that one is sane. It's supposed to be about moments of crisis, not everyday governance. And its intended targets are supposed to be America's enemies—the Soviets, in Garment's case—not friends like Mexican President Enrique Peña Nieto.

The theory of crazy is also a theory of cunning, of throwing your domestic and foreign opponents off balance. Imagine if, instead of the refugee ban, the administration had announced the intention to fast-track the immigration applications of the thousands of interpreters who helped U.S. forces in Afghanistan and Iraq, even as it subjected *all* other applications to greater scrutiny. That would have been good crazy, a reminder that Mr. Trump could honor his political promises even as he honored America's Muslim friends.

Above all, the right kind of crazy requires sufficient ambiguity to provide room for political and diplomatic maneuver. With Mr. Trump, it can sometimes be hard to tell whether his utterances are serious or in jest—a semi-ironic

pose that served him well in the campaign. But so far, what this administration has mainly managed to do is paint itself into corners, where it either has to back down or double down. That's crazy of a particularly dangerous sort.

Maybe I'm misreading the administration's intentions. It may be that its idea of crazy is to throw half the country into a state of semi-constant apoplexy, to the point of national exhaustion with its own outrage. But I doubt it. A proper theory of crazy requires a presumption of smarts that nobody in this administration has yet to earn. Like Sigmund Freud's cigar, sometimes crazy is just crazy.

So what is the Trump administration to do? A few suggestions: Invite the ambassadors of Poland, Ukraine

and the Baltic states to the White House this spring, to solemnly commemorate the 77th anniversary of the Katyn Forest massacre. Issue a statement welcoming the Chinese New Year by quoting the poetry of imprisoned Nobel Peace Laureate Liu Xiaobo. Quietly move the U.S. Embassy in Israel, merely by changing the shingle of the U.S. Consulate in Jerusalem.

If the president wants to stun his critics into amazed silence, this would be the good kind of crazy. It isn't yet too late.

Write [bstephens@wsj.com](mailto:bstephens@wsj.com).



## Ed Rogers : Running the government is like conducting an orchestra, not having a sword fight

By Ed Rogers

President Trump signing an executive order temporarily or indefinitely freezing immigration from seven broken countries should be no more than a 4 on the "gasp/wow" scale of 1 to 10. To remind, the executive order suspends entry into the United States for refugees from any country for 120 days; suspends refugees from Syria indefinitely; and bars visitors from the seven countries President Obama restricted from participating in the Visa Waiver Program for 90 days. So why has the reaction to this order become an 8? Restricting immigration from select countries on sudden notice is fair game for criticism. But it should not have been hard to anticipate the criticism and get in front of most of it. It is usually standard operating procedure at the White House to be prepared with a rollout plan for any significant presidential announcements, including fact sheets, prepared surrogates and allies, a rapid response plan, etc. Most people working at the White

House already know all this and more. So why weren't they ready?

Similarly, Trump wanting to include his senior strategist in National Security Council meetings should be a 1 on the 1-to-10 scale. In this news cycle, it has risen to about a 5. Why? Well, two reasons. First, this order slightly changed the wording of some previous orders, suggesting there was something different about the chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff and director of national intelligence's participation in NSC meetings. Second, some want to argue that political types should be excluded from NSC meetings, in an effort to head off potential criticism that national security decisions are made with politics in mind.

As if to reinforce the idea that politics should be banned from the situation room, it has even been reported that Karl Rove was specifically excluded from President George W. Bush's NSC meetings. Well, how did that work out? Arguably some of the worst decisions of the Bush era were made in NSC meetings. Right?

Maybe Rove can't say so, but maybe if he had been in the room, things would be different today. Anyway, I am told by a senior NSC official that a lot of NSC meetings are tedious, laborious affairs that are not always worth the chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff and the director of national intelligence's time. Why didn't the White House just say that?

Read These Comments

The best conversations on The Washington Post

Please provide a valid email address.

I'm always second-guessing myself when it comes to analyzing Trump: Does the White House see some value in the stark, unchoreographed nature of these announcements?

The Trump team must recognize the headwinds they are facing. There is a bias to find fault and there always will be. It's natural. Rather than just complain about it, they should anticipate what will be said against this, that or the other action and think three or four moves

down the board. This may take a little more time and it may include more people, but they would avoid ultimately having to waste time on the defensive, doing damage control, when they could be doing something else.

So what are the lessons learned from all the unintended and unanticipated consequences of Trump's executive orders so far? A presidential election campaign is kind of like a sword fight. You dual with one opponent while foreign objects are thrown at the combatants and the media howls around you. Running an administration is like conducting a symphony. If the conductor shows up to the rostrum with only his or her sword-fighting skills, armed with a weapon instead of a baton, and starts swinging the sword and shouting, the music isn't going to be very pretty. That's even more true if all the seats in the orchestra are not yet filled.

As president, you always have the option to be patient. Team Trump should keep this in mind as they plot their next moves.



## Obama, in a rare move for an ex-president, breaks silence to criticize Trump on immigration

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

Criticism of President Trump's immigration orders continued on Jan. 30, as former president Barack

Obama issued a statement urging demonstrations to continue and Democrats rallied in protest. Trump hit back by firing the acting attorney general Sally Yates, who instructed

Justice Department lawyers not to defend the order. Criticism of Trump's immigration orders continued, as Obama issued a statement urging public protests to

continue and Democrats rallied in opposition. (Video: Reuters / Photo: Michael Robinson Chavez/The Washington Post)

(Video: Reuters / Photo: Michael Robinson Chavez/The Washington Post)

On Jan. 18, President Barack Obama told reporters in his final news conference that he would comment on his successor's actions only at "certain moments where I think our core values may be at stake."

He managed to stay quiet for less than two weeks.

Obama, who is still on vacation with his family after leaving office this month, issued a statement through his spokesman Monday encouraging Americans to publicly protest President Trump's move to ban citizens from seven majority-Muslim countries — as well as refugees from across the globe — from entering the United States.

He also contested Trump's claim that Friday's executive order was based in part on decisions made during his administration, including identifying the same seven countries as harboring terrorism threats and slowing the processing of visas for Iraqis after evidence surfaced that two Iraqis seeking resettlement had been linked to terrorist activity in their homeland.

"With regard to comparisons to President Obama's foreign policy decisions, as we've heard before, the President fundamentally disagrees with the notion of discriminating against individuals because of their faith or religion," Obama spokesman Kevin Lewis said in a statement.

Obama's decision to speak out — after pledging to do so in rare instances — underscores the predicament he and many of his top advisers find themselves in just days after leaving the White House. While the president repeatedly emphasized the need to ensure a smooth transition and not interfere with the workings of the new

administration, the adoption of a policy antithetical to the values he espoused while in office caused him to break his silence.

While some former presidents eventually came to criticize their successors — Theodore Roosevelt broke with William Howard Taft, whom he worked to get elected in 1908 and then ran against four years later — they have generally sought to stay quiet.

Even Roosevelt told Taft after returning from a vacation overseas that while some progressives were disappointed with the new administration's direction, "I will make no speeches or say anything for two months. But I will keep my mind open ... as I keep my mouth shut."

"I don't think it's very common at all for an ex-president to be commenting on the performance of his successor," presidential historian Robert Dallek said. "This current incumbent is so out of sync with what the normal behavior of a president is that it calls for ex-presidents to respond."

During his last news conference, Obama sketched out the criteria for what would prompt him to speak out as a private citizen. He said threats to some of the key ideas he championed — including tolerance for minorities, immigrants and political dissent, as well as the need for broad voter participation among Americans — could prompt him to weigh into the public discourse.

"I put in that category if I saw systematic discrimination being ratified in some fashion. I put in that category explicit or functional obstacles to people being able to vote, to exercise their franchise," he said. "I'd put in that category institutional efforts to silence dissent or the press. And for me, at least, I would put in that category efforts to round up kids who have grown up here, and for all practical purposes

are American kids, and send them someplace else, when they love this country."

Several journalists put in requests for comment to Obama's office in the wake of the executive order, Lewis said, and while the former president is trying to take time off with his family, "he's reading the news like everyone else."

Presidential historian Douglas Brinkley — who discussed Obama's post-presidential role with him — said the former president had initially hoped to avoid commenting on the political issues of the day.

"Donald Trump's thrown a monkey wrench into those plans," Brinkley said, adding that while "he's not going to be getting into the nitty-gritty of the policy fights" or serving as "a Democratic Party operative," he's "going to have to stay very engaged" on a few key issues.

"He'll be a voice of dissent, but done in a calm and reassuring way," said Brinkley, a Rice University history professor. "There was no way Barack Obama could have stayed silent on this immigration ban."

The very structure of Obama's post-presidential office — which includes a few of his top White House communications aides — highlights the extent to which he is already positioning himself to engage in political advocacy.

Obama — who in his farewell address called on supporters to engage in political organizing to advance progressive goals — praised the idea Monday of Americans taking part in peaceful protests in the wake of the executive order.

"President Obama is heartened by the level of engagement taking place in communities around the country," Lewis said. "Citizens exercising their Constitutional right

to assemble, organize and have their voices heard by their elected officials is exactly what we expect to see when American values are at stake."

#### Local Politics Alerts

Breaking news about local government in D.C., Md., Va.

Please provide a valid email address.

Over the past year, Obama and several of his closest allies expressed concern that he had been unable to transfer the enthusiasm he generated onto either another political candidate or the Democratic Party more broadly. In recent weeks, however, liberals have managed to organize major protests on issues including women's rights and support for immigrants and those seeking asylum.

"What is notable about the grassroots response to Trump ... is that it is exactly the response that President Obama called for in his farewell address," former White House senior adviser Dan Pfeiffer wrote in an email.

While Obama expressed his opposition to Trump's latest policy announcement in fairly diplomatic terms, other members of his former White House team have been more forceful in expressing their dismay.

Susan E. Rice, who served as Obama's national security adviser during his second term, could not contain her outrage at the idea that Trump gave his chief strategist, Stephen K. Bannon, a regular seat on the National Security Council's principals committee and that the director of national intelligence and the chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff would sit in only as needed.

"This is stone cold crazy," she tweeted early Sunday morning. "After a week of crazy.

## POLITICO

Barack Obama and his aides expected to take on President Donald Trump at some point, but they didn't think it would happen this quickly.

Now they're trying to find the right balance on issues that demand a response, and how to use Obama to deliver the selective pushback. Obama and his team are monitoring what's happening at the White House, and not ruling out the possibility that Obama will challenge Trump more forcefully in the coming months, according to people who've

## Edward-Isaac Dove : How Obama will take on Trump

been in contact with the former president.

Story Continued Below

It depends on Trump. It also depends, the people close to the former president said Monday, on whether speaking out would just set him up to have no effect and be dismissed, and result in empowering Trump more, which is a very real worry for them.

From his vacation spot in the Caribbean, Obama has been keeping up with news from Washington and the protests around the country. Friends and

former aides have been emailing and talking to him. His staff at his post-presidential office, still unpacking its boxes, told him about the reporters who kept asking, even in Trump's first week as president, whether enough had happened already to meet his threshold to speak up.

He decided he finally had to say something about the immigration executive order that's sparked outrage across the country. But he decided he couldn't say it himself—not yet, at least.

The result was an extraordinary statement Monday from an Obama

spokesperson that "President Obama is heartened by the level of engagement taking place in communities around the country."

But Obama won't weigh in on Trump's firing deputy attorney general Sally Yates for refusing to enforce the executive order that sparked the statement, wary of getting drawn in to every battle.

Democrats are desperate for leadership, but some fear the battle could become all about him. There are frustrations over Obama's handling of the party, and how he insisted on a low-drama transfer of power.

Rep. Ted Lieu (D-Calif.) took a long pause when asked if he'd want to see Obama out more forcefully.

"I wouldn't be opposed if he spoke out," Lieu said. "I just don't know what effect it would be."

Rep. Ted Lieu: "In hindsight, I believe it was wrong for Barack Obama to normalize Donald Trump." | AP Photo

"In hindsight, I believe it was wrong for Barack Obama to normalize Donald Trump," Lieu added.

Lieu isn't the only one with hesitations. Several Democratic officials passed on the chance to say if Obama's decision to wade in was a positive.

By focusing in the statement Monday on the efforts of protesters, Obama tried to draw a connection to the call to action to his supporters in his farewell address three weeks ago in Chicago. By including a line that "American values are at stake," Obama issued a reminder of what would pull him in more.

What they don't want, though, is for Obama to become the face of the anti-Trump movement.

"The only way that our values get reinstated is if people take this responsibility on themselves," said Eric Schultz, a former White House aide who's serving as a senior

adviser to the former president's office.

Obama knows there are many much more drastic measures that he might want to speak out on, and he's saving more direct intervention for maximum impact, people familiar with his thinking say. He knows he only gets one chance at it being the first time that he takes on Trump himself.

"He'll know the right time," said one person involved. "He will have the best sense of when he needs to do it directly."

That means there won't be a statement from Obama on Trump's Supreme Court pick, or on other more standard issues of the political fray, with the former president continuing to be concerned both about sticking to the tradition of giving deference to successors and worried that being too active will keep a new generation of Democrats from rising up.

California Attorney General Xavier Becerra said he shared the concerns that Obama comes the face of the opposition or a purely partisan figure. The former president, he said, is the only one who's earned the right not to be directly involved.

"At the end of the day we have to have an all-hands-on-deck policy here to deal with this moving target," Lieu said, but "I would welcome and acknowledge and

accept whatever President Obama decides to do."

Obama's closest aides, though, have been speaking up with increasing force.

"Trump is succeeding in uniting the country — against him. Above all, he cares about his popularity. Will his yes men ever challenge him?" wrote Obama's friend and former Education secretary, Arne Duncan.

