

Revue de presse américaine

Ambassade de France aux États-Unis

Service de presse et de communication



Liberté • Égalité • Fraternité

RÉPUBLIQUE FRANÇAISE

Lundi 8 mai, réalisation : Josselin Brémaud



FRANCE – EUROPE3

Editorial : Europe's French Reprieve	3
Editorial : France Elects Emmanuel Macron	3
Editorial : France rejects 'high priestess of fear'	4
Boston Globe : Editorial : Biggest loser in French election? Tech companies	4
Rohac : Macron defeats LePen - France's next leader is no Hillary Clinton	4
Milman : Le Pen and the future of France	5

E. J. Dionne Jr. : Macron won — now comes the hard part	5
McArdle : In France, the 'Can't Lose' Candidate Pays a Price	6
Lucas : Why Macron's victory is reassuring ... and yet not.....	7
Boot : France's election proves it — America is now an example of what not to do.....	7
El-Erian : What Macron Can Do for Free Markets Everywhere	8
Cohen : Macron and the Revival of Europe (online)	9
Sansal : The Altered State of France (online)	9

Macron wins presidency as France rejects Le Pen and her right-wing populist tide (UNE).....	10
Macron Decisively Defeats Le Pen in French Presidential Race (UNE).....	11
Why Macron Won: Luck, Skill and France's Dark History (UNE).....	12
Emmanuel Macron Wins French Presidency (UNE)....	12
French Election Victor Emmanuel Macron's 'New Deal' for Europe Faces Old German Doubts (UNE)	13
With Le Pen defeat, Europe's far-right surge stalls (UNE).....	14
Does Emmanuel Macron's win signal the end of populism in Europe? Not likely	15
Marine Le Pen falls short in far-right bid for the presidency of France	16
Emmanuel Macron's unlikely path to the French presidency	17
Emmanuel Macron Wins the French Presidency	18
French Election: Emmanuel Macron Wins Presidency	19
France Has Its Businessman on Horseback	19
Emmanuel Macron, the Next President of France	21
Centrist Macron wins French presidential election.....	22
The Huge Challenges Facing Emmanuel Macron, France's New President	23
NPR : Emmanuel Macron Declared French President In Early Vote Counts : The Two-Way	23
Emmanuel Macron Wins Big in the French Election- Now Comes the Hard Part	24
Paris breathes a sigh of relief as Macron takes center stage	25
CBS : Why Emmanuel Macron French election matters to US and Donald Trump	26
Merci for nothing, Donald	26
Marine Le Pen's landslide loss in France is an embarrassment for President Trump (online)	27
Macron defeats populism in France but must now work with Trump	28
World Leaders Congratulate Macron for French Presidential Election Win	29
Trump congratulates Macron on his 'big win' in France (online).....	29
French Election: World Leaders Congratulate Emmanuel Macron.....	30
CNBC : Macron, in victory speech, says task ahead is immense and will require commitment of all of France	30
France: Emmanuel Macron eyes legislative elections after landslide win.....	31
Macron Win Slows March of Euroskeptics	31
EU Leaders Breathe Sigh of Relief With Emmanuel Macron Victory	32
Emmanuel Macron Vanquishes Marine Le Pen to Become President of France	32
Who Is Emmanuel Macron?	33
Banker, economic adviser and now youngest French president (online)	34
French President-Elect Macron, In His Own Words	34

French Companies Cheer Emmanuel Macron's Victory	34
Euro Bolstered as Focus Turns to Growth	35
Emmanuel Macron's Win in France Offers a Reprieve for Europe's Single Currency.....	36
France's Emmanuel Macron Set to Clash With Rivals on World Stage.....	36
Russian Link Cited in Hacked Macron Party Files	37
Brigitte Trogneux: From Macron's teacher to France's first lady	37
After Defeat, Marine Le Pen Emerges as Leader of French Opposition.....	38
TechCrunch : Emmanuel Macron and how political campaigns will never be the same.....	39
Angela Merkel's Party Wins Unexpectedly in German State Elections	39
E.U. Leader Says (in English) That English Is Waning	40

INTERNATIONAL..... 40

U.S. Wants to Spend Added Billions on Military in Asia	40
Hiatt : China is bent on world domination — but not in the way you think.....	41
Rogin : Taiwan arms deal in limbo as Trump courts China	42
North Korea Detains Fourth U.S. Citizen for 'Hostile Acts'	42
Chinese-North Korean Venture Shows How Much Sanctions Can Miss (UNE)	43
Israeli Politicians Pressure Trump on Mideast Promises	44
The Mother of All Terrorist Groups Isn't the Islamic State.....	45
U.S. Military Says Troops Killed Islamic State Leader in Afghanistan	46
O'Grady : Colombia's Perilous Deal With the FARC..	46
John McCain: Why We Must Support Human Rights..	47

ETATS-UNIS..... 48

A Republican Principle Is Shed in the Fight on Health Care (UNE)	48
White House Presses Insurance-Market Woes in Health Fight.....	49
Obama urges 'political courage' to save Affordable Care Act	49
Obama Defends Affordable Care Act, but Leaves Trump Out of It	50
Blow : Republican Death Wish.....	51
Binder : A Disaster Wrapped in Victory	51
Krugman : Republicans Party Like It's 1984.....	52
E.P.A. Dismisses Members of Major Scientific Review Board (UNE)	52
Sally Yates Testimony to Shine Public Light on Russia Probes.....	53

Tillerson to staff: State changes ‘really stressful’ but ultimately ‘satisfying’	54
Trump Set to Name Slate of Federal-Court Judges	55
Rep. Cramer : Remake the Paris Climate Deal to Promote American Energy.....	55

Editorial : Mr. Zinke, Keep Channeling Teddy Roosevelt.....	56
Editorial : Same-sex marriage is the law of the land. A Kentucky judge must have missed that.	56
Lazear : Trump’s Tax Plan Would Spur Growth	57

FRANCE – EUROPE

**THE WALL
STREET
JOURNAL.**

ET 139 COMMENTS

5-6 minutes

Editorial : Europe’s French Reprieve

Updated May 7,
2017 4:29 p.m.

reform alternative, with proposals to shrink the bureaucracy, cut corporate taxes and modify the job-killing 35-hour workweek.

He was also lucky. The center-right Republican nominee François Fillon, a self-proclaimed Thatcherite, was felled by allegations of nepotism. Independent, hard-left firebrand Jean-Luc Mélenchon divided the socialist vote. In the runoff Mr. Macron was the default choice of voters who wanted to block the National Front.

This means President Macron will have a fragile mandate and a narrow window to press his agenda. France needs radical reform of a government that in 2015 took 57% of national GDP and an economy with a jobless rate that is 10% eight years after the financial crisis.

Yet political failure is the recent French norm. Successive Presidents have failed to undo the 1999 35-hour-workweek law amid militant union protests. Mr. Mélenchon and his “Unbowed France” movement are promising chaos if Mr. Macron dares to advance what the socialist calls “neoliberalism.” Mr. Macron’s best bet is to go big and abolish the 35-hour workweek as Mr. Fillon promised, rather than seek marginal

fixes and pay the political price anyway. The same goes for cutting the corporate tax rate to 25% from 33.3%, especially as the U.S. heads toward a 20% rate.

Mr. Macron’s ability to push reform will depend on the strength of the parliamentary coalition he can assemble. If En Marche! fails to win a majority in June’s parliamentary vote, he should hope the Republicans do. One way to set the tone for the June vote would be to invite Republican heavyweights to join the Macron cabinet.

The new President will also need help on national security, which was his weakest pitch to voters. While he committed to increasing capacity at the security agencies, Ms. Le Pen’s vows to fight radical Islam and toughen border controls appealed to voters who witnessed massacres across the country.

The toughest challenge is the self-isolation of too many of France’s six million Muslim citizens. French voters understood that Ms. Le Pen’s immigration crackdowns would do little to stop self-radicalization among native French Muslims. But Mr. Macron can help by speaking frankly about the threat and encouraging Muslims to see integration as a two-way street.

Mr. Macron is a French sort of Atlanticist, which means he’s wary of looking too pro-American. He accused the West of “constantly” escalating the Ukraine conflict, described Moscow as a “partner” and warned that the U.S. shouldn’t “dictate” French foreign policy, as if the latter ever happens. But perhaps the weekend dump of documents from his campaign, which bore the hallmarks of a Russian cyber operation, will open his eyes to the Kremlin threat.

As for European Union elites, the temptation will be to view the Macron triumph as vindication of the status quo, given Ms. Le Pen’s vow to leave the EU and ditch the euro. It is at most a reprieve. Ms. Le Pen improved on her father’s performance 15 years ago, she and Mr. Mélenchon drew broad support among the young, and France’s mainstream parties were repudiated. The EU project is far from secure unless it can provide more economic opportunity and better security, and show more respect for voters who resent dictates from Brussels.

The French center held, barely. If Mr. Macron fails to deliver faster growth, France may not be so lucky the next time.

**The
New York
Times**

4 minutes

Editorial : France Elects Emmanuel Macron

The Editorial
Board

A mysterious, 11th-hour email hack of the Macron campaign appears to have made little or no difference to the eventual outcome. With projections showing Mr. Macron with more than 65 percent of the vote to 35 percent for the far-right, nationalist Marine Le Pen, his was a victory of hope and optimism over fear and reaction; of a future in Europe rather than in resentful isolation.

The victory was remarkable in many ways. When he enters the Élysée Palace to start his five-year term next weekend, Mr. Macron will be the youngest president in French republican history. He will be the first president in decades not to

come from one of the traditional parties of the left or right; he formed his own centrist political party, En Marche! (loosely translated as “Forward!”) barely a year ago. A student of philosophy, accomplished pianist, former investment banker and most recently minister of economy under President François Hollande, he had never before run for office.

But dramatic and impressive as his victory is, Mr. Macron faces formidable challenges. He is taking charge of a nation deeply divided, much like the United States, Britain and other major democracies, with many people feeling marginalized by globalization, economic stagnation,

an unresponsive government, unemployment, faceless terrorism and a tide of immigrants.

That a far-right nationalist like Ms. Le Pen could reach the second round of voting over the established parties, and then collect more than a third of the vote, was stark evidence of the despair of what she calls “les oubliés,” “the forgotten.”

In a victory address before a vast throng of cheering supporters in the courtyard of the Louvre, Mr. Macron acknowledged the divisions in French society and repeatedly invoked the “immense task” that lies ahead. That begins immediately: Achieving any of his goals, which

The decisive election of Emmanuel Macron, a 39-year-old political neophyte committed to the European Union, economic reform and traditional liberalism, as president of France offered powerful relief to everyone who had feared that France could become the next country to succumb to the wave of populism, nationalism and antiglobalism sweeping through Western democracies.

include reforming the stultifying French labor code, a perennial frustration for businesses, and cutting the bloated ranks of public employees, will require another political feat next month when

France votes for a new National Assembly. Mr. Macron's fledgling party plans to run candidates in all districts.

All that lies ahead. For now, there is the satisfaction that despite the

breakdown of traditional parties, despite considerable malaise in the French and European publics, and despite the email hack (causing fingers to be pointed at a familiar target, Moscow) French voters were

not seduced by nativist illusions and instead chose a youthful and optimistic president who believes that France must remain open, progressive, tolerant and European.



TODAY

4-5 minutes

President-elect Emmanuel Macron(Photo: Thierry Chesnot, Getty Images)

The French roundly rejected the isolationism and fear-mongering of populist French candidate Marine Le Pen in the presidential election Sunday, reembracing the European Union, the continent's decades-old experiment in economic union, stability and peace borne out of the ashes of World War II.

For an America that engaged in two costly wars in the past century spawned by a divided Europe, that's good news.

Centrist former economy minister Emmanuel Macron appeared to be on his way to an easy victory over Le Pen after voters overwhelmingly endorsed his promise of economic reform and a renewed commitment to making France competitive in the global economy.

Le Pen, in contrast, had promised a Brexit-like referendum aimed at pulling France out of the

Editorial : France rejects 'high priestess of fear'

The Editorial Board, USA

EU and rejection of the euro. France was a founding member of the EU and, as the world's sixth largest economy, its abandonment of the EU could have spelled doom for the 50-year-old institution.

The election was also the latest reckoning for an anti-immigrant fervor that has animated voters across Europe and America. In the final debate with Le Pen last week, Macron called her "the high priestess of fear." Similar angst over globalization and the influx of "outsiders" was the driving force behind Britain's vote last year to leave the EU and President Trump's surprise victory in November. But Sunday's results — following the narrow defeat of the far right in Austria's presidential election in December and a more resounding rejection of a right-wing populist in the Dutch elections in March — hold out hope that a populist insurgency has reached a high-water mark in Europe and is receding.

With victory in the presidential contest, Macron's struggle has only just started. He now leads a nation burdened with 10% unemployment — 25% among youth — caused as much by a cumbersome social welfare system and overregulated labor markets as by cut-throat international competition. And while

the messenger of French populism has suffered a defeat, the underlying concerns about globalization and Muslim immigration remain potent forces.

French voters made history during the initial round of voting by rejecting for the first time France's established political parties and have now done so a second time by coming together behind a 39-year-old independent centrist who has never held elected office.

The former investment banker's first big test will come in parliamentary elections in June. Macron and his new party, *En Marche!* or *Onward!*, faces the daunting task of beating out the established Socialist and Republican parties to secure a majority of parliament's 577 seats. Without that, Macron risks a prime minister chosen from one of those two opposing parties — more than likely, the conservative Republicans — and a divided government, which could leave him hamstrung as president. He needs a mandate for his vision of overhauling the nation's crushing labor code and creating jobs in a way that could alleviate French concerns about immigration.

Macron's embrace of free trade and a common currency for Europe are what Americans need to hear. The

EU, after all, is the United States' largest trading partner. Macron also has a healthy skepticism of President Vladimir Putin, who was embraced by Le Pen, and there are rumors that the massive, last-minute release of the Macron campaign documents was engineered by Russian hackers.

When Macron takes office next week, he will be modern France's youngest president. He faces stiff challenges immediately, but offers a far brighter alternative to the dark world of divisiveness and fear propagated by his now-vanquished opponent.

USA TODAY's editorial opinions are decided by its Editorial Board, separate from the news staff. Most editorials are coupled with an opposing view — a unique USA TODAY feature.

To read more editorials, go to the Opinion front page or sign up for the daily Opinion email newsletter. To respond to this editorial, submit a comment to letters@usatoday.com.

Read or Share this story: <https://usat.ly/2pUypVq>

Boston Globe : Editorial : Biggest loser in French election? Tech companies

May 07, 2017

3 minutes

THE LAST-MINUTE HACKING and social-media campaign against Emmanuel Macron may have failed to stop his victory in Sunday's French elections, but it did expose how little tech companies have improved since their failures during the US election last year. Social media giants like Facebook and Twitter have allowed themselves to become platforms for misinformation, rumors, and manipulation by Russian (and presumably other) intelligence services. Whatever Silicon Valley is

doing to raise standards, it's not working yet.

In the final hours of the campaign, Macron fell victim to a flurry of social media attacks allegedly based on hacked documents. Although French media outlets largely avoided reporting on the files, American social-media titans showed no such restraint. On Twitter, hashtag campaigns directed at Macron based on the hacks crested on Friday night. The campaign against Macron seems to be linked to Russian operatives and right-wing American activists, and included a mix of genuine documents and fakes purportedly related to his personal finances.

Advertisement

Luckily, the attacks didn't seem to matter: As polls predicted, the centrist Macron defeated the far-right candidate, Marine Le Pen, in a landslide of more than 20 points. Most other European leaders breathed a sigh of relief as the results came in, since the 39-year-old Macron is a strong supporter of the beleaguered European Union. Although President Trump tacitly supported Le Pen, there's no doubt that Macron's victory is also good news for the United States.

Historically, Silicon Valley companies were reluctant to accept the responsibilities of publishers,

clinging instead to the notion that social-media sites were mere platforms for users. But after Trump's election last year, aided by Russian hacks and fake news circulated online, tech giants promised to do a better job policing the content on their sites. "While the percentage of misinformation is relatively small, we have much more work ahead on our road map," Facebook founder Mark Zuckerberg wrote in November.

Clearly, though, there's still work ahead. A pivotal German election is scheduled for later this year. Will Silicon Valley be ready this time?



Rohac : Macron defeats LePen - France's next leader is no Hillary Clinton

Dalibor Rohac

4-5 minutes

First of all, a sigh of relief is in order. The election of Marine Le Pen in

France's presidential election on Sunday would have been bad news for France, for the United States, and for the world. Le Pen is no friend of conservatism – instead, as my AEI colleague Marc Thiessen put it, she is “the left’s caricature of Trump come to life.”

At home, her agenda of economic protectionism and government-led reindustrialization would lead the French economy closer to a precipice of a disaster. She advocated the withdrawal of France from the common European currency. Sure, the introduction of the Euro might have been an instance of overreach by European leaders at the time. However, Frexit, which would have been likely accompanied by a default on France’s sovereign debt, could trigger a global financial panic of a magnitude far exceeding the experience of 2008 and 2009.

Le Pen’s ties to Moscow are well known, including €11m worth of loans from Russia. The hacking of the emails of the campaign of her opponent, Emmanuel Macron, revealed just before the end of the campaign, does not appear accidental. Le Pen repeatedly denied that there

had been a Russian invasion of Ukraine and asserted that Crimea, annexed illegally by Vladimir Putin in 2014, “had always been Russian.”

Like the United States in 2016, France is living through a moment of public discontent with politics. The grievances behind the anger directed at the political class are real. Yet, those who are trying to draw parallels with the US election need to be careful. For one, Emmanuel Macron is no Hillary Clinton.

Sure, the 39-year old former banker and a graduate of one of the country’s most elite educational institutions, the *Ecole nationale d’administration*, might be seen vaguely as a member of the country’s establishment. Yet, he does not exude entitlement nor does he have a corrupt, self-serving political dynasty behind him. Notwithstanding the WikiLeaks’ dump of 9 gigabytes of stolen data from servers of his campaign on Friday, the most controversial thing about France’s president-elect seems to be the fact that he is married to his high school teacher, 24 years his elder.

None of this is meant to suggest that Macron’s decisive victory on Sunday is in itself a cause for celebrations. Just like in the case of former president Barack Obama, Macron’s biggest strength – the fact that people on the left and right are able to project their own ideas of hope and renewal on him – might easily become his biggest weakness.

In particular, unless the government he appoints moves aggressively to liberalize France’s labor markets, liberalize areas of the economy shielded from competition, and drive down the cost of doing business, the country will not see a return of economic dynamism. To be sure, France is far from being an economic basket case – its per capita income is comparable to that of the United Kingdom. However, with a growth rate of a mere 1.4 percent, the French economy is failing to generate economic opportunities. Since the onset of the crisis of 2008, youth unemployment has exceeded 20 percent and hundreds of thousands of particularly young French have left the country in search of jobs.

Red tape remains an acute problem too. According to the World Bank’s

Doing Business project, France ranks 100th in the world in the ease of registering property, behind Uzbekistan and Burundi. If an entrepreneur in France buys a piece of real estate, he will spend three times as much time dealing with bureaucrats than in an average developed economy.

Among other promises, Macron has vowed to change all that and turn France into a much more flexible and dynamic place, friendly to entrepreneurs and start-ups. But the necessary reforms are going to upset influential interest groups, particularly trade unions. Unless he can seize the window of opportunity of the first months of his presidency to radically transform the French economy, his presidency risks being a simple continuation of the status quo. That would make a 2022 victory by a candidate of either the far left or the far-right inevitable.

Dalibor Rohac is a research fellow at the American Enterprise Institute. Follow him on Twitter @DaliborRohac.



Milman : Le Pen and the future of France

Noah Millman
Published 6:49 p.m. ET May 7, 2017
| Updated 13 hours ago

3 minutes

Marine Le Pen on May 07, 2017, in Paris. (Photo: Thierry Chesnot, Getty Images)

Emmanuel Macron’s decisive victory in the French presidential election will be a great relief to the traditional political leadership of France, which overwhelmingly endorsed him in the second round, as well as to friends of liberal democracy around the world. But this relief will be short-lived if Macron and his supporters do not recognize the fragility of their success, and the

lack of popular support for key parts of their program.

The National Front roughly doubled its strongest prior performance in a presidential election, which is partly a testament to Marine Le Pen’s strengths as a campaigner, and her efforts to distance herself and her party from the legacy of her father, an admirer of the collaborationist Vichy regime and a nostalgist for the imperialist age of French Algeria.

However, her campaign was not about the past but about the future. The primary reason why Le Pen did as well as she did is the widespread and growing discontent with the future that France has been pursuing for the past generation, and which Macron’s campaign

exemplified: a future of ever-closer European integration and ever-weaker bonds of solidarity uniting the people of France.

Questions of sovereignty and identity were central to both campaigns. And while a clear majority of French voters have rejected precipitous withdrawal from the European Union, the stigmatization of immigrants, and an open embrace of Vladimir Putin’s Russia, the discontent with the French establishment consensus in all three areas is manifestly growing. Most fundamental is the urgent desire by French citizens simply for greater control over their individual and collective lives — a sense that they can choose their future, and not merely suffer it.

For now, there is a majority for a France that is “on the march.” But there is no clear majority for a France that is on the market. If Macron wishes to have a more successful term than his predecessor, he will keep that in mind.

If America wishes France to be a strong and successful ally, we should do the same.

Noah Millman is a senior editor at The American Conservative and a columnist at The Week.

Read or Share this story:
<https://usat.ly/2pkAupQ>



E. J. Dionne Jr. : Macron won — now comes the hard part

<http://www.facebook.com/ejdionne>

6-7 minutes

The voters of France acted responsibly and decently on Sunday. But they also sent a warning.

France’s new president-elect is Emmanuel Macron, a 39-year-old centrist whose solid victory over the National Front’s Marine Le Pen

offered yet another sign that the rise of President Trump is not the harbinger of a new and unhinged form of nationalism. For now, the center is holding, pluralism is hanging on, and the far right is being held in check. As they had in recent elections in Austria and the Netherlands, the friends of liberal democracy prevailed while Trump, who publicly tilted toward Le Pen, suffered another rebuke.

The fact that hackers went after Macron’s campaign and dumped

emails publicly just before the vote underscored the election’s international stakes. Russia strongly favored Le Pen and subsidized her party while ultra-right groups across the West saw a Le Pen victory as a chance to break up an alliance system that includes the European Union and NATO. The latest cyberattack increases the urgency of understanding Russia’s role in the 2016 election in the United States.

Opinions newsletter

Thought-provoking opinions and commentary, in your inbox daily.

Macron ran as a confident and unflinching advocate of pluralism and openness, and he will become, instantly, a major global voice for those values. But he will have to govern a deeply torn nation in a surly mood. Le Pen’s share of the vote, while not as high as her supporters had hoped and her detractors had feared, was still a major breakthrough for what had once been a pariah party long

dismissed as a neofascist movement rooted in unsavory aspects of French history. Like Trump, Le Pen rallied voters in once prosperous but now ailing industrial towns. Macron swept France's prospering and cosmopolitan big cities.

The creator of a political party that is only a year old, Macron faces significant challenges reflected in the unusually large number of blank protest ballots. He will have to take on or work around the country's established parties in June's legislative elections. He will also have to square the many circles of his neither-left-nor-right campaign platform. He promised both a more flexible regulatory climate for business and solid social protections for a 21st-century economy. Macron is both a former investment banker and a moderate social democrat. Demonstrating how these two sides of him fit together will define the drama of his presidency.

A particular test will be whether he is willing and able to nudge Germany

toward a less austere and constraining economic approach to southern Europe. Macron's election could signal a renewed Franco-German alliance. This would be a tonic for the E.U., but only if it becomes the engine for both reform and more widely shared growth. German Chancellor Angela Merkel quickly expressed her pleasure over Macron's victory.

None of this will be easy, and if Macron is unsuccessful and the mainstream French right fails to revive itself, many in France fear that Le Pen (who is only 48 years old) could win the next election five years from now.

Macron was endorsed by former President Barack Obama, and their similarities are striking: youth, a hopeful attitude toward the future, a vaguely progressive spirit of moderation and a well-advertised desire to overcome traditional divides.

Less remarked upon is their shared political luck. When Obama ran for the U.S. Senate in Illinois in 2004 —

the job that, along with his Democratic National Convention speech that year, propelled him to the national stage — two of his strongest rivals were forced out of the running by sex and marital scandals.

Macron would likely not even have made it to Sunday's runoff but for the troubles of two key competitors: François Fillon, the candidate of the mainstream right, was caught in a scandal involving paid no-show jobs for his family. The more moderate Socialist alternative, former prime minister Manuel Valls, lost his party's primary, opening new room in the political center.

But it took more than luck for the new French president to accomplish something most students of French politics thought impossible: From scratch, he built his own political party of the center, En Marche! Its name can be roughly translated as "Onward," though it might best be seen as a compact Gallic version of John F. Kennedy's "Let's get this country moving again."

While presidents of both the left and the right in France have often pursued moderate policies, the loyalties to political tribes and to the very concept of left vs. right — a French invention, after all — have typically stranded centrist politicians in a nowhere land.

Macron grasped that the old left/right divide is an increasingly imperfect construct for the new fissures in a Western politics organized around openness, pluralism and a transnational approach on the one side, and nationalism, more closed economies and a rejection of pluralism on the other.

In the 1990s, President Bill Clinton and British Prime Minister Tony Blair spoke of creating a "Third Way" in politics between an old left and a new right. Under far more trying circumstances, Emmanuel Macron's victory gives the Third Way a second chance — and liberal democracy a much-needed reprieve.



McArdle : In France, the 'Can't Lose' Candidate Pays a Price

@asymmetriconline
More stories by

Megan McArdle

7-9 minutes

Europe

Emmanuel Macron won by a landslide over the far-right candidate. Leading a coalition will be harder.

7 mai 2017 à 16:21 UTC-4

Emmanuel Macron won by a landslide over the far-right candidate. Leading a coalition will be harder.

Photographer: Thierry Chesnot/Getty Images

Emmanuel Macron was the "can't lose" candidate in the French presidential election. Impeccably well-credentialed. Handsome and sharp. Running against a far-right populist who spurs frightened talk of fascism. The polls showed him comfortably ahead, said the analysts. There was little chance that his opponent, Marine Le Pen of the National Front, could close such an enormous gap.