Using Twitter so that they can get their thoughts out in a completely controlled way, they've hit him on the immigration executive order, the White House statement for Holocaust Remembrance Day that purposefully left out mention of the six million Jews killed and the reorganization of the National Security Council to elevate Trump chief strategist Steve Bannon.

Susan Rice, Obama's former national security adviser, called the NSC move "stone cold crazy," wondered about "what sickness enables" the Holocaust statement without the reference to the Jews and called the refugee order "nuts."

Ben Rhodes, the former deputy national security adviser and now serving as a foreign policy adviser to Obama in his post presidency, slammed Trump and his White House for comparing Friday's executive order to actions Obama took in 2011 to add screening to Iraqis after learning of a direct threat.

"This is a lie," Rhodes wrote. "There was no ban on Iraqis in 2011. Anyone pushing that line is hiding behind a lie because they can't defend the EO." In another tweet, Rhodes added that Trump is doing "precisely what Obama argued against over and over and over again in 2015-2016."

"I immigrated to US as 9yo & became UN ambass; other diplomats marveled @familiar American story. Now they're horrified by unAmerican madness," wrote Samantha Power, Obama's former ambassador to the United Nations.

Another common question posed by former Obama aides: How would Republicans have reacted if Obama had done what Trump had, such as issue a Holocaust Remembrance Day statement that doesn't specifically mention Jews?

"Just imagine the response if Pres. Obama did that," Rice wrote.

"If Obama omitted the Jewish people from a statement on the Holocaust are we really supposed to believe the RNC wouldn't have been critical?" Rhodes wrote.

Monday night, former Attorney General Eric Holder, another friend of Obama's, spoke up for Yates.

"For standing up for what is right," read the text over the photo of her he tweeted, "#THANKYOUSALLY."



## Eugene Robinson : Trump's travel ban isn't about making America safe. It's about kicking Muslims around.

<https://www.facebook.com/eugenerobinson.columnist>

President Trump's refugee ban and travel restrictions are a disgraceful exercise in cruelty. They do nothing to make us safer — and may, in fact, make us less safe — but they punish Muslims, and that is his whole point.

Fear and loathing of Islam was one of Trump's campaign themes. He appealed to those who wrongly see the fight against terrorism as a clash of civilizations between Christian and Muslim worlds — and see Muslim immigrants as a kind of fifth column intent on destroying America from within.

During the campaign, Trump called for a "total and complete shutdown of Muslims entering the United States until our country's representatives can figure out what is going on." He later modified this position into a call for "extreme vetting" of Muslim immigrants,

including Syrian refugees. But he continued to cite a discredited survey, conducted by a stridently anti-Muslim group, purporting to show that many Muslims in this country support "global jihad" and the replacement of our legal system with Islamic sharia law.

Read These Comments

The best conversations on The Washington Post

Please provide a valid email address.

*[Did you attend a protest? Tell us what you plan to do next.]*

Is Trump just playing politics or is he truly an anti-Muslim bigot who believes this rubbish? At this point, it hardly matters. He has fulfilled his campaign promise by striking a gratuitous blow against would-be immigrants and visitors from seven predominantly Muslim countries — Iraq, Iran, Sudan, Somalia, Syria, Libya and Yemen.

Even more shamefully, Trump has barred entry by refugees from all nations worldwide. Perhaps he will have the Statue of Liberty toppled and sold for scrap.

"This is not a Muslim ban," the president claimed in a statement. But unquestionably it is.

Former New York mayor Rudy Giuliani, an early Trump supporter, said Saturday on Fox News that "when [Trump] first announced it, he said, 'Muslim ban.' He called me up. He said, 'Put a commission together. Show me the right way to do it legally.'" Giuliani said the ban is based not on religion, but rather "on places where there [is] substantial evidence that people are sending terrorists into our country."

The countries covered by Trump's executive order were indeed singled out by the Obama administration for extra scrutiny. But if "sending terrorists" were the major criterion, surely Trump would have included Saudi Arabia, where 15 of the 19

hijackers in the 9/11 attacks came from.

And as for the supposed goal of "extreme vetting" for refugees, President Barack Obama already put such a system in place. In 2011, Obama paused the refugee flow so that authorities could reinvestigate tens of thousands of refugees who had already come to the United States. Homeland Security officials instituted rigorous vetting procedures for new refugees that require multiple interviews, and many months of waiting, before an applicant is cleared for entry.

What, then, is the point of Trump's executive orders? To kick around some Muslims who are too weak to kick back — and to further the pernicious narrative of global conflict between Muslim and Christian worlds.

Trump's orders carve out an exemption for religious minorities, which in this context clearly means Christians in majority-Muslim

countries. By all means, I believe, the United States should be a haven for Christians or any other religious group that is persecuted. But the vast majority of those who have suffered at the hands of the Islamic State, the Syrian regime, al-Shabab and other evil forces in the affected countries are Muslims. If you prick them, do they not bleed?

Trump's action was abominable; the reaction, however, has been heartening. Thousands of people spontaneously

gathered at airports around the country in protest. Immigration lawyers set up shop in busy terminals and worked to gain entry for passengers who were detained. Federal judges intervened to keep travelers from being sent home. Canadian Prime Minister Justin Trudeau announced that his nation would welcome any refugees the United States turned away. Other world leaders criticized the move, as did — cautiously — a few Republican senators. Iran and Iraq

warned they would reciprocate and close their borders to Americans.

Trump's orders were not circulated through the normal interagency process before being issued, and it showed; key questions were left open, such as the status of green-card holders from the affected countries. But while the administration's incompetence might have blurred the orders' impact, it did not soften their intent.

This wasn't about making America safe. It was about nationalism, xenophobia and punishing innocent Muslims for the vile acts committed by terrorists. It was a betrayal of our most fundamental American values. And he's been president for barely a week.

*Read more from Eugene Robinson's archive, follow him on Twitter or subscribe to his updates on Facebook. You can also join him Tuesdays at 1 p.m. for a live Q&A*

## THE WALL STREET JOURNAL

### Seth Lipsky : Even Jimmy Carter Was Cautious About Admitting Refugees

Seth Lipsky

Updated Jan. 30, 2017 7:41 p.m. ET

One day in Bangkok in 1979, the prime minister of Thailand, Kriangsak Chamanan, was cooking dinner in his kitchen with a longtime friend. An aide came in with a phone on a long cord and proffered the handset to the premier.

Kriangsak put the phone to his ear. His friend could hear only one end of the conversation: "Yes, Mr. President, they're going back." Then a pause. "Yes, Mr. President, 40,000. They're going to be sent back to Cambodia."

A pause was followed by: "No, Mr. President. Not 14,000. Forty thousand. . . . No, Mr. President, either the United States will take them or they're going back. . . . No, Mr. President. I'll need to hear from you or they will go back."

Then the premier hung up on President Jimmy Carter. As I heard the story, Mr. Carter was phoning from Vienna, where he would ink the SALT II treaty and kiss the Soviet party boss, Leonid Brezhnev. The call was followed by an infamous refolement of as many as 40,000 refugees, just as Kriangsak had threatened.

With President Trump desperately trying to get on top of a new and even more dramatic refugee crisis, the events of June 1979 are a moment to think about. They offer both a warning of danger and glimpse of more-promising possibilities.

The Thais were being overwhelmed with refugees, many having clawed their way up a cliff to escape the communist killing fields. The exasperated Thais rounded up the refugees at gunpoint and put them on buses for the border.

Then the refugees were forced to clamber down the steep hillsides back into Cambodia, where—according to two scholars who wrote about it—the first wave "stumbled into a minefield." Many others died in more horrible ways.

Mr. Carter's office was unable to confirm the account of the phone call by deadline. I heard the story from Kriangsak's friend Ronald Nairn, a businessman and philosopher. When he was a junior New Zealand military officer, he'd walked the border that separates Thailand from Laos and Cambodia.

Kriangsak, then a young army officer, had been assigned to accompany Nairn. They remained such good friends that for some years they lived in adjacent

bungalows in Bangkok, where they liked to cook for their wives.

Nairn—whom I'd met when I was posted in Hong Kong for The Wall Street Journal and he was in town for a meeting of the Mont Pelerin Society—was a believer in human capital. He posed a question that echoes in this refugee crisis: "Why is it," he asked, "that when a cow is born we call it an asset but when a human being is born we call it a liability?"

He believed that given the incentives of a free market, human beings would always be an asset. He eventually became an American—and an advocate of America's taking every refugee it could get. (He later became a Thai citizen.)

In June 1979, the leading industrial nations were preparing for a summit at Tokyo. Malaysia was threatening, absent Western action, its own refolement—to push Indochinese boat people back into the sea.

The Journal responded with an editorial calling on the Tokyo summit to lay aside its agenda and focus on the Indochina refugees. Mr. Carter, to his everlasting credit, led it in doing just that. The U.S. doubled, to 14,000, the number of refugees admitted monthly from the region. First Lady Rosalynn Carter's visit to Cambodian refugee camps

in Thailand in November 1979 helped shine a light on the humanitarian crisis there.

Over the next 20 years more than two million Indochinese fleeing communism found refuge. America eventually took more than 1.25 million; Canada, Australia and France another half million combined. Israel took 300.

It would be an error to make too much of an analogy between the two crises. Our current enemies are far more dangerous. But both crises followed an American retreat, the first in Indochina and the second in the Middle East and Afghanistan.

The American people are within their rights to bring in a president pledged to suspend refugee visas until we can get on top of the situation. But the prohibition on refolement—returning a refugee to the place he fled—is ratified treaty, supreme law of the land.

All the better the example of the Tokyo summit. It showed that, shocked into action, the leading countries of the world can spring to and chart a way forward—and that human capital can contribute to an economic boom.

Mr. Lipsky is editor of the New York Sun.

## The Washington Post

Gerson

### Michael Gerson : Trump's half-baked travel ban is a picture of American shame

By Michael

picture of bullying. A picture of cruelty. A picture of national shame.

It sits in my head beside images of Syrian refugees in Lebanon and Jordan, bewildered by the loss of their old lives, assets depleted, living (in some cases) eight to a room, exploited by human traffickers. Many families feel compelled to put their boys to work and their girls into early, forced marriages. "My home is all broken

in Syria," a girl of 6 told me while coloring a picture of helicopters and bombs. Trump is a champion at punching down, but seldom this far.

This executive order is a security measure that very few actual security professionals would prioritize, given that refugees are some of the most carefully vetted people who enter the country. Meanwhile, the downside of (in effect) targeting foreigners by their

religion is immediate and considerable — worrying American Muslims and embarrassing the United States' Muslim friends and allies in the world. When some radical cleric in, say, Central Asia, says, "The new American president hates Islam," he does not require a conspiracy theory to support his claim. And all of this may have been done with no security upside at all, given the utter incompetence with which the order was drafted and the



likelihood that the courts will prevent its implementation.

Evening Edition newsletter

The day's most important stories.

Please provide a valid email address.

*[President Trump's refugee ban is an affront to American values]*

Trump came to power promising that masterful leadership would replace the "stupid" kind. This action was malicious, counterproductive and inept — the half-baked work of amateurs who know little about security, little about immigration law and nothing about compassion.

(Dalton Bennett, Erin Patrick O'Connor, Katherine Shaver, Monica Akhtar, McKenna Ewen/The Washington Post)

President Trump signed an executive order to halt U.S. entry for refugees, migrants and foreign nationals for 120 days starting Jan. 27. Fiery protests and lawsuits made for a tumultuous weekend. Here's what you need to know. President Trump signed an executive order to halt U.S. entry for refugees, migrants and foreign nationals for 120 days starting Jan. 27. Fiery protests and lawsuits made for a tumultuous weekend. Here's what you need to know. (Video: Dalton Bennett, Erin Patrick O'Connor, Katherine Shaver, Monica Akhtar,

McKenna Ewen/Photo: Jewel Samad, Agence France-Presse via Getty Images/The Washington Post)

There is more systematic thought, however, behind Trump's attempt to recast the United States' global role — presumably the guiding influence of his chief strategist, Stephen K. Bannon. In his inaugural address, Trump asserted the "right of all nations to put their own interests first" and promised that "we do not seek to impose our way of life on anyone." Trump's version of the United States is a normal nation, like the Netherlands or Ghana, concerned with its own borders and business, and generally indifferent to the "way of life" chosen by others. Our national identity — as for other nations — is ethnic and cultural. Trump's America is vaguely Christian. Vaguely 1950s. Vividly white.

A number of policies emerge from these convictions: a walled country, a closed economy and highly restricted immigration. Traditional U.S. commitments — to the special relationship with Britain, to a strong and growing NATO and European Union, to the United States' Pacific security umbrella — seem up for grabs. The trumpet always calls retreat.

Every U.S. president since World War II has disagreed with the stunted and self-defeating view of the country now held by Trump.

Over the past century — in some ways from the beginning — the United States has been a cheerfully abnormal nation. American identity (in this view) is not based mainly on blood or soil, but rather on the patriotic acceptance of a unifying creed. American leaders, Democratic and Republican, have believed that a world where the realm of freedom is growing is more prosperous and secure; a world where freedom is retreating is more dangerous. The reason is not mystical. Dictators tend to be belligerent. Governments accountable to their people are generally more peaceful.

*[Middle Eastern Christians are Trump's pawns]*

It is the lesson of hard experience. The United States found — twice — that it could not avoid the bloody disorders of Europe by ignoring them. It found that a Pacific dominated by a single, hostile power is a direct threat to its economy and security. It found that Russian aggression in Europe is like Newton's First Law — moving until some force stops it.

And the United States has often accepted refugees, reflecting its deepest values and building reserves of trust and respect. The Soviet Union or Cuba under Fidel Castro were not working out unique and special "ways of life." They were producing fleeing victims who would be imprisoned or murdered at

home. It is in the United States' nature to offer at least some of them a home and refuge. The same should be true for Bashar al-Assad's victims, including the children of a broken country.