"Where have we heard that before?" muttered Americans.

As Election Day waned on on Sunday, slight traces of nervousness could be observed. Voter turnout was down from previous second-round elections, a circumstance that was thought to

favor Le Pen. Brexit Trump ... could Le Pen be about to add her name to the litany of nasty surprises for the globe's cosmopolitan ruling class?

Yeah, no. By 8 p.m., Paris time, Macron had been projected the landslide winner, with early returns showing him sweeping into office with roughly two-thirds of the vote. History may repeat itself. But the question is always "Which bit of history?" In the past few years, old establishments have been swept out by populist movements complaining that long rule had made them far too comfortable in their positions, too little responsive to the ordinary people who kept putting them in office. Well, this time around, a clear majority of those ordinary folks have opted for continuity with that past, rather than a radical break from it.

On Saturday, I asked Arun Kapil, a political scientist, to run down the implications of various vote tallies Le Pen might get. He broke it down for me thus:

45 percent of the vote: "An earthquake"

40 percent of the vote: "Very good for her"

High 30s: "Good, about what she's expecting"

Low 30s: "A disappointment"

Under 30 percent, he said, she would lose control of the party her father founded.

It looks like Le Pen will get about 35 percent, the electoral equivalent of "meh." On the one hand, this is a very good result for the National Front, which has long struggled to get political representation in line with the percentage of the population that supports them. France's two-round elections make it hard for them to win seats in the legislature, much less the presidency, because even if they make it into the second round, all the other parties gang up to deny them a win. The last time the National Front was in the second-round presidential election, in 2002, Le Pen's father collected only 17.7 percent of the vote. Marine Le Pen has doubled that.

In part, that's because neither the parties nor the voters mounted as fierce an effort to hold down her vote totals. François Fillon, the mainstream conservative candidate, immediately urged his supporters to turn out and vote for Macron. But Jean-Luc Mélenchon, the far left candidate who outperformed the stalwart old-guard left of the Socialist Party, was not so supportive. And voters, apparently almost as sick of politics-as-usual as they are afraid of Le Pen, often decided to stay home rather than turn out to vote "Anyone but Le Pen."

But if this is not a terrible result for the National Front, neither is it terribly exciting for them, no matter how hard they try to spin it into a moral victory. Getting a third of the

vote is all very well, but France's system is structured to require a clear majority. In a dispirited year, when populist waves seem to be advancing everywhere, two-thirds of voters rejected the party's politics in favor of an upstart no one had heard of a couple of years ago. Perhaps they are on an upswing that will deliver them the presidency five years hence. But then, perhaps they have a cap that will forever keep them distant from power -- close enough to see the presidency in reach, but never to reach it.

That does not, however, mean that politics-as-usual can simply keep on keeping on. For one thing, Macron's En Marche party still faces legislative elections in June. If it cannot get a legislative majority it will enter "La Cohabitation," an uneasy alliance with another party that will weaken the position Macron has just won. And while France tends to deliver its presidents legislative majorities to go along with their new office, a brand-new party like this one is not as well positioned as the old standbys to take the majority that Macron will need to govern as he wants.

The deeper issue is the fact that French voters were forced into the position of voting for a far-right nationalist or "God no, not that!"

Depressed turnout and record support for the National Front suggest that something real has happened in French politics, something that should worry the

establishment. Even if the party never makes it to the presidency, it may be able to play spoiler in future second rounds, effectively forcing the choice of president back to the first round of the elections.

Clear thinking from leading voices in business, economics, politics, foreign affairs, culture, and more.

Share the View

But it seems very possible that presidents who make it into office that way could find themselves without the political capital that comes from winning an election because a majority of voters wanted you, or at least, wanted your side of the political spectrum. Those who gain office simply by being somewhat less horrifying than the alternative may find it hard to amass

the popular support, and legislative majorities, they need to get anything done. Becoming the "can't lose" candidate could thus very easily turn out to be a no-win proposition.

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

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

Megan McArdle is a Bloomberg View columnist. She wrote for the Daily Beast, Newsweek, the Atlantic and the Economist and founded the blog Asymmetrical Information. She is the author of "The Up Side of Down: Why Failing Well Is the Key to Success."



Lucas : Why Macron's victory is reassuring ... and yet not

Edward Lucas

6-7 minutes

Story highlights

- Emmanuel Macron defeated Marine Le Pen in the second round of France's presidential election
- Edward Lucas: But his battle shows the fragility of a political system that can be easily exploited by outside powers like Russia

Edward Lucas is a senior editor at The Economist, where he was the Moscow bureau chief from 1998 to 2002. He is also senior vice president at the Center for European Policy Analysis, a Washington think tank. The opinions expressed in this commentary are his own.

(CNN)Here's the way Western democracies are supposed to work. Populist parties -- the ones that offer incendiary, crowd-pleasing answers -- belong on the fringes. Elections are fought between mainstream parties, which are big coalitions of idealists and pragmatists, reflecting well-structured social and economic interests. The outcome is decided by voters, not by foreign interference.

Not any more. What we are now seeing -- most recently in France -- is competition between the political mainstream, coalescing behind a single candidate, and its anti-systemic competitors.

The old coalitions are breaking down. The parties that once dominated politics are imploding. And a big -- although not yet decisive role -- has been played by an outsider, in the form of Russia

and its leaking of stolen e-mails.

It was a similar story in America, where the establishment (including a large slice of "Never Trump" Republicans) largely supported Hillary Clinton. But Donald Trump was able to beat her. Despite being a dodgy tycoon, he managed to crystallize public rage against a system dominated by dodgy rich people. Russian leaking of the Clinton campaign's e-mails helped too.

The same tide of rage against an unfair system and its smug beneficiaries, coupled with Russian interference, has been running strongly in France. It did not surge all the way up the beach because Emmanuel Macron was a much better candidate than Clinton. He was not part of a political dynasty. He was an outsider, of a kind. He did not reek of entitlement. His message of Europhile liberalism and modernization was considerably more inspiring than Clinton's, which was a barely disguised "it's my turn."

Macron's advantage is that he enjoys the support of the establishment but is not its captive. They rallied behind him. He doesn't have to do what they want.

But his victory came only because the French political system had in effect collapsed. President François Hollande has destroyed his Socialist Party. On the right, François Fillon's careless approach to public money (he hired his wife for a non-job) epitomized the self-interested disdain for the rules which has so corroded the establishment's legitimacy.

It may be that this weekend's election marks a turning point. Macron's En Marche! party may do stunningly well in next month's parliamentary elections, giving him a chance of forming an effective government. French politics may

realign with a modern center-left party, mildly pro-market but socially liberal on one side and more socially conservative and zealously free-market on the other.

But I wouldn't bet on it.

In particular, whatever happens on the left, it looks as though Le Pen is going to dominate the French political right for the foreseeable future. Though defeated in the presidential election, her strong showing is an excellent springboard for the upcoming parliamentary elections.

The Kremlin did not succeed in getting its chosen candidate, the ardently pro-Putin Fillon, elected. But it has succeeded in another, broader aim, of undermining the legitimacy and stability of the political system, and in changing the political calculus within it.

Perhaps the most striking fact about the first round of the French presidential campaign was that just over 60% of the voters chose the explicitly pro-Kremlin candidates: Fillon and Le Pen, as well as the hard left's Jean-Luc Mélenchon. Only 30% voted for Macron and the also-ran Socialist, Benoît Hamon. That is a stunning sign of Kremlin influence in a country which is a founder-member of NATO and one of Europe's only two nuclear powers.

With Britain largely disengaged from European security, at least until the agonies over Brexit are resolved, and with continuing uncertainty over Donald Trump's geopolitical instincts and consistency, Germany under Angela Merkel is now the last big pillar of the old Euro-Atlantic security order.

Having scored an unexpected victory in America's presidential election, and a near-miss in France, the Kremlin will be gunning for Merkel in the German elections this

fall. Russia may have lost the element of surprise, but it has not paid any significant political price for its meddling in Western countries' elections.

It would be nice to think that outrage over Russia's blatant meddling in the election, coupled with Macron's victory, reboots French -- and Western -- politics. An ideal opportunity comes with France's role in NATO's Enhanced Forward Presence in the Baltic states, as John Vinocur noted

in a powerful commentary

in the Wall Street Journal: "Macron promised that his first trip out of the country would be to 'visit the troops.' Election maneuvering apart, if he wants to say something significant about himself as a man of responsibility, the new commander-in-chief's destination ought to be the NATO battle-group barracks of the French marines in Tapa, Estonia."

The other question is about what, if anything, we will do to deter future Russian political attacks. In theory, we can do plenty. The thought of Western displeasure should terrify Vladimir Putin. The West, broadly defined, is seven times bigger than Russia in terms of population, and 14 times bigger in terms of GDP.

Yet the as the judo-loving Russian president knows all too well, a smaller opponent, if skilled, nimble and determined, can easily topple a bigger and stronger one.

Our political system has become extraordinary fragile as a result of our own greed, complacency and arrogance. Until we start fixing those problems, Russia will exploit them -- and win.



Boot : France's election proves it — America is now an example of what not to do

Max Boot

5-7 minutes

Americans have a long and ignoble tradition of telling jokes about the French. Old chestnuts such as "I'm

selling a French rifle: Never shot, dropped only once" became popular again in 2003 when the French --

wisely as it turns out — refused to join their U.S. allies in the invasion of Iraq. The House of Representatives cafeteria even renamed French fries, “freedom fries.”

Turns out the joke's on us.

The American electorate in November chose as our president an international laughingstock who is ignorant and impetuous, his chief saving grace being that his extremism is tempered by his incompetence.

By contrast, on Sunday, the French electorate decisively defeated Marine Le Pen, who trafficked in the same sort of racist and xenophobic rhetoric that Donald Trump rode to the White House. The winner by a landslide was Emmanuel Macron, who is young (at only 39, he is the youngest leader France has had since Napoleon), telegenic, intelligent and resolutely centrist. (Maybe the French should now, as suggested by Michael Tomasky, start calling steak well done with ketchup — Trump's preference — *bifteck à l'Américaine*.)

It is telling that, while Barack Obama endorsed Macron, Trump openly pulled for Le Pen. It didn't matter to him (or was he simply unaware?) that she and her National Front party have a long history of anti-Semitism, racism, anti-Americanism, pro-Putinism and Holocaust denial.

Le Pen has tried to clean up her act in public, but her mask slipped when she denied Vichy France's complicity in the deportation of French Jews to the concentration camps. She remains surrounded, according to one of her former advisors, by “real Nazis.”

That did not deter Trump from delivering a quasi-endorsement. After a terrorist attack in Paris just before the first round of voting, Trump tweeted: “Another terrorist attack in Paris. The people of France will not take much more of this. Will have a big effect on presidential election!” He told the Associated Press: “I think that it'll probably help her because she is the strongest on borders and she is the strongest on what's been going on in France.”

This turned out to be wishful thinking. The terrorist attack did not help Le Pen's cause. Neither did the transparent attempts of the Russian intelligence services to target Macron the way they had targeted Hillary Clinton. Friday night, 9 gigabytes of stolen emails and documents from the Macron campaign appeared online on the 4Chan website favored by the alt right, soon to be picked up by WikiLeaks, the Kremlin's bulletin board of choice. The digital fingerprints of Fancy Bear, the nickname for a group of Russian intelligence hackers, were reportedly all over this operation. Funny how

pro-Kremlin candidates never seem to get hacked.

It was too little, too late. In fact, because of a French blackout of election-related news the day before and the day of an election, all that voters knew was that someone — almost certainly someone in Moscow — was trying to sabotage the Macron campaign. The French were mercifully spared the kind of credulous reporting on the contents of the leak that occurred in the United States, where news outlets used Kremlin-provided documents to embarrass and distract the Clinton campaign. The French were smarter than we were: They did not let Vladimir Putin cast a ballot in their election.

In fairness, however, France, and indeed the whole world, benefited from watching what happened in the United States. Our presidential election made clear that populist-nationalist extremists are a serious threat — they can actually take power. Voters elsewhere have been forewarned and forearmed, which surely helped to account for the failure of ultra-nationalist candidates in the Austrian, Dutch and now French elections. Once a shining city on a hill, America is now an example of what *not* to do.

That France rejected Le Pen, and so decisively, is a welcome message that the center, socially liberal but market-oriented, can still hold in

spite of the disorienting disturbances wrought in all modern societies by the forces of automation, immigration, de-industrialization, globalization and multiculturalism — all phenomena that are particularly disruptive to poorer, less-educated voters. But to hold extremism at bay, Macron will have to prove a more effective president than the Socialist he once served and now replaces — Francois Hollande.

France must still deal with a large, unassimilated class of Muslim immigrants who are prey to crime and terrorism; with unsustainable levels of government spending (57% of GDP); high unemployment (10.1% overall; 23.7% among the young); and crippling regulations, such as a 35-hour workweek, that hold back the economy (1.1% growth last year). Macron will somehow have to cut government spending and taxes, loosen regulations and enhance assimilation. If he does not succeed, rest assured that either Le Pen or some other demagogue will arise in the future.

But for now at least the danger of an illiberal rabble-rouser taking office has been averted in France — if not, alas, here.

Max Boot is a contributing writer to Opinion and a senior fellow at the Council on Foreign Relations.



El-Erian : What Macron Can Do for Free Markets Everywhere

@elerianm More stories by

Mohamed A. El-Erian

7-8 minutes

Europe

He can help open the way for better economic governance in the West rather than just setting the stage for a bigger political shock.

by

7 mai 2017 à 16:54 UTC-4

From campaigning to governing.

Photographer: /Getty Images

Once the initial market relief plays out -- that, even during an unprecedented “anti-establishment” wave in both Europe and the U.S., French voters rejected a far right president in Marine Le Pen of the National Front -- interest will shift to how relative newcomer Emmanuel Macron will manage to govern in a country accustomed to mainstream politics. And it is not just about his prospects for reinvigorating the French economy and, working

closely with Germany, spearheading a modernization of Europe. It is also about a bigger and more consequential issue: the extent to which endogenous political disruptions are opening the way for better economic governance in the West rather than just setting the stage for a bigger eventual political shock.

Preliminary results from France confirm what markets were expecting: a decisive loss for Le Pen. With the markets' near certainty now becoming certainty, this is likely to give a further boost to risk sentiment in the short-run. However, the resulting rise in stocks, the appreciation of the Euro, and the fall in the France-Germany government bond spreads will likely be tempered by what has already been priced following Macron's first round win and the opinion polls forecasting Sunday's vote. Meanwhile, the European Central Bank and the Swiss National Bank will be putting their contingency plans back on the shelf, with the ECB also preparing for greater pressure to ease off the monetary policy accelerator.

Beyond the immediate reactions, much will depend on the consequences of an establishment shakeup that speaks to considerable dissatisfaction among younger citizens. Remember, over half of them voted in the first round for fringe candidates: Le Pen of the extreme right and Jean-Luc Melenchon on the far left.

Like her father's loss to Jacques Chirac in 2002, Le Pen was unable to convert her relatively good first round showing into sufficient country-wide support in the second round of the presidential elections. Instead, she lost to a combination of genuine support for Macron and the coming together of voters insisting that France should not be led by someone from the National Front.

This highlights the challenges facing Macron who, just a few months ago, was a long shot in a crowded presidential field. He inherits a divided nation that, yes, resisted extreme politics yet remains highly dissatisfied with a system that has staggered through too many years of low growth, high youth unemployment, and glaring inequalities.

Now that Macron has been elected, markets will be gradually shifting their focus to his ability to overcome gridlock both at home and in Europe. Ahead of parliamentary elections in June, his choice of prime minister will signal how he intends to “cohabitate” as he tries to reinvigorate France within what he hopes will be a stronger and more coherent growth-oriented Europe. He must both cooperate with and shape a National Assembly whose long-standing mainstream parties just suffered a humiliating defeat at the polls.

It is a challenge that, in many ways, is similar to that facing two other G7 leaders who came to their countries' highest office on the back of the anti-establishment wave -- President Donald Trump of the U.S. and Prime Minister Theresa May of Britain. All three leaders agree that the economy can -- and should -- benefit from low corporate tax rates and a slimmed-down government. They also agree that regionalization and globalization -- as well as the evolution of national identity -- need to pay greater attention to both real and perceived economic losers,

even if they constitute a minority relative to the beneficiaries.

More generally, the Macron-May-Trump outcomes speak to an historic internal disruption to the functioning of traditional politics in the advanced world. And it is part of the larger erosion of trust, credibility, and effectiveness of the establishment, and not just in the public sector.

The jury is still out as to whether these three leaders will be able to lead mainstream-dominated parliaments in unleashing productivity, economic growth, and more inclusive market-based

economies. Much will depend on the reaction of establishment forces that remain in control of significant parts of the public and private sectors.

Rather than a decisive blow to anti-establishment wave, as some are claiming, Macron's victory is a stop along a journey whose destination is still in question.

Clear thinking from leading voices in business, economics, politics, foreign affairs, culture, and more.

Share the View

If the internal political disruption France and other Western countries

are experiencing delivers higher and more inclusive growth, it will mark a revitalization of liberal democracies in a pro-market fashion. If it fails, it is just a matter of time before France will be dealing with a more mainstream National Front, more inward anti-establishment forces, and greater sympathy for the view that the Eurozone is about the past and not the future. And that is an outcome that markets would find destabilizing.

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

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

Mohamed A. El-Erian is a Bloomberg View columnist. He is the chief economic adviser at Allianz SE and chairman of the President's Global Development Council, and he was chief executive and co-chief investment officer of Pimco. His books include "The Only Game in Town: Central Banks, Instability and Avoiding the Next Collapse."

**The
New York
Times**

Cohen : Macron and the Revival of Europe (online)

Roger Cohen

4-5 minutes

That will require reform. Europe, complacent, has lost traction. Macron recognized this. He declared, "I want to re-weave the bond between citizens and Europe." More transparency, more accountability and more creativity are required. No miracle ever marketed itself more miserably than the European Union.

Macron, who came from nowhere in the space of a year at the head of a new political movement, did not make facile promises or make up stories. He stood by refugees; he stood by Europe's shared currency, the euro; and he was prepared to tell the French that they cannot turn their back on modernity and prosper.

Through rational argument he increased a lead over Le Pen that polls put at 20 percent after the first round two weeks ago to 30 percent, winning with 65 percent of the vote

to Le Pen's 35 percent. This, in the age of Trump's fake news, fake claims, and overall fakeness, was an important demonstration that reason and coherence still matter in politics.

Now the hard part begins. For the first time in France, the far right took more than a third of the vote, a reflection of the anger in the country at lost jobs, failed immigrant integration and economic stagnation. Macron, who said he was aware of "the anger, the anxiety, the doubts" needs to address this social unease head-on by reviving a sense of possibility in France. Without change, Le Pen will continue to gain support.

Change is notoriously hard to fashion in France. It is a country fiercely attached to the "acquis," or acquired rights, enshrined in its comprehensive welfare state. Many have tried. Many have failed.

It is especially hard without strong parliamentary backing, and Macron will need that. Parliamentary elections will be held next month. His En Marche! (Onward!)

movement must organize fast to build on his victory. It has extraordinary momentum. The traditional political landscape of the Fifth Republic — the alternation of center-left Socialists and center-right Republicans — has been blown apart.

Perhaps this very feat, without parallel in recent European political history, and Macron's status as a centrist independent give him unique latitude to persuade the French, at last, that they can — like the Germans and the Dutch and the Swedes and the Danes — preserve the essence of their welfare state while forging a more flexible labor market that gives hope to the young. With 25 percent of its youth unemployed, France undoes itself.

If France grows again, Europe will grow with it. This would constitute a powerful rebuke to the autocratic-nationalist school — Le Pen with her sham of a political makeover, the xenophobic buffoon Nigel Farage in Britain (friend of Trump), Putin in Moscow, Recep Tayyip Erdogan in Turkey, and of course the American

president himself, whose irresponsibility on the subject of America's European allies has been appalling.

Macron's is a victory for many things. He has demonstrated that France is not a country where racism and anti-European jingoism can win an election. He has reasserted the European idea and raised the possibility that France and Germany will conjure a revival of European idealism. He has rebuked the little Englishers who voted to take Britain out the Union (and made a tough negotiation on that exit inevitable).

Above all, through his intelligence and civility, his culture and his openness, Macron has erected a much-needed barrier to the crassness and incivility, the ignorance and the closed-mindedness that seeps from Trump's Oval Office and threatens to corrupt the conduct of world affairs.

Vive la France! Vive l'Europe! Now more than ever.

**The
New York
Times**

Sansal : The Altered State of France (online)

Boualem Sansal

4 minutes

Certainly, he greatly enlivened the campaign. What an entertainer, what a strategist, that Jean-Luc! Thank you for the good times. Our incorrigibly romantic side appreciated that slogan you coined on the eve of the first round of voting: "Let the happy days come. Let us taste happiness!"

By weakening Les Républicains, the Socialist Party and the National Front, Mélenchon will have served Macron and the oligarchs — while scoring something of a win for

himself. See you for the legislative elections in June.

The other unknown in this story was the people. It's too stupid, it was said; a flock of anxious sheep, and unpredictable. In fact, maybe the moment has come to change the people. This one's time is over. It still talks about Charles de Gaulle, Jean Jaurès, Joan of Arc. And it did balk a little: On election day, registered voters abstained in record numbers.

Out of this great hodgepodge now comes Macron. Never before elected to office, the head of a movement just one year old, he is France's new president. Any doubts that he would eventually win were a pretense to deflect suspicions about

political manipulation. Fillon was investigated for embezzlement, and French judges asked to lift Le Pen's immunity as an European Union parliamentarian so they could look into charges that she diverted money. Yet they wouldn't start an inquiry into Macron's assets, even though many candidates called for one.

But even this is small potatoes, horseplay, piddling tales about big ambitions. Valls, Juppé, Le Pen, Fillon, Macron, Mélenchon, John Doe — they're all the same, give or take. France changes presidents every five years, but nothing about them ever really changes.

France no longer governs itself anyway; Europe always has a say.

And because of globalization, the world now turns only one way — the way of the banking cartel, which took over from the oil producers' cartel, which had taken over from the mining cartel.

That's why it was so important for globalized issues — Islamization, terrorism, climate change, migration, the erosion of international institutions — to be discussed during the campaign. Yet they were barely evoked. Maybe it's because we feel helpless in the face of these problems. But being unable to change something isn't a reason not to look at it.

Nor did this presidential campaign do much to address the midterm and long-term strategic choices that

France faces. Can the country reinvent its institutions? More important: Can it reverse its decline? Can it reclaim its role as the engine of Europe, especially versus Germany? Instead the campaign was about resource management and account

balances. While talking shop the candidates waxed lyrical at times only to sound grand. Throughout they bowed to the tyranny of short-termism and make-no-waves-ism.

On both the left and the right, the grand old parties of yore have been

shattered, discredited. The reshuffling of France's political life is like spring cleaning. Meanwhile, the presidency has been considerably weakened. Thank you, Nicolas Sarkozy and François Hollande. Macron, who inherits a much depreciated office, will soon

discover how little room to maneuver he will have in that position — and all the more so because he will also be the hostage of the disparate troupe that got him there.

The
Washington
Post

Macron wins presidency as France rejects Le Pen and her right-wing populist tide (UNE)

<https://www.facebook.com/griff.witte>

ook.com/griff.witte

11-13 minutes

PARIS — France on Sunday shrugged off the siren call of right-wing populism that enchanted voters in the United States and United Kingdom, rejecting anti-E.U. firebrand Marine Le Pen and choosing as its next president Emmanuel Macron, a centrist political neophyte who has pledged to revive both his struggling country and the flailing continent.

The result brought to a close a tumultuous and polarized campaign that defied prediction at nearly every turn, although not at the end. Pre-election polls had forecast a sizable Macron victory, and he delivered — winning some 66 percent of the vote.

The landslide was just the latest blow in 2017 for far-right movements that had seemed to be on the march last year but have suffered setbacks in recent months across continental Europe.

In a pointed endorsement of European unity, Macron strode to the stage at his raucous victory party in the grand central courtyard of Paris's Louvre Museum on Sunday night to the strains of Beethoven's "Ode to Joy" theme, the European Union's anthem.

"The task that awaits us, my fellow citizens, is immense and it starts tomorrow," Macron said as thousands of supporters cheered and waved French flags.

The leader of the far-right National Front party thanked her 11 million supporters and said that the country had 'chosen continuity.' Marine Le Pen concedes French election to Emmanuel Macron (Reuters)

(Reuters)

Alluding to the deep divisions laid bare by the campaign, he said Le Pen backers had "expressed an anger, a dismay, and I respect that. I will do everything possible in the five years to come so that they have no reason to vote for the extremes."

[Macron's unlikely path to the French presidency]

At her own gathering at a Paris restaurant and events center, a downcast Le Pen conceded defeat, telling her demoralized supporters that the country had "chosen continuity" and that the election had drawn clear lines between "the patriots and the globalists."

She also vowed to make her National Front the "primary force of opposition" to Macron's government.

The repudiation of Le Pen by French voters will soothe Europe's anxious political establishment. Across the continent, mainstream politicians had feared that a victory would throw in reverse decades of efforts to forge continental integration.

But the outcome instantly puts pressure on Macron to deliver on promises made to an unhappy French electorate, including reform of two institutions notoriously resistant to change: the E.U. and the French bureaucracy.

At 39, the trim, blue-eyed and square-jawed Macron will become France's youngest leader since Napoleon when he is inaugurated Sunday, and his election caps an astonishing rise.

With a background in investment banking and a turn as economy minister under a historically unpopular president, he may have seemed an ill fit for the anti-establishment anger coursing through Western politics.

But by bucking France's traditional parties and launching his own movement — En Marche, or Onward — Macron managed to cast himself as the outsider the country needs. And by unapologetically embracing the E.U., immigration and the multicultural tableau of modern France, he positioned himself as the optimistic and progressive antidote to the dark and reactionary vision of Le Pen's National Front.

Le Pen, 48, has long sought to become the first far-right leader elected in Western Europe's post-war history. Sunday's vote frustrated those ambitions but is unlikely to end them.

By winning about 34 percent of the vote, she nearly doubled the share claimed by her father, Jean-Marie Le Pen, in the 2002 election, the only other time the National Front's presidential candidate has made it to the second round of voting. The result seemed to cement the party's long march from the political fringe to the center of the nation's discontented political discourse, if not the pinnacle of its power.

[Marine Le Pen lost the French election. But her power is growing.]

Struggling with chronically high unemployment and recurrent terrorist attacks, France's mood on the day of its presidential vote was reflected in the dark clouds and chilly spring rains that blanketed much of the country.

Nonetheless, the public voted at a rate that would be the envy of many Western democracies: From the chic neighborhoods of Paris to the struggling post-industrial towns of the French countryside, turnout nationwide was about 75 percent, down slightly from previous votes.

No matter whom French voters picked, the choice was bound to be historic.

The dominant two parties of France's Fifth Republic were both eliminated in the first round. The center-left Socialists were decimated, brought low by the failure of incumbent President François Hollande to turn around the economy or to prevent a succession of mass-casualty terrorist attacks.

The center-right Republicans, meanwhile, missed what was once seen as a sure-fire bet at returning to power after their candidate, former prime minister François Fillon, was hobbled by a series of corruption allegations.

The two candidates who remained, Le Pen and Macron, both traced an outsider's path as they sought residence at the Elysee Palace.

Of the two, Macron had the more direct route. But his campaign still had to overcome all the usual challenges of a start-up, plus some extraordinary ones — including the publication online Friday night of thousands of hacked campaign

documents in a cyberattack that aroused suspicions of Russian meddling.

The outcome of Sunday's vote will have profound implications not only for France's 67 million citizens, but also for the future of Europe and for the political trajectory across the Western world.

After a pair of dramatic triumphs for the populist right in 2016 — with Brexit in Britain and Donald Trump in the United States — France's vote was viewed as a test of whether the political mainstream could beat back a rising tide.

[A youth revolt in France boosts the far right]

Many of Europe's mainstream leaders — both center-right and center-left — lined up to cheer Macron on after he punched his ticket to the second round in voting last month. The endorsements were a break from protocol for presidents and prime ministers, who normally stay out of one another's domestic elections.

But they reflected the gravity of the choice that France faced. A victory by Le Pen was seen as a possible market-rattling death blow to decades of efforts to draw Europe more closely together, with the National Front leader expected to try to take the country out of both the E.U. and the euro.

Former president Barack Obama had also endorsed Macron, and the young French politician often appeared to be trying to emulate the magic of Obama's 2008 campaign with speeches that appealed to hope, change and unity — while eliding many of the details of his policies.

The current White House occupant was cagey about his choice, saying before the first round that Le Pen was "the strongest on borders and she's the strongest on what's been going on in France." Trump predicted that she would do well, but he stopped short of endorsing her.

After Macron's victory, Trump tweeted congratulations shortly after 3 p.m. Washington time on "his big win today as the next President of

France. I look very much forward to working with him!"

On the campaign trail this spring, Le Pen's rhetoric had often echoed Trump's, with vows to put "France first" and to defend "the forgotten France." She also condemned globalist cosmopolitans — Macron chief among them — who she said did not have the nation's interests at heart.

But Le Pen had distanced herself from Trump since his inauguration, often declining to mention him by name, and analysts said her association with the unpopular U.S. president may have hurt her among French voters.

Macron has almost nothing in common with Trump except one key fact: Like the New York real estate tycoon, Macron became president of his country on his first run for elective office.

The son of doctors who was raised in the northern city of Amiens, Macron had to teach himself the basics of campaigning on the fly in the white-hot glare of a presidential race.

Vowing during the campaign to borrow from both left and right, he will now have to learn how to govern a country without the backing of any of its traditional parties.

Instead, he has a movement that he built from scratch, and faces the immediate challenge of getting Onward Allies elected to the National Assembly.

That vote, due next month, will determine whether Macron has the parliamentary support he needs to enact an agenda of sweeping economic reforms, many of which are likely to unsettle the country's deeply entrenched labor unions.

Despite his victory, pre-election polls showed that most of Macron's supporters saw themselves voting against Le Pen rather than for him.

That was reflected on the streets Sunday, with voters even in heavily pro-Macron neighborhoods of Paris saying they felt more resigned than excited.

"On the one hand you have a far-right party that will take us straight to disaster," said Gilbert Cohen, a

retired 82-year-old engineer who cast his ballot amid the vaulted ceilings of Paris's 17th-century Place des Vosges, a former royal residence that was also home to Victor Hugo. "On the other, you have the candidate who's the only reasonable choice we have."

[Emmanuel Macron is 39 and his wife is 64. French women say it's about time.]

Elsewhere in France, the mood was even more markedly downbeat. In Laon, a small and struggling city 90 miles north of Paris, many voters said they were so disillusioned by the choice that they would cast a blank ballot.

Others said their disenchantment had led them to Le Pen — and a hope that, despite the polls, she could still eke out a victory that would bring the radical break for France that they crave.

"We've had 50 years of rule from the left and the right," said Francis Morel, a 54-year-old bread maker who cast his ballot for Le Pen. "Nothing has changed."

The mood was considerably more cheerful Sunday night at the Louvre, where Macron supporters gathered in what was once the seat of French kings for their candidate's victory party.

Today's WorldView

What's most important from where the world meets Washington

Valentin Coutouly, a 23-year-old student who described himself as "European to the core," said the campaign had been a whirl of emotion, with anxiety setting in near the end. "I think we were all afraid that Le Pen could actually win," he said.

But as the reality of a Macron presidency washed over the crowd, he could sum up his mood in three words:

"I feel relieved."

Stanley-Becker reported from Laon. Benjamin Zagzag in Laon and Virgile Demoustier in Paris contributed to this report.

**The
New York
Times**

Macron Decisively Defeats Le Pen in French Presidential Race (UNE)

Alissa J. Rubin
6-7 minutes

PARIS — Emmanuel Macron, a youthful former investment banker, handily won France's presidential election on Sunday, defeating the staunch nationalist Marine Le Pen after voters firmly rejected her far-right message and backed his call for centrist change.

Mr. Macron, 39, who has never held elected office, will be the youngest president in the 59-year history of France's Fifth Republic after leading an improbable campaign that swept aside France's establishment political parties.

The election was watched around the world for magnifying many of the broader tensions rippling through Western democracies, including the United States: populist anger at the political mainstream, economic insecurity among middle-class voters and rising resentment toward immigrants.

Mr. Macron's victory offered significant relief to the European Union, which Ms. Le Pen had threatened to leave. His platform to loosen labor rules, make France more competitive globally and deepen ties with the European Union is also likely to reassure a global financial market that was jittery at the prospect of a Le Pen victory.

Her loss provided further signs that the populist wave that swept Britain out of the European Union and Donald J. Trump into the White House may have crested in Europe, for now.

"I understand the divisions of our country that have led some to vote for extremists," Mr. Macron said after the vote. "I understand the anger, the anxiety, the doubts that a great part among us have also expressed."

Mr. Macron pledged to do all he could in his five-year term to bring France together. "I will do everything I can in the coming five years to make sure you never have a reason to vote for extremism again," he said later Sunday evening, standing before the glass pyramid in front of the Louvre, once the main residence of France's kings, as thousands of flag-waving supporters gathered in the courtyard to celebrate.

But the election results showed that many people chose not to vote for either candidate, signaling skepticism about his project. And Mr. Macron quickly made clear that he understood the magnitude of the task before him after an often angry campaign.

Supporters Elated by Macron's Election

French citizens hoping the centrist candidate would become France's next president were overcome with

joy and relief as the final result came in.

By CAMILLA SCHICK and STEFANIA ROUSSELLE on May 7, 2017. Photo by Eric Feferberg/Agence France-Presse — Getty Images. Watch in Times Video »

"It is my responsibility to hear and protect the most fragile," he said.

With nearly 100 percent of the vote counted, Mr. Macron had 66 percent, compared with 34 percent for Ms. Le Pen, according to the official count from the Interior Ministry.

The outcome was a watershed for Ms. Le Pen's party, the far-right National Front, giving it new legitimacy even though the results showed that the party remains anathema to much of the French electorate for its history of anti-Semitism, racism and Nazi nostalgia.

As significant for France and for Mr. Macron's future, nearly 34 percent of eligible voters did not cast a ballot or cast a blank or null one, suggesting that a large number of people could not bring themselves to vote for him. The abstention rate was the highest since 1969.

That lack of support presaged a difficult road ahead as Mr. Macron tries to build a legislative majority to push through his program. French parliamentary elections are next

month. Currently, he has no party in Parliament.

Among the odds stacked against Mr. Macron, a former economy minister in the departing Socialist government, are deep doubts about the merits of a market economy.

"We saw the emergence of very strong anticapitalist forces," said Gaspard Koenig, the director of the French think tank Generation Libre.

"You have 50 percent of the electorate that reject the market economy in a very radical way," Mr. Koenig added. "Thus, he must during the next five years convince people that there are alternatives to the destruction of capitalism that can help them."

The runoff election was groundbreaking for being a choice between two political outsiders, as well as for its rancor and for an apparent attempt to sway the vote with the hacking of Macron campaign emails, similar to the attack directed at last year's election in the United States.

Ms. Le Pen, 48, conceded the election not long after polls closed in France, saying voters had chosen "continuity," denying Mr. Macron his outsider status and linking him to the departing Socialists.

The vote was a record for the National Front and, she said, a mandate for it to become a new "patriotic and republican alliance"

that would be “the primary opposition force against the new president.”

Ms. Le Pen earned 10.6 million votes, close to twice the number her father, Jean-Marie Le Pen, received when he ran a losing presidential campaign against Jacques Chirac in 2002. The 34 percent of the vote Ms. Le Pen won was the highest share the French had ever given to her party.

**The
New York
Times**

Why Macron Won: Luck, Skill and France's Dark History (UNE)

Adam Nossiter

7-8 minutes

Mr. Macron, on the other hand, demonstrated a quality that French voters, unlike many Anglo-Saxon ones, have long found essential in their successful candidates: cool mastery of the critical issues confronting the country. Where Ms. Le Pen repeatedly lost herself in the weeds, Mr. Macron sailed right through them. Whether he will now be able to translate that knowledge into action is another question.

So far he has been the beneficiary of spectacular luck.

Four months ago he was polling a distant third, an all-but-certain loser whose maverick, nonparty movement was considered promising for the future but unripe. The soaring banality of his rhetoric appeared to turn off as many voters as it inspired. His rallies began in enthusiasm but soon sagged under the weight of his speechifying.

But that was before the center-right front-runner François Fillon imploded under the weight of an embezzlement scandal, fueling Mr. Macron's rise in the general election in April and into the final pairing with Ms. Le Pen. Many Fillon voters turned reluctantly to Mr. Macron on Sunday, rejecting Ms. Le Pen, who had made a concerted pitch for voters of Mr. Mélenchon, the fourth-place finisher, who advocated a similar anticapitalist platform. And Mr. Macron was lucky to face Ms. Le Pen, a candidate considered simply unacceptable by a majority of the French.

The election was also the first in which the National Front candidate — rather than being a pariah who was shut out of debates and kept off the front pages of major newspapers, as happened in 2002 — was treated more like a normal candidate despite the party's anti-Semitic and racist roots.

After taking over the party leadership in 2011, Ms. Le Pen worked to distance the National Front from her father, its founder.

Mr. Macron with President François Hollande, center, and Prime Minister Manuel Valls in 2015. Mr. Macron had been Mr. Hollande's economy minister. Lionel Bonaventure/Agence France-Presse — Getty Images

But he also played his limited hand with great skill from the beginning, outmaneuvering his elders. First, he wisely renounced the man who had given him his break, the deeply unpopular Socialist president François Hollande, quitting his post as economy minister in Mr. Hollande's government before it was too late. Then, he refused to take part in the Socialist Party primary in January, rightly judging that party activists would dominate and choose a far-left candidate on the fringes, who would then be devoured by Mr. Mélenchon — exactly what happened.

Mr. Macron's final correct bet was that French voters, like those elsewhere, were disgusted by the mainstream parties, having judged the policy prescriptions of both the establishment right and left as failures in dealing with France's multiple ills. He positioned himself in the center, drawing on left and right, balancing protection of the French welfare state with mild encouragement for business, in an attempt to break through France's employment and productivity stagnation.

But Mr. Macron's pro-market views stirred much opposition. Mr. Mélenchon not only refused to endorse him, but also encouraged the idea that Mr. Macron and Ms. Le Pen were equivalent menaces — a calculation endorsed by many far-left voters. Nearly half the first-round electorate voted for candidates

Stéphane Ravier, a National Front senator and a close adviser to Ms. Le Pen, said the party needed to go further in remaking its identity.

“We will need to make some changes, do things differently,” he said in an interview as the returns came in. “We will have to talk about our positions on the euro with more pedagogy. We may also have to change the name of the party.”

hostile to the free market and to capitalism. Even if they voted for Mr. Macron on Sunday to save the country from Ms. Le Pen, they did so without enthusiasm.

A high school student with a poster reading “neither banker, nor racist” in reference to Marine Le Pen's nationalist campaign and Mr. Macron's pro-business campaign during a demonstration in Paris on Thursday. François Mori/Associated Press

Some of the antipathy sprang from his hermetic persona, as a caricature of the elite-educated, know-it-all technocrats, perpetually encased in a dark suit, who have guided France for much its postwar history, usually from behind the scenes, and whose record is mixed.

“He's not someone I feel a lot of conviction for,” said Thomas Goldschmidt, a 26-year-old architectural firm employee in Paris who voted for Mr. Macron after supporting the Socialist Benoît Hamon in the first round. “He's someone who raises a lot of questions. It's a vision of society that is too business-friendly,” Mr. Goldschmidt said. “It's this whole idea of making working life more uncertain. We just can't bet on it, that everyone out there can be an entrepreneur. Society isn't built like that.”

Mr. Macron seems aware that his large victory isn't a large mandate, that the pressure is now on to ensure that France's reprieve from the National Front is not just a temporary one. “If I fail to solve” France's problems “or fail to offer a solid start to solving them, in five years it will be even worse,” he told the left-wing news website

In her concession speech, Ms. Le Pen acknowledged that the party had to “profoundly” renew itself to become a “new political force.”

Ms. Le Pen clearly failed to persuade enough voters that her party had sufficiently changed. Many of the votes Mr. Macron received on Sunday were no doubt cast less in support of him than in rejection of her. Nearly the entire political establishment spoke out against a Le Pen presidency.

Mediapart on Friday night. “What nourishes the National Front will be even more virulent,” he added.

Without an established party behind him, Mr. Macron's most immediate hurdle will be in June's legislative elections for France's Parliament. He has promised to field candidates in all 577 parliamentary districts, but whether he can do so is unclear. Nor is it clear how many Socialists will support his program.

The National Front could win as many as 100 seats in the new Parliament, according to some analyses, making it a formidable opposition party. Indeed, even as Ms. Le Pen was soundly defeated on Sunday, she still managed a showing that not too long ago would have been unthinkable. And in her concession, she made it clear that she was already looking toward the parliamentary elections, and the future.

Then there is the potential opposition represented by Mr. Mélenchon, who won in some of France's biggest cities — Marseille, Toulouse and Lille — and is already claiming the mantle of Mr. Macron's principal opponent on the left. His voters, as much as Ms. Le Pen's, do not trust Mr. Macron.

Mr. Macron, in his uncharacteristically brief and sober victory speech on Sunday night, recognized that he had many people to win over.

“My responsibility will be to unite all the women and men ready to take on the tremendous challenges which are waiting for us, and to act,” Mr. Macron said. “I will fight with all my power against the divisions that undermine us, and which are tearing us apart.”

**THE WALL
STREET
JOURNAL**
Meichtry

7-9 minutes

Emmanuel Macron Wins French Presidency (UNE)

William Horobin
and Stacy

Updated May 7, 2017 11:03 p.m. ET

PARIS— Emmanuel Macron was elected president of France Sunday in a victory for a political newcomer who campaigned on promises to reform France's heavily regulated

economy and fight a tide of nationalism sweeping the European Union.

The 39-year-old former investment banker, who won 66.1% of the vote, has vowed to undertake contentious

labor reforms in France as part of a push for greater economic convergence among the European Union's fractious member states.

Marine Le Pen, who ran on a plan to pull the country out of the euro and

close its borders to migrants, took 33.9%. The results surpassed pollsters' predictions that Mr. Macron would win about 60%.

Mr. Macron will become the youngest president in French history at a time when France and the EU, the 60-year political project it helped found, are at a major crossroads.

Nearly a decade of lost economic growth for many EU countries has fueled the rise of Ms. Le Pen and other nationalists across the Continent, emboldened by the British vote to leave the EU, or Brexit, and the election of U.S. President Donald Trump.

"I know the divisions in our nation, which led some to vote for extremist parties. I respect them," Mr. Macron said in a somber address after the victory. "I will work to recreate the link between Europe and its peoples."

Still, the scale of Mr. Macron's victory provides a shot in the arm to the pro-EU establishment. He ran as a staunch defender of the bloc, positioning himself as a bulwark against Europe's nationalist wave. The strategy broke with parts of France's political mainstream that had been gravitating toward more populist positions.

The euro rose by around 0.2% to \$1.102 against the dollar following the results, taking the common currency to its highest level since the U.S. presidential election in November.

On Sunday evening, the soaring notes of Beethoven's Ninth Symphony, the EU's anthem, played as Mr. Macron entered the courtyard of the Louvre Museum to deliver his victory speech.

"The whole world told us it was impossible, but they didn't know France," Mr. Macron said.

In conceding defeat Sunday, Ms. Le Pen said her far-right National Front party was in need of "deep transformation...to build a new political force."

Ms. Le Pen said the election cemented her status as the leading opposition figure of a new political order centered around "the divide between patriots and globalists."

In the coming weeks, Mr. Macron will face a scramble to show that his fledgling political party, En Marche, or "On the Move," is capable of winning a majority in June's legislative elections. En Marche has so far refused to forge alliances with mainstream parties and has only named a handful of candidates it intends to field in the 577 seats up for grabs.

If Mr. Macron fails to secure a majority, he would have to seek ad hoc alliances with opposition parties or could even be forced into a so-called cohabitation—a form of power-sharing under which a prime minister from the opposition runs the government.

Voters on Sunday appeared unmoved by the massive leak of emails and documents purportedly from the Macron campaign, which were posted to the internet on Friday evening. Once in office, however, Mr. Macron faces possible fallout from the data dump, which his campaign said mixed real and phony documents with the aim of "sowing doubt and disinformation." For months, Mr. Macron had said his camp was being targeted by Russian government hackers. The Kremlin denied any involvement.

Mr. Macron has said the EU's future depends on whether its shaky architecture can undergo a root-and-branch overhaul to correct stark economic imbalances among wealthier Northern and poorer Southern members and develop a security apparatus able to protect the bloc from terror attacks and control a recent wave of migration.

For that to happen, he says, France needs to set an example among countries that have been slow to embrace economic restructuring by loosening its own rigid labor market to become more competitive with stronger neighbors like Germany.

Those mammoth tasks fall to a relative newcomer to politics. Until now, Mr. Macron has never held elected office. He was trained in elite French academies to become a high-ranking civil servant, but switched to a career in investment banking, joining Rothschild & Cie. at the height of the financial crisis.

The rise of both Mr. Macron and Ms. Le Pen stems from a meltdown of the political establishment that had ruled France for decades. No candidate from the country's main conservative or center-left parties survived the first round of voting last month. François Hollande, the incumbent president, didn't run, and the candidate of his party captured just 6.4% of the first-round vote.

Mr. Hollande tapped Mr. Macron as a top aide in 2012 and later promoted him to economy minister. Those posts have given him insight into policy-making but have provided limited experience on the sort of parliamentary coalition-building needed to pass difficult legislation—of the type that will be needed to move ahead with his agenda.

Despite her defeat, Ms. Le Pen managed to pick up millions of supporters, breaking through a key political barrier of previous elections, when big majorities overwhelmingly rallied against the National Front, tainted by the xenophobia of her father, Jean-Marie Le Pen, who has faced criticism for anti-Semitic rhetoric.

The preliminary results show Ms. Le Pen nearly doubled the 17.8% of the vote her father won in 2002, the only previous occasion a National Front candidate reached the final round of a French presidential election.

"The National Front is now very ingrained, so we have to live with it," said Xavier Néront, a 51 year-old translator, who voted for Mr. Macron in Paris.

National Front brass and party faithful who had gathered in a Paris hotel for the results Sunday said the party now needed to reorganize its

ranks—and even rebrand itself—to become a mainstream political power.

"The National Front has seen its limits," said Jean-Lin Lacapelle, a senior National Front official.

Damien Medel, an 28 year old from Le Mans who voted for Ms. Le Pen, said the party needed to do a better job of explaining its platform, particularly its anti-euro stance. "I'm convinced people were scared of that," he said.

Still, Ms. Le Pen's success in broadening the National Front's base is a measure of how voters in France's rural and declining industrial areas have become skeptical of a project that, only a decade ago, was strongly embraced as a recipe for ending centuries of conflict in Europe.

The EU's goal of binding its member countries in an "ever closer" union has also placed many of its weaker economies in a straitjacket. The sovereign-debt crisis that swept the bloc's southern economies—from Greece and Italy to Spain and Portugal—has left the Continent struggling to kick-start growth.

Some on Sunday warned that support for Mr. Macron was more tenuous than the results suggested. Maurice Attuil, a 63 year-old plumber, said he cast a vote for Mr. Macron in Ris-Orangis, 20 miles south of Paris, because "we don't really have a choice. I don't want to vote for extremists."

—Nick Kostov, Matthew Dalton and Noémie Bisserbe contributed to this article.

Write to William Horobin at William.Horobin@wsj.com and Stacy Meichtry at stacy.meichtry@wsj.com

Appeared in the May. 08, 2017, print edition as 'Macron Cruises to French Victory.'

THE WALL STREET JOURNAL

Marcus Walker

8-10 minutes

Updated May 7, 2017 7:33 p.m. ET

BERLIN— Emmanuel Macron wants to save the euro by deepening the ties among its 19 countries, completing a rickety union that he likens to a "half-pregnancy."

French Election Victor Emmanuel Macron's 'New Deal' for Europe Faces Old German Doubts (UNE)

His chances of achieving change in France and Europe may well go hand in hand. If he fails, it is likely to revive the nationalist challenge to the European Union represented by Marine Le Pen, his beaten opponent in Sunday's French presidential election.

At the core of the French president-elect's program is a double overhaul: of France's sluggish economy and of the eurozone, with

all its shortcomings. To get what he wants, Mr. Macron needs Europe's dominant economic power, Germany, to accept a rethink. His proposals, including for a common eurozone budget, go against firmly held German views that eurozone countries should follow common rules but keep their taxpayers' money separate.

Yet the stakes are as high for German Chancellor Angela Merkel

as for Mr. Macron. In recent months Berlin's political establishment feared losing its closest partner in Europe, France, to a nationalist backlash against the EU. Following the U.K.'s referendum vote to leave the EU, and Donald Trump's election as U.S. president on a platform of "America First," Germany feared being left isolated as the last major defender of liberal internationalism.

Ms. Le Pen, in conceding defeat, also proclaimed herself the leader of France's opposition. Other euroskeptical politicians are waiting in the wings around Europe, including Beppe Grillo, whose antiestablishment 5 Star Movement is currently the most popular party in Italy, where elections are due next year.

The Dutch far-right Party for Freedom fell short of its aims in elections in March, and the nationalist Alternative for Germany is currently mired in internal squabbles, but the government establishment in both countries fears the potential of such movements in an age of discontent with mainstream parties.

Mr. Macron showed on Sunday that an expressly pro-EU candidate can triumph in elections. But his victory over Ms. Le Pen represents a reprieve for the EU, not salvation, Europe's policy elite knows.

French and German leaders now have a chance to revamp the eurozone and the wider EU. If they can't rebuild public trust in the European project, battered by a decade of crises, populist insurgents on the left and right will return strengthened in the next election cycle.

Economic growth is improving in the bloc, but it remains unevenly spread, and deep scars from the crisis era persist, including high unemployment in France and Europe's indebted South.

Economists widely agree that the euro falls short of being an ideal currency union, because—in addition to the limited pan-European mobility of workers—the 19-country eurozone lacks common taxes, spending and borrowing, while its banking union is only half-built.

Such a deepening of the eurozone, however, risks fueling political opposition to a further loss of national sovereignty. The first big hurdle facing Mr. Macron, a 39-year-old centrist, is to convince a skeptical Berlin.

"For Macron to succeed, he needs a partner in Germany," said former European Central Bank director Jörg Asmussen. "If Macron can show that he is able to shape change in Europe, that would also help him domestically."

Last week, Mr. Asmussen joined with numerous, mainly left-of-center German politicians, economists and other public figures in a public call for Berlin to engage with Mr. Macron and not rebuff his ideas. The strength of anti-EU voter sentiment in France partly reflects the perception that Germany dominates Europe, their joint statement said.

The prevailing view in Chancellor Merkel's government, however is that—given the current antiestablishment mood in much of the continent—more steps toward a federal Europe would inflame anti-EU populism, rather than countering it.

Germany's political establishment has looked doubtfully upon French ideas for collective, state-directed investment programs for decades.

Yet Berlin is also keen for Mr. Macron to succeed at home where outgoing President François Hollande failed: in shaking up a sluggish French economy. Economists say France needs to overhaul its heavily regulated labor market, where restrictions have contributed to stubbornly high unemployment of around 10%.

The price if Mr. Macron were to fail, many policy makers across the EU fear, could well be victory in the 2022 presidential elections for Ms.

Le Pen, a far-right, anti-EU nationalist.

German Foreign Minister Sigmar Gabriel, who recently stepped down as leader of the center-left Social Democrats, has also welcomed Mr. Macron's call to reform the eurozone.

But his party, the junior partner in Ms. Merkel's governing coalition in Berlin, is deeply ambivalent about putting more of German taxpayers' money at Europe's disposal. Ms. Merkel's conservative Christian Democrats are even less eager.

Neither of Germany's two major parties is campaigning for deeper European integration ahead of the country's elections this September. Political strategists for both parties believe there are no votes in it. Even Social Democrat candidate for chancellor Martin Schulz has been circumspect, despite his pro-federalist stance in his previous post as president of the European Parliament.