This is the difference a creed can make: When Ronald Reagan spoke on foreign policy, tyrants sat uneasy on their thrones and dissidents and refugees took heart. When Donald Trump speaks on foreign policy, tyrants rest easier and dissidents and refugees lose hope.

(Adriana Usero/The Washington Post)

The Washington Post's Jonathan Capehart explains some reasons why President Trump's executive actions won't make the country safer against the risk of terror. The Washington Post's Jonathan Capehart explains some reasons why President Trump's executive actions won't make the country safer against the risk of terror. (Adriana Usero/The Washington Post)

*Read more from Michael Gerson's archive, follow him on Twitter or subscribe to his updates on Facebook.*

**The  
Washington  
Post**

## Editorial : Trump's executive order on immigration is a self-inflicted wound

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

ON SUNDAY, a White House official told reporters that President Trump's order for temporary travel bans on visitors from seven countries and on refugees, as well as an indefinite ban on Syrian refugees, was "a massive success story in terms of implementation on every single level." What really happened was a train wreck of decision-making. More worrisome even than the rookie procedural mistakes are the grave potential consequences of an order that's wrong ethically and strategically.

Mr. Trump's executive order was not vetted in advance by key Cabinet departments, including Homeland Security, State, Defense and Justice, according to multiple reports. Rather, it appears the order was drafted by a White House coterie. The New York Times reports that Homeland Security

Secretary John F. Kelly was on a Coast Guard plane, in the middle of listening to an internal briefing about it, when Mr. Trump signed the order. Confusion erupted as thousands of green-card holders — who are permanent legal U.S. residents — found themselves stranded abroad. At first, the administration said that green-card holders were included in the travel ban; Mr. Kelly later said they should be admitted. Those who were hurt were not terrorists but residents of the United States who had already gone through extensive checking.

The temporary inconvenience and insult are unfortunate but not the worst of this debacle. Mr. Trump's order for a 90-day halt to entry and four-month pause in refugees included Iraq, the United States' main ally in the battle that Mr. Trump claims to prioritize, against the Islamic State. As Mr. Trump insults their nation, Iraqi troops are engaged in a grinding struggle,

supported by more than 5,000 U.S. troops, to reclaim Mosul. Where is the wisdom in undermining the credibility and standing of their fragile government in Baghdad, which is so essential to the strategic goal of defeating the Islamic State? If the point of Mr. Trump's action was to improve security, why deepen the dangerous power vacuum in Iraq? In the future, the United States may need battlefield allies such as translators, but Mr. Trump's order has endangered hundreds of them in Iraq who helped U.S. troops, had been waiting for special visas to the United States and now find themselves in limbo. Who will risk helping Americans if this is the thanks they get?

Today's Headlines newsletter

The day's most important stories.

Please provide a valid email address.

Yet another counterproductive outcome will be to give terrorist groups such as the Islamic State fresh recruiting material for the calumny that the United States is at war with the Muslim world. A "self-inflicted wound," said Sens. John McCain (Ariz.) and Lindsay O. Graham (S.C.), among the small number of Republicans with the gumption to speak out against Mr. Trump's misguided action.

It was an inspiration to see the spontaneous outpouring of public support for refugees and immigrants at airports and in cities across the country, including from lawyers who rushed to help those being denied entry. As Mr. Trump stained the nation's reputation by barring the doors to deserving refugees, those demonstrators showed the world that thousands of Americans remain committed to the values that have made this nation a beacon for so long.

**NATIONAL  
REVIEW  
ONLINE**

## Andrew McCarthy : Is It a 'Muslim Ban'?

revue de presse américaine du 31 janvier 2017

President Trump's temporary ban on entry into the U.S. by various categories of aliens has caused a firestorm. That owes in part to the rash implementation of perfectly legal restrictions, but the hysteria is out of proportion to the minimal harm actually done.

One of the most dismaying parts of the debate has been the banter over whether Trump has imposed a "Muslim Ban."

It is no surprise, of course, that Islamists — along with their friends and stooges on both sides of the political aisle — have used the opportunity to agitate and hand-wring over the specter of America "at war with Islam." That, after all, has been page-one of their playbook for a generation.

There has also, however, been indignation on the other side, from Trump defenders denying that the executive order (EO) is in any way a "Muslim ban." Time after time this weekend, right-of-center news outlets and commentators could be found defying their guests and counterparts to find the word "Muslim" or "Islam" in the EO. I sympathize with the frustration. The EO is clearly not a ban on *all* Muslims, or even of any specific Muslim. Since the other side is slanderously suggesting otherwise, there is an irresistible urge to seize on anything that proves them wrong.

Yet the only reason there is an EO is the threat posed by sharia-supremacism, which we inexactly refer to as "radical Islam." You can't have radical Islam without Islam. Therefore, the people the EO seeks to exclude are, of necessity, Muslims — not all Muslims, of course, but a significant subset of them nonetheless.

Trump got to the EO (which is a temporary stop on the way to a more refined policy) by starting — during his campaign — with the proposal of a *temporary* categorical ban on *all* Muslims. I highlight *temporary* because it is important. Trump never took the position that all Muslims outside the U.S. should be banned from our country for all time. He recognized the need to separate our Muslim friends from our radical Islamic enemies. He was groping for a way to do that while protecting the country.

For decades, Washington has been suicidally unwilling to target our radical Islamic enemies for fear of offending

Muslims in general. Trump's more security-minded approach — which many Americans outside Washington regard as common sense — was to call a temporary halt to the admission of Muslim aliens until the government could figure out an effective way to screen out Islamists from pro-constitutional Muslims who would be an asset to our country.

During the campaign, then, Trump asked Rudy Giuliani — the former New York City mayor and renowned federal prosecutor — to help him develop a policy that would solve this dilemma. Rudy then put together a team of advisers, of which I was a member, to work the problem. Trump's proposals consequently evolved away from a coarse categorical ban, adopting instead a *threat-based* approach that would rely on *vetting* rather than banning, and that would *target the places* where the threat is most prevalent.

Again, since the threat is radical Islam, the geographical focus would necessarily involve places where that ideology is most prevalent. Those are *Muslim* places.

As president, Trump is now moving national policy in the direction of the threat-based strategy of heightened vetting (which he calls "extreme" vetting) that he called for during the campaign. It is not something that can be accomplished overnight. Thus, just as he did during the campaign, Trump is starting with temporary exclusions that are categorical: an indefinite ban on Syrian refugees, a four-month ban on other refugees, and a three-month ban on aliens from seven Muslim-majority countries that were cited by Congress and President Obama because of vetting challenges.

These bans are not the ultimate objective. The goal is to give the public immediate protection while the government has a few months to refine threat-based vetting procedures.

As already noted, there were implementation problems with Trump's EO. Nevertheless, if our choice is (a) the Washington approach of never getting to a good national-security policy because it could offend Islamists and the Left, or (b) Trump's approach of imperfectly implementing a good national-security policy at the risk of offending Islamists and the Left, then give me Trump's approach every time.

All that said, though, we should not hide under our beds in shame every time an Islamist, a Democrat, or a media talking-head spews: "Muslim ban!" Of course we're banning Muslims. We're moving to an exclusion of radical Islam, and radical Islam is exclusively made up of Muslims.

Go through the EO. Refugees in general and those from Syria in particular are problematic because of the *heavy concentration of Muslims*, some percentage of which are adherent to radical Islam. The seven countries in Congress's Obama-era statute were cited as vetting problems because they are *Muslim-majority countries* embroiled in savage wars and terror promotion, which have resulted in governments that either hate the United States or are too dysfunctional to provide background checks on their nationals. It is not our fault that majority-Muslim societies tend to breed such pathologies.

I make no apologies for wanting to keep sharia supremacists out of my country. Nor do I look at excluding them as excluding *religion*. It is, instead, the exclusion of a *totalitarian political ideology*.

Our goal is not to exclude Muslims from our country; it is to exclude sharia supremacists, a significant subset of Muslims. They reject our Constitution. Many of them would like to kill us. All of them want us to submit to their law. The threat they pose is not hypothetical — they have killed thousands of Americans and are actively plotting to kill thousands more.

I make no apologies for wanting to keep them out of my country. Nor do I look at excluding them as excluding *religion*. It is, instead, the exclusion of a *totalitarian political ideology* — something that *our law already explicitly endorses*. See, e.g., Section 1182(a)(3)(D) of federal immigration law ("Immigrant Membership in Totalitarian Party"): "Any immigrant who is or has been a member of or affiliated with the Communist or any other totalitarian party (or subdivision or affiliate thereof), domestic or foreign, is inadmissible" (emphasis added).

If we are serious about banning sharia-supremacism — or, if you insist, "radical Islam" — that is inescapably going to involve banning Muslims. All sharia supremacists are Muslims, just like

all members of the Irish Republican Army are Irish.

Sharia supremacism is an interpretation of Islam that traces to both its seventh-century origins and to the cementing, a millennium ago, of its classical legal code — which is totalitarian, discriminatory, and in some particulars, brutal. That code holds that all the world must be governed by Allah's law, sharia. It is, to repeat, less a religion than a form of totalitarianism under a religious veneer.

Sharia-supremacism is not the only interpretation of Islam — not by a long shot. It is, however, an *aggressive* interpretation of Islam. That matters: Since other interpretations of Islam tend to be passive, and since tens of millions of Muslims identify with Islam more culturally than canonically or theologically, sharia-supremacism is far more influential and threatening than its mere numbers indicate. Whether its adherents constitute a quarter, a third, a half, or some other percentage of global Islam is beside the point. As we see throughout Europe, it punches way above its weight in countries where Islam accounts for less than 10 percent of the population.

It is true that only a small percentage of sharia supremacists become violent jihadists. That is not much comfort since we're talking about a small percentage of *millions of people*. More significantly, though, jihadism is not the totality of the threat against us. Communities in which sharia-supremacism is prevalent are supportive of jihadist goals and thus become safe harbors for radicalization, as well as jihadist recruitment, training, and fund-raising. As illustrated by the deterioration of Europe under mass-immigration by Muslims from the Middle East and North Africa, sharia-supremacists aim to establish anti-assimilationist enclaves that breed jihadism while challenging the sovereignty of the host country.

That is the threat we must confront. That doing so involves restrictions against Muslims is unavoidable. We should not pretend otherwise. And we should not apologize for saying so.

— Andrew C. McCarthy is as senior policy fellow at the National Review Institute and a contributing editor of National Review.



## Jay Michaelson: Is Donald Trump's Travel Ban Legal? Months of Court Battles Will Decide

**Photo Illustration by Lyne Lucien/The Daily Beast**

### **Darweesh v. Trump**

Half a dozen challenges to the Trump executive order have already been filed. Inevitably, they will end at the Supreme Court. Will it survive?

What happens next for the lawsuits challenging the Trump travel ban?

Ultimately, it seems certain that one or more of the pending cases—four court orders have been issued so far—will end up at the Supreme Court, which will have before it several constitutional and statutory questions.

However, many things could happen before then, with consequences not only for the 200 million people currently prohibited entry to the United States, but for the next four years of how the judiciary and presidency will relate to one another on vital questions of democracy and civil rights.

The two most important elements of the EO, as explained in a viral post by conservative analyst Benjamin Wittes, are its malevolence and its incompetence. First, as Wittes demonstrates, the EO cannot possibly be designed to “prevent terror and keep our country safe,” because it is both overbroad (all people from seven countries, including millions of Christians) and under-inclusive (leading exporters of terrorism, i.e., Saudi Arabia, Egypt, and Pakistan, were not included). If preventing terror were the objective, these blanket travel bans would not be the means. Thus, Wittes argues, it must be seen as “elevating the symbolic politics of bashing Islam”—which, indeed, it has done quite well.

As Wittes also observed, however, the EO was drafted in a rushed and incompetent manner, without vetting from experts (least of all the Department of Homeland Security), apparently by Trump advisors Stephen Miller, Steve Bannon, and Attorney General-designate Jeff Sessions, none of whom have national security experience. As a result, it is filled with ambiguity and errors, using outdated terminology, lacking guidance for implementation, and leaving several key questions—What about asylees? What benefits are covered?—unanswered.

Unsurprisingly, this lack of clarity has led to wide disparities in enforcement. What’s allowed in Miami has been banned in New York. What judges have barred in Boston is still OK in Los Angeles.

And in Washington, D.C., Customs and Border Protection (CBP) officials are using their “discretion” to basically ignore a court order.

In response to the widespread chaos and vocal protests, the Trump administration has already backpedaled on the EO, notwithstanding its typically counterfactual assertions that no one is really protesting anyway. Already, green card holders (formally known as those with “lawful permanent residence”) have apparently been exempted, although no formal document has yet done so. Trump’s own justice department has admitted that it has no clear idea what the EO actually requires. And according to recent reports, most visitors are now being let through, albeit with enhanced screening that can last for a number of hours.

If that pattern continues, there may not be much of a case left to pursue. While organizations like the ACLU are the real drivers of the litigation, ultimately they still require actual plaintiffs who have suffered actual harm. (In a nice bit of optics, the New York case is formally known as *Hameed Darweesh v. Donald Trump*.) If only two people remain in temporary detention—which, at press time, is what lawyers at JFK told The Daily Beast—the litigation could wither for lack of enforcement.

At the same time, additional challenges continue to be filed. Just today, as Katie Zavatski reported, a Muslim organization filed a First Amendment claim against the ban, and a further challenge was filed on behalf of two brothers from Yemen who had been granted immediate-relative immigrant visas (their father is a U.S. citizen) but who were sent home from Dulles airport (PDF). Given that they’re stuck in the Addis Ababa airport at present, they certainly have standing to sue.

In the near term, the plurality of challenges and venues will lead to a patchwork of legal results, as we have already seen. Different judges will continue to issue different temporary orders while the cases move through the system. The disorder of the last 72 hours will continue, but that, in itself, is not unusual.

Most likely, as the cases wend their way up, district and circuit courts will place stays on enforcement while the litigation proceeds. It’s also possible that some of the cases will be expedited because they are *habeas corpus* claims, meaning that the government has a person in physical custody; those are sometimes expedited as well. Indeed, it’s often efficient for courts to defer judgment on the merits

pending the outcome of similar cases further up the system.

This, too, happens all the time. For example, in the same-sex marriage litigation which led to *Obergefell* and the campaign-finance litigation which led to *Citizens United*, there were, in fact, multiple cases filed by multiple organizations in multiple circuits across the country. Activist lawyers competed for the best cases: the most appealing plaintiffs, the friendliest judges and courts.

Sometimes the “best” cases are the ones that make it to the Supreme Court, and sometimes they aren’t. To choose a recent example, conservative activists wanted their recent challenge to Obamacare to be on behalf of the Little Sisters of the Poor Home for the Aged, a nursing home run by an order of nuns. Talk about the perfect plaintiff! But because that case was consolidated with others, the named plaintiff ended up being David Zubik, an archbishop from Pittsburgh.

Here, it seems likely that the various cases will eventually be consolidated into one, and that the Supreme Court will have to rule on the merits. Probably that process will take several months, but it’s likely to be decided this term or next term, due to the intense scrutiny of the policy. By way of comparison, the right-wing challenges to the Obama administration’s immigration order took 18 months from the initial filings to the (inconclusive) Supreme Court judgment.

When they do so, the Court will have to address both constitutional and statutory challenges.

Thank You!

You are now subscribed to the Daily Digest and Cheat Sheet. We will not share your email with anyone for any reason

The Dulles case, a petition for *habeas corpus* relief entitled *Aziz v. Trump*, is representative. The Aziz brothers allege violations of the Fifth Amendment, since they were denied due process and denied access to an attorney. Indeed, according to their petition, they were handcuffed, lied to, forced to sign papers they didn’t understand, and sent back to Ethiopia, where their flight had originated. They also allege violations of the First Amendment (the EO is biased against Islam) and Fifth Amendment (it discriminates on the basis of religion).

The statutory claims, though, are even stronger. The petition alleges two major violations of the Immigration and Nationality Act because the EO denies entry to people possessing valid documents,

and because the EO discriminates on the basis of religion. Both are clear violations of the Act, and the Trump EO’s claim that national security is at stake does not constitute a valid exception. (In a nice twist, the petition also alleges a violation of the Religious Freedom Restoration Act, which is currently the law of choice for conservatives seeking to discriminate against LGBT people.)

These multiple causes of action will give the Supreme Court multiple bases for whatever opinion it reaches. On the merits, the violations of the statute seem clear, and the Court could decide purely on that basis, declining to address the contentious constitutional issues. Or the Court could take a more expansive position, given the threats to civil liberties that will be emerging in the coming months.

In particular, it’s hard to see the Court’s judicial moderates—especially Chief Justice Roberts, who has evinced a mission of restoring legitimacy to the Court—going along with it. And if that’s true, the travel ban would fail by a vote of 6 to 2. But it’s impossible to predict.

It’s also unknown how the travel ban will impact the debate over Trump’s Supreme Court nominee, to be named in true reality-television fashion on live television Tuesday night. Normally, justices are quizzed primarily on hot-button social issues like abortion. But with three arch-conservatives in the running—William Pryor, Thomas Hardiman, and Neil Gorsuch—their views on civil liberties may now become more important.

Of the three, Pryor has the most significant, and extreme, record: He called the *Miranda* case, which gave us the familiar “you have the right to remain silent” warning, one of the “two worst examples of judicial activism.” Hardiman is no civil libertarian either, having written opinions upholding the strip-searching of anyone arrested, even for minor traffic offenses, and rejecting a constitutional right to record police conduct. Gorsuch does not have a significant record on the issue.

Whoever is sitting on the bench, though, when these cases reach the Supreme Court, will have a far-reaching impact on the clash between Trump’s nationalist populism and the values of equality that have for so long defined the American experiment. Which will win remains, like so much else, profoundly unknown.



Damian Paletta

Updated Jan. 30, 2017 6:22 p.m.  
ET

WASHINGTON—President Donald Trump will amend a recent executive action so he can add Central Intelligence Agency director Mike Pompeo into a role on the National Security Council, White House spokesman Sean Spicer said Monday.

Mr. Trump signed an executive action Saturday that changed the structure of the NSC, giving his chief strategist, Steve Bannon, a role in the group's principals committee while changing the status of the director of National Intelligence and

## President Donald Trump to Add CIA Director to National Security Council (UNE)

the chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff. Those two men now wouldn't be considered regular attendees of the committee but could attend when certain issues pertaining to them were to be discussed.

These changes led to criticism from lawmakers and former national-security officials. Mr. Spicer said one former national-security adviser complained in a Twitter post that Mr. Bannon was given a formal role but the CIA wasn't. Mr. Spicer didn't say which Twitter post he was referring to, but Obama administration national security adviser Susan Rice posted a Twitter message with that exact question on Sunday.

Ms. Rice in that Twitter post also questioned the change of status for the chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, Marine Gen. Joseph Dunford, and the director of national intelligence, Dan Coats.

After mentioning the Twitter post, Mr. Spicer said Mr. Trump would give the CIA director a role in the NSC.

The NSC is a principal advisory group to the president on national security and foreign affairs, and is typically charged with coordinating activity in other departments represented on the council.

In other changes announced Saturday, the chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, Marine Gen. Joseph

Dunford, and the director of national intelligence, Dan Coats, will now be able to attend the council's top-level meetings, typically headed by the president, only if they are specifically invited.

On Monday, Mr. Spicer challenged media reporting on the moves, and said it was "utter nonsense" that those roles were being downgraded. "They are at every NSC meeting, and are welcome to attend the principals meetings," he said.

**Write to Damian Paletta at**  
damian.paletta@wsj.com

and Damian Paletta

Updated Jan. 30, 2017 8:39 p.m.  
ET

WASHINGTON—President Donald Trump has selected a nominee for the U.S. Supreme Court and will introduce him to a national television audience Tuesday evening, a crucial early moment for his administration that could shape American law for decades.

Mr. Trump has chosen either Judge Thomas Hardiman of the Third U.S. Circuit Court of Appeals in Philadelphia or Judge Neil Gorsuch of the 10th U.S. Circuit Court of Appeals in Denver, a person familiar with the selection process said Monday.

With the aid of senior advisers such as White House Counsel Don McGahn, the president last week narrowed the list to a handful of federal appellate judges admired in conservative circles, four of whom he interviewed personally, people familiar with the process said.

Mr. Trump said on Twitter early Monday he had made his decision. Speaking later to small-business owners in the White House, the president didn't reveal the nominee's identity but said the selection is "a person who is unbelievably highly respected....I think you will be very impressed with this person."

The announcement is likely to trigger a tussle in Congress, between the White House and its critics, and among a host of interest groups as they battle over a nomination that would restore a

## Donald Trump to Name His Supreme Court Nominee Tuesday

Jess Bravin,  
Brent Kendall

conservative majority to the evenly split court, replacing the influential Justice Antonin Scalia, who was revered by conservative scholars and activists.

In setting the announcement for Tuesday, Mr. Trump sped up the announcement by two days from a timeline he laid out last week, when he said on Twitter the nomination would come Thursday. A person familiar with the process said that once the president made his decision, the White House was concerned that the name could leak before a formal announcement.

The White House may see another benefit in quickly moving on the nomination—shifting attention from the controversy that has followed Friday's executive order excluding aliens from seven predominantly Muslim nations from entering the U.S. and moving the debate to the familiar ideological face-off of a Supreme Court confirmation fight.

Several federal district judges have blocked parts of Mr. Trump's exclusion order from taking effect, the first round of a legal battle that could make his Supreme Court nominee's own independence and views of executive power a central question of the confirmation debate.

Judges Hardiman and Gorsuch were both nominated to the lower courts by President George W. Bush and received easy Senate approval. The road to confirmation for the Supreme Court will certainly be rougher, although the White House aims to get the nominee confirmed in time to participate in the current term's cases.

Senate Democrats are still smarting over Senate Republicans' refusal to consider Chief Judge Merrick Garland of the District of Columbia Circuit, the center-left nominee President Barack Obama put forward within weeks of Justice Scalia's unexpected death last February. They have vowed stringent examination—and not ruled out a filibuster—for any Trump nominee for a seat that Oregon Sen. Jeff Merkley and others characterize as "stolen" from Mr. Obama.

Justice Scalia's death upended the court's term, leaving it deadlocked 4-4 along a conservative-liberal divide on several high-profile cases. Because a tie vote leaves intact the lower-court opinion on appeal, both factions have at times been frustrated.

The loss of Justice Scalia apparently halted a conservative drive to strip states of the power to require public employees to pay union dues for collective bargaining, for example, while the failure to seat Judge Garland may have cost Mr. Obama the fifth vote needed to revive his plan to defer deportations and provide work authorization for millions of illegal immigrants.

Still, under Chief Justice John Roberts the short-handed court has managed to find common ground on some notable cases, often finding consensus through rulings that decided narrow issues without making significant national precedents.

Mr. Trump's nominee, if confirmed, would reconstitute a longstanding, if slim, conservative majority on the court. Last year during the

campaign, Mr. Trump published a list of 21 candidates recommended by conservative activists from which he said he would select his nominee. That pledge helped Mr. Trump shore up support among conservative activists who view control of the courts as a paramount political goal.

Judge Hardiman, 51 years old, and Judge Gorsuch, 49, are relatively young, so they would have the potential to serve on the high court for two decades or more. What mainly differentiates them is style and background, rather than ideology.

Judge Hardiman brings a touch of the everyman, and would be the only current justice lacking an Ivy League degree. He was the first in his family to go to college, at Notre Dame, and helped pay for his legal training at Georgetown by driving a cab.

He practiced law in Pittsburgh, where he immersed himself in Republican politics and came to the attention of party leaders including then-Sen. Rick Santorum. Mr. Bush appointed him to the federal district court in 2003 and, with Mr. Santorum's backing, elevated him to the Third Circuit four years later. The Senate confirmed him unanimously.

Judge Gorsuch, with degrees from Columbia, Harvard and Oxford, as well as a Marshall Scholarship and a Supreme Court clerkship on his résumé, brings the glittering credentials that typically adorn a Supreme Court nominee. He also would be the first appointee to serve with a justice for whom he once clerked, Anthony Kennedy.



As a young man, Judge Gorsuch saw high-level politics up close; his mother, Anne Gorsuch Burford, was a Colorado state legislator and later Environmental Protection Agency administrator in Ronald Reagan's administration, where environmentalists criticized her for downsizing the agency and slashing its budget.

The Senate confirmed Judge Gorsuch to the 10th Circuit in 2006 in a simple voice vote. His nomination hearing before the Senate Judiciary Committee lasted less than an hour. The judge previously worked in the Bush Justice Department and spent a decade in private practice in Washington, working on a wide range of cases.

Both judges have been involved in high-profile rulings that are likely to be the subject of considerable debate as Mr. Trump's Supreme

Court nomination moves forward.

Judge Hardiman has taken an expansive view of gun rights, dissenting in 2013 from a decision that upheld New Jersey's requirement that applicants show "justifiable need" for a permit to carry firearms in public. The judge also ruled that jails can strip-search every person police bring them, a decision the Supreme Court affirmed in 2012.

Judge Gorsuch has favored the right of religious business owners and nonprofits to claim exemptions from an Obama administration requirement that employers provide contraception coverage to their workers. He also has questioned precedent that requires courts to give deference to regulations adopted by federal agencies.

In a lecture last year, Judge Gorsuch spoke in glowing terms of Justice Scalia's career and his originalist approach to the

Constitution, which refers to interpreting the text based on what a judge believes it meant at the time it was adopted. "Mark me down, too, as a believer that the traditional account of the judicial role Justice Scalia defended will endure," Judge Gorsuch said at Case Western Reserve University School of Law.

"When you get to the final stage, everybody's probably qualified to get on the court," said a person familiar with the process. "Then it's a question of who you're impressed with and who you get along with. A computer can't make the decision."

In addition to meetings with Senate leaders and his staff, Mr. Trump consulted with outside figures including Mr. Santorum and conservative commentators Laura Ingraham and Andrew Napolitano, this person said.

Republicans hold a narrow advantage in the Senate, but if Democrats mobilize and unify they

could block any Supreme Court nomination by preventing Republicans from assembling the 60 votes needed to allow a final vote on any nominee. Any such move could, in turn, prompt the GOP to change Senate rules to prohibit filibusters of Supreme Court nominees.

Regardless, both conservative groups promoting the nominee and liberal organizations opposing it are expected to rally their followers, as Supreme Court nominations often provide an opportunity for mobilizing their forces and raising funds.

**Write to** Jess Bravin at [jess.bravin@wsj.com](mailto:jess.bravin@wsj.com), Brent Kendall at [brent.kendall@wsj.com](mailto:brent.kendall@wsj.com) and Damian Paletta at [damian.paletta@wsj.com](mailto:damian.paletta@wsj.com)

**The  
Washington  
Post**

Sandhya-  
Somashekhar/424900341023463

The White House is pledging to keep the Obama administration protections extended to lesbian, gay, bisexual and transgender workers, a statement said, apparently responding to reports that the orders would be reversed.