Aware of the prevailing skepticism, Mr. Macron made his pitch to Germany in a speech at Berlin's Humboldt University in January. His language was diplomatic, but the subtext was clear: Germany's huge trade surpluses and fixation on fiscal austerity have hurt growth and support for the EU elsewhere in the continent.

Offering a "New Deal," Mr. Macron suggested France needed to win Germany's trust through overhauls to meet eurozone fiscal rules—and that Germany should accept that it can't sustain economic growth if other nations in the euro are struggling. "The euro is incomplete and cannot last without major reforms," he said.

Concretely, he proposed a common eurozone budget, funded from both tax revenues and common

borrowing, which would finance investment programs, and support countries hit by economic crises.

Economists close to Mr. Macron say he knows that to gain more credibility with Germany than Mr. Hollande had he must show he can push through difficult economic overhauls in France.

Germany's powerful finance minister, Wolfgang Schäuble, has said repeatedly over the past year that the time isn't right for deeper integration of the EU or eurozone, because public support for a federal Europe is lacking. He has called instead for more ad hoc cooperation between governments that are willing to act together in areas such as defense. Mr. Schäuble is seen throughout the eurozone as the toughest foe of proposals for common fiscal policies that could create new liabilities for Germany.

Germany's September election might lead to Mr. Schäuble leaving the finance ministry, if the Social Democrats demand the ministry in return for serving again under Ms. Merkel. However, even the Social Democrats have rarely strayed far from German orthodoxy on finance, fearing that the Christian Democrats would attack them for handing German taxpayers' money to Southern Europe.

"Macron is not blind to German views," says Nicolas Veron, a French economist and fellow at Brussels think tank Bruegel. "His aim is not fiscal union, but to start a meaningful conversation about how to strengthen the eurozone. His idea for a eurozone budget is an opening gambit."

Write to Marcus Walker at marcus.walker@wsj.com

**The
Washington
Post**

With Le Pen defeat, Europe's far-right surge stalls (UNE)

Appeared in the May. 08, 2017, print edition as 'New Deal for EU Faces Old Doubt.'

<https://www.facebook.com/anthony.f.aiola>

9-11 minutes

BRUSSELS — The anti-E.U. French leader Marine Le Pen's larger-than-expected defeat Sunday in her nation's presidential election was a crushing reality check for the far-right forces who seek to overthrow Europe: Despite the victories for Brexit and Donald Trump, they are likely to be shut out of power for years.

Given one choice after another since Trump's U.S. presidential victory, Western European voters have delivered mainstream candidates to office despite a post-November sense that an anti-immigrant populist wave was washing over the Western world. Far-right candidates in Austria, the Netherlands and France have faltered. The euroskeptical far-right party in Germany has collapsed in recent polls ahead of September elections. And an unforgiving election calendar now offers few routes into power for years.

The thwarted momentum comes despite clear evidence that views that would have been taboo to express just a few years ago are no

longer too toxic to exclude politicians from coming a breath away from leadership. When Le Pen's father reached a presidential runoff in 2002, his opponent refused even to debate with him, so unacceptable to the mainstream were his views. This time, many French citizens sat out the election altogether because they detested both Le Pen and Emmanuel Macron — even though the pro-European centrist Macron offered a vastly different platform from his opponent. Le Pen's result, about 34 percent, was still a historic high for her party.

"French people have chosen the continuity candidate," a visibly disappointed Le Pen said in a brief

concession address. She said she would seek to rename her National Front party, a measure of the extent to which her defeat rattled supporters who just weeks ago harbored hopes of capturing the Elysee Palace.

Instead, Le Pen's numbers sank in the two weeks since she placed second in the first round of the French elections.

(Adam Taylor, Jason Aldag/The Washington Post)

Centrist Emmanuel Macron has won the French presidency. He defeated Marine Le Pen, the leader of France's far-right National Front, a strongly anti-immigrant populist party. Macron, 39, will now become

France's youngest head of state since Napoleon Bonaparte. What Emmanuel Macron's victory means for France and the world (Adam Taylor, Jason Aldag/The Washington Post)

Now the test for Europe's future will be whether Macron can rekindle France's relationship with German Chancellor Angela Merkel after it languished during the five-year term of France's current president, François Hollande, whose popularity hit record lows. If France continues to stagnate, Sunday's victory may turn out to be a five-year reprieve from the far-right rather than a decisive rejection of it.

But the failure of the far-right to seize office comes in stark contrast to expectations in November that Trump's ascendancy in the United States would unleash a global wave of populist politicians. Le Pen was one of the first political leaders around the world to congratulate Trump the night of his victory. Dutch far-right leader Geert Wilders exulted the day after. And Trump advisers and top European far-right leaders conferred in the weeks after the U.S. election.

The subsequent elections have shown a clear trend in Western Europe: Voters are sick of the mainstream and fed up with their leaders. But they are still not ready to hand power to the far-right. The chaotic first months of the Trump presidency may actually have hurt Europe's populists rather than helping them.

"This is what happens when the refugee crisis doesn't dominate the headlines anymore and the right-wing populists are dismantling themselves," said Josef Janning, head of the Berlin

office of the European Council on Foreign Relations. "It isn't that simple after all to break Europe apart with nationalism."

In Central Europe, right-wing nationalist leaders are in power in Poland and Hungary. But neither presents an existential challenge to the European Union as Le Pen did in France.

European leaders rushed to turn the page on a grim year for the bloc, embracing Macron's victory as the first step in the rejuvenation of an embattled alliance against forces that would tear it apart. Many mainstream leaders feared political Armageddon if Le Pen had won. In Brussels, the seat of the E.U., cheers could be heard in the streets the moment the exit polls were released Sunday evening, as though a favorite soccer team had clinched a match.

"The French clearly demonstrate that protest and a desire for change doesn't always have to lead to the election of right-wing populists," Austrian Foreign Minister Sebastian Kurz wrote on Twitter.

The far-right's best hope for a victory may be Austria, where opinion polls suggest that the anti-immigrant Freedom Party may be able to lead a coalition after elections that must be held by next year at the latest. But the party's presidential candidate lost an election in December, underperforming opinion polls ahead of the vote.

In Germany, meanwhile, the far-right Alternative for Germany has collapsed in opinion polls in recent months following post-Trump heights. The party presided over a smaller but still telling defeat on

Sunday, bringing up the rear in Sunday's vote in the northern German state of Schleswig-Holstein, with projections showing it winning less than 6 percent of the vote. That result was far below the party's strong showing in local elections last year and came as its support is flagging in Germany following a scandal in which one of its top members made controversial statements on Adolf Hitler and the Holocaust.

Merkel's Christian Democratic Union, meanwhile, easily came out on top in the state, projected to win nearly 33 percent of the vote.

In a Sunday night phone call with Macron, Merkel "recognized his espousal of a united and open European Union in the election campaign. The decision of the French voters therefore also was a clear commitment to Europe," said Merkel spokesman Steffen Seibert.

Amid the celebration, there was acknowledgment that Macron's victory may be just a temporary reprieve, since anti-E.U. forces remain powerful and growing in France. If the new French president fails to deliver on his promises by the next election in 2022, Le Pen or another anti-E.U. leader may return stronger than ever. Elsewhere in Europe, the euroskeptic Five Star Movement now tops Italian opinion polls ahead of elections that must be held before spring 2018, though it is not a far-right party.

Macron hopes to soften Germany's exacting insistence on fiscal austerity as he imposes sweeping pro-business reforms in his own country. If he succeeds, he may help disarm anti-E.U. voices across the continent. But if he fails to jumpstart France's economy — and

Europe's — he will fuel questions about whether the E.U. is helping or hurting citizens' lives.

"If the mood in France and Europe is the same five years from now it becomes impossible," said Stefano Stefanini, a former senior Italian diplomat who now is a fellow at the Atlantic Council. "You cannot have forever a part of Europe that is growing and a part that is not."

Today's Headlines newsletter

The day's most important stories.

With so much at stake, Macron remains a largely unknown quantity: This was his first bid for elected office, and he has no political party behind him. German leaders hope Macron will prove to be a Gallic version of themselves, wagering that his finance background will lead to German-style economic changes.

He may yet be tempted, however, to answer the problem of France's economic stagnation with more government spending. Should he move in that direction, Merkel would face a new and potentially potent challenge to German financial orthodoxy that has kept a lid on budget deficits — and economic growth — across the bloc.

Many elements remain unsettled, most notably the extent of Macron's leeway to impose his vision on his nation. His powers will be severely limited if he fails to capture a working majority of the French legislature in June elections. And Merkel faces elections in September.

Faiola reported from Berlin. Stephanie Kirchner in Berlin contributed to this report.



Does Emmanuel Macron's win signal the end of populism in Europe? Not likely

Analysis by Jane

Merrick

Updated 7:40 AM ET, Mon May 8, 2017

Story highlights

- Macron's decisive victory suggests that centrism never really went away
- But with Le Pen, previously fringe views have become mainstream

(CNN)Minutes into his acceptance speech, Emmanuel Macron acknowledged the "anger, anxiety and doubt" among people who voted for his rival Marine Le Pen. By addressing her supporters so directly and taking their concerns so seriously, the new French president

demonstrated that he knows his historic triumph has not crushed populism -- it has merely kept it at bay.

Macron's margin of victory, 66% to 34%, was decisive. His achievement, from the creation of a new party to the Elysee within a year, is extraordinary. Centrism, in all its forms -- internationalism, liberalism, Europeanism, Blairism, social democracy -- is back, it seems. In fact, it never really went away -- it's just that Brexit in the UK and Donald Trump in the US were such unexpected, disruptive and spectacular victories for populist causes that their noise drowned out the centrist background music.

In March, a liberal beat a right-wing populist in the Netherlands. After

Macron's victory, Germany's foreign minister, Sigmar Gabriel, tweeted that France "is and will remain in the middle and in the heart of Europe," underlining the two-nation, pro-EU alliance that has been under threat from Brexit and Le Pen.

Denis MacShane, former UK minister for Europe and author of a biography of François Mitterrand, France's longest-serving President, described Macron's win as "the biggest victory for Europe in two decades" that showed "France is willing to resist the waves of populist nationalist extremism of the right and the Podemos-Chavista left, represented by Jean-Luc Mélenchon".

"It is a big win for Angela Merkel and for others seeking to reform and re-

dynamise the European Union on the basis of pro-market, pro-entrepreneur and labour reforms. Macron will face many problems, but they are the problems of government and of power," he added.

Yet Le Pen's performance shows that populism remains a potent electoral force.

Why these French voters support Le Pen 00:52

Her 34% share of the vote is almost double that won by her father Jean Marie Le Pen in 2002. The long-term progress of the Front National shows a steady upwards trajectory, and the party believes it can win up to 40 seats in parliamentary elections next month. Macron's victory has not eliminated at a stroke

all the issues that Le Pen was able to convert into votes: immigration, terrorism, unemployment and identity.

Professor Matthew Goodwin, a senior fellow at Chatham House, said: "Despite Macron's triumphant victory, the fact that one in three voters backed Marine Le Pen should remind us all of the lingering appeal of populism."

"It appears unlikely over the longer term that an economic liberal such as Macron will satisfy the left behind workers who have been voting for the Le Pen family since the 1990s. There is likely to remain a sizeable reservoir of support for Le Pen going forward."

Populism, a fluid term

Le Pen -- whose politics are widely seen as racist and fascist -- was endorsed by the pro-Brexit UK Independent Party in Britain and its former leader Nigel Farage.

Yet Dominic Cummings, the campaign director of Vote Leave, the official campaign of the populist pro-Brexit cause in last year's EU referendum, made clear Sunday night that his organization wanted Macron to beat Le Pen, tweeting that "semi/proto-fascist parties with history of Holocaust denial winning elections is v bad for humanity"

Will Europe ride the populist wave? A visual guide

In Britain, Theresa May has taken up the populist cause of a hard Brexit, but unlike Le Pen and Trump in the US, she does not pursue a

protectionist agenda on trade and globalization.

Nevertheless, Le Pen's brand of populism has entered the mainstream. If she had won the presidency, it would have registered as a global political earthquake, but when she reached the second round of voting last month, few were surprised.

Brian Klaas, a fellow at the London School of Economics and an ex-US campaign adviser, said: "Macron's victory is a crushing defeat for the momentum of extremist populism in Europe."

"However, Le Pen's showing is comparatively strong and signals the mainstreaming of previously fringe views. This is happening everywhere. In the US, for example,

alt-right commentary used to occupy a dark corner of the internet. Now some of its architects are in the Oval Office.

"That's the double-edged sword of last night's defeat of xenophobic populism. It sliced through the momentum forged by Brexit and Trump's victory. Centrist pragmatism won. But by getting more than a third of the vote tonight, Le Pen ensured that nobody can really treat her movement as a 'fringe' political movement."

No one knows this more than the new French president himself, who in his victory speech at the Louvre said of Le Pen's supporters he would do "everything in the next five years so that they have no more reason to vote for extremes".



Marine Le Pen falls short in far-right bid for the presidency of France

By Isaac Stanley-Becker

9-12 minutes

PARIS — Marine Le Pen, the 48-year-old heir to a far-right party once considered beyond the pale in French political life, failed to capture the presidency Sunday night. But she has undeniably broadened the appeal of the National Front and is poised to capitalize on the party's growing power and play a more authoritative role in opposing the new government.

Le Pen was thwarted by Emmanuel Macron, who won about 66 percent of the vote. He is a former investment banker and Socialist finance minister who, at 39, led an insurgent bid under the banner of a new party to the presidential palace. Together they broke the French political establishment, banishing from the final round the two parties — the Socialists and the Republicans — that have ruled France since 1958.

Le Pen, in brief remarks conceding defeat, claimed the country's political reorganization as a victory for her and for the populist protest roiling the West.

"The first round led to a major reconfiguration of the French political landscape," she said. "The second round led to a reconfiguration between patriots and globalists."

She promised that the National Front would be the "first force of opposition," although she also acknowledged that her party would have to "renew itself to live up to this moment."

[The dark history at the heart of the French election]

This year's contest marked only the second time that Le Pen's party, from which she formally distanced herself in a last-ditch effort to win over skeptics, made it to the runoff. In 2002, her father, Jean-Marie Le Pen, who is one of the National Front's founders and still embodies its roots in anti-Semitism, shocked France by advancing to the second round, only to win just 18 percent of the vote. Fifteen years later, Marine Le Pen — who dates her political consciousness to 1976, when dynamite intended for the family patriarch tore through their Paris apartment — nearly doubled that figure.

Still, the outcome was a stinging setback for Le Pen, who was hoping to ride an apparent populist, anti-establishment wave — beginning in Britain last summer with Brexit and coursing through the United States in the fall with the election of Donald Trump — into power.

Le Pen, who grew up in one of France's richest districts, proved an imperfect vessel of anti-elite protest, just as the National Front, which has been a fixture of French politics for decades, failed to inoculate itself against its own anti-establishment invective. Looking for alternatives to politics as usual, many voters remained skeptical that Le Pen offered anything but a retreat into the darkest chapters of France's past, or a leap into a perilous unknown.

"It's a danger for our democracy," said Céline Denain, a 32-year-old artist, who pointed to her pregnant belly to explain why a Le Pen presidency was unthinkable to her.

[Macron's strong finish in the French election shows populist wave may be ebbing]

National Front supporters carried plastic blue roses signaling party loyalty to the restaurant and event space on the east side of Paris where Le Pen spoke. They were not surprised by the outcome, they said, and found cause for optimism.

"We are disappointed that she's not president, but it's an important score," said Maurice Blanc, 59, a longtime friend of the Le Pen family. "It's a score that places the National Front at the forefront of French politics."

Now, the National Front turns to the June legislative elections, analysts and party leaders said, the aim being to make it impossible for Macron to govern. Le Pen's party boasts a meager two deputies in the National Assembly but could easily gain the requisite seats, 15, to form an official parliamentary group. This would grant it the capacity to form part of the official opposition to the ruling party, to gain additional speaking time in parliament and to hold more sway in powerful government commissions.

Then there is the question of 2022.

"Too soon to say for now," said Nonna Mayer, a political scientist at Sciences Po in Paris and an expert on the far right, when asked whether Le Pen would run a third time for president. Mayer enumerated several hurdles, including the June elections, and other regional and local contests, as well as divisions within the movement. Party unity, she said, is threatened by a disagreement between newer followers of the National Front attracted to its doctrine of economic nationalism, a message honed by

top aide and party vice president Florian Philippot, and those who crave a harder line on religious and social issues. The latter group sees its views represented by Le Pen's niece, Marion Maréchal-Le Pen, who may come to pose a leadership challenge to her aunt, Mayer said.

But Christophe Boutin, a political scientist at the University of Caen, said these divisions are overstated. He expects Marine Le Pen to run again in 2022.

"I hope, I hope," said Marie-Christine Arnautu, a National Front member of the European Parliament and a longtime associate of the Le Pen family, when asked whether the unsuccessful candidate would stand again.

But Arnautu also exemplifies the party's internal tensions. Sanctioned last year for participating in a rally organized by the exiled Jean-Marie Le Pen, in which he questioned his daughter's leadership, she represents a wing of the party still wedded to a stricter stance on social issues, such as opposition to same-sex marriage. Marine Le Pen's promise was economic revival — notably by yanking France from the euro and holding a referendum on an exit from the European Union — not a new offensive in the country's culture wars.

Arnaud played down these disagreements. She called for unity around the party's central pledge — saving "the heart of France" from Europe — and predicted that it would gain many seats in the June parliamentary elections, as it welcomed voters fleeing the humbled parties that did not make it past the first round of presidential elections last month.

[In French election, voters face a choice that mirrors the West's new divide]

Growing support for the National Front owes to Le Pen's efforts, since she took its helm in 2011, to "demonize" the party and discipline its message, analysts said. She has sought to present a movement shorn of its ugliest strains, such as denial of the Holocaust; she formally banished her father in 2015. But French media — as recently as last week — have continued to expose Holocaust denial in the highest ranks of the party's leadership, and despite the purported estrangement between father and daughter, Le Pen ultimately accepted a 6 million euro loan from her father late last year to finance her struggling campaign.

Party members said her electoral gains are the result of years spent cultivating economically dislocated regions of the country, remote from its cosmopolitan urban centers. Dividends came,

for instance, in 2014, when the National Front finished first in elections to the European Parliament.

Under Le Pen, the party has made major inroads in once left-leaning parts of the country's postindustrial northeast, parts of which are now governed by a peculiar patchwork of Socialist and National Front officials. Its traditional base of support has been in the south, where anti-immigrant sentiment is most powerfully felt. But many voters in once-prosperous, midsize towns who have not reaped the rewards of globalized markets have gravitated to the far right, whose leaders promise tightened borders, a new industrial push and protections for workers whose jobs are threatened by globalization.

The phenomenon finds a parallel in Trump's triumph in the hardest-hit parts of the U.S. Rust Belt.

"For too long, French elites have not resembled the country and its

voters," Bernard Monot, an economist and delegate to the European Parliament representing the National Front, wrote in an email.

World News Alerts

Breaking news from around the world.

With this message, a claim that her movement represents the interests of the underserved majority, Le Pen has steadily sought to move the party into the mainstream. Despite her loss, modest success was evident not just in the percentage of the vote she captured but in the endorsement after the first round of voting of Nicolas Dupont-Aignan, the leader of a rival right-wing, Euroskeptical party.

"She is much more elevated than her father was in 2002," said Bruno Cautrès, a political scientist at Sciences Po. "Dupont-Aignan presents himself as a Gaullist, and even if it's a small party, it's a

relationship for the National Front. It shows the party is no longer isolated."

Yet Sunday's decisive defeat also suggested that Le Pen's support may have hit a hard ceiling and that, despite her effort to brush up the party's image and distance herself from some of her father's most incendiary rhetoric, the family's politics remain unacceptable to much of the country. Le Pen gave fresh cause for doubt about the distance between her views and those of her father, a convicted Holocaust denier, when she said last month that France was not responsible for a massive, wartime roundup of Jews in Paris.

"This is not a democratic party; it is a family party," said Philippe Blacher, a professor of constitutional law at the University of Lyon. "It doesn't truly evolve. The same lies and insults just come from a new member of the family."

The
Washington
Post

McAuley

8-10 minutes

Emmanuel Macron's unlikely path to the French presidency

By James

Macron's story is of a highly improbable ascent in a system that typically rewards entrenched political dynasties.

Centrist Emmanuel Macron has won the French presidency. He defeated Marine Le Pen, the leader of France's far-right National Front, a strongly anti-immigrant populist party. Macron, 39, will now become France's youngest head of state since Napoleon Bonaparte. What Emmanuel Macron's victory means for France and the world (Adam Taylor, Jason Aldag/The Washington Post)

(Adam Taylor, Jason Aldag/The Washington Post)

"It's entirely unprecedented in the Fifth Republic," said François Heisbourg, a well-known French defense expert who has advised Macron on security and terrorism issues. "It's extraordinarily unusual, the way he has broken through the system — coming from nowhere."

[Macron campaign says its emails have been subjected to "massive" hacking]

Macron, who has never held elected office, has now been elected to one of the most powerful executive positions in the Western world and will be the leader of Europe's second-largest economy. He did it, analysts say, through a combination of luck and a campaign message attuned to a new political moment.

In France, 2017 proved an ideal year to run as an independent candidate. A rare political vacuum

emerged, and Macron — a former Socialist economy minister who stepped down from his post in July — was able to take full advantage.

With the public frightened by a slew of terrorist attacks by Islamist extremists, and with the unemployment rate in double digits, France's Socialist Party, under President François Hollande, sank to historic levels of unpopularity. Hollande promised in December not to seek reelection, but his Socialist stand-in, Benoît Hamon, was eliminated in the election's first round, winning a meager 6.35 percent of the vote.

France's mainstream conservative party, Les Républicains (the Republicans), was undermined by a spending scandal involving François Fillon, its contender. Once the undisputed favorite, Fillon suffered a fatal blow after Le Canard Enchaîné, a French satirical newspaper, accused him of funneling about 900,000 euros (\$990,000) of public funds to his wife and children for work they never did.

Macron perceived that the "new divide" among French voters was not between left and right but rather between an open and closed society, Heisbourg said.

Defending an open, multicultural society was a central component of En Marche (Onward), the movement Macron launched in 2016. "Globalization can be a great opportunity," he said at one point on the campaign trail. "There is no such thing as French culture," he said at

another. "There is culture in France, and it is diverse."

The great French novels are often stories of ambitious young men from the provinces who come to Paris to seek their fortunes. For many, Macron is no exception. The literary son of doctors from provincial Amiens, he graduated from France's elite École Nationale d'Administration, the traditional breeding ground of presidents.

Some in the French news media have placed the first sign of Macron's formidable ambitions in, of all places, his love life — namely, in his dogged pursuit of his wife, Brigitte, his former high school teacher and a woman 24 years his senior. As Brigitte Macron told a French documentary maker last year, "Bit by bit, he defeated all my resistance, in an amazing way, with patience." The candidate showed the same persistence in capturing the Elysee Palace.

[Macron is 39 and his wife is 64. French women say it's about time]

"I have known failures, sometimes bitter, but I have never allowed myself to turn away," Macron wrote in his 2016 book "Révolution."

That doggedness — along with a calculating eye for useful associations, critics say — brought him into contact with many prominent French thinkers and government officials, who then helped him advance.

In the late 1990s, while still a graduate student, Macron worked as

an assistant to Paul Ricoeur, a prominent French intellectual and writer; by the mid-2000s, he was working for the Finance Ministry, on a commission dedicated to stimulating economic growth. It was there that he met Jacques Attali, a prominent economist and Parisian power broker who many say later ushered Macron along a speedy path to the highest echelons of the Hollande administration.

In an interview, Attali, who has also served as an adviser to the Macron campaign, rejected out of hand the idea that the candidate was mainly a gifted networker.

"He would be where he is today with or without my help," Attali said.

If Macron's ambition has led him to considerable success, it has also earned him enemies — including, some say, Hollande, whom he served as economy minister but then abandoned to launch his party.

"Emmanuel Macron betrayed me methodically," Hollande said last year, according to the daily newspaper *Le Monde*.

Jean Pisani-Ferry, another Macron adviser and the author of much of the candidate's platform, brushed off the comment.

"He launched another politics, created a new movement. Political life wouldn't exist otherwise," Pisani-Ferry said in an interview.

Today's WorldView

What's most important from where the world meets Washington

Despite the improbable nature of Macron's victory, France's new president will face a considerable challenge as he attempts to form a government. Given that he has no party structure behind him, he will be deeply affected by the results of the parliamentary elections, scheduled for June.

"There is huge uncertainty regarding the parliamentary elections to come, because France's main political forces were largely absent in the second round — the traditional right wing, the Socialists and the far left," said Patrick Weil, a leading French legal scholar and historian. "Now they are frustrated, and they are

ready to take their revenge in the legislative elections."

In the past, when the National Front made it to the final round of the presidential election, the rest of the political spectrum united in opposition to the extreme right. But this year, certain politicians hesitated to back Macron in the final round — notably the far-left Jean-Luc Mélenchon. Many voters also opted to abstain or to cast blank ballots.

"You might have higher mobilization for the parliamentary elections than usual, which, given turnout in the presidential election, could mean a higher legitimacy for the parliament than for the presidency," Weil said.



Emmanuel Macron Wins the French Presidency

Yasmeen Serhan

6-8 minutes

French voters handed Emmanuel Macron, the independent candidate, a decisive victory in the presidential runoff Sunday over Marine Le Pen, the far-right candidate, buoying Europe's political establishment that had watched with despair as populist movements threatened to derail the European experiment.

Macron, 39, who had all but been endorsed by Europe's leaders after his first-round victory on April 23, earned 65.5 percent of the vote, according to early exit polls; Le Pen won 34.5 percent—slightly lower than polls had predicted. The polls projected Macron would win approximately 64 percent of the vote. Voter turnout was 74 percent by the time polls closed at 8 p.m. local time, markedly lower than the 80 percent that turned out in 2012. Approximately 4 million blank votes were cast.

Not only is Macron the youngest president in French history (he's a year younger than Louis-Napoléon, Napoléon Bonaparte's nephew, who was 40 when he was elected in 1848), he is also the first president in modern French history who does not belong to a major political party. Despite briefly serving as economy minister under outgoing Socialist President François Hollande, Macron quit the government in August 2016 to launch his own independent party, *En Marche!*, which he said aimed to "reconcile the two Frances that have been growing apart for too long."