"President Trump continues to be respectful and supportive of L.G.B.T.Q. rights, just as he was throughout the election," the White House said in a statement early Tuesday. "The president is proud to have been the first ever G.O.P. nominee to mention the L.G.B.T.Q. community in his nomination acceptance speech, pledging then to protect the community from violence and oppression."

The stance followed reports that the Trump administration was considering a sharp break with Obama's policies.

A draft of a potential executive order that began circulating in Washington over the weekend that would overturn then President Obama's directive barring discrimination on the basis of sexual orientation and gender identity in the federal workforce and by federal contractors.

But individuals familiar with deliberations within the White

House, who spoke on the condition of anonymity because no final decision has been made, said that the details of the policy remain in flux and that it is far from certain President Trump would ultimately issue such an order.

The New York Times first reported the decision by the White House to stick with the Obama-era protections.

That top officials are debating whether to wade into the issue of gay and transgender rights highlights the tension the new administration faces when it comes to social issues. Trump campaigned on an economic message, but he is under pressure from the social conservatives who propelled him into office to implement their top priorities.

*[Supreme Court takes up school bathroom rules for transgender students]*

The issue of gay rights is particularly fraught for Vice President Pence, who as governor of Indiana signed a controversial measure expanding religious liberties in a way that gay rights groups said opened the door to legalized discrimination. A national outcry over the bill led Pence and the state legislature to weaken the measure.

Speaking to reporters earlier Monday, White House press

secretary Sean Spicer declined to comment on whether an executive order affecting gay and transgender people was under consideration.

"I'm not getting ahead of the executive orders that we may or may not issue," Spicer said. "There is a lot of executive orders, a lot of things that the president has talked about and will continue to fulfill, but we have nothing on that front now."

The executive order Obama signed in 2014 had two parts. It expanded protections in federal hiring, which already barred discrimination on the basis of sexual orientation, to also include gender identity. And it required all companies doing business with the federal government to have explicit policies barring discrimination against gay and transgender workers.

The move was significant because it applied to 24,000 companies that collectively employed about 28 million workers — representing about a fifth of the U.S. workforce.

But the order drew sharp criticism from religious leaders — including many who were Obama's allies at the time — because it did not provide an exemption for religious organizations that contract with the government. Many faith-based groups, including Catholic Charities USA, receive federal grants to assist people with housing, disaster relief and hunger, and expressed concern about the precedent it

could set for other forms of federal funding.

National News Alerts

Major national and political news as it breaks.

Please provide a valid email address.

Gay rights groups argued that such an exemption would amount to a loophole giving groups the right to discriminate.

Any attempt by the Trump administration to rescind or weaken Obama's order would essentially be an effort to "authorize discrimination" against gay and transgender people, said James Esseys, director of the LGBT program at the American Civil Liberties Union.

"The Trump administration has shown that it's willing to go against core American values of freedom and equality, and it's troubling to hear they may target LGBT people as well," he said.

But he said the impact might be mitigated because federal law bans discrimination on the basis of sex. Many courts have interpreted discrimination on the basis of sexual orientation or gender identity to be a form of sex discrimination.

Robert Costa contributed to this report.

**The  
Washington  
Post**

## White House says LGBT protections for federal workers will remain

## Editorial : The White House's soft-core Holocaust denialism

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

**IGNORANCE AND INCOMPETENCE** would be the charitable explanations of the White House's intentional decision to omit any mention of the slaughter of 6 million Jews from an annual statement marking International Holocaust Remembrance Day, an event established, on the anniversary of the liberation of the death camp at Auschwitz, to remind the world of a genocide conceived and executed by the Nazis to exterminate European Jewry.

A passing familiarity with Nazi Germany's history, with Hitler's Final Solution or with modern manifestations of anti-Semitism would have enlightened the White House that while the Nazis' victims included Roma, homosexuals, and mentally and physically handicapped people, among others, the Holocaust was, first and foremost, a calculated campaign of mass extermination carried out by a regime for which anti-Semitism was

a fixed worldview and an organizing principle.

Another reading of the White House statement, which was a departure from those issued by both the Obama and Bush administrations, is more sinister. By stripping any reference to Jews from its brief statement, the Trump administration engaged in what Deborah Lipstadt, an Emory University historian, calls "soft-core Holocaust denial."

Today's Headlines newsletter

The day's most important stories.

Please provide a valid email address.

The hardcore variety is depicted in the 2016 film "Denial," about Ms. Lipstadt's and Penguin Books' legal defense of historical truth in a lawsuit brought 20 years ago by David Irving, a notorious British Holocaust denier who cast doubt on the existence of gas chambers and mass killings. "Soft-core denial is much more insidious and squishier but when you know something is

not quite right," she told us. "When you take out the identity of the victims, when those victims were specifically targeted, that is a form of rewriting history, and that's what denial is all about."

Trump administration officials reject any such intent, while doubling down to defend their statement as a purposeful act of inclusion. "I mean, everyone's suffering [in] the Holocaust including, obviously, all of the Jewish people affected and miserable genocide that occurs," Chief of Staff Reince Priebus said.

To expand the Holocaust's meaning to include "everyone" is to obliterate history. By refusing to name the Holocaust's primary targets — by positing an infinite number of victims — the mass incineration of Europe's Jews is minimized and diminished. Right-wing governments in present-day Europe have similarly fudged the historical record.

The Nazis perpetrated a staggering number of unspeakable crimes —

routine murders; human "medical" experimentation; mass rape — and Hitler's victims were legion. In the former East Germany or Soviet Union, a visitor to a World War II museum could form the impression that communists were the Nazis' main victims.

Yet the Holocaust was a unique crime undertaken on a vast scale, impelled by a focused, sustained hatred, specifically of Jews. That hatred, and that crime, must not be conflated with all Nazi hatreds and all crimes, nor gauzily recalled as one of many such atrocities, nor reimagined as a worn-out grievance. In an extraordinary repudiation of the White House on Monday, the U.S. Holocaust Memorial Museum felt compelled to restate the obvious: "Nazi ideology cast the world as a racial struggle, and the singular focus on the total destruction of every Jewish person was at its racist core. ... As Elie Wiesel said, 'Not all victims were Jews, but all Jews were victims.'"

**The  
New York  
Times**

## Editorial : President Bannon?

The Editorial Board

Illustration by Selman Design;  
Photos by Damon Winter/The New York Times

Plenty of presidents have had prominent political advisers, and some of those advisers have been suspected of quietly setting policy behind the scenes (recall Karl Rove or, if your memory stretches back far enough, Dick Morris). But we've never witnessed a political aide move as brazenly to consolidate power as Stephen Bannon — nor have we seen one do quite so much damage so quickly to his putative boss's popular standing or pretenses of competence.

Mr. Bannon supercharged Breitbart News as a platform for inciting the alt-right, did the same with the Trump campaign and is now repeating the act with the Trump White House itself. That was perhaps to be expected, though the speed with which President Trump has moved to alienate Mexicans (by declaring they would pay for a border wall), Jews (by disregarding their unique experience of the Holocaust) and Muslims (the ban) has been impressive. Mr. Trump never showed much inclination to reach beyond the minority base of voters that delivered his Electoral College victory, and Mr. Bannon, whose fingerprints were on each of those initiatives, is helping make sure he doesn't.

But a new executive order, politicizing the process for national security decisions, suggests Mr. Bannon is positioning himself not merely as a Svengali but as the de facto president.

In that new order, issued on Saturday, Mr. Trump took the unprecedented step of naming Mr. Bannon to the National Security Council, along with the secretaries of state and defense and certain other top officials. President George W. Bush's last chief of staff, Joshua Bolten, was so concerned about separating politics from national security that he barred Mr. Rove, Mr. Bush's political adviser, from N.S.C. meetings. To the annoyance of experienced foreign policy aides, David Axelrod, President Barack Obama's political adviser, sat in on some N.S.C. meetings, but he was not a permanent member of the council.

More telling still, Mr. Trump appointed Mr. Bannon to the N.S.C. "principals' committee," which includes most of those same top officials and meets far more frequently. At the same time, President Trump downgraded two senior national security officials — the chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, a role now held by Gen. Joseph Dunford Jr., and the director of national intelligence, the job that Dan Coats, a former member of the Senate Intelligence Committee and former ambassador to Germany, has been nominated to fill.

All this may seem like boring bureaucratic chart-making, but who sits at the National Security Council table when the administration debates issues of war and peace can make a real difference in decisions. In giving Mr. Bannon an official role in national security policy making, Mr. Trump has not simply broken with tradition but has embraced the risk of politicizing national security, or giving the impression of doing so.

Mr. Trump's order says that the chairman of the Joint Chiefs and the director of national intelligence will attend the principals' committee meetings only "where issues pertaining to their responsibilities and expertise are to be discussed." Could there be any national security discussions when input from the intelligence agencies and the military will not be required? People in those jobs are often the ones to tell presidents hard truths, even when they are unwelcome.

As his first week in office amply demonstrated, Mr. Trump has no grounding in national security decision making, no sophistication in governance and little apparent grasp of what it takes to lead a great diverse nation. He needs to hear from experienced officials, like General Dunford. But Mr. Bannon has positioned himself, along with Mr. Trump's son-in-law, Jared Kushner, as the president's most trusted aide, shutting out other voices that might offer alternative views. He is now reportedly

eclipsing the national security adviser, retired Lt. Gen. Michael Flynn.

While Mr. Trump long ago embraced Mr. Bannon's politics, he would be wise to reconsider allowing him to run his White House, particularly after the fiasco over the weekend of the risible Muslim ban. Mr. Bannon helped push that order through without consulting Mr. Trump's own experts at the Department of Homeland Security or even seeking deliberation by the N.S.C. itself. The administration's subsequent modifications, the courtroom reversals and the international furor have made the president look not bold and decisive but simply incompetent.

As a candidate, Mr. Trump was immensely gratified by the applause at his rallies for Mr. Bannon's jingoism. Yet now casually weaponized in executive orders, those same ideas are alienating American allies and damaging the presidency.

Presidents are entitled to pick their advisers. But Mr. Trump's first spasms of policy making have supplied ample evidence that he needs advisers who can think strategically and weigh second- and third-order consequences beyond the immediate domestic political effects. Imagine tomorrow if Mr. Trump is faced with a crisis involving China in the South China Sea or Russia in Ukraine. Will he look to his chief political

provocateur, Mr. Bannon, with his penchant for blowing things up, or will he turn at last for counsel to the

few more thoughtful experienced hands in his administration, like

Defense Secretary Jim Mattis and General Dunford?

**The  
New York  
Times**

## A Republican Plan for Medicare Gets a Revival

Aaron E. Carroll  
and Austin Frakt

A number of Republican health care policy proposals that seemed out of favor in the Obama era are now being given new life. One of these involves Medicare, the government health insurance program primarily for older Americans, and is known as premium support.

Right now, the federal government subsidizes Medicare premiums — those of the traditional program, as well as private plan alternatives that participate in Medicare Advantage. The subsidies are established so that they grow at the rate of overall per enrollee Medicare spending. No matter what Medicare costs, older Americans can be sure that the government will cover a certain percentage of it. That's the main thing that panics fiscal conservatives, because that costs the government more each year.

Premium support could quiet that fear. Subsidies would be calculated so they don't grow as quickly, thus protecting the federal government (that is, taxpayers) from runaway spending. There are lots of variants, but there are really two principal ideas.

The first is to set the subsidy to a level established by the market, as opposed to one established by the government, as it is now.

One way to do that is to tie the subsidy to the average premium of all Medicare plans, including that of traditional Medicare. This is how the Medicare drug program, Part D, already works. For Part D, Medicare collects bids from all plans that reflect their costs of providing the required, minimum level of drug

coverage. Then it sets the subsidy at 74.5 percent of the average bid.

Beneficiaries pay the difference, which will be higher for more costly plans that may offer more generous benefits, and lower for cheaper plans. The system also includes additional subsidies for low-income beneficiaries.

The thinking is that the market drives the subsidy. Because insurance companies want to attract more enrollees, they are motivated to drive their bids downward, driving subsidies downward as well and saving taxpayers money.

If this sounds somewhat similar to how the subsidies for the Affordable Care Act marketplace plans work, it's because it is similar. Obamacare ties the premium subsidy to the second-lowest premium instead of the average. If an enrollee wants a plan with more benefits but at a higher premium, he or she would pay the difference, not the government.

But even though the approach is similar to Part D — which was passed by a Republican Congress and signed into law by a Republican president — and the A.C.A. marketplaces — established with only Democratic support — it does not have bipartisan endorsement.

That's just one more example of how congressional actions and attitudes on health care reform are inconsistent. Republicans think subsidies based on bids is an excellent way to reform Medicare, but they don't laud the Affordable Care Act for adopting the same approach. When it comes to the A.C.A., of course, Democrats supported this mechanism, but

they've opposed it when it comes to Medicare reform.

Obamacare's creation of the insurance exchanges and subsidies to expand coverage was a move leftward, supported by Democrats and opposed by Republicans. Anything that relies more heavily on private Medicare options would be a move rightward, and it would probably be opposed by Democrats and supported by Republicans. Such is Washington.

It's worth noting that progressives are also concerned that this plan might erode traditional Medicare. It could do that because, for a variety of reasons, private plans are likely to bid lower than traditional Medicare. If people have to pay more for traditional Medicare, relative to private plans, they're likely to leave it, weakening that arm of the program.

The second main idea included in some premium support plans is to further protect the government from rapidly growing expenditures by explicitly capping the growth in subsidies. This could be layered on top of the bidding approach. It would work like this: Plans bid, and the government picks the average or second lowest. Then the government makes sure it doesn't pay a predetermined amount more than last year — a growth cap.

This kind of cap on subsidy growth is an even more contentious issue. As anyone who follows health care spending knows, it has grown significantly faster than inflation for the past several decades. Putting a more restrictive cap on growth will make budget projections look better. The problem is that such action assumes that there are ways

we haven't previously figured out to reduce Medicare spending without reducing benefits, reducing reimbursement or increasing cost-sharing.

Progressives fear that, given our inability to control health care spending in other ways, this would most likely wind up transferring more and more of the cost of health care onto older Americans themselves. Many would be unable to afford care. The same problems we're seeing with underinsurance and cost-related access barriers in the private insurance market could become more prevalent.

The entire point of premium support is to rely on the market to innovate and come up with more efficient ways of providing health care and health insurance for it. As such, one cannot say in advance how it would keep costs below a growth cap.

Some people deride this as "market magic," and it's easy to see where they're coming from. It's not crazy, however, to think that care could be better managed to produce good outcomes more efficiently, at least to some extent. This, in fact, is the theory underlying some of the Affordable Care Act's reforms, like accountable care organizations.

But the bottom line is this: With premium support, no one can be certain how things will work out. As we consider any premium support approach, we will need to acknowledge that one of the easiest ways to cut premiums is to shift more health care costs to older Americans.

**The  
Washington  
Post**

## Will Hurd, GOP congressman: A wall is the least effective way to secure the border

By Will Hurd

By Will Hurd January 30 at 2:11 PM

*Will Hurd, a Republican, represents Texas's 23rd Congressional District in the House.*

Because the world we live in is more dangerous than our parents' was, and our children are set to inherit a world more dangerous than ours, Congress must get right our mandated mission to provide for the common defense of our country. With a unified Republican government, we now have a commander in chief who takes

protecting our borders as seriously as Congress does.

But taking action for action's sake rarely leads to positive results. Our leaders have the solemn obligation to know the proper steps to take before acting upon them, and building a wall from the Pacific Ocean to the Gulf Coast of Texas is a third-century solution to a 21st-century problem.

President Trump's recent executive order on border security is vague when it comes to what the term physical barrier means. I am hoping that our new secretary of homeland

security is afforded significant latitude regarding the implementation of this order. I agree with Secretary John Kelly's comments during his confirmation hearing that a wall does not solve our security problems. In fact, building a wall from sea to shining sea would be the most expensive and least effective way to secure the border.

[Read These Comments](#)

The best conversations on The Washington Post

Please provide a valid email address.

For the past eight years, we had an administration with a one-size-fits-all approach to border security. We must change the strategy, not simply adopt a different one-size-fits-all solution. Each sector of the border faces unique geographical, cultural and technological challenges that would be best addressed with a flexible, sector-by-sector approach that empowers the Border Patrol agents on the ground with the resources they need. What you need in San Diego is very

different from what you need in Eagle Pass, Tex.

The Rio Grande serves as the international boundary for 1,200 miles of the Texas-Mexico border — including more than 800 miles in my district — and the majestic Big Bend National Park runs along more than 100 miles of it. The tallest peak in the park is almost 8,000 feet. Building a wall in the middle of a river or at the top of a mountain would be a waste of taxpayer money. The Texas-Mexico border is also home to a significant part of the largest desert in North America — the Chihuahuan Desert. Building a barrier through hundreds of miles of desert on the border is useless if you do not have Border Patrol agents available to respond to challenges to the barrier. Furthermore, much of the property along the Texas-

Mexico border is privately owned, and seizing land to build a wall is not popular among these landowners.

There are already almost 700 miles of fencing along the 2,000 miles of the U.S.-Mexico border, and hundreds of miles are in need of repair because criminal organizations have cut through and dug under it repeatedly. Part of the existing wall along the border in places such as Arizona has been used as the foundation of a ramp upon which drug traffickers have moved heavy equipment.

For every move we make to defend ourselves, our adversaries will make a counter-move. True border security demands a flexible, defense-in-depth strategy that includes a mix of personnel, technology and changing tactics, all

of which come at a lower price tag than a border wall.

During the campaign, Trump suggested his wall would cost between \$8 billion and \$12 billion. A further analysis of these proposals by the MIT Technology Review suggests the cost could be as much as \$40 billion. To give some perspective on this number, the entire national intelligence program's (the CIA, National Security Agency, etc.) annual budget is \$53 billion.

As a conservative legislator, I believe the U.S. government has a responsibility to use the hard-earned taxpayer dollars entrusted to it wisely. Some of this border wall money should go to increase CIA and NSA operations targeting the criminal organizations operating in Mexico and the rest of Central America. Improved intelligence and

closer working relationships with our partners in Mexico could solve the problem before it hits our country.

The president has said that he will ensure that Mexico pays for the construction of a border wall. Mexico is our friend and partner. Our national security depends on working together to ensure the integrity of our Southern border. While chasing terrorists as an undercover officer in the CIA, I learned a few life lessons, such as: Be nice to nice guys and tough with tough guys; and make sure your friends trust you and your enemies fear you. Asking our friends to pay for something that won't solve our problems is not how to ensure that our children inherit a country less dangerous than ours.



## David Andelman : Messing with Mexico is a dangerous idea

David A. Andelman 5:02 a.m. ET Jan. 31, 2017

The U.S.-Mexican border in Tijuana on Jan. 27, 2017. (Photo: Justin Sullivan, Getty Images)

President Trump's growing feud with Mexico is destabilizing our enormous neighbor to the South and putting our national security in grave jeopardy. If he's not aware of that, he should be.

Forget the cost of the wall or who might be paying for it. Forget America's new tax code, or all the new Rust Belt jobs or all those other great benefits he contends we'll get from blowing up the North American Free Trade Agreement (NAFTA). Mexico is America's third largest trading partner (after China and Canada), but the United States is Mexico's #1. It sends 80% of its exports, worth more than \$300 billion, to the U.S. That's about a quarter of its entire GDP.

So when White House press secretary Sean Spicer suggested that a 20% tax on all Mexican exports to the United States could yield enough revenue (several times over) to pay for the wall, he was right. White House chief of staff Reince Priebus soon walked it back, suggesting such a tax might be one of "a buffet of options."

But what a toxic buffet this could be. Taxing American companies to the point where

they'd just close up shop in Mexico, and bring their jobs back here, could be catastrophic for Mexico. And not good for us, either.

Imagine for a moment that the 1.1 million Mexicans employed in American-owned companies in Mexico were suddenly to lose their jobs. Ultimately, that's really what's at stake here. The number of jobless there would surge by nearly 50%. Given the relative size of our two countries, that would be the equivalent of 3.3 million American workers suddenly thrown out of productive work. Could our economy stand that?

And the impact in Mexico would be far deeper, especially in a fragile nation recently emerging out of staggering poverty, with a deeply embedded criminal culture as well. Shuttered American plants in Mexico would send a shudder through the real estate industry, banks with outstanding loans or lines of credit to these enterprises. Millions, not only in these closed facilities but dependent on these workers spending their salaries, would lose their paychecks and their homes. The result would be social and economic chaos.

Large swaths of Mexico's fastest-growing communities, where General Electric and DuPont facilities elbow Whirlpool and Nabisco and major automakers, could become ghost towns overnight — their workers, catapulted into a nascent middle

class in the past decade, suddenly destitute and desperate.

There are other components of the broad and deep ties that bind our two countries that are at stake. Mexicans in the United States sent \$27 billion back home to their families last year, \$2 billion more than the year before. If those payments were to be taxed or reduced, suffering would only be compounded in broad swaths of Mexico.

The first evidence of the potential impact of some steps under discussion was the behavior of the Mexican peso right after Mexican President Enrique Peña Nieto's tweet that he was canceling his visit to Washington, which had been scheduled for Tuesday. The peso plunged more than 1% in a matter of minutes.

If the Trump administration began jawboning American companies to close down their plants or make it financially impossible for them to continue producing south of the border for consumers to the north, it would be impossible to build a wall high enough or thick enough to keep out Mexicans suddenly stranded with no hope and no future.

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

Deep cooperation among U.S. and Mexican law enforcement and intelligence agencies, who have

joined in identifying and unwinding organized crime, drug cartels and potential terrorist threats, could also be a casualty of hasty and draconian measures that would do little to promote America's national security.

As it happens, the immigrants crossing our southern frontier today are largely from Central America, which has its own social and economic problems. Multiply that ten-fold by adding newly jobless Mexicans, and the potential for chaos is incalculable. NAFTA was an agreement designed to stabilize our borders with Canada and Mexico. It was a small price to pay for a southern neighbor that is a strong, secure ally rather than a critically wounded threat.

*David A. Andelman, a member of USA TODAY's Board of Contributors, is editor emeritus of World Policy Journal and author of A Shattered Peace: Versailles 1919 and the Price We Pay Today. Follow him on Twitter @DavidAndelman.*

*You can read diverse opinions from our Board of Contributors and other writers on the Opinion front page, on Twitter @USATOpinion and in our daily Opinion newsletter. To submit a letter, comment or column, check our submission guidelines.*



## Trump Vows Regulatory Rollback



John D. McKinnon and Amy Harder

Jan. 30, 2017 7:39 p.m. ET

The Trump administration's ambitious regulatory rollback, billed as the biggest action since the Reagan era to cut federal red tape, could have far-reaching impacts on businesses and the economy.

But experts in Canada, where a similar program already has been implemented, cautioned that success in the U.S. could depend on details of the program that have yet to be worked out, which could take time. Designing key aspects of the regulatory rollback will be left to the White House budget office, leaving some big battles yet to be fought.

Still, the National Federation of Independent Business, a small-business group, said it was "very pleased," terming President Donald Trump's order "a good first step on the long road toward eliminating ball-and-chain regulations" that tend to hit small businesses harder.

Mr. Trump announced the outline of the sweeping regulatory overhaul on Monday, as he sought to turn a page on the recent controversy over his immigration order.

The most basic change requires federal agencies to repeal two existing rules for each new rule they enact going forward.

To ensure that those changes are meaningful, the administration also will adopt what amounts to a regulatory budget for agencies—a long-sought goal for some conservatives. The White House said it would restrict agencies' ability to increase the regulatory costs that they impose on businesses and others, with the aim of forcing agencies to roll back existing regulatory costs to offset new costs.

Regulatory costs are often criticized by conservatives as a hidden tax on businesses, although there is a lively debate about the impact.

But the changes are likely to provoke sharp conflicts between business and advocacy groups.

The consumer group Public Citizen termed the changes "radical" and "unworkable" on Monday.

"It will result in immediate and lasting damage to our government's ability to save lives, protect our environment, police Wall Street, keep consumers safe and fight discrimination," said Public Citizen President Robert Weissman.

Past presidents' efforts to scale back regulation often have produced little, some experts say. Mr. Trump's more ambitious approach faces its own challenges, including how to define regulatory costs and how to treat individual agencies.

In addition, not all regulations are the same. Agencies often have more flexibility to repeal some rules than others, particularly those prescribed by Congress, for instance.

In remarks to a group of small-business owners, Mr. Trump promised the benefits would be substantial.

"We'll be reducing them [rules] big league and their damaging effects on our small businesses, our economy, our entrepreneurial spirit," he said. "So the American dream is back, and we're going to create an environment for small business like we haven't had in many, many decades."

He said regulations could be reduced as much as 75% or more, and that the government will retain "great protection for the consumer." Big businesses will benefit as well, he said.

The president also said again that his administration would seek sweeping changes in the 2010 Dodd-Frank financial overhaul, adding that "Dodd-Frank is a disaster." But it wasn't immediately clear that any of those changes would come through the new regulatory rollback order.

A White House official termed the changes "probably the most significant administrative action in the world of regulatory reform since President Reagan" and his creation of a White House clearinghouse for government regulations in 1981.

Mr. Trump's executive order could have an outsize impact on the Environmental Protection Agency, which issues far more regulations than any other federal agency, according to data from the White House budget office.

That in turn could benefit businesses that are most affected by EPA rules.

Between 2005 and 2015, the agency issued a total of 37 major regulations with costs up to \$51 billion and monetary benefits, primarily through better public health, up to nearly \$680 billion, according to an annual report last year. EPA's numbers dwarf all others, such as the Department of Health and Human Services, which issued 17 major rules with costs of up to \$5.7 billion and benefits of up to \$22.6 billion.

Some environmental advocates worry that the executive order focuses too much on costs, without seeking to preserve environmental benefits.

Other environmental experts aligned with Mr. Trump's agenda said his executive order won't prevent EPA from issuing regulations it is required to by law, such as updating air-pollution standards that current law requires the agency to do every five years.

The practical impact of Mr. Trump's orders on several other sectors isn't clear because some agencies are independent from the White House.

An expert at the Canadian Federation of Independent Business said the benefits could be significant, if the U.S. can design a system that is broad enough.

"It's not easy, but if you can do it it's fantastic," said executive Vice President Laura Jones. "If developed countries want to continue to have prosperity and health and safety...I think this is the way they have to go. It's not sustainable to add more and more and more rules."

Meanwhile, House Republicans plan this week to start rolling back federal regulations that President Barack Obama put in place in his last months in office, by using a little-used legislative tool called the Congressional Review Act. The act allows Congress to pass measures nullifying recently completed regulations with a lower threshold of votes than what most legislation requires. Congressional Republicans will likely be successful in these efforts, largely because Mr. Trump is aligned in their views and won't veto the measures like in past attempts.

At the top of the list to repeal include two Interior Department environmental rules issued late last year. One rule requires companies drilling for oil and natural gas on federal lands to curb the amount of methane, a potent greenhouse gas, emitted, and another sets tougher standards for coal mining near streams.

—Natalie Andrews and Ryan Tracy contributed to this article.

**Write to** John D. McKinnon at [john.mckinnon@wsj.com](mailto:john.mckinnon@wsj.com) and Amy Harder at [amy.harder@wsj.com](mailto:amy.harder@wsj.com)



## Rosa Brooks : 3 Ways to Get Rid of President Trump Before 2020

Paul McLeary | 52 mins ago

Are we really stuck with this guy?