"A new page of our long history is turned," Macron said in his first

statement after the results were announced.

Macron's victory brings an end to a presidential contest labeled a rebuke of the political establishment. Both Macron and Le Pen cast themselves early on as outsiders who are far removed from the established parties that have ruled France for decades. It's an anti-system characterization the two attempted to use against one another—Le Pen derided Macron during the final presidential debate as a Hollande 2.0, whereas Macron cast Le Pen as "the heiress of a name, of a political party, of a system that has prospered for years and years on the back of French people's anger," in apparent reference to her National Front (FN) party, which has maintained a fringe presence in French politics for most of its 45-year history. But Le Pen was able to capitalize on French disaffection with the existing political system, an erosion of the parties that once championed the working classes, and the notion that something fundamental—foreign—ails France.

Addressing her supporters in Paris, Le Pen said the country had "chosen continuity" and wished Macron "success in the face of the immense challenges facing France." She added that her party must renew itself "to form a new political force."

Hollande, the outgoing president, congratulated Macron on his victory, which he said "confirms that a very large majority of our fellow citizens wanted to gather around the values of the Republic and mark their attachment to the European Union as a gateway for France to the world."

Macron's victory is merely the first step of his efforts to govern France: He must now turn his focus to the next month's parliamentary elections, during which voters will return to the polls to elect members of the National Assembly, the country's lower but more powerful house of parliament. The election is particularly important because it will likely determine who becomes Macron's prime minister, an individual who almost always comes from the party that controls the chamber.

Although Macron's young party doesn't hold any parliamentary seats—making the chances of him commanding a legislative majority or having a premier from his party less likely—it won't be that way for long. The centrist candidate has vowed to field candidates for all 577 of the chamber's seats, pledging not to make "backroom deals" with other parties and instead putting forward a diverse pool of candidates, half of whom he said would be new to politics.

It's an ambitious goal that polls suggest Macron may be able to pull off. A Wednesday poll by OpinionWay-SLPV Analytics puts Macron's *En Marche* on track to win between 249 and 286 seats in the National Assembly, making it the largest party but just short of a majority. Centrist and conservative parties are expected to win between 200 and 210 seats, while the Socialists are projected to have the greatest loss, slumping from 280 seats to between 28 and 43 seats. Conversely, the far-right FN is anticipated to win between 15 and 25 seats, a marked increase from the two seats it now has.

Though Le Pen's electoral defeat follows similar far-right populist

losses in Austria and Netherlands, the ideological surge is far from dead. Indeed, while Le Pen may have lost the presidency, she also boasted her greatest political performance to date. Not only did she nearly double her 18-percent finish in the 2012 presidential election, but she also managed to take her father's historically fringe party and, for perhaps the first time in its decades-long history, push it into the political mainstream. Should the FN win as many seats in the legislative election's as polls suggest it might, Le Pen could enjoy another five years of being in the opposition before trying for the presidency again in 2022.

Such a result demonstrates neither the rise nor fall of the populist wave, but rather, the disintegration of the political establishment as we know it. As my colleague Uri Friedman noted shortly before the first round of the French contest:

A disaffected and discouraged citizenry isn't just a boon for populists, who condemn the "establishment" and ease worries about the future with nostalgic appeals to past greatness. It also has consequences for left-right politics. If you lack confidence in the government in general, you're unlikely to distinguish much between left, right, and center. If you doubt that your future is bright, you're unlikely to be satisfied with the same old ping-ponging policies of the center-right and center-left.

As Macron assesses the task of governing and Le Pen revels in her unprecedented performance, France will confront a future with its two traditionally main parties—the Republicans and the Socialists—being eclipsed, many of the issues that have made this election a

contentious terrorism, one—immigration, employment—still relevant, and a legislative election

that's likely to be as rancorous as this one.

TIME

French Election: Emmanuel Macron Wins Presidency

Paris

7-9 minutes

Vivienne Walt / past five months of campaigning seem simple.

An untested whizkid has shot to power as President of France in his very first election campaign, crumpling older, hard-bitten veterans in his wake.

Emmanuel Macron's astonishing rise from provincial straight-A student to Rothschild banker, to civil servant, to Sunday's victory as President of the sixth-biggest economy in the world seems like one of the mythic tales of success familiar to all French children, in which a gallant young hero overcomes impossible odds to achieve giant success.

At just 39, Macron is France's youngest leader ever—breaking a 169-year record held by the famed French emperor Napoleon Bonaparte, who took power at age 40.

Thousands of people poured in the huge courtyard of the Louvre Museum after polls closed at 8 p.m. on Sunday night, hugging each other and chanting "Macron Président!" as they waved flags. Macron defeated Le Pen by 66.1% to 33.9%, with 99% of votes counted.

From outside the Louvre, Meriem Tertouche, 40, an immigrant from Algeria, said she drove into Paris with her three small children from their home 120 miles away to celebrate Macron's victory, adding that she had been "horrified by Le Pen and all her talk against immigrants."

In an address to the nation from inside his office, Macron said he had sensed the "rage, anxiety and doubt" coursing through much of France. "The renewal of public life starts tomorrow," he said.

And yet, after Macron takes the oath of office inside the ornate Elysée Palace next Monday, the years ahead could hold far more difficult and complicated plot twists than those heroic tales suggest—challenges that will likely make his

Macron, who was barely known just a year ago, when he was President François Hollande's Economy Minister, won over many French voters as much for his jolting fresh-faced vigor and his razor-sharp intellect, as for his policies themselves. "He's our own J.F.K.," cooed one supporter during a Macron rally in late April, who said she had ditched her support for the traditional conservative Republican candidate in order to back Macron.

But youthful energy will take Macron only so far. And millions, too, voted for Macron not for what he represented, but for who he was not: His far-right rival, National Front leader Marine Le Pen.

Just like that other young leader Napoleon, Macron inherits a country that is bitterly divided and mired in problems that have endured for years. Those include double-digit unemployment—about 24% among young French—serious terrorist threats, Europe's biggest migrant crisis since the Second World War, marked skepticism over the E.U., and ballooning public debt.

In March, Macron told TIME he aimed to win people over to his ideas—ones that include even tighter E.U. coordination, and a far-reaching economic overhaul. "My point is to convince the French people that a positive project and a progressive view is more adapted to our challenges," he said.

That will be no small feat, however.

Having ridden to power on a groundswell of voter exasperation, Macron now has to somehow unite France without any political party of his own; he founded his movement, called *En Marche!* (On the go) just 13 months ago, drafting thousands of young unpaid volunteers on Facebook and sending them out across the country to ask regular French citizens what they wanted from their leaders; people were amazed to be asked the question.

"This was very much like a U.S. movement," Guillaume Liegey, partner at the Paris political strategy group Liegey Muller Pons, who designed Macron's door-knocking methods, told TIME last week. "He did what Obama did in 2007. He built a movement outside of the party structure."

If Macron was Obama-like, Le Pen's campaign seemed to channel that of Donald Trump, whose victory she hailed as a prelude to her own. Much like Trump, she campaigned on closing the borders, virtually stopping all immigration, and ripping up free-trade agreements, in particular by getting France out of the E.U., and dropping its use of the Euro in favor of a national currency. The choice, as Le Pen put it, was between "patriots" and those who supported what she called Macron's "savage globalization."

On Friday, Macron admitted his campaign had evolved over the months "by the anger we found in the country," he said, during his final interview as candidate, with the French website Mediapart. "There is a very deep fracture," he said. "We have to reconcile it."

Macron's victory has shattered the two-party system of Socialists and conservatives that have endured for 60 years. That system, he told TIME last summer, before he launched *En Marche!*, was "sclerotic."

But what comes next is not entirely clear, and Macron has little time to piece together a replacement for the old structure.

Immediately, Macron needs to forge a coalition capable of winning a majority of seats in the French parliament, called the National Assembly, whose elections are in June. Without that, he could find it intensely difficult to ram through his campaign promises, which include cutting 160,000 positions in France's mammoth public-service sector, cutting corporate taxes from 33% to 25%, and cutting the huge payroll taxes, which economists (like Macron) believe keep companies from hiring more people. Macron's campaign spokeswoman Laurence

Haim told TIME last month they were vetting about 15,000 candidates to run in the June elections.

That is only one problem, however. The other big hurdle ahead is his vanquished rival, National Front leader Le Pen.

In their presidential debate last Wednesday night, Macron laid into Le Pen for making fraudulent promises to fearful French voters, accusing her of sprinkling *poudre de Perlimpinpin*, or snake oil, among them.

Yet Le Pen's "France first" message hit home among millions of voters, especially in the hard-hit northern Rust Belt, where she and Macron brawled in the campaign's final days over the fate of Whirlpool factory in the city of Amiens, where 290 workers are set to lose their jobs next year when production moves to Poland.

Even in defeat, Le Pen could present a menacing political force to Macron if the sluggish economy fails to improve. She repeatedly cast Macron as a rich banker with no concern for the working poor, and as the ultimate embodiment of the elite status quo.

Key Le Pen aides have told TIME in the past few days that they regard their campaign as a huge success, despite her loss, since they have effectively placed the National Front's anti-immigrant ideas at the center of French political debate. "We have totally changed the whole *paysage* [landscape] of French politics," Ludovic de Danne, Le Pen's foreign affairs advisor, told TIME in an interview last week. As for her prospects in 2022, says de Danne, "she will be in a good position."

In his final interview as candidate, on Friday for the investigative French website Mediapart, Macron admitted he faced some steep obstacles ahead. "Politics is not a game that you win every time," he said. For now, at least, Macron has won the biggest contest of all.



As Its Businessman on Horseback

A country desperate for a

sense of renewal has chosen Emmanuel Macron, a leader restless in his pursuit of destiny.

By James Traub

May 7, 2017

Emmanuel Macron is France's next president. We must pause for a moment to consider just how extraordinary and unexpected an outcome this is. Never in its modern history has France chosen a leader as professedly dedicated as Macron is to what the Anglo-American world understands as liberalism — economic and political liberty reinforcing one another in a virtuous circle. The very word remains an anathema in French intellectual life. But of course the election does not matter for France alone: Macron trounced Marine Le Pen, his radically anti-liberal opponent, at a moment when illiberalism was on the march across the West. Macron's elevation permits us to reconsider our worst nightmares.

At a minimum, Macron represents a triumph of what in France are known as "republican values" — the equal value of each individual, free and truthful speech, above all the idea of a just and impartial state. For many voters, Macron was simply the available instrument with which to express a resolute refusal to accept Le Pen's anti-immigrant, anti-Europe, fear-mongering Front National. This passionate support of principle, rather than the candidate himself, might have been best expressed by Benoit Hamon, the Socialist candidate who got only 6 percent of the vote in the first round. In an editorial in *Le Monde*, Hamon informed his supporters that, despite the fact that Macron had conducted a campaign "as dangerously maladroit as arrogant," its principles meriting a through repudiation, he was nevertheless prepared to distinguish between "a political adversary" and "an enemy of the Republic," and vote for the former.

So France has defended its national values in a way that the United States, in electing Donald Trump, failed to do. But has it also opened itself up to the reforms that Macron has championed? The hope, at the very least, is premature. There is very little evidence that French voters have become more enthusiastic about globalization or the EU or painful labor reforms than they have been over the last decade, when they filled the streets to block workplace laws proposed by both the Socialist president Francois Hollande and the conservative Republican Nicholas Sarkozy. Many commentators give Macron little chance of assembling a legislative majority in next month's elections for the National Assembly without which he will have trouble

governing. (See this able recitation of the conventional wisdom in *Foreign Affairs*.)

But this is the first day of spring training, and we should be looking for signs of hope, not futility. A poll released a few days before the election predicted that Macron's self-created political movement *En Marche!* would take 249 to 286 of the 577 seats. Macron's forces would essentially absorb the Socialist Party, whose representation would shrink to between 28 and 43. That would be an astonishing realignment, eliminating the institutional party of post-war France and the home of virtually its entire intellectual class, and substituting for it a party that did not exist until April 2016, when *En Marche!* was founded. If that happened, the feverish comparisons to Napoleon that I heard from one Macron insider might not be so very ridiculous.

The French are so deeply torn between fear of a globalized future in which they are quite sure they will lose, and the desperate hope to escape years of deadlock, that one can easily imagine either outcome. Laurent Bigorgne, head of the Montaigne Institute, a think tank in Paris, told me that Macron just might be the Moses who could lead France into the Promised Land of the 21st century. "Macron," Bigorgne told me, at the iconic Cafe de Flore where French sources have been meeting journalists for generations, "is part of a very small club of French people able to cope with globalization, who can explain to the French how we can gain the benefits of globalization." Bigorgne pointed me to a 2016 survey that found that 89 percent of respondents considered English fluency a critical attribute of an ideal president of France — a higher fraction than for any other qualification, including political or administrative experience. For a country so much worse than its neighbors at speaking foreign languages, this implies an almost painful yearning to swallow national pride and join a globalizing world.

You have to wonder how many secret *Macronistes* there are out there, wavering between fear and hope, between ideology and opportunity. The French distrust of capitalism is no myth. Mathieu Chaigne, a former pollster and the author of *France En Face*, a recently published book about French attitudes towards the state, said to me, "The French remain crypto-Marxists in their hearts. They're convinced that if something is good for companies, it's bad for workers. The win-win does not exist." Chaigne pointed out that polling on the modest 2016 labor reform

known as the *loi Khomry* found that 70 percent thought it favored corporations, and 15 percent thought it would boost employment. The groups did not overlap.

But they want an English-speaking president. And they voted for one. The French may stereotype themselves too much. Renaud Dutreil, the chairman of the luxury behemoth LVMH and a key Macron supporter, argues that French hostility towards the European Union, which Le Pen did everything she could to exploit, has very little to do with British-style Europhobia and a great deal to do with the dismayed sense that France has been evicted from its rightful place at the heart of the continent. "The dream," he told me, "is to have Europe, but a French version of Europe. Germany is the accountant, taking care of the economy, and France is the leader for political and moral values."

The idea that France doesn't matter very much any more is intolerable to the French. And Macron says, "We can matter again." What really is Napoleonic about Macron is his restlessness, his passion for movement, his sense of destiny — and the way he has wound France itself into his own ambitions. In his campaign book, bluntly titled *Révolution*, Macron writes, "For as long as I can remember, I always had this. ... conviction that nothing is more precious than the free choice of your action, the pursuit of a project that you set out, the realization of your talent, whatever it is." It was this calling, Macron writes, that made him enter politics, that made him "sensitive to the injustice of a society of rules, statutes, castes, of a social scorn where all conspire — to what result! — to prevent personal fulfillment." He makes himself sound like Lucien Rubempre, Balzac's provincial. Yet Macron has conquered from the word go. Despite a perfect record of individual success, he has managed to convert the fires of personal ambition into a political program to free his fellow men from the fetters of his caste-bound society.

Political leaders don't attract followers prepared to march off a cliff by publishing a list of sound proposals (perhaps the one thing about politics that Bill Clinton never explained to Hillary). They need music; they need metaphor. Emmanuel Macron is, as everyone notes, a technocrat, a pragmatist, a difference-splitter. Yet he understood the imperative of metaphor deeply enough to place it well ahead of policy in his campaign. Macron's metaphor was simple, and it was summarized in his party's name: motion. You could hear it in every speech. Here, for example, is Macron before a vast crowd in

Marseille last month: "It's now been more than twenty years that that the right and the left, in a back and forth which has become a habit, have divided the affairs of the nation between them. ... It's twenty years of obstruction of the country." By contrast, he cried, "What we're working together to do is true renewal, at all levels. Renewal of faces, renewal of practices, renewal of thoughts." Change, go, new: that was visceral Macronisme.

Macron did, in fact, have a program, though he held off delineating it until his metaphor had done its work among the multitudes who had always considered politics a waste of time, as well as among disgruntled supporters of the Socialists and the Republicans. It was a canny program, designed to subtly insinuate the win-win idea among voters to whom it was foreign. Can France afford to keep its 35-hour workweek when Asians were toiling six days a week? Le Pen and Jean-Luc Mélenchon, the candidate of the far-left *La France Insoumise*, defended the law as a sacred prerogative of the French worker; Francois Fillon, candidate of the Republicans, insisted that the French needed to work 39 hours, as they had in the past. Macron said: Everyone is wrong. Work rules, including hours, need to be determined in negotiations between firms and workers, as they are in much of the capitalist world, and not in negotiations between the state and the major unions. Such a system would offer employers flexibility without intrinsically disadvantaging workers.

Macron's economic policy would not have looked out of place at a "Third Way" conference during the era of Bill Clinton and Tony Blair. He wants to invest 50 billion euros over five years in a new program of lifelong job training, on green technology, and on the modernization of health care, agriculture, public administration and infrastructure. He wants to reduce corporate and capital gains taxes as well as taxes on wealth and on housing, while promising possibly notional savings by slowing the growth of health insurance costs, reforming unemployment insurance, mildly shrinking the vast public sector and introducing digital technology to the state. He wants to pry some of the regulatory barnacles off the ship of state — for example, by making it cheaper and easier to get a driver's license, which can take a year and cost 3,000 to 4,000 euros, preventing young people of modest means from taking a job far from a small-town home. (As finance minister, Macron broke the state's transportation monopoly by allowing

private companies to offer inter-city bus service.)

Listening to Macron and his supporters, you could almost believe that the new president has discovered a magical way to make an omelette without breaking any eggs. It is not so. In the first round of the elections, a majority of voters chose a candidate of the left or right who did not believe in free markets. Liberalism remains a dirty word in France. And so does the private sector. Bruno Cautrès, a scholar at the Centre for Political Research at Sciences Po, pointed out that Macron's plan to push labor decisions to the level of the firm would run headlong into a fundamental tenet of republicanism: "No one will accept that just because you live in a different place, you won't have the same rights, and the same duties, as someone elsewhere." What's more, he added, "There's a lack of trust in the good will of the *patronat*" — the bosses. "People don't trust their workplace or their company, especially in the small firms."

Macron has a plan to circumvent opposition, though for someone who touts the virtues of the grassroots, it's not a very democratic one. Early in his tenure, during his first summer in office, he plans to ask the Assembly for the right to issue an ordinance voiding the 35-hour week and leaving the private sector to determine a range of labor conditions. This will provoke tremendous opposition and require a near-majority in the Assembly, but unions can not

organize mass protests during the summer holiday, and Macron hopes that by the time of the *rentrée*, in early September, the new rules will have become irreversible. That's a lot to count on.

Macron's tenure will rise or fall on whether, as Cautrès puts it, he can "lift some blockage that people feel will never change," above all youth unemployment, which now hovers around 25 percent and seems immune to all treatment. But the economy was only one of the twin poles of the campaign; the other was national identity. The 35 percent of French voters who went with Le Pen share a belief that national identity is under assault from immigrants, refugees, bureaucrats in Brussels and elites in Paris. Macron's election will vindicate their fears every bit as much as Le Pen's election would have confirmed the deepest anxieties of cosmopolitan liberals. Macron is their antitype — a banker, a product of France's elite schools, a secular liberal, a globalist. There is no middle ground on these existential issues. And Macron has not pretended to occupy one. He was the most unapologetically pro-European of the eleven candidates in the first round, arguing that France needed to draw closer to Germany, and to help establish a new body inside the EU that would set policy and pool funds for nations in the Eurozone. In *Révolution*, he writes, "We have confused sovereignty and nationalism. I'll say it: the true sovereignists are the pro-Europeans."

That "I'll say it" is an implicit acknowledgment of how far out of step Macron is with his own citizens. He believes that if France starts playing by EU rules — for example, by reducing its deficit — it can resume its rightful position of leadership in Brussels, and thus push for needed European reforms and mollify French nationalists. It needs to be said, at the very least, that no one would take so brave and unlikely a position save out of genuine conviction. Macron is no calculating cynic; he has argued, convincingly, that Europe did a terrible job of preparing for the flood of refugees that began in the summer of 2015, but he has also said that France must accept its share of refugees and do everything necessary to integrate them in French society. He has refuted Le Pen's insistent claim that France should lock up everyone on its list of terrorism suspects, known as *Fiche S*. And in the aftermath of the Christmas market attack in Berlin, he took to the pages of *Le Monde* to stoutly defend Germany's open-door policy to refugees and to insist that "the solution lies in protection, not in closing ourselves off, in a stronger European cooperation and not in an ineffective national retort."

When another terrorist attack strikes France, as it is bound to do, President Macron will have to combine outrage with admonitions that effective police and intelligence work will protect the nation more effectively than dragnets and emergency laws. He will have to hope that the French will not be scared out of their wits — that they

cherish their lives too much to surrender them to fear. It's worked so far, but barely.

It is hard to imagine that a 39-year-old man who has never held elective office, who has led a charmed life that has brought him wealth, station, and now power, can navigate through these rocks and lead his nation out of the whirlpool in which it has been spinning around and around for long years. Renewal, of course, is the work of the young, as both John F. Kennedy and Barack Obama could attest. Macron lacks the seductive charm of the one and the twice-born irony of the other. He is a solemn and very sententious young man. Perhaps, however, this is what the French want from their leader. "He's in the presidential mood, like De Gaulle," says Laurent Bigorgne, the think tank director, who has known Macron since university days.

At times, when he writes about France, this young ex-banker does strike an almost Gaullist note. He seems to have been born old. "As a Frenchman," he writes in *Révolution*, "I think that our destiny lies in renewing the thread of that history which has seen us, for a thousand years, maintain an incomparable place in the community of nations. France is loved for the ranks she holds. ... She is herself, strong and proud, when she holds that rank. She is always ready to do so. It is only a matter of reconstituting her forces. We are already there."



Emmanuel Macron, the Next President of France

By Emily Tamkin

May 7, 2017 - 2:46 pm

Emmanuel Macron — a 39-year-old former banker who formed his political party around a year ago — will be the next president of France, according to exit polls released around 8 pm local time on Sunday.

According to those polls, Macron bested his opponent, Marine Le Pen of the far-right National Front with roughly 65 percent of the vote; she received around 35 percent. Turnout was 65.3 percent at 5 pm local time — down from 71.96 percent in 2012. Over a quarter of voters abstained — the highest on record for France in decades (perhaps because far-left candidate Jean-Luc Mélenchon said he would not endorse either of the candidates after he failed to make the second round).

The result, then, went much the way experts and pollsters alike expected it to go — even with an eleventh hour dump of hacked (and faked)

Macron emails and documents just hours before the campaign officially ended on Friday. French media, however, also respected the blackout law — *Le Monde*, for example, one of the biggest papers in France, announced it would not publish or report on the Macron leaks until after Sunday's second round vote).

Macron is expected to celebrate at a packed rally at the Louvre. Le Pen's post-vote party was, much like her candidacy, fraught with scandal even before it got started — after media outlets like *Politico* and *BuzzFeed France* were refused admittance, *Le Monde* and *Bloomberg* refused to cover the event out of solidarity.

At Vincennes Park in Paris, Le Pen thanked the 11 million who voted for her, and all those who wanted to choose patriotism over globalization. "I call on all patriots to take part in the decisive political battles ... Long live the republic, long live France."

And with that, she had conceded, and walked off the stage.

Macron thanked those who voted for him, but went on to address every citizen of France. "I'm speaking to each of you tonight, to all of you together who make up the people of France. We have a duty to our country." He added, "It is our very civilization that is at stake," and said he would fight against terrorism and global warming, and for the French people and Europe. "A new page of our history is starting today. I want this new page to be one of hope."

Macron's win is met with "an extraordinary global sense of relief," Irene Finel-Honigman, a French politics expert at Columbia University, told Foreign Policy. From the perspective of global markets and politics, as well as from a European perspective, she said, this is "still seen as a total positive." And, indeed, Macron's win over Le Pen will be widely seen as a clear victory for Europe and a blow to xenophobia and fear.

But that doesn't mean Sunday was a complete victory for Macron — or a total loss for Le Pen.

Macron's next challenge is the parliamentary election in June. His own *En Marche* (Forward) movement, roughly a year old, faces an uphill battle in winning a legislative majority. "A new election will start immediately," Pierre Vimont of Carnegie Europe said.

In the likely event that Macron's movement does not win a majority, he will need to try to form a workable governing coalition, bringing together some from the left and the right. With jobs at the top of voters' concerns, he'll likely want to move quickly to enact labor market reforms, and that will require confidence of people and parliament alike.

But forming and leading a governing coalition is not so simple. For one thing, as Martin Michelot of the Prague-based EUROPEUM told FP, the traditional right and left parties

— namely, the Republicans and the Socialists — were left in shambles after they both failed to make the second round (the first time in the history of the Fifth Republic that neither was able to do so).

"What will also be interesting to see is whether French politicians can develop a coalition and compromise culture," Michelot said. "In the context of the left/right divide, whoever was in opposition tended to vote against the majority along pretty strict party lines, in what was a rather unconstructive system."

A
Macron

presidency with a coalition government could be a chance to change all that — or it could mean Macron has to fight with both sides every time he wants to push a policy through, warned Columbia University's Sheri Berman. That would only see the already massively discontented French electorate grow still more despondent.

And if that's the case, there's one recently defeated force that will be ready and waiting.

What we saw in this election, said Yascha Mounk, an expert on liberal democracy and populism, was "a

radically transformed political landscape. [Le Pen] has more than doubled her party's vote over the course of 15 years." In 2002, when her father, Jean Marie Le Pen, faced Jacques Chirac, he got just 18 percent of the vote. "Imagine how she'll do five years from now."

"The trend line is incredibly scary," Mounk said.

For Macron, "It's going to be hard," said Alessia Lefebure of Columbia University. Under the French constitution, parliament is more empowered than the president, but that hasn't been the case — or at least hasn't been perceived as being

the case — in recent history. Still, Lefebure — like millions of French voters today — isn't entirely pessimistic.

"I think this could be a very positive moment," she said. "France will be again very active in Europe, bringing hope to people in Europe that see the anti-democratic movement."

"If he's smart, he can benefit from this momentum, and then the French will follow him."



Centrist Macron wins French presidential election

Mallory
Shelbo
urne

6-8 minutes

Emmanuel Macron, leader of the center-left En Marche! party, won France's presidential election on Sunday, according to France24 and other outlets.