It's the question being asked around the globe, because Donald Trump's first week as president has made it all too clear: Yes, he is as crazy as everyone feared.

Remember those optimistic pre-inauguration fantasies? I cherished them, too. You know: "Once he's president, I'm sure he'll realize it doesn't really make sense to withdraw from all those treaties." "Once he's president, surely he'll understand that he needs to stop

tweeting out those random insults." "Once he's president, he'll have to put aside that ridiculous campaign braggadocio about building a wall along the Mexican border." And so on.

Nope. In his first week in office, Trump has made it eminently clear that he meant every loopy, appalling word — and then some.

The result so far: The president of China is warning against trade wars and declaring that Beijing will take up the task of defending globalization and free trade against American protectionism. The

president of Mexico has canceled a state visit to Washington, and prominent Mexican leaders say that Trump's border wall plans "could take us to a war — not a trade war." Senior leaders in Trump's own party are denouncing the new president's claims of widespread voter fraud and his reported plans to reopen CIA "black sites." Oh, and the entire senior management team at the U.S. Department of State has resigned.

Meanwhile, Trump's approval ratings are lower than those of any new U.S. president in the history of polling: Just 36 percent of

Americans are pleased with his performance so far. Some 80 percent of British citizens think Trump will make a "bad president," along with 77 percent of those polled in France and 78 percent in Germany.

And that's just week one.

Thus the question: Are we truly stuck with Donald Trump?

It depends.

There are essentially four ways to get rid of a crummy president.

There are essentially four ways to get rid of a crummy president. First, of course, the world can just wait patiently for November 2020 to roll around, at which point, American voters will presumably have come to their senses and be prepared to throw the bum out.

But after such a catastrophic first week, four years seems like a long time to wait. This brings us to option two: impeachment. Under the U.S. Constitution, a simple majority in the House of Representatives could vote to impeach Trump for "treason, bribery, or other high crimes or misdemeanors." If convicted by the Senate on a two-thirds vote, Trump could be removed from office — and a new poll suggests that after week one, more than a third of Americans are already eager to see Trump impeached.

If impeachment seems like a fine solution to you, the good news is that Congress doesn't need evidence of actual treason or murder to move forward with an impeachment: Practically anything can be considered a "high crime or misdemeanor." (Remember, former President Bill Clinton was impeached for lying about his affair with Monica Lewinsky). The bad news is that Republicans control both the House and the Senate, making impeachment politically unlikely, unless and until Democrats retake Congress. And that can't happen until the elections of 2018.

Anyway, impeachments take time: months, if not

longer — even with an enthusiastic Congress. And when you have a lunatic controlling the nuclear codes, even a few months seems like a perilously long time to wait. How long will it take before Trump decides that "you're fired" is a phrase that should also apply to nuclear missiles? (Aimed, perhaps, at Mexico?)

In these dark days, some around the globe are finding solace in the 25th Amendment to the Constitution. This previously obscure amendment states that "the Vice President and a majority of ... the principal officers of the executive departments" can declare the president "unable to discharge the powers and duties of his office," in which case "the Vice President shall immediately assume the powers and duties of the office as Acting President."

This is option three for getting rid of Trump: an appeal to Vice President Mike Pence's ambitions. Surely Pence wants to be president himself one day, right? Pence isn't exactly a political moderate — he's been unremittingly hostile to gay rights, he's a climate change skeptic, etc. — but, unappealing as his politics may be to many Americans, he does not appear to actually be insane. (This is the new threshold for plausibility in American politics: "not actually insane.")

Presumably, Pence is sane enough to oppose rash acts involving, say, the evisceration of all U.S. military alliances, or America's first use of

nuclear weapons — and presumably, if things got bad enough, other Trump cabinet members might also be inclined to oust their boss and replace him with his vice president. Congress would have to acquiesce in a permanent 25th Amendment removal, but if Pence and half the cabinet declared Trump unfit, even a Republican-controlled Congress would likely fall in line.

The fourth possibility is one that until recently I would have said was unthinkable in the United States of America: a military coup, or at least a refusal by military leaders to obey certain orders.

The principle of civilian control of the military has been deeply internalized by the U.S. military, which prides itself on its nonpartisan professionalism. What's more, we know that a high-ranking lawbreaker with even a little subtlety can run rings around the uniformed military. During the first years of the George W. Bush administration, for instance, formal protests from the nation's senior-most military lawyers didn't stop the use of torture. When military leaders objected to tactics such as waterboarding, the Bush administration simply bypassed the military, getting the CIA and private contractors to do their dirty work.

But Trump isn't subtle or sophisticated: He sets policy through rants and late-night tweets, not through quiet hints to aides and lawyers. He's thin-skinned, erratic, and unconstrained — and his

unexpected, self-indulgent pronouncements are reportedly sending shivers through even his closest aides.

What would top U.S. military leaders do if given an order that struck them as not merely ill-advised, but dangerously unhinged? An order that wasn't along the lines of "Prepare a plan to invade Iraq if Congress authorizes it based on questionable intelligence," but "Prepare to invade Mexico tomorrow!" or "Start rounding up Muslim Americans and sending them to Guantánamo!" or "I'm going to teach China a lesson — with nukes!"

It's impossible to say, of course. The prospect of American military leaders responding to a presidential order with open defiance is frightening — but so, too, is the prospect of military obedience to an insane order. After all, military officers swear to protect and defend the Constitution of the United States, not the president. For the first time in my life, I can imagine plausible scenarios in which senior military officials might simply tell the president: "No, sir. We're not doing that," to thunderous applause from the *New York Times* editorial board.

Brace yourselves. One way or another, it's going to be a wild few years.

## THE WALL STREET JOURNAL

### U.S. Consumer Inflation Firmed, Spending Accelerated in December

Eric Morath

Updated Jan. 30, 2017 5:18 p.m. ET

WASHINGTON—The Federal Reserve's preferred measure of inflation rose last month to the strongest reading in more than two years, providing fresh evidence of firming prices a day before policy makers meet to discuss the path of interest rates this year.

The personal-consumption-expenditures price index advanced 0.2% in December from the prior month, the Commerce Department said Monday. The measure of consumer inflation rose 1.6% from a year earlier, a 12-month increase last seen in September 2014. The reading was last higher in July that year.

The report also showed consumer spending increased solidly last month, with strong year-end car sales and higher utility spending with the return of seasonably cool temperatures. Meanwhile, incomes grew more modestly than spending,

cutting the share of earnings Americans saved.

The annual inflation reading remains below the Fed's 2% target, but the PCE index has accelerated from nearly flat just more than a year ago. And there are signs that may continue.

"Inflation will gradually accelerate over the next couple of years due to higher energy prices and stronger wage growth that leads firms to raise prices," PNC Bank economist Gus Faucher said.

Rising gasoline prices are pushing the overall gain to line up with inflation recorded for the past year outside of the volatile food and energy categories. The so-called core inflation index increased 0.1% in December and rose 1.7% from a year earlier. The inflation figure excluding food and energy has held near that level since the start of 2016.

The steady but slow climb in consumer prices isn't likely to spur the Fed to act on its benchmark

interest rate this week. A two-day policy meeting starts Tuesday. But rising prices do give the central bank more leeway to bump up interest rates later this year, with the unemployment rate at historically low levels.

The central bank has raised its key rate just once in each of the past two years but indicated in December that three increases could be in order this year.

"This rise in inflation was anticipated and largely represents a fading of the effects of earlier declines in energy prices and the prices of nonenergy imports," Fed Chairwoman Janet Yellen said in a speech this month. "In addition, slack in labor and product markets is no longer placing downward pressure on inflation, in contrast to the situation only a few years ago."

The pace of price increases is expected to remain modest. A forecast of inflation over the next year from the Federal Reserve Bank of Dallas, updated after the Commerce Department's report,

projected a 1.8% increase, where the reading has stood since October.

In December, Fed policy makers' median projection for annual headline inflation in late 2017 was 1.9%.

The Commerce Department report showed consumer spending rose 0.5% in December from November. Incomes advanced 0.3% during the month. The figures show outlays picked up after a fall slowdown. But when adjusting for inflation, spending rose 0.3% last month.

To support better spending, Americans saved a smaller share of their income last month. The personal saving rate fell to 5.4% from 5.6% in the prior month. December's saving rate was the lowest since March 2015.

"The gradual downward trend in the household savings rate confirms that households were on a solid footing by the end of the fourth quarter and precautionary savings

are not a concern," Barclays economist Blerina Uruci said.

Inflation-adjusted disposable personal income—income after taxes—was up 0.1% in December after holding flat in November.

Consumer spending accounts for about two-thirds of total economic output in the U.S., and household outlays have been the main driver

of economic growth throughout much of the expansion. Slower consumer-spending gains in the fourth quarter contributed to a deceleration of overall economic growth to a 1.9% pace from a 3.5% increase in the third quarter, according to a Commerce Department report on gross domestic product released last week.

Last week's report incorporated the December spending data released in more detail Monday.

Outlays on long-lasting goods, such as cars and appliances, rose sharply in December, while spending on goods that are used more quickly, including gasoline and clothes, increased slightly. Spending on services maintained

the same pace recorded for much of 2016.

Spending for November was unrevised at a 0.2% gain. Incomes rose 0.1% that month, revised up from a previous estimate of unchanged.

**Write to** Eric Morath at [eric.morath@wsj.com](mailto:eric.morath@wsj.com)

## THE WALL STREET JOURNAL

7:11 p.m. ET

On Wednesday the Federal Open Market Committee will conclude its first policy meeting of the year. The Fed is expected to issue two documents. The first is a jargon-filled policy statement that market pros and pundits will scrutinize intently for clues about when the next interest-rate increase will come. The second document—purporting to state the Fed's strategy and long-term goals—is likely to receive far less attention. In past years, it recited vacuous truisms and provided neither constructive guidance nor any meaningful constraint on the Fed's discretionary impulses.

Let's hope the Fed takes the opportunity this year to announce a practicable long-term strategy and stick to it. I am afraid, however, this won't happen. The central bank has offered plenty of plans over the years. But too often these prove to be as fleeting as the seasons.

A year ago around this time, the U.S. stock market fell about 10%. The Fed reacted precipitously, reversing its announced plan for 2016 of four quarter-point rate increases. But when prices rallied near the end of the year, the Fed decided it wouldn't look good to let the moment pass without raising rates. It raised its key interest rate by a quarter point in December.

In late October, Fed Chair Janet Yellen expressed willingness to run a "high-pressure economy" to push the unemployment rate lower and inflation higher. Yet in a speech two weeks ago, she said that allowing the economy to run "persistently 'hot' would be risky and unwise."

Changes in judgment should be encouraged, but they ought to

## Kevin Warsh : America Needs a Steady, Strategic Fed

Kevin Warsh

Jan. 30, 2017

indicate something other than day trading or academic fashion. They must be rooted in strategy. Otherwise, the real economy winds up worse off. Short-term thinking and ad hoc measures by the Fed beget short-term reactions by financial firms, businesses and households. And eight years into the economic recovery, the long run is at hand.

In recent years, the rationale for the Fed's choice to loosen or tighten policy has been as nebulous as Justice Potter Stewart's famed definition of pornography: You know it when you see it.

The Fed's technocratic expertise is no substitute for a durable strategy. This make-it-up-as-you-go-along approach causes many Fed members to race to their ideological corners, covering themselves as hawks and doves. It causes economists to litigate a false choice between fixed policy rules and unfettered discretion.

The absence of an observable Fed strategy is also causing congressional leaders, understandably, to seek legislative changes in the central bank's mandate. Congress cannot properly oversee what cannot be understood and evaluated. Rigorous Fed oversight is of a piece with an independent central bank. Reforms are coming, one way or another.

What would a well-conceived, rigorously implemented Fed strategy look like? It would be clearly delineated and broadly measurable. Its goals would be within the scope of the Fed's policy tools, attainable over time and circumstance. Critically, the strategy would be squarely focused on the medium term, that is, the next several years. Here is what reform of Fed strategy might look like in practice:

First, the Fed should establish an inflation objective of around 1% to 2%, with a band of acceptable outcomes. The current 2.0% inflation target offers false precision. According to the Fed's preferred measure, inflation is running at 1.7%, only a few tenths below target. The difference to the right of the decimal point is too thin a reed alone to justify the current policy stance. It also undermines credibility to claim more knowledge than the data support.

Second, the Fed should adjust monetary policy only when deviations from its employment and inflation objectives are readily observable and significant. The Fed should stop indulging in a policy of trying to fine-tune the economy. When the central bank acts in response to a monthly payroll report, it confuses the immediate with the important. Seeking in the short run to exploit a Phillips curve trade-off between inflation and employment is bound to end badly.

Third, the Fed should elevate the importance of nonwage prices, including commodity prices, as a forward-looking measure of inflation. It should stop treating labor-market data as the ultimate arbiter of price stability. The cost-push wage inflation of the 1970s is fundamentally different from the later-cycle wage increases that we're starting to see now. A material catch-up in wages after a long period of stagnation need not trigger a panicky response.

Fourth, the Fed should assess monetary policy by examining the business cycle and the financial cycle. Continued quantitative easing—which Fed leaders praise unabashedly—increases the value of financial assets like stocks, while doing little to bolster the real economy. Finance, money and credit curiously are at the fringe of

the Fed's dominant models and deliberations. That must change, because booms and busts take the central bank farthest afield from its objectives.

Fifth, the Fed should institutionalize its new strategy and boldly pursue it with a keen eye toward the medium-term. Central bankers who vow allegiance to "data dependence" find themselves lurching to and fro according to undistilled, short-term noise. Instead, the Fed should adhere to a concept I would term "trend dependence." When the broader trends begin to turn—for example, in labor markets or output—the Fed should take account of the new prevailing signal.

A new Fed strategy would have the central bank acting as a responsible, forward-looking grown-up. Markedly better tax and regulatory policy is likely with the new administration. The Fed should recognize that American productivity, and potential economic growth, could improve significantly. Conversely, if economic trends turn south, the Fed needs a more credible, practicable strategy to respond.

In 1979, another consequential moment for the U.S. economy, Milton Friedman wrote to newly appointed Fed Chairman Paul Volcker that he was skeptical the Fed could "rise to the challenge without major changes in its method of operation." A change in the central bank's strategy and practice is no less essential today.

*Mr. Warsh, a former member of the Federal Reserve Board, is a distinguished visiting fellow in economics at Stanford University's Hoover Institution.*

## The New York Times

President Trump took aim at financial regulations and other federal rules on Monday, signing an executive order to trim

## Republicans' Paths to Unraveling the Dodd-Frank Act

Ben Protess

back the federal regulatory thicket and promising to do "a big number" on Obama-era Wall Street restrictions.

At the same time, congressional Republicans opened their own front against the Dodd-Frank Act, the law that overhauled financial regulation after the 2008 financial crisis. And with Mr. Trump in the White House,

Republicans who previously challenged Dodd-Frank now see success in their sights after years of futility.



"Dodd-Frank is a disaster," the president declared during a 10-minute session with reporters as he signed an unrelated executive order that could reduce other types of government regulations.

"We're going to be doing a big number on Dodd-Frank," Mr. Trump added. "The American dream is back."

In reality, the president cannot unravel Dodd-Frank with a stroke of a pen, and congressional Republicans will find it easier to chip away at the law than to repeal it altogether.

Defanging Dodd-Frank, a sweeping law that created a consumer protection agency and reined in mortgage practices and derivatives trading, would also seem to contradict Mr. Trump's anti-Wall Street language from the campaign trail. His closing campaign ad, which lamented a "global power structure" and a "corrupt machine," flashed an image of Lloyd C. Blankfein, the chairman and chief executive of Goldman Sachs.

But the president has spoken out against Dodd-Frank, claiming that eliminating it would benefit working people, even as he stocks his administration with former Goldman executives and billionaires.

His allies in Congress began their legislative assault on Dodd-Frank on Monday, introducing a measure to repeal a Securities and Exchange Commission regulation that requires oil companies to publicly disclose payments they make to governments when developing resources around the world. The regulation was tangential to Dodd-Frank's mission of reforming Wall Street but was included as a bipartisan effort intended to shine a light on potential bribes.

Republicans argue that the rule puts American companies at a disadvantage; the House Financial Services Committee has called it a "politically motivated mandate." And the rule has some powerful opponents in the industry, including Exxon Mobil and, according to one account, its former top executive, Rex W. Tillerson, Mr. Trump's pick for secretary of state.

The legislation to repeal the rule, introduced by Representative Bill Huizenga of Michigan and advanced to the House floor by the rules committee on Monday, has a good shot of becoming law thanks to an obscure parliamentary procedure. Under the Congressional Review Act, passed in 1996, Congress has a limited window to undo newly finalized regulations using only 51 Senate votes, rather than the normal 60

needed to overcome a filibuster. Republicans hold a majority in both chambers, all but guaranteeing them success.

This effort is just the beginning. House Republicans are also moving bolder legislation that would repeal crucial provisions of Dodd-Frank, including the so-called Volcker rule, which prevents banks from making risky bets with their own money. And they are exploring ways to use the budget process to potentially defund some of the law's most contentious provisions.

Still, each strategy has its limits. The House legislation to repeal Dodd-Frank could stall in the Senate, where it needs 60 votes. And even though the Congressional Review Act requires only a majority of lawmakers to repeal a rule, only 10 or so Dodd-Frank rules are vulnerable to this process.

"It is the height of hypocrisy for Republicans to now be wasting time attacking rules signed by the former president, which went through a rigorous vetting process," said Representative Louise M. Slaughter of New York, the top Democrat on the rules committee.

The New York Stock Exchange  
Spencer Platt/Getty Images

Even the president's latest executive order could have a minor impact.

The order says each new rule must be offset by regulatory cuts that save at least twice as much money. It also instructs the Office of Management and Budget to set annual limits on the total cost of rules issued by each department. For the current year, the limit is set at zero.

"This will be the largest cut ever, by far, in terms of regulation," Mr. Trump said hyperbolically.

But the order does not apply to independent agencies like the Federal Reserve and the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau, limiting its effect on financial regulation. Independent agencies could choose to comply but are unlikely to do so while under the leadership of people appointed by President Obama.

In addition, the order includes a broad exemption for "emergencies and other circumstances."

Despite the obstacles, there are a number of different tactics that Republicans can use to try to dismantle Dodd-Frank.

#### Congressional Review Act

Dodd-Frank opponents owe Newt Gingrich a debt of gratitude.

The Congressional Review Act, passed some 20 years ago as part of his Contract With America, provides lawmakers at least 60 days to introduce legislation disapproving major new regulations. The lawmakers can ultimately repeal the regulations with support from just a majority of lawmakers and the president. The Congressional Research Service has determined that rules sent to Congress on or after June 13 of last year are vulnerable to repeal.

Until now, the Congressional Review Act was not much of a weapon. It has led to a repeal measure being signed into law only once, in 2001, when Republicans and President George W. Bush wiped out workplace safety regulations adopted near the end of President Bill Clinton's administration.

But Republicans have identified dozens of potential rules to override, some of which arose from Dodd-Frank, according to congressional documents reviewed by The New York Times.

Republicans can target a derivatives rule adopted last year by the Commodity Futures Trading Commission, a Consumer Financial Protection Bureau rule for prepaid debit cards and a rule approved by banking regulators that imposed capital requirements for banks that trade derivatives. The threat also applies to any unfinished rules that the consumer bureau completes, including its looming crackdown on payday lending.

The S.E.C. oil-payment rule is the first of five Obama administration rules scheduled to be challenged this week. The House rules committee advanced the legislation to repeal that rule on Monday over the objections of the panel's Democrats, who argued that Republicans were misusing the Congressional Review Act to undermine Dodd-Frank.

The oil-disclosure policy has already had a tortured history. The S.E.C. completed the rule in 2012, with the support of antipoverty groups like Oxfam and the One Campaign, but the American Petroleum Institute, the trade group representing Exxon Mobil and other oil companies, sued the agency and won.

In 2013, a federal judge in the District of Columbia vacated the rule. It took the S.E.C. another three years to redo the rule, which it finally did in June of last year, opening it to Republican attack under the Congressional Review Act.

"What they're doing is responding to a narrow interest within the industry that is trying to be secretive," said Senator Benjamin L. Cardin of Maryland, the top Democrat on the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, who sponsored the amendment in Dodd-Frank along with former Senator Richard Lugar, a Republican.

#### Replacing Dodd-Frank

If the Congressional Review Act is a scalpel, then the Financial Choice Act is a sledgehammer.

The legislation, introduced last summer by Representative Jeb Hensarling, the chairman of the House Financial Services Committee, represents the most comprehensive response to Dodd-Frank yet.

President Barack Obama and Vice President Joseph R. Biden Jr. at the signing of the Dodd-Frank financial overhaul act on July 10, 2010. At right is Senator Christopher J. Dodd and Representative Barney Frank. Saul Loeb/Agence France-Presse — Getty Images

The bill would repeal the Volcker rule as well as the so-called Durbin amendment, which set a limit on fees retailers are charged for debit card transactions. It would replace Dodd-Frank with a more flexible regulatory structure.

After a false start under President Obama, Mr. Hensarling's plan to repeal and replace Dodd-Frank could gain new life from Mr. Trump.

"Republicans on the Financial Services Committee are eager to work with the president and his administration to unclog the arteries of our financial system so the lifeblood of capital can flow more freely and create jobs," Mr. Hensarling said in a statement.

He hopes to pass the bill this year — with his committee expected to take it up in the coming weeks — but that is no sure thing.

For one thing, the deep-pocketed banking lobby is not unanimous in its support of Mr. Hensarling, a Texan with a populist streak whose plan is arguably more geared toward small banks than big ones. Many of the biggest banks, creatures of habit that have already adjusted to much of Dodd-Frank, would prefer specific accommodations, rather than wholesale repeal of the law.

Mr. Hensarling's plan would also need to merge with legislation offered by Senate Republicans. And even then, they would need some Democrats to reach 60 votes.

House Democrats have vowed to fight Mr. Hensarling.



"This bill is so bad that it simply cannot be fixed," Representative Maxine Waters of California, the top Democrat on Mr. Hensarling's committee, said of his bill last year.

### The Budget

If his straightforward legislation stalls, Mr. Hensarling may find comfort in the minutiae of the budget reconciliation process.

In the next six weeks or so, his committee is required to submit its "budget views" for 2018 to the House Budget Committee. In this document, Mr.

Hensarling is expected to recommend a number of measures that could rein in some core aspects of Dodd-Frank.

For example, he will most likely recommend replacing regulators' authority to wind down troubled banks with a new chapter of the bankruptcy code. He also could tinker with the funding for two bodies that Republicans love to hate: the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau and the Financial Stability Oversight Council, a collective of regulators who monitor threats to the financial system.

By subjecting these bodies to the congressional appropriations process, rather than a dedicated funding mechanism, Congress may be able to cut their funding.

It is unclear whether this plan will gain traction with congressional leaders.

### Regulatory Apathy

While Congress is busy fighting Dodd-Frank, the Trump administration's financial regulators may prove that less is more.

Wall Street is hoping that with new leaders at the S.E.C. and the Commodity Futures Trading Commission, regulators may allow some leeway for violations of the Volcker rule and other regulations.

And while most of Dodd-Frank has been completed, there are rules left to set, including restrictions on executive compensation. Under the Trump administration, those rules may remain unfinished business.

## THE WALL STREET JOURNAL

### William McGurn : The Press Deserves Freedom, Not Privilege

Jan. 30, 2017  
7:09 p.m. ET

Senior presidential counselor Steve Bannon overstepped when he told the New York Times the press ought to "keep its mouth shut," and for that he's taking a shellacking. More intriguing is another part of his statement: "The media here is the opposition party."

Turns out this is a rare area of agreement between the White House and the Times. For what Mr. Bannon just said is not much different from what the Times ran on its front page on Aug. 8.

Back then the paper put it this way: "If you view a Trump presidency as something that's potentially dangerous, then your reporting is going to reflect that. You would move closer than you've ever been to being oppositional." The piece went on to suggest "normal standards" of journalism did not apply to Donald Trump.

Now Mr. Trump is president, and it's his turn to question whether "normal" standards apply.

Already we saw one small example, when press secretary Sean Spicer used his first press conference to pass on the Associated Press—by tradition the first to get a question—in favor of the New York Post. His second question went to the Christian Broadcasting Network. Mr. Spicer also introduced Skype

"seats" for journalists not in the room. All this is clever, because it expands the exercise of the First Amendment while diminishing the idea of a privileged Fourth Estate.

The expression "Fourth Estate" is attributed to Edmund Burke, who is supposed to have said that while Parliament had three estates (the church, the secular lords, the commons), in the reporters' gallery there sat a fourth, "more important far than they all." Among the privileges enjoyed by their successors are designated West Wing offices, a briefing room and a press office to assist them.

This columnist has been in this briefing room on both sides of the podium—first, as a journalist, and, much later, as a member of the George W. Bush administration. In the latter capacity it was illuminating to learn how administrations help feed the illusions upon which reporters depend, especially those on TV.

It was amusing to watch, for example, the little game before each press conference. The press secretary would deliver handouts of what was coming just before the event started, leading the TV reporters to start filming introductions informing their viewers what the president will say literally two or three minutes before those viewers would hear it from the president himself. In like manner

there are the network cameras on the driveway out front, positioned so reporters will have the White House in the background to foster the impression they are in the know.

There is nothing wrong with these practices. Indeed, the arrangements exist for a simple reason: They are mutually convenient.

Still, the system is less democratic than it might be. Plainly Mr. Trump has found Twitter a way of reaching more people. But there are any number of other possibilities that would be preferable to booting the press out, as some seem to be suggesting.

For example, instead of releasing a speech exclusively to the White House press, how about posting it on the web at the same time for everyone? In a Jan. 5 piece for the Columbia Journalism Review, two former press secretaries, Ari Fleischer (George W. Bush) and Mike McCurry (Bill Clinton), offer their own suggestions, beginning with regularly rotating those who sit in the 49 seats of the White House press briefing room. The two men further suggest keeping the daily press briefing but no longer making it a live televised event, the better to discourage grandstanding (on both sides) and encourage more exchange of information.

In its landmark 1972 decision *Branzburg v. Hayes*, the Supreme

Court famously rejected the idea that journalists have privileges others do not have simply by virtue of being journalists. "The liberty of the First Amendment," wrote Justice Byron White, "is the right of the lonely pamphleteer who uses carbon paper or a mimeograph just as much as of the large metropolitan publisher."

A similar understanding is at the heart of 2010's *Citizens United v. Federal Election Commission* decision, perhaps best understood as rejecting the idea of a privileged journalist caste and ensuring the First Amendment could be freely exercised by all—even those who might want to release a critical film about Hillary Clinton near a primary. Along these same lines, Mr. Trump's press operation would surely do best to focus on continuing to democratize the distribution of news rather than seeking to punish outlets regarded as hostile.

"This is a David vs. Goliath fight and much of the public will accept Trump's fight with the media if the media is seen as Goliath," says Mr. Fleischer. "But if he throws them out of the West Wing, he'll turn the press into David."

Write to McGurn@wsj.com.