The French network projected the win as soon as polls closed, saying Macron had won an estimated 65 percent of the vote.

Following the initial results, FiveThirtyEight's Nate Silver said Macron was on track to beat polling expectations.

"Macron headed for a ~31 point win, which will mean polls underestimated him by ~7 pt. A bigger error than Brexit and much bigger than Trump!" Silver tweeted.

Addressing the nation following his victory, Macron thanked Francois Hollande, the current leader, and saluted his opponent, National Front leader Marine Le Pen, according to Reuters.

The president-elect said he does not discount the economic issues facing the country and also promised, "France will be on the front line in the fight against terrorism."

"I know the country is divided ... I understand the anger, the anxiety, the doubt," he added. "I want to be the president of all the people of France, for the patriots facing the threat of nationalism."

Macron's victory deals a blow to the populist movement across Europe, and a former deputy national security adviser to President Obama said he thinks the defeat of Le Pen signals a "blow" to far-right nationalism.

"Macron's win is a blow to far-right nationalism and a sign (after

Austrian, Dutch elections) that the Brexit-Trump wave has broken in West," Ben Rhodes tweeted Sunday.

Former Democratic presidential candidate Hillary Clinton Hillary Rodham Clinton This week: Senate Republicans search for deal on ObamaCare repeal Juan Williams: GOP health moves set to backfire The 43 people who might run against Trump in 2020 MORE also weighed in on Twitter, saying Macron's win is a "victory for Macron, for France, the EU, & the world" and a "Defeat to those interfering w/democracy. (But the media says I can't talk about that)."

Clinton's campaign, like Macron's, was targeted by hacks and interference that many believe to be tied to Russia.

Macron and Le Pen emerged as the top two contenders following the first round of France's presidential election last month.

Le Pen called Macron and conceded shortly after the announced projections, Reuters said.

"France has voted for continuity," the National Front leader said. She said she called Macron to congratulate him, even as she urged the National Front and its supporters to regroup.

"I propose we embark on a completely new phase for our party, which the French want and is absolutely necessary," she said. " ... I urge all my supporters to commit to this campaign."

President Trump, who pundits have compared to Le Pen, congratulated Macron on Twitter Sunday afternoon.

"Congratulations to Emmanuel Macron on his big win today as the next President of France. I look very much forward to working with him!" Trump wrote.

The White House also issued a statement on the results, saying: "We congratulate President-elect Macron and the people of France on their successful presidential election," Spicer said. "We look forward to working with the new President and continuing our close cooperation with the French government."

Some of the rhetoric during Le Pen's presidential campaign echoed that of Trump's, specifically on immigration and national security issues. Both candidates during their bids criticized the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO). Trump has since backed off his NATO criticisms, saying the alliance is "no longer obsolete."

A Le Pen victory would likely have marked a sharp shift in French politics, as the National Front leader has spoke of at least partially withdrawing from NATO and holding a referendum on France's membership in the European Union (EU).

Outgoing French President Francois Hollande also called Macron to congratulate him, CNN reported.

"His large victory confirms that a very large majority of our citizens wanted to assemble around the values of the Republic and mark their attachment to the European Union as well as to the openness of France in the world," a statement from the president reads.

A spokesperson for British Prime Minister Theresa May issued a statement following the projection results, according to a reporter for Agence France-Presse.

"The Prime Minister warmly congratulates President-elect Macron on his election success. France is one of our closest allies and we look forward to working with the new President on a wide range of shared priorities," the spokesperson said.

Other European leaders took to Twitter to commend Macron, such as Belgian Prime Minister Charles Michel and the head of the European Commission.

Bravo @EmmanuelMacron Laat ons samenwerken om Europa een nieuw elan te geven! #Presidentielles2017

— Charles Michel (@CharlesMichel) May 7, 2017

Félicitations @EmmanuelMacron! Heureux que les Français aient choisi un avenir européen. Ensemble pour une #Europe plus forte et plus juste pic.twitter.com/GWlXKYs4hL

— Jean-Claude Juncker (@JunckerEU) May 7, 2017

A spokesman for German Chancellor Angela Merkel congratulated Macron on the win.

"Congratulations, @EmmanuelMacron. Your victory is a victory for a strong and United Europe and the Franco-German friendship," Steffen Seibert said.

The value of the Euro reportedly jumped after Macron was projected as the winner.

The closely watched race has been viewed as a test of the nativist and populist sentiments rising to the surface in Europe since the United Kingdom's vote to leave the European Union and since President Trump's November election victory in the U.S.

Le Pen's loss would be the second for a far-right party in Europe in recent months. Geert Wilders of the Party for Freedom in the Netherlands lost in the country's March election.

Macron in the last week officially gained the support of former President Barack Obama Barack Obama to tour Trump administration, focusing on working families, women Regulations, farmers and the law Obama to

discuss climate change in Italy MORE, who endorsed Macron on Thursday. But his campaign also fell victim to a large-scale email hack just days before the election when

an archive of purported campaign was posted online.

The Sunday runoff putting Macron against Le Pen did not include a

candidate from one of France's major political parties.

Macron, who is consistently pro-European Union, previously served

as the economy minister under current Hollande.

Updated 4:45 p.m.

THE NEW YORKER The Huge Challenges Facing Emmanuel Macron, France's New President

by Françoise Mouly

7-9 minutes

Emmanuel Macron, who defeated Marine Le Pen in the French Presidential election on Sunday, delivers his victory speech at the Louvre, festooned by the flags of France and the European Union. Credit: PHOTOGRAPH BY DAVID RAMOS / GETTY

As Emmanuel Macron and his supporters celebrated his big victory in the French Presidential election outside the Louvre on Sunday night, you could almost hear the sighs of relief from other parts of Europe, and also from this country. After a long and fractious campaign, which saw the two parties that have run France for decades humiliated, and the far-right National Front enjoying record levels of support, the center ultimately held. Which is good news all around.

Last November, it looked as if Donald Trump's election, which followed the Brexit vote in Britain, might herald a wave of successes for far-right nationalist parties across Europe. That hasn't happened. First in Austria, then in the Netherlands, and now in France, the spiritual home of European democracy, the extremists have been defeated in national elections. For now, at least, it looks as if Trump's success may have marked the crest of a right-wing wave, rather than the upsurge.

In Sunday's election, Marine Le Pen, the leader of the National Front, virtually doubled the share of the vote that her father, Jean-Marie, received in the 2002 Presidential election. But she didn't get close to the forty per cent that she had breached in some opinion polls. Surveys taken in the past couple of weeks indicated that Macron would win by somewhere between twenty and twenty-five percentage points. In the event, his margin of victory was about thirty-one percentage points—65.5 per cent to 34.5 per cent. (This according to the French exit poll, which is much more

reliable than its American counterpart.)

The endorsements Macron received from politicians of the center-right and center-left after he came out on top in the first round of voting helped his cause a lot, as did the critical coverage that almost all of the French media meted out to Le Pen. But, even allowing for these factors, the final result represented a stirring victory for a thirty-nine-year-old former technocrat and investment banker who had never run for office, and who only founded his independent political movement, *En Marche!*, last April.

In an address at his campaign headquarters, in the Fifteenth Arrondissement, shortly after the result was announced, Macron sought to project an image of himself as a sober and mature leader, someone fully prepared to enter the Élysée Palace. He also recapitulated some of the themes of his campaign, including his defense of liberal values, his support for the European Union, and his embrace of hope and optimism. "I will protect and defend France's vital interests. I will protect and defend Europe," he declared. He added, "It is a new page in our long history, and I want that page to be a page of trust and hope recovered."

After thanking the outgoing President, François Hollande, for his services to the country, Macron said he would seek to overcome the divisions in French society that the campaign had highlighted. His main goal, he said, was to "calm people's fears, restore France's confidence, and gather all its people together to face the immense challenges that face us." He went on, "I will fight against the division . . . With humility but with total devotion and total determination, I am going to serve on your behalf. Long live the Republic, and long live France."

As this speech indicated, Macron is stronger on generalizations and appeals for unity than specific policy proposals. During the campaign, he pledged to cut government spending, reform the tax code, and

loosen up France's rigid labor markets—all this in an effort to make the French economy more dynamic. But he didn't spell out many details.

On the French left, he is widely seen as the Gallic equivalent of Tony Blair, a youthful figure intent on forcing trade unions and workers to submit to the rigors of the global market. Skeptical conservative politicians point out that he served in Hollande's Socialist government for four years, and that he promised not to scrap two pillars of the French welfare state: the thirty-five-hour work week and the retirement age, sixty-two.

It is unclear what sort of mandate Macron will have for carrying out his reform program. To a large extent, his first-place finish in the first round of the election represented a rejection of the traditional parties rather than a vigorous endorsement of his agenda. Hollande didn't even enter the race because he is so unpopular. The candidate of the center-right Republican party, François Fillon, saw his campaign undone by a corruption scandal.

Similarly, Macron's victory in Sunday's runoff may have largely represented a rejection of Le Pen and the National Front, with its record of racism, anti-Semitism, and apologies for Vichyism. According to the exit poll, forty-three per cent of Macron's voters cast their ballots primarily to keep out Le Pen. Although Macron's margin was large, turnout was low by French standards, and many ballots were left blank. Clearly, lots of voters didn't like either of the choices.

Much now depends on next month's parliamentary elections, which will determine how much support Macron has in the National Assembly, which makes legislation. At the moment, the Socialists and their allies have a sizable majority. Macron's *En Marche!* party is planning to field candidates in all five hundred and seventy-seven constituencies, but it's far from clear how they will fare. Despite his personal victory, his centrist political

movement is still young and untested.

There is also a great deal of uncertainty about what impact Sunday's result will have on the future of the E.U. By removing the possibility of a Le Pen Presidency, Macron's victory lifted the gravest immediate threat to the union: a deeply Euro-skeptic government taking office in Paris, to go along with the one in London. Even before Macron arrived at the Louvre, Angela Merkel, the German Chancellor, had called and congratulated him. "She praised him for championing a united European Union that is open to the world," Merkel's spokesman said.

But one election result doesn't mean that the E.U., which has just suffered through a lost decade in economic terms, can now mobilize enough popular support to survive and prosper. Macron supports open borders, free trade, free movement of labor, and greater efforts to accommodate refugees and assimilate Muslim minorities—all of which are under threat. His big idea is that, by showing that France is capable of serious internal reforms, the country will be able to persuade Germany to shift the E.U. toward a less austere economic policy, one more favorable to growth. Previous French Presidents have harbored similar ambitions that went nowhere in the face of Teutonic resistance. Can Macron do better?

But these are challenges for the future. Right now, it is enough to celebrate the defeat of right-wing extremism and to salute the victor. "What we have done, there is no comparison, there is no equivalent for that," Macron told the cheering crowd outside the Louvre. "Everyone was saying it was impossible, but they didn't know anything about France." After he had finished speaking, the President-elect clutched his hand to his heart, closed his eyes, and led the crowd in a spirited rendition of "La Marseillaise." Even from afar, it was hard not to join in.

NPR : Emmanuel Macron Declared French President In Early Vote Counts : The Two-Way

Frank Langfitt Twitter Facebook 6-8 minutes Instagram

Emmanuel Macron acknowledges supporters at the Louvre on Sunday

after winning the French presidential election. Pro-EU centrist Macron defeated far-right rival Marine Le Pen by a comfortable margin. **Patrick Aventurier/Getty Images hide caption**

toggle caption

Patrick Aventurier/Getty Images

Emmanuel Macron acknowledges supporters at the Louvre on Sunday after winning the French presidential election. Pro-EU centrist Macron defeated far-right rival Marine Le Pen by a comfortable margin.

Patrick Aventurier/Getty Images

France has a new president. Emmanuel Macron — an independent centrist who has never held elected office — has won a resounding victory over far-right, nationalist Marine Le Pen in the most important French presidential race in decades.

According to the French Interior Ministry and multiple news outlets, Macron won with near 66 percent of the vote over Le Pen's just over 34 percent.

In his victory speech outside Paris' Louvre Museum, where thousands of Macron supporters gathered, the 39-year-old vowed to bring "hope and renewed confidence" to France amid widened social rifts exposed by the election campaign.

"I know the divisions in our nation that led some to extreme votes. I respect them," he declared, solemnly. "I know the anger, the anxiety, the doubts that a large number of you also expressed. It is my responsibility to hear them."

Sunday's results mark a big defeat for Le Pen, a right-wing populist who had hoped to repeat the surprise victories of Donald Trump and the

Brexit camp, which won last summer's referendum to take the United Kingdom out of the European Union.

Le Pen called to congratulate Macron and conceded defeat to a gathering of supporters of her National Front party in Paris. But she vowed to continue her fight.

"We are now the second part in the country," she told supporters. "It is up to us to confront the globalist agenda of Macron."

Macron, who has never held elective office, is set to become the youngest president in modern French history. His improbable path to victory has been extraordinary in that it included dispatching France's two major political parties, the Socialists and the Republicans.

Macron does not have a lot of time to savor his victory. His movement, *En Marche!* (Onwards!), which he created last year, does not hold a single seat in France's lower-house of parliament. If Macron hopes to govern effectively, his party needs to win as many seats as it can in legislative elections scheduled for next month.

Corinne Mellul, who teaches political science at Catholic University of Lille in northern France, noted that although Le Pen lost, she did far better than her father, Jean-Marie Le Pen.

Jean-Marie Le Pen founded the National Front in 1972. For much of its existence, the party was treated as a political pariah. When Jean-Marie advanced to the run-off in the 2002 presidential race, his candidacy provoked street protests and the other political parties called on their voters to reject him. As a consequence, center-right President Jacques Chirac won a second term

in a landslide with Jean-Marie Le Pen receiving less than 18 percent of the vote.

By getting a little more than a third of the vote, Le Pen shows "there is a lot of anger, there's a lot of frustration, many grievances on the part of the voters," Mellul said. "I think Macron in the next five years will ignore these grievances and this anger at his own peril."

The French presidential race — which has been closely watched around the world — became the latest referendum in the West on globalization and its benefits and societal costs. The race here also focused on the deeper question of what it means to be French.

As the day began, French voters faced a stark choice. Macron, 39, is an avowed internationalist who speaks fluent English and envisions a France deeply integrated with Europe and open to the world.

The France Le Pen described to supporters in her National Front party could not be more different. Le Pen, 48, had called for a temporary ban on immigration, a referendum to leave the European Union and replacing the Euro with the Franc, the old French currency.

Among those cheering Macron's victory are officials in Brussels who work with the European Union. The E.U. is in the early stages of negotiating the exit of the United Kingdom, which is seen as damaging to the 28-member trading block, but not fatal. Le Pen had promised as president to call a referendum to pull France out of the E.U., which would have threatened to destroy the institution.

The White House released a statement Sunday congratulating Macron: "We look forward to

working with the new President and continuing our close cooperation with the French government."

Macron's victory is not a surprise as polls routinely showed him far ahead of Le Pen. Political observers insisted that she faced an electoral glass ceiling because they perceived her positions as too extreme to win over the majority of French voters.

The final week of the race was marked by dramatic twists and turns.

On Wednesday, the candidates faced off in a gripping televised debate that ran two and a half hours without any commercial breaks. Le Pen, who is a fiery speaker with a laser-focused message, was expected to clobber Macron, who has little political experience. Macron had served as economy minister in the outgoing, deeply unpopular government of President Francois Hollande.

Le Pen spent most of the evening on the attack, but provided few detailed solutions to France's myriad problems, which include a 23-percent youth unemployment rate and a spate of horrifying, terrorist attacks in recent two years. Both the news media and public opinion suggested Macron was the clear winner.

On Friday, hackers dumped a trove of emails from Macron's campaign on the internet in an apparent attempt to damage his candidacy just ahead of today's vote. But the French government warned both the media and citizens not to spread the hacked documents and abide by a traditional black-out ahead of the vote. The hacked documents did not appear to gain much traction and were not seen to have an effect on today's results.

the Atlantic

Emmanuel Macron Wins Big in the French Election-Now Comes the Hard Part

Uri Friedman

7-9 minutes

Emmanuel Macron, the next president of France, campaigned on a slogan of "Together, France!" And why not? He is a sunny centrist who attracted votes from the left and the right to decisively defeat the far-right nationalist Marine Le Pen on Sunday. The center seems not only to have held, but to have swelled.

But Macron's victory could further fracture French politics rather than bridge the country's political divisions, illustrating a challenge

confronting many democracies at the moment, especially in Europe: A disenchanting public has blown up the political establishment, but it's difficult to then fashion a well-functioning government out of the pieces. This can produce more disillusionment with politics, not less.

For signs of trouble ahead, consider the fact that a full quarter of the French electorate didn't cast a ballot in this weekend's runoff presidential election—one of the highest abstention rates in the history of France's Fifth Republic, which was established by Charles de Gaulle in 1958. French voters are so disillusioned with their political

leaders that, for the first time in the history of the Fifth Republic, the runoff didn't feature a representative from the main parties of the left and right. Whether that's a response to the government's failure to boost a stagnant economy, secure the nation from ISIS-inspired terrorism, or assimilate immigrants and address the downsides of globalization, the French consistently express low levels of trust in government. In the run-up to Sunday's vote, a survey found that French voters are more polarized than the citizens of other European countries, with 20 percent describing themselves as politically extreme (compared with 7 percent in the EU

as a whole) and 36 percent identifying as centrist (compared with 62 percent in the EU). So much for togetherness.

Related Story

What If the 'Populist Wave' Is Just Political Fragmentation?

This protest against politics-as-usual is what catapulted Macron, a former government official who has never held elected office, into the Elysee Palace. He doesn't belong to a party and only founded his "On the Move" movement a year ago. But the

political independence that proved an asset during the presidential campaign could become a liability during parliamentary elections in June.

Macron has promised to field On the Move candidates in every French electoral district, and polls suggest the movement could win more seats in France's National Assembly than any other party—maybe even enough to achieve a majority in the 577-seat lower house, which would be astonishing for an organization that has only just burst onto the political scene.

If, however, Macron falls short of a majority, he will need to form a governing coalition with other parties. And if another party wins a majority, he will need to deal with that rival party, in a scenario the French refer to rather euphemistically as “cohabitation.”

In France, presidents have for the last several decades generally been drawn from the major center-left or center-right party. Their victory in presidential elections has typically paved the way for their party to win a majority in parliament, allowing the president to appoint a prime minister from his party who will run the government according to the president's wishes. This hasn't always occurred; the Fifth Republic has experienced cohabitation three

times. But the system has been running smoothly for a while: France hasn't endured divided government since a constitutional amendment in the early 2000s that made both presidential and parliamentary terms five years, and scheduled parliamentary elections shortly after presidential elections to reduce the likelihood of cohabitation.

“During cohabitation periods, the presidency diminished in stature, and the premier tended to exercise the main executive policymaking authority,” writes John Carey, a comparative-politics professor at Dartmouth College. “For example, in the late 1980s, [Jacques] Chirac as premier engineered a major tax cut and privatized state-owned enterprises while the Socialist [President Francois] Mitterand could only watch. But when Chirac was president, Socialist Party Premier [Lionel] Jospin pushed through legislation to shorten the workweek from 39 hours to 35.”

Now, however, France's traditional party system has imploded—and the risks of cohabitation and political dysfunction have returned. If an opposition party ends up controlling the National Assembly, Macron will likely be blocked from carrying out his ambitious policy agenda, which includes cutting government spending and giving employers more flexibility to hire, fire, and

negotiate with employees. If he has to cobble together a coalition of diverse factions, he will have to painstakingly build support for each vote on each piece of legislation. As Francois Fillon, the Republican candidate who lost in the first round of the presidential election, memorably put it, Macron might have to again and again “cook up parliamentary dishes of impotence and compromises”—the very worst kind of French cuisine.

In these scenarios, the election of Macron would have the opposite effect of what his supporters intend: A man elected to finally get things done would struggle to get things done; a man elected to break with the traditional parties would have to work closely with them. Desires for political change and disillusionment with government might only grow.

This vicious circle is playing out across Europe, where frustration with establishment politics is hollowing out center-right and center-left parties, splintering the political landscape into an array of small- and medium-sized parties competing for influence. “The more fragmentation occurs, the more difficult it's going to be [for fragile, unstable coalition governments] to pass any type of coherent policy program,” the political scientist Robin Best told me after the Dutch election. “And voters are probably

going to end up being even more dissatisfied” and inclined toward protest votes and politicians on the political extremes.

If, on the other hand, On the Move secures a parliamentary majority, or if Republican and Socialist lawmakers decide to be uncommonly cooperative, Macron's presidency could go swimmingly. As the historian Aline-Florence Manent has pointed out, De Gaulle designed the Fifth Republic so that it wouldn't be dependent on political parties, which he viewed as sources of gridlock and instability. The founder of modern France “designed the Fifth Republic as a hybrid regime, combining the institutions of a parliamentary system with a powerful presidential office so that a crisis in the party system might not necessarily provoke a crisis of government,” Manent notes.

Macron's presidency will “be a true test of the Fifth Republic as De Gaulle envisioned it,” she added. “So far, this has never really been tested, because the system developed into a *de facto* two party system.”

“It may have taken 60 years,” Manent writes, “but De Gaulle's vision of the Fifth Republic could well be coming to a point of crisis.”



Paris breathes a sigh of relief as Macron takes center stage

By Kara Fox, CNN

Updated 2:11 AM ET, Mon May 8, 2017

Paris (CNN) A fiery dance party broke out in the French capital on Sunday night as Parisian voters celebrated the victory of their new president, Emmanuel Macron.

Thousands gathered in front of the Louvre, waving the tri-colored flag as they embraced one another under a blazing soundtrack of pop music among scantily clad dancers and neon laser lights.

The set was perhaps unconventional for a presidential victory party -- but then again, this was no ordinary election -- nor an ordinary electorate.

Throughout the campaign, Macron's unique political offering spoke to neither the traditional left nor the right, helping shake up an already confused electorate looking for political solutions outside of the norm.

On Sunday night, with 66.06% of the vote secured, Macron overthrew any chance of his opponent, the far-right nationalist Marine Le Pen, entering

a higher political sphere -- and Parisians rejoiced.

A couple dances at Macron's victory rally at the Louvre in Paris on Sunday night.

It seemed as if the city was released from the plague of a decision unlike any other, collectively embracing a *joie de vivre* once again, manifested in the form of a new president whose landslide victory was celebrated until the early hours of Monday morning.

In front of two gigantic LED screens with Macron's party logo “En Marche!,” a stoic man waving a French flag stood out from a crowd of undulating bodies.

“This is a new story and a new beginning for France,” Loic Victor said.

Victor, a 30-year-old international development officer originally from Martinique, a Caribbean island that's an overseas region of France, told CNN he supported Macron from the beginning because he defined a new political class, one that is “not right, not left.”

Loic Victor celebrated Macron's victory at the Louvre on Sunday night.

Macron, France's youngest incoming president, was once a political wild card. The 39-year-old centrist independent -- a former investment banker turned government minister who entered the presidential race without the backing of any established party -- garnered a solid footing through his pro-EU stance and promises to reform France's welfare and pension systems.

But there is no doubt that his win was also largely thanks to the traditional left, a group that had no candidate in the second round of voting. Many on the left voted for Macron out of fear of the other option: a country led by Le Pen and her xenophobic, anti-EU extremist National Front party.

Parisians dance and cheer at the Macron victory rally on Sunday night.

At the victory rally, Anas Ammounah, a 29-year-old Syrian refugee, said he was especially on-edge in the weeks leading up to the election.

Along with his wife and daughter, who were reunited in France six months ago, Ammounah waved the French flag as high as his smile was wide. He spoke of the generosity and kindness he received in the 18 months since he arrived in the country as a documented refugee -- and of the fear that it might be stripped away under a Le Pen government.

“We're here to celebrate a victory against Le Pen,” he told CNN. “We found that Le Pen would stop immigration and we were scared.”

“We hope Macron will stop (Syrian President) Bashar, so we can return to our home,” he added.

Anas Ammounah, a Syrian refugee, attends the celebrations with his family in Paris on May 7.

Returning to their home in war-ravaged Aleppo remains a distant dream for Ammounah's family, so they basked in the bright lights of Macron's win in their new home in Paris. The win to them was a victory for France but also felt uniquely theirs.

As victory celebrations raged on into the late hours of Sunday night, a group of left-wing protesters clashed

with police in a Northern Paris suburb.

What to know about Emmanuel Macron 01:32

When asked about the protests, Macron supporter Pascal Bardin, 60, chalked it up as a typical reaction of young, left-wing political activists. He told CNN that the demonstrations didn't speak specifically to the fact that Macron won but reflected the French national pastime of protest.

"Whenever anyone is in power, they say 'degage' (French for 'Get Lost')," Bardin explained. "Whenever anyone can't fix my life, 'degage.'"

Macron will face a daunting task in uniting a nearly obliterated traditional left (along with Macron's

allies from the right) who voted for him simply in rejection of Le Pen.

A woman walks past election campaign posters in Paris' 18th district. One poster, in yellow, encourages voters to vote against Marine Le Pen.

At his victory rally, Macron spoke to this fissure.

"I know the country is divided and this has led to people voting for extremes," Macron said during a speech at his team's headquarters Sunday night. "I understand the anger, the anxiety, the doubt which many of you have expressed and it is my responsibility to hear that."

Earlier in the evening, as the final polls rolled in, a crowd of residents of Paris' 15th district lined the

streets around Macron's heavily-policed campaign headquarters.

Sabine Gruhier was one of them.

The 47-year-old Parisian tech-savvy start-up officer donned a red hat in commemoration of the lives lost in the 2015 Charlie Hebdo attacks as she waited to hear the results.

Gruhier told CNN that although Macron's win was "surely the best option" for her country, it was a shame that her fellow citizens were pushed to such a polarizing extreme that presented them to choose an option that didn't represent any of their political identities.

Sabine Gruhier (L), of Paris' 15th district, gathers with her neighbors on the street outside Macron's

headquarters moments before the polls close on election day.

As Macron declared victory, Gruhier let out a sigh of relief, but vowed to remain politically vigilant throughout his candidacy. She called on Macron to investigate the spread of fake news online -- something she believes helped to fuel a grassroots spread of "ignorance" that led to Le Pen's rise in popularity.

"With this election I think people realized democracy is something fragile, and we have to keep fighting to protect it. Even if Macron won, we must still fight -- because the situation that Le Pen put us in was frightening."

CBS : Why Emmanuel Macron French election matters to US and Donald Trump

Pamela Falk

5-6 minutes

PARIS -- Despite its predictability, the election victory of Emmanuel Macron, a 39-year-old liberal (in American parlance, anyway) has drawn a sigh of collective relief from all corners but the far-right. Even American centrists and more conservative Washington Republicans may take comfort that the Old World has not lost all perspective.

Leader of 'En Marche!' Emmanuel Macron addresses supporters after winning the French Presidential Election, at The Louvre, May 7, 2017 in Paris, France.

Getty

Many feared the anti-immigration, protectionist and isolationist tide that recently swept over the U.S. presidential and British European referendum votes could spread to mainland Europe, but in this era of polarization -- for now, at least -- the political center has held.

As a result, from a defense and economic perspective, the U.S. can still rely on its European Union (EU) ally.

Trade

Macron supports staying in the EU, while his defeated opponent, Marine Le Pen, was adamantly against it. With some 500 million consumers, the EU is a massive market for U.S. goods, and the bloc remains the biggest single U.S. trading partner.

President Trump's Commerce Secretary Wilber Ross has prioritized opening trade talks with the EU.

For now, stanching the risk that France might have followed in the U.K.'s path and headed for the "Frexit" should negate any serious impact on global trade.

Defense

NATO and the common defense structure of the West also benefit from the Macron victory. "The European Union will die," Le Pen predicted, and she made a platform of pulling out of NATO, as well.

Macron, on the other hand, warned that Balkanizing Europe would have disrupted the global fight against the Islamic State of Iraq and Syria (ISIS), and he emphasized sharing intelligence with the U.S.

The recent terror attacks in France have put counterterrorism high on the U.S.-French agenda.

New York Police Department Counterterror and Intelligence Deputy Commissioner John Miller has described those attacks as the "new normal," and he says they demand cross-border cooperation. Speaking two weeks ago at New York Law School, Miller called Paris' counterterrorism command center essential to fighting the terror threat in "real time."

On Syria, the U.S. and Russia continue to disagree over how to resolve the conflict and support for Syria's President Bashar Assad.

Macron will likely maintain the outgoing French government's firm stance against Assad, strengthening Mr. Trump's own position. He praised President Trump's decision to launch a strike directly targeting Assad's forces in retaliation for a chemical weapons attack earlier this year. Le Pen criticized that strike.

Climate

Macron's election ensures France will stick to the Paris Agreement on climate change, agreed just last year in the French capital by 195 countries, including the U.S.

Macron will likely try to convince Mr. Trump to stay the course on the agreement; in Oslo this week, investors with \$15 trillion of assets urged governments to stick with the agreement, and even members of Mr. Trump's family are on the case.

Catastrophe averted, for now

French essayist and documentary filmmaker, Romuald Sciora, who runs Le Monde diplomatique Debates and is now living in the U.S., has written on U.S.-French relations for years, and he told CBS News that a Le Pen victory would have been a disaster for Europe, and the rest of the world by extension.

Still, Sciora laments that "the victory of Macron won't change anything about the nationalist wave across the Western world; only a veritable civilizational revolution would be able to stop this wave."

"Those Americans ready to write off Europe as a dream gone sour may

be disappointed that the nationalist and populist wave has been halted," notes Alan Riding, an author and former New York Times Paris bureau chief. He also has a word of caution, however: "Macron's victory brings enormous relief to those who want the European Union to survive, but it does not resolve Europe's problems: it merely averts a catastrophe."

Riding says Macron still faces the immense challenge of unifying a country increasingly divided economically, politically and socially, "and many French still harbor doubts he can do this."

As CBS News' Mark Phillips reports, Macron appeared recently at an event with the out-going President Francois Hollande, and he now inherits all the problems that undermined his predecessor; France's stagnant economy, a 10 percent unemployment rate, and, of course, its terrorism. They are all Macron's problems now.

For now though, as the raucous Macron victory rally in front of the iconic Louvre Museum demonstrated, the mood is beyond jubilant; it is both energized, and relieved -- that France has stemmed the flow of international isolationism and division.

Pamela Falk is the CBS News foreign affairs analyst, based at United Nations Headquarters in New York.

POLITICO Merci for nothing, Donald

6-8 minutes

Matthew Karnitschnig

BERLIN — Liberalism, it turns out, isn't dead after all.

In a year that has seen a Euroskeptic become president of the

U.S. and the U.K. trigger its withdrawal from the European Union, some feared France's election would be the *coup de grâce* for Western democratic ideals.

Europe's far right boasted that Marine Le Pen would ride the transatlantic populist wave into office and lead the country out of the European Union and the euro. The optimism was justified: As recently as March, the nationalist firebrand was leading the pack in some polls. France's far right had never been closer to victory.

Or so it seemed. In the end, the rise of President Donald Trump and Brexit influenced the French result — just not the way most had anticipated.

Any number of factors will have contributed to Emmanuel Macron's blowout victory Sunday. Yet it's undeniable that by elevating an unabashedly pro-EU liberal to its highest office, France wanted to send a clear message to the world that it rejects the nativist instincts that have taken hold in other parts of the West.

In other words, far from attracting voters, the Trump phenomenon scared them away.

Emmanuel Macron speaks to supporters after winning the French Presidential Election, at The Louvre on May 7, 2017 in Paris | Jeff J Mitchell/Getty Images

At first, Le Pen tried hard to ride Trump's coattails, declaring the morning after his election that they were part of a global movement that would "bury the old order." During the transition, she even visited Trump Tower (though she didn't meet with the man himself).

What she didn't anticipate was the degree to which the spectacle of the Trump presidency had unnerved the French public. With about 80 percent of the French expressing a negative view of the American

president, according to polls, Le Pen soon stopped mentioning him on the campaign trail.

Brexit was another wake-up call for many would-be Le Pen followers. Quitting the EU wasn't quite as straightforward as many thought. Amid talk of the U.K. disintegrating and its economy imploding, the attractiveness of EU secession, which Le Pen put on the table by promising a referendum, quickly dissipated.

World in flux

The French aren't the only Europeans in recent months to reject the nuclear option in the wake of the U.S. election. In both Austria and the Netherlands, voters turned out in droves to head off a populist surge and elect liberal candidates.

Macron "has to succeed because if he doesn't the next president of [France] might be called Le Pen" — German Foreign Minister Sigmar Gabriel

In Germany, many voters had abandoned Chancellor Angela Merkel's center-right conservatives in the wake of the refugee crisis to support the anti-immigrant Alternative for Deutschland (AfD) party.

More recently, they've been returning to the center. Support for the AfD has halved in recent months. On Sunday, Merkel's party retook control of a state in a regional election for the first time in more than a decade.

"The world is in motion and not necessarily for the better," said Wolfgang Bosbach, a veteran politician in Merkel's Christian Democratic Union. "People are looking for reliability."

In the near term, the primary beneficiary from these developments is an institution that sees itself as the epitome of stability and western liberalism — the EU.

It's unlikely the EU could have survived a President Le Pen, who has long harbored a deep disdain for Europe.

A Le Pen win would have opened a chasm across the Continent, a disruption of a magnitude not seen since World War II with unforeseeable consequences.

With Macron, who put the necessity of reforming the EU at the center of his campaign, the bloc would appear to have a chance for genuine renewal.

"Europe is waiting for us to defend the enlightenment," he said during his victory speech on Sunday. "They are waiting for a new hope, a new humanism, for a safer world ... Europe and the world are waiting for us. They are waiting for France to surprise them."

Initiatives to rethink how the EU functions (albeit in less flowery terms) have been frustrated in recent years by a string of crises, from Greece to Brexit to the rise of populism.

Risk of backlash

The hope in Brussels now is that with Macron in power and a pro-EU leader expected in Germany after fall elections — most likely Merkel — the bloc has a genuine chance at introducing reform. Topping the list is an overhaul of the 19-member eurozone that would deepen integration between countries to make it less susceptible to the kind of shocks that nearly triggered its collapse during the debt crisis.

"It will be a window of opportunity that we must not miss," European Commissioner for Economic and Financial Affairs Pierre Moscovici said in a recent interview.

Despite that urgency, the EU remains deeply divided over what shape the reforms should take. While Merkel says she's open to the rethink, her party is one of the biggest obstacles. German

conservatives worry that any move to collectivize eurozone members' debt, for example, would leave Berlin holding the bag and have vowed to fight tooth and nail to prevent such an outcome.

A less obvious obstacle to reform could be Europe's improving economy. For the first time in about a decade, Europe's economy is showing real signs of life. Though that's welcome news in a region that has been plagued by economic misery ever since the financial crisis, it might also lift the pressure to pursue controversial changes.

What worries some EU leaders is that the recent economic improvement is likely to prove fleeting. If they don't seize the opportunity to fix the EU now, they say, the same forces that fueled the rise of the populists, such as high youth unemployment and stagnant wages, could hasten another resurgence.

For the first time in about a decade, Europe's economy is showing real signs of life.

What's more, if Trump succeeds in reviving the U.S. economy and continues to moderate on foreign policy, the fear European voters have of populism could wane, they say.

France, where Le Pen's National Front remains a potent political force, is particularly exposed to a backlash. Macron's victory may have been convincing, but he has yet to prove he can govern without a strong party apparatus behind him. It's a risk not lost on his European allies.

Macron "has to succeed because if he doesn't the next president of [France] might be called Le Pen," German Foreign Minister Sigmar Gabriel warned.



Marine Le Pen's landslide loss in France is an embarrassment for President Trump (online)

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

5-7 minutes

The Fix

Analysis

Analysis Interpretation of the news based on evidence, including data, as well as anticipating how events might unfold based on past events

By Aaron Blake

The Fix

Analysis

Analysis Interpretation of the news based on evidence, including data, as well as anticipating how events might unfold based on past events

May 8 at 7:00 AM

The leader of the far-right National Front party thanked her 11 million supporters and said that the country had 'chosen continuity.' (Reuters)

The leader of the far-right National Front party thanked her 11 million supporters and said that the country had 'chosen continuity.' Marine Le Pen concedes French election to Emmanuel Macron (Reuters)

Depending on your interpretation, President Trump either endorsed far-right French presidential candidate Marine Le Pen or suggested that her stock was rising because of a pre-election terrorist attack in Paris.

Either way, Sunday's results were an embarrassment for Trump.

Late results Sunday night showed centrist candidate Emmanuel Macron leading National Front candidate Le Pen by a nearly 2-to-1 margin — a landslide the likes of which we have never seen in an American popular vote. The biggest margin ever recorded here was Warren Harding's 60 percent to 34 percent win in the 1920 election; Macron led 66 percent to 34 percent.

I argued on this blog that Trump's comments about Le Pen amounted to an endorsement. He had said that she was the best candidate when it came to the most important issue: the security of her country. And he clearly suggested that her popularity was rising after the terrorist attack, a claim that in retrospect looks haphazard, at best, and foolhardy, at worst.

Trump tweeted the following on April 21, the day after the attack that killed one police officer and wounded two others on the Champs-Élysées:

Then he added in an interview with the Associated Press: "She's the strongest on borders, and she's the strongest on what's been going on in France. Whoever is the toughest on radical Islamic terrorism, and whoever is the toughest at the borders will do well in the election."

Asked whether that was an endorsement, Trump said no. He said instead that it was him handicapping the election.

"Everybody is making predictions on who is going to win," he said. "I'm no different than you."

But his prediction was wrong — very wrong. Although it's notable that Le Pen emerged from the first round of voting into the final round between two candidates — a development that former secretary of state Condoleezza Rice says shouldn't be undersold — it's clear that she wasn't close to winning the presidency. The candidate Trump said would "do well in the election" did not. The terrorist attack he said would have a "big effect on the presidential election," in the end, did not.

Le Pen was already running close to Macron in the first round of voting, polls showed, even weeks before it occurred. A crowded field with four candidates bunched between 24 percent and 19 percent two weeks ago allowed a fringe candidate to sneak into the final round, where she proved she was indeed a fringe candidate.

Centrist Emmanuel Macron has won the French presidency. He defeated Marine Le Pen, the leader of France's far-right National Front, a strongly anti-immigrant populist party. Macron, 39, will now become France's youngest head of state since Napoleon Bonaparte. What Emmanuel Macron's victory means for France and the world (Adam Taylor, Jason Aldag/The Washington Post)

Centrist Emmanuel Macron has won the French presidency. He defeated Marine Le Pen, the leader of France's far-right National Front, a strongly anti-immigrant populist party. Macron, 39, will now become France's youngest head of state since Napoleon Bonaparte. (Adam Taylor, Jason Aldag/The Washington Post)

Le Pen's loss is also something of a setback for Trump in another way; it suggests the nationalist, anti-Islam rhetoric that populated his campaign isn't quite so ascendant across the pond.

5-Minute Fix newsletter

Keeping up with politics is easy now.

Trump was apparently pretty confident in his European political prognosticating skills after the Brexit vote in the United Kingdom in early 2016. In that case, Trump actually did have something to crow about. He said before the vote, "I think that Britain will separate from the [European Union]," while clarifying (as with Le Pen) that it wasn't an endorsement.

But in that case, of course, it wasn't quite so bold a prediction; although the Brexit vote shocked the political establishment and is remembered as a big upset, polls were actually very close heading into Election Day.

In France, Trump really went out on a limb, suggesting momentum for a candidate who was ideologically similar to him — very clearly hoping that his brand of nationalism would get a boost in an allied country.

He may want to stick to predicting races for which the polls are actually tight.



Macron defeats populism in France but must now work with Trump

By Stephen Collinson, CNN

that have roiled developed world politics over the last year.

a global economy that has hemorrhaged blue collar jobs.

What to know about Emmanuel Macron 01:32

Updated 8:02 AM ET, Mon May 8, 2017

Emmanuel Macron's full speech at the Louvre

Story highlights

- Macron is a proponent of globalization, centrist politics and the European Union
- He will have to consider how to frame his relationship with the United States and Trump

(CNN)By turning to Emmanuel Macron as its new president, France has elevated a charismatic new leader in the great political battle between globalism and nationalism that is underway in Western democracies.

The 39-year-old's win over far-right candidate Marine Le Pen Sunday in the second round of the French election represents liberal internationalism's most significant response yet to the populist tsunami that yielded President Donald Trump and Brexit and ended a crop of establishment political careers.

Macron, a proponent of globalization, centrist politics and the European Union, in effect erected a bastion against the unconventional and disruptive forces

"This is our civilization that's at stake, our way of life," Macron said shortly after his victory, in which he took almost 66% of the vote against Le Pen.

How Emmanuel Macron won the French presidency 01:50

But it would be premature to declare that the populist wave has reached a high-water mark, given the recent turbulence in international politics. And Macron, who ran as an outsider despite establishment credentials, does bear some resemblance -- in his light political resume if nothing else -- to the neophyte leaders who have come from nowhere to shake up politics.

The French campaign trod what has become familiar ground in big Western elections over the last year. It saw the older, establishment politicians crushed as they failed to identify and adapt to waves of change. None of the traditional parties reached the run-off as voters in France, like elsewhere, soured on the same old choices.

As with the Brexit referendum and the US election last year, the election was fought on the fault line between well-off, cosmopolitan, urban elites and insurgents who tapped the frustrations of rural, less-educated and poorer voters, ones who are fixated on immigration policies and feel disenfranchised in

A fresh-faced candidate wins

But this time, the elite candidate -- albeit one whose youth and outlook suggested a break from older, more conventional political forces -- came out on top. In effect, Macron ran on insider ground while adopting the rhetoric and habits of an outsider.

The graduate of exclusive French schools who became a banker and finance minister formed his own party "En Marche" to escape the taint of the political establishment. His youth was a break from the past in itself. He will be the youngest French president ever and the youngest French leader, period, since Napoleon.

That sense of freshness could help break the somber mood that has settled over French politics for years -- though his inexperience will also test him.

Such attributes allowed him to separate himself from old-school politics and the establishment "swamp" in a way that Democratic nominee Hillary Clinton, with her decades at the center of Washington intrigue, failed to do last year.

Macron's victory is likely to be studied by other centrist hopefuls in Europe and the United States as they struggle to combat the powerful economic message of candidates like Trump.

He will have to tackle the question of how to reach out to those who have given up on politics as usual and who find the promises of Trump and candidates like him so attractive.

In fact, Macron's enthusiastic support for the EU and globalization was an implicit rebuke to the instincts of Trump and those who successfully campaigned for Britain to leave the European Union.

He portrayed himself as a reformer, but as a bulwark against the forces of disruption dedicated to tearing down institutions rather than repairing them.

But he also took aim at the hidebound realities of French politics by warning of public spending cuts and more free market reforms designed to kick-start France's highly regulated economy.

Macron's triumph will buck up establishment figures who have had little to cheer in recent months: He was endorsed by former President Barack Obama, who is seeing his own legacy dismantled by the populist Trump. Macron also carried the hopes of European elites like German Chancellor Angela Merkel.

Trump, however, had seemed to hint earlier in the race that he preferred Le Pen. The US President has struck similar themes to Le Pen on Islamic terrorism and immigration. And following a terrorist

attack in Paris last month, he tweeted: "Will have a big effect on presidential election!"

Reinforcing the EU

Despite the idiosyncrasies of the French race, many European analysts believe that Macron's win sent an unequivocal signal at an existential moment for EU unity.

"This is a victory of values, the values of the Enlightenment, the values of France, the values on which America was founded, the values from which the US and the UK have gone significantly astray," said Nicholas Dungan, an Atlantic Council senior fellow, who teaches at Sciences Po, a top international research university in France that counts Macron as among its most distinguished alumni.

"This is the end of know-nothing populism," he said.

Macron's victory is already being seen as an invigorating boost for the European Union, which was knocked sideways by the British decision to exit and would have faced a meltdown had Le Pen, an avowed opponent of the European bloc, won.

"The French electorate clearly said after Brexit, against all the forecasts from the Dr. Dooms of this world, that they were against Frexit and against leaving the Eurozone," said Philippe Le Corre, a Brookings Institution visiting fellow, who is a

former French Defense Ministry official.

Just as Trump raged against Washington, Le Pen played into frustration with distant EU bureaucrats among blue collar voters, a tactic that proved potent for "Leave" campaigners in the British referendum.

Macron addresses nation after election 02:05

But this time, the anti-establishment fury was not enough.

In dramatic scenes Sunday, Macron, whose supporters often waved EU flags alongside those of the French tricolor, marched to his victory rally at the Louvre in Paris to the strains of Beethoven's "Ode to Joy" — which serves as the European anthem.

In many ways, the trauma of the UK's vote to leave Europe, which was warmly and repeatedly welcomed by Trump as a political achievement akin to his own shock election victory, appears to have concentrated the minds of French voters.

"The Brexit vote, you could even say, helped (Macron), because it helped France realize the importance of the European Union," said Dominic Thomas, head of the Department of French and Francophone Studies at UCLA, on CNN International.

There are some reasons to think that the populist wave has broken.

Le Pen's defeat follows a showing of far-right leader Geert Wilders in the Dutch election in March that fell short of expectations. In local council elections across the Channel last week, meanwhile, the UK Independence Party, which campaigned for Brexit, was all but wiped out. A surge by a right-wing populist party in Germany, the AfD, appears to have peaked ahead of Merkel's re-election bid in the fall.

Yet it would be premature to dismiss populist, anti-establishment sentiments as a force in modern Western politics. For one thing, some establishment parties have adopted populist positions -- one reason why UKIP voters, for instance, are moving back towards the Conservative Party in Britain ahead of a general election in June.

Le Pen splits France

And after all, Le Pen managed to garner around 34% of the vote in the second round of an election which opened up deep splits in French society.

Still, Macron's presidency may not count for much unless he is able to address the feelings of economic disenfranchisement and blight that have forced themselves to the fore in elections in the Western world over the last year.

Macron signaled in his victory speech that he understood the

stakes, asking his supporters not to boo Le Pen or her partisans.

"They expressed today anger, dismay and sometimes strong beliefs. I respect them but I will do everything over the next five years to make sure there is no reason at all to vote for extremes," Macron said.

The new French President will also have to consider how to frame his relations with the United States and Trump, whom he will now encounter at the G7 and NATO summits in Europe this month.

Populist influences in the White House, including political guru Steve Bannon, have been openly critical of the European Union.

But Trump played it straight down the line on Sunday, writing on Twitter: "Congratulations to Emmanuel Macron on his big win today as the next President of France. I look very much forward to working with him!"

Macron, for all his philosophical, generational and temperamental differences with Trump, is likely to move carefully, stressing areas of agreement with the administration -- on fighting terrorism for instance.

But he is likely to be critical of Trump in places where the US and France differ, like climate change.



World Leaders Congratulate Macron for French Presidential Election Win

VOA News

3 minutes

World leaders and other political heavyweights have sent congratulatory messages to France's president-elect, Emmanuel Macron on his victory over Marine Le Pen.

U.S. President Donald Trump tweeted "Congratulations to Emmanuel Macron on his big win today as the next President of France. I look very much forward to working with him!"

Trump had not publicly endorsed either candidate ahead of the election, but let it be known he generally favored Marine Le Pen's views.

Former U.S. presidential candidate Hillary Clinton, American civil rights leader Jesse Jackson and New York mayor Bill de Blasio, among others, congratulated Macron and the people of France for the presidential election result.

"Your victory is a victory for a strong and united Europe and for French-German friendship," German Chancellor Angela Merkel's spokesman said in statement.

Macron spoke with Merkel after his victory was announced, telling her that he would travel to Berlin "very quickly."

A British spokesman for Prime Minister Theresa May said in a statement that May "warmly congratulates President-elect Macron on his election success. France is one of our closest allies

and we look forward to working with the new President on a wide range of shared priorities."

May also discussed Brexit with Macron, saying "the UK wants a strong partnership with a secure and prosperous EU once we leave," the spokesman added.

European Union leaders also offered congratulations to Macron: "Happy that the French chose a European future," European Commission President Jean-Claude Juncker wrote on Twitter.

EU Council President Donald Tusk said the French had chosen "liberty, equality and fraternity" and "said no to the tyranny of fake news".

Japanese Prime Minister Shinzo Abe said "the victory of President-elect Macron is a symbolic victory against inward-looking and

protectionist moves and shows a vote of confidence in the EU."

Chinese President Xi Jinping said in his message to Macron that China is willing to push partnership with France to a higher level. Xi said their countries share a "responsibility toward peace and development in the world."

Xi recalled that France was the first Western power to establish diplomatic relations with communist-ruled China in 1964.

Other world leaders from Canada to Latin America to Australia also congratulated Macron on his historic victory.

Macron, the youngest French leader since the Emperor Napoleon, will take office on May 14, 2017.



Trump congratulates Macron on his 'big win' in France (online)

By John Wagner 3-4 minutes

BEDMINSTER, N.J. — President Trump on Sunday took to Twitter to

congratulate Emmanuel Macron for winning France's presidential election, giving a nod to a centrist who didn't seem to have been his preferred candidate.

"Congratulations to Emmanuel Macron on his big win today as the next President of France," Trump said in his tweet. "I look very much forward to working with him!"

[Macron to become next French president after beating back Le Pen and her populist tide]

A brief, more formal statement followed a few minutes later in which White House press secretary Sean Spicer added, "We look forward to working with the new President and continuing our close cooperation with the French government."

There was no word from the White House on whether Trump had made a congratulatory phone call.

The U.S. president had stopped short of making an endorsement in the race, saying it was up to the French people to pick their next leader.

But before the first round of voting in France last month, Trump described anti-E.U. candidate Marine Le Pen as "the strongest on borders" and said "she's the strongest on what's been going on in France," referring to terrorist attacks, among other trends.

[Marine Le Pen falls short in far-right bid for the presidency of France]

Trump also weighed in on Twitter shortly before the first round, saying a terrorist attack in which a police

officer was killed in Paris would "have a big effect" on the French election.

"The people of France will not take much more of this," Trump wrote in a tweet in which he did not refer to Le Pen by name but was widely interpreted to be referring to her.

Trump had been less vocal about the election in the lead-up to Sunday's runoff.

Politics newsletter

The big stories and commentary shaping the day.

On the campaign trail this spring, Le Pen's rhetoric had often echoed Trump's, with vows to put "France first" and to defend "the forgotten France." She also condemned globalist cosmopolitans — Macron chief among them — who she said

did not have the nation's interests at heart.

But she had distanced herself from Trump since his inauguration, often declining to mention him by name, and analysts said her association with the unpopular U.S. president may have hurt her among French voters.

[After the 'Winter White House' in Fla., Trump shifts to 'Camp David North' in N.J.]

Trump was preparing to return to Washington on Sunday night after three full days at his secluded golf club here in New Jersey. He made no public appearances on Friday or Saturday and had no scheduled events before his departure on Sunday.

Griff Witte contributed to this report.



French Election: World Leaders Congratulate Emmanuel Macron

Alana Abramson

3-4 minutes

Congratulatory statements from world leaders across the globe began trickling in after it was announced that centrist Emmanuel Macron won the French presidential runoff, even from those who aligned more ideologically with his opponent, the far-right National Front's Marine Le Pen.

After Macron was announced the projected winner, President Donald Trump weighed in on Twitter.

"Congratulations to Emmanuel Macron on his big win today as the next President of France. I look very much forward to working with him!" Trump tweeted.

The White House subsequently issued a short congratulatory statement.

"We congratulate President-elect Macron and the people of France on their successful presidential

election. We look forward to working with the new President and continuing our close cooperation with the French government," the statement said.

While Trump never officially endorsed anyone in the French election, he told the Associated Press last month he thought the attack on the Champs-Élysées that left one police officer dead and two others injured would help Marine Le Pen's prospects because "she is the strongest on borders and she is the strongest on what's been going on in France."

READ MORE: Emmanuel Macron Has Big Plans for France. Is It Ready for Them?

Le Pen's ideology and rhetoric also shared a lot of similarities with what Trump espoused on the campaign trail in 2016: putting the people of their own countries first and cracking down on immigration, which they claimed was taking away jobs.

"We are both fighting the treaties aggravating free trade and wild

globalization, in the mutual interest of our respective nations," Le Pen, who said Clinton's election would have had "disastrous" consequences for France, told *TIME* last December.

Theresa May, Britain's Prime Minister, who is currently in the midst of negotiating Britain's exit from the European Union, also offered congratulations to Macron.

"I warmly congratulate Emmanuel Macron on his success and I look forward to working with him on a wide range of shared priorities," she said.

Leaders of the European Union, from which Le Pen said she wanted to remove France, were explicitly effusive in their congratulations.

"Happy that the French chose a European future. Together for a #Europe more strong and more just," Europe," tweeted Jean-Claude Juncker.

The European Council President went even further: "Congratulations to Emmanuel Macron, the french

who chose freedom, equality and fraternity and said no to the tyranny of the 'fake news,'" he posted on Twitter.

The sentiment was similar among countries in the European Union.

German Chancellor Angela Merkel, who faces her reelection campaign in the fall, called Macron to congratulate him. Mark Rutte, the new Prime Minister of the Netherlands who defeated his own right wing opponent in March, praised the outcome on Facebook, writing that Macron was "a clear progressive and pro-European choice."

And former candidates who hadn't managed to fend off their populist opponents seemed to be finding some redemption.

"Victory for Macron, for France, the EU, & the world," Hillary Clinton wrote on Twitter. "Defeat to those interfering w/democracy. (But the media says I can't talk about that)."

CNBC : Macron, in victory speech, says task ahead is immense and will require commitment of all of France

Gemma Acton

2-3 minutes

Emmanuel Macron called on his countrymen to join him in turning a new page in French history in his first speech since exit polls indicated he will be the next president of France.

In his characteristic tempered style, Macron raised the tender topic of

terrorism in talking to a country that has been wracked by several attacks claiming in total hundreds of lives in recent years, promising, "France will be on the front line in the fight against terrorism."

The independent centrist victor also launched an appeal to protect the country's illustrious cultural past by affirming that, "we have a great history, we have a great humanist face to put forward to the world,"

and claiming that France's civilization is at stake.

The theme of morality also featured more than once in Macron's speech, with him saying that he would prioritize improving the morality of the public service and ensuring a vital democracy.

Macron listed the difficulties that have debilitated France over time, highlighting economic troubles, social fracturing and moral

weakening among the elements that he intends to redress.

In a later speech to thousands of supporters who had been dancing along to live music while they waited for Macron to arrive before their congregation in front of Le Louvre museum, Macron appealed to those who voted for Le Pen to give him a chance.

The centrist politician vowed to "protect the republic" and asserted

that he respected their views despite his disagreements with them before

adding that he would do all he could to ensure that they "never have a

reason to vote for extreme candidates again."



France: Emmanuel Macron eyes legislative elections after landslide win

By Angela Dewan, CNN

Story highlights

- Macron beat far-right Marine Le Pen with more than 65% of the vote
- He is now looking for his party En Marche! to win big in legislative polls

(CNN)French President-elect Emmanuel Macron will start getting his house in order Monday after a landslide victory that handed him the reins to the world's sixth-largest economy.

The independent centrist beat his rival Marine Le Pen from the far-right National Front with a decisive 65.7% of the ballots in Sunday's presidential vote, official figures show.

Macron, who will be inaugurated this Sunday, is now looking to use his popularity to win hundreds of seats for his fledgling party En Marche! in legislative elections, in little over a month from now.

Macron ran as an independent, but he founded En Marche! less than a year ago. Transforming an outfit so young into a political force will be no easy task.

But one recent poll by OpinionWay-SLPV Analytics, for the Les Echos newspaper, projected that Macron's party would win the largest share -- possibly a majority -- of Parliament's 577 seats.

Does Emmanuel Macron's win signal the end of populism in Europe? Not likely

Macron will need a strong En Marche! presence in Parliament to push his legislative agenda through as the country battles high unemployment, a stagnant economy and relentless security woes.

The government has also struggled to cope with immigration and integration, issues that drew throngs of supporters to Le Pen and her anti-migrant campaign.

Sunday's results mark a meteoric rise for Macron,

who at 39 will become France's youngest-ever president. The former investment banker has little experience in governance, serving as economy minister for two years as his most senior role.

The President-elect will attend a party board meeting Monday afternoon. He is expected to stand down as En Marche! president before taking on the country's leadership, his party has said.

A supporter of Emmanuel Macron celebrates in front of the Louvre Museum in Paris on Sunday.

An unexpected unity

Macron addressed thousands of supporters outside the Louvre in Paris late Sunday night, making a call for unity in the country that has seen deep divisions with the rise of the far right.

"I know the country is divided and this has led to people voting for extremes," Macron said in a speech at his team's headquarters.

"I understand the anger, the anxiety, the doubt which many of you have expressed and it is my responsibility to hear that.

"A new page of our history has turned this evening, I want that page to be one of hope and refund trust, the renewal of our public life, will be at the base of what I do from the very first day of our presidency."

But even before the results were in, France had made clear it was looking for change. Voters whittled down 11 candidates in a first-round poll in April to two from outside the political establishment.

And the huge margin by which Macron won shows that the country may not be quite as divided as many had thought.

The vote appeared to be as much a rejection of Le Pen as it was an endorsement of Macron. Several voters told CNN they would back just about anyone to keep Le Pen from the presidency. Ironically, it seems Le Pen has inadvertently united the country -- against her.

Le Pen congratulates Macron on victory 01:21

Read: Macron's tricky to-do list after French election

Several candidates knocked out in the first round of votes publicly endorsed Macron, as did French president Francois Hollande. Even former US President Barack Obama threw his two cents in, telling the world he supported Macron.

But Macron's mandate may be more muted than the numbers suggest. Around 25% of registered voters abstained, the highest this century, while 9% cast blank or spoiled ballots.

And while Le Pen's defeat was something of a thrashing, it was not as pronounced as the defeat of her father, Jean-Marie Le Pen, who ran for the National Front in 2002 and gained less than 18% of the vote.

Macron's Putin strategy

Beyond a long to-do list on domestic issues, Macron will have to deal with fractures in the wider region, including Russia's increasing hostility towards Europe.

During the election, Macron's camp accused Russia of trying to influence the French election by spreading "fake news" through state-controlled media. His team was also the victim of a hack, which a cybersecurity firm has said bears the hallmarks of Russian involvement.

But Putin sent his congratulations to Macron in a telegram and called for a renewal of trust between the countries.

"The growing threat of terrorism and militant extremism is accompanied by an escalation in local conflicts and the destabilization of entire regions. In these circumstances, it is especially important to overcome mutual distrust and unite efforts to ensure international stability and security," he said.

In Brussels, Macron's win was met with a sigh of relief, as European Union leaders have watched several elections in the past year as litmus

tests of the strength of their 28-member bloc.

Macron addresses nation after election 02:05

Macron had campaigned on a pro-EU platform, in stark contrast to Le Pen, who vowed to pull France out of the union in referendum, as Britain voted to do last year.

European Commission chief Jean-Claude Juncker wrote on Twitter that he was "happy that the French chose a European future."

European Council President Donald Tusk congratulated the French people "for choosing Liberty, Equality and Fraternity over tyranny of fake news."

Read: From economic woes to terrorism, a daunting to-do list for France's next president

President Hollande also called Macron to "warmly" congratulate him on his victory.

"His large victory confirms that a very large majority of our citizens wanted to assemble around the values of the Republic and mark their attachment to the European Union as well as to the openness of France in the world," Hollande said in a statement.

Earlier, Le Pen told supporters she had called to congratulate Macron after exit estimates projected her heavy defeat. While she wished him success, she continued to criticize her opponent as an establishment candidate, saying the French people had voted for "continuity."

"The French have chosen a new president," Le Pen told supporters.

"We have seen a major decomposition of French political life, of the old political mainstream parties and what we see now is a real new configuration which is emerging between the patriots and the new liberals."

CNN's James Masters and Hilary Clarke contributed to this report.



Macron Win Slows March of Euroskeptics

Valentina Pop
4 minutes

BRUSSELS—The victory of Emmanuel Macron and his upstart pro-European party in France marks a significant pushback against nationalist parties that have challenged the existence of the European Union over the past year.

Euroskeptical movements, long on the political fringe in Britain and a few other EU countries, began to spread over the past decade as financial and security crises hit the bloc. In Greece and Italy, financial austerity following the euro crisis stoked anti-

EU sentiment. Then many in ex-communist central and Eastern Europe bristled at the mass influx of migrants in 2015 and the perception that Brussels was ordering them to accept the refugees.

Updated May 8, 2017 6:04 a.m. ET

The October 2015 victory of the euroskeptic Law and Justice party in Poland, which until then had been governed by a staunchly Europhile government, marked the first recent success of an anti-EU party in one of the bloc's larger countries.

Austria's far-right Norbert Hofer added to the momentum by making it into the runoff of the presidential election in May 2016, bringing for the first time the prospect of an EU head of state who had campaigned for a referendum on leaving the EU. His pro-EU, Green opponent, Alexander Van Der Bellen, won by a razor-thin margin, but the vote was annulled because of irregularities and rerun in December. Mr. Van Der Bellen won again, by a larger margin.

THE WALL STREET JOURNAL

4-5 minutes

Updated May 7, 2017 4:44 p.m. ET

BRUSSELS—The victory of pro-European Union candidate Emmanuel Macron in the French presidential election triggered immediate sighs of relief by EU leaders and expectations that his victory will strengthen the embattled bloc.

Mr. Macron's support for the EU marked a stark contrast with his opponent, nationalist Marine Le Pen, an advocate for France leaving the bloc and abandoning the euro. His victory is seen as an endorsement of the European project and comes after months of uncertainty about the future of the bloc following the U.K.'s decision to leave; the U.S. election of President Donald Trump, a critic of the EU; and the rise of nationalist politicians across the bloc.

EU leaders were quick to congratulate Mr. Macron.

German Chancellor Angela Merkel called Mr. Macron Sunday night and told him that "the French voters' decision was a

His victory was barely noticed, however, because the EU had by then sunk into a deeper existential crisis with the U.K.'s June 2016 vote to leave the EU, a result that sent shock waves around the world.

November brought the election of U.S. President Donald Trump, who said he supported Brexit and predicted that other countries would soon follow. Brexit and Mr. Trump's victory boosted euroskeptic parties across the continent, which expressed the hope that several elections in core countries could lead to the beginning of the end of the EU.

The Dutch election in March, however, began to turn the tide. The far right, anti-EU party of Geert Wilders came in second despite having polled first for months. The

victory of the center-right party led by incumbent Prime Minister Mark Rutte was modest, though. He may need to govern with three other parties to muster a parliamentary majority.

Mr. Wilders consoled Ms. Le Pen for her loss on Sunday, tweeting, "Well done anyway...millions of patriots voted for you! You will win next time—and so will I!"

The French presidential election, with anti-EU candidate Marine Le Pen making it into the second round, was seen as life-threatening to the bloc. France is a founder of the EU and has the second-largest economy on the continent after Germany.

In Germany, a euroskeptic, anti-establishment party called Alternative for Deutschland, which

was rising last year, has plunged in polls and is consumed by internal squabbles ahead of general elections in September.

European Commission President Jean-Claude Juncker's chief of staff, Martin Selmayr, on Sunday tweeted his celebration of the victories against anti-EU parties: "Kick off: Felix Austria. Quarterfinal: Stable Netherlands. Semi final: La France en Marche!"

Write to Valentina Pop at valentina.pop@wsj.com

Appeared in the May. 08, 2017, print edition as 'Win Slows Anti-EU Movement.'

EU Leaders Breathe Sigh of Relief With Emmanuel Macron Victory

Valentina Pop

clear commitment to Europe," said her spokesman, Steffen Seibert.

Belgian Prime Minister Charles Michel said Mr. Macron's victory represented "a clear rejection of a dangerous project of European withdrawal."

European Commission President Jean-Claude Juncker was the first top EU official to send a letter of congratulations to Mr. Macron, after having endorsed him ahead of the Sunday vote—an unusual move for EU officials. Mr. Juncker wrote that "the history of the EU is so closely linked to that of France that the public debate about France's place in Europe echoed far beyond your country."

"For my part, I am happy that the ideas that you defended, of a strong and progressive France which protects all its citizens are those which France will bring in the debate about the future of Europe," Mr. Juncker said.

Before the election, EU officials were privately warning that a victory for Ms. Le Pen would spell the end of the 27-country union. Mr. Macron's win solidifies pro-EU gains made in the Austrian presidential elections last year and in the Dutch election in March.

"It is a third and very important turning point," said a senior EU official.

The new French president, who must still muster a majority in parliamentary elections next month, is no fan of the EU status quo, however. He has called for significant overhauls aimed at getting the EU more involved in social policies and in boosting its democratic credentials.

"He will be more demanding with the EU. The logical next step is to develop a eurozone budget and develop the responsibilities of the European Commission and the European Parliament," said Éric Bussière, a history professor at Paris Sorbonne University.

Estonian president Kersti Kaljulaid, who, like Mr. Macron, is her country's youngest president and a staunch defender of the EU, said no overhauls can replace the authority of national governments.

"The EU level is never going to take over the responsibility which governments have for prosperity and security of their people," said Ms. Kaljulaid. "If that is the message Mr. Macron wants to reinforce, I will join hands with him and look forward to it."

Mr. Macron's ability to shake up the EU depends largely on upcoming general elections in Germany, where Ms. Merkel is challenged by a former top EU official, Martin Schulz, said Paolo Graziano, a political scientist with the University of Padua, Italy.

"Macron-Schulz would really make a difference for Europe," Mr. Graziano said. "If Schulz wins on European issues, then it may be a good moment for Europe to relaunch some of its one-time existing policies and revise austerity measures." EU austerity programs imposed on Greece and other countries in the EU's periphery has fueled anti-EU sentiments.

German opinion polls give Ms. Merkel's Christian Democrats a strong lead. Her party won state elections Sunday in Schleswig-Holstein over Mr. Schulz's Socialist party.

Write to Valentina Pop at valentina.pop@wsj.com

Appeared in the May. 08, 2017, print edition as 'Victory Heartens Europe Leaders.'

THE DAILY BEAST

Christopher Dickey05.07.17 2:00 PM ET

8-11 minutes

PARIS — Emmanuel Macron has been elected the next president of France, defeating far-right candidate

Marine Le Pen and ending, for now, what had seemed a tidal wave of populism and nativism sweeping the West. Macron won by a landslide according to official counts, with 65.68 percent of the valid ballots versus 34.32 percent for Le Pen.

In some respects, this critical election had come to appear a proxy battle between current U.S. President Donald Trump and his predecessor Barack Obama, both of whom weighed in during the campaign.

Trump favored Le Pen's anti-immigrant, anti-Muslim, closed-border protectionist positions, which would have gone a long way toward destroying the European Union and NATO as we know them. He called Le Pen the "strongest" candidate on security issues, as he sees them. (Trump tweeted his congratulations

Emmanuel Macron Vanquishes Marine Le Pen to Become President of France

Christopher

to Macron in unusually stiff language, and the White House offered formal felicitations, while Germany's Angela Merkel, Canada's Justin Trudeau and Britain's Theresa May spoke with Macron directly within minutes of the announced results.)

Le Pen had enjoyed conspicuous support from Russian President Vladimir Putin, who received her at the Kremlin during the campaign, and who is suspected of links to the hackers who tried, at the last minute, to bring down Macron. According to a Macron spokesperson, Putin sent a congratulatory "message" to Macron on Monday morning.

Obama, meanwhile, actually taped an endorsement of Macron, who is much more moderate and pragmatic than Le Pen, and shares many of Obama's core beliefs. Among them: the need to act to slow climate change. A video that Macron released in February, speaking in English to American researchers and scientists, telling them they should come to France rather than suffer the hostility of the Trump administration, has gone viral since the Macron election.

The president-elect supports reforms on immigration issues, including much stronger European borders, and he takes a tough stand on terrorism, of course, but it is untainted by the thinly disguised racism integral to the history of Le Pen's National Front party. Macron supports reforms to the European Union, not its dissolution and destruction, and is also a firm believer in the North Atlantic Alliance, which Trump used to call "obsolete," then decided it was no longer so.

As French political scientist and author Dominique Moïsi says, succinctly, Le Pen (and many other populists) represent "anger, fear, and nostalgia." Macron has presented himself as a man with a vision for the future, one built on reform, not upheaval, focused on the economic and security imperatives of the 21st century.

But one might well ask, where did this 39-year-old

wunderkind—the youngest leader of France since Napoleon—actually come from? In an era of what seems relentless polarization, how did he pull together the forces of centrism and pragmatism to win such a convincing victory?

It was barely more than a year ago that Macron announced the formation of his political movement, *En Marche!* (Onward!), which not only was not a traditional political party, but hoped to siphon support from both the traditional Socialists and the traditional conservatives, now known as *Les Républicains*. He was neither one, nor the other, he said, and when he started his march toward the French presidential palace, the Élysée, it seemed at best quixotic.

But, Macron was never really an outsider, and his bitter opponents on both left and right often portrayed him as nothing more than a front man for the stagnant status quo. They claimed Macron benefitted from the quiet—some said nefarious and conspiratorial—backing of the wildly unpopular outgoing Socialist president, François Hollande. Because Macron also worked for a few years as an investment banker with Rothschild, he was portrayed as well as a tool of global financial interests. Were there hints of anti-Semitism in the Rothschild references when Macron (a Roman Catholic) was attacked? Of course there were.

Where might one begin with the story of Macron's rise?

Possibly with his upbringing in the provincial northern French city of Amiens, where according to his own campaign autobiography he was a child whose parents, both doctors, were rarely at home; who was raised by his beloved grandmother. He buried himself in books, reading and rereading French classics, and seems to have had few friends his age.

Get The Beast In Your Inbox!

Indeed, when he was about 15 he fell in love with—and some years later married—his drama teacher, who was 24 years his elder.

Or, one might start with Macron's stellar academic career: he always seemed to be the smartest kid in the class, even at the prestigious École Nationale d'Administration (ENA), which traditionally produces many of the top civil servants, business leaders, and indeed presidents of France. He was spotted by Jacques Attali, once an *éminence grise* advising French President François Mitterrand in the 1980s, who gave him a choice assignment working with a commission looking for ways to increase economic growth in France. That helped lead to the job at Rothschild, and then to a position advising President Hollande, who made Macron minister of the economy in 2014.

If one is to look at when and how the Macron *movement* began, that ministry at Bercy on the edge of Paris probably is the place to start. Because surrounding Macron there were some of the best and brightest minds in French administration and politics. Many of them had been part of the team of another presidential hopeful a few years earlier: Dominique Strauss-Kahn.

DSK, as he was known, had gone on from the economy ministry to serve as head of the International Monetary Fund in Washington, but was widely touted as the man sure to win the top job in France in the 2012 elections. By the spring of 2011, his path to the Élysée had seemed bright and open. Then, while on a visit to New York City, he was arrested, accused of assaulting and raping a hotel maid. The charges eventually were dropped, and he settled a civil suit out of court, but the flood of revelations about his private life—sordid even by the tolerant standards of France—ended his career.

When members of DSK's old team crossed the path of Macron at Bercy, they knew they had another chance. And by the time Macron resigned from the economy ministry in 2016, he knew he had the core of his movement. The march of *En Marche!* had begun. Many who were there at the beginning describe it as a sort of a political start-up.

In the months that followed, Macron proved an attractive candidate for

the French mainstream media (which loathed Le Pen), and his strongest opponent, *Les Républicains* candidate François Fillon, fell prey to a scandal: after Fillon announced he would do away with 500,000 public sector jobs in the name of much-needed reforms, he was put under formal investigation for putting his wife and children on the public payroll for work they either did not do, or were not qualified to do, to the tune of \$1 million.

To this day, some Fillon supporters are among the most bitter opponents of Macron, sure that President Hollande's "black cabinet" must have leaked the scandalous information about their candidate.

The level of discontent with this election was evident. Some 25 percent of registered voters did not cast ballots (although their motives on a rainy three-day weekend might have been as slothful as political), and almost 12 percent of those who did drop their ballots in the boxes either left them blank or spoiled them in one fashion or another. As a result, when counting the numbers of votes for the candidates against the total number of registered voters, as the Macron camp is well aware, the figures suggest troubles ahead: Macron got the support of only 43.75 percent of the total number of registered voters, while Le Pen got 22.86 percent. And many on the left and the right who voted against Le Pen say they are committed to fighting against Macron's movement in the legislative elections coming up next month.

But for the moment, among many in France, Europe, the United States and the world (including the financial markets) there is a huge collective sigh of relief. The outsider with all the inside connections has won. Now what he has to do is govern an angry, fearful, nostalgic country, and prove things really can be better than they were before.

This article was last updated at 6:20 a.m. EDT, Monday, May 8, 2017

**THE WALL
STREET
JOURNAL**
3 minutes

Who Is Emmanuel Macron?

William Horobin

France in a watershed victory over Marine Le Pen on Sunday.

In the space of three years, Mr. Macron has climbed from a backstage role as a government technocrat to France's youngest-ever president.

Mr. Macron, a former investment banker, founded his own centrist party, *En Marche*, last year and

espouses positions borrowed from the left and right.

As president, he says he will cut public spending and roll out sweeping pro-business measures to reduce taxes and make it easier for employers to hire and fire.

But Mr. Macron, who served as economy minister in the Socialist government of President François

Hollande, also says he will open up unemployment benefits to more people and launch a €50 billion (\$55 billion) investment plan focused on clean energy.

Born to a family of medical doctors in the northern French town of Amiens, Mr. Macron met his future wife, Brigitte Trogneux, while he was in high school and she was his

Updated May 7, 2017 5:56 p.m. ET

Emmanuel Macron, a 39-year-old pro-European newcomer to electoral politics, was elected president of

drama coach. He starred in a play organized by Ms. Trogneux, who is 20 years older than Mr. Macron, and they moved in together a couple of years later.

Mr. Macron gained entry to the halls of power after his acceptance into the École Nationale d'Administration, a highly selective school that counts numerous presidents among its alumni, including Mr. Hollande.

In 2012, Mr. Macron left his job at investment bank Rothschild & Cie. when Mr. Hollande brought him to the Élysée Palace as a senior adviser. He was promoted to economy minister in 2014, and pushed for economic overhauls that met resistance within the Socialist Party.

He quit the government last year to pursue his own presidential ambitions, leaving behind him a deeply divided and unpopular party

that ultimately fell out of contention in this year's presidential elections.

At the start of the year, polls showed Mr. Macron was trailing in the race for the top job. But when conservative candidate François Fillon was hit by allegations that relatives received state funds for work they didn't do, it opened the way for Mr. Macron. Mr. Fillon has denied wrongdoing.

In the first-round vote on April 23, Mr. Macron garnered the largest share, with 24%.

In the second round on Sunday, 64.6% of voters cast ballots for Mr. Macron, with Ms. Le Pen taking 35.4%, according to preliminary results.

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

The
Washington
Post

Corbet | AP

5-6 minutes

By Sylvie Corbet | AP May 7 at 6:23 PM

PARIS — Emmanuel Macron has been a star student, a champion of France's tech startup movement, an investment banker and economy minister.

But the man who will become France's youngest president has never held elected office. After a campaign based on promises to revive the country through pro-business and pro-European policies, the 39-year-old centrist independent defeated far-right nationalist Marine Le Pen and her protectionist, anti-immigration party.

In his victory speech, Macron vowed to "rebuild the relationship between Europe and the peoples that make it." He pledged to open a new page for France based on hope and "restored confidence."

It won't be his first experience in the challenge of reforming France.

He quit his job as a banker at Rothschild to become Socialist President François Hollande's economic adviser, working for two years by Hollande's side at the

Banker, economic adviser and now youngest French president (online)

By Sylvie Corbet | AP

Then as economy minister in Hollande's government from 2014 to 2016, he promoted a package of measures, notably allowing more stores to open on Sundays and evenings and opening up regulated sectors of the economy.

Opponents on the left accused him of destroying workers' protections. Tens of thousands of people poured into the streets for months of protests, and the government had to force the law through parliament under special powers.

Last year, Macron launched his own political movement, En Marche, or In Motion, and quit the Socialist government. He promised to shake up the political landscape by appointing a government that includes new figures from business and civil society.

His next challenge will be to get a parliamentary majority in an election next month to make major changes — with no mainstream party to support him.

The strong advocate of a free market and entrepreneurial spirit has called for France to focus on getting benefits from globalization rather than the protectionist policies advocated by the far right.

In his political rallies, he encouraged supporters to wave both the French

tricolor and the European Union flags.

Le Pen, who has tapped into working-class anger at the loss of jobs and once-secure futures, called him the face of "the world of finance," the candidate of "the caviar left."

"I'm not under control of the banks. If that was the case, I would have kept working for them," Macron answered.

Macron had an unexpected test of his political skills following the first round of the vote during what became known as "the battle of Whirlpool," when Le Pen upstaged him at a Whirlpool factory in Amiens that is threatened with closure.

Le Pen's surprise appearance put him on the defensive and prompted him to meet with angry Whirlpool workers later the same day. He was whistled and booed when he first arrived. But he stood his ground, patiently debating workers in often heated exchanges about how to stop French jobs from moving abroad.

In a country shaken by recent terror attacks, he pledged to boost the police and military as well as the intelligence services and to put pressure on internet giants to better monitor extremism online.

To improve Europe's security, he wants the EU to deploy some 5,000

European border guards to the external borders of the bloc's passport-free travel zone.

Macron did not campaign alone: His wife was never far away. Brigitte Macron, 24 years his senior, is his closest adviser, supporting him and helping prepare his speeches.

Macron and his wife have publicly described how their unusual romance started — when he was a student at the high school where she was teaching in Amiens in northern France. A married mother of three at the time, she was supervising the drama club. Macron, a literature lover, was a member.

Macron moved to Paris for his last year of high school.

"We called each other all the time. We spent hours on the phone, hours and hours," Brigitte Macron recalled in a televised documentary. "Little by little, he overcame all my resistances in an unbelievable way, with patience."

She eventually moved to the French capital to join him and divorced. They married in 2007. Emmanuel Macron says he wants to formalize the job of first lady, adding "she has her word to say in this."

THE WALL
STREET
JOURNAL

ET 0 COMMENTS

2 minutes

May 3, to his opponent Marine Le Pen during a live televised debate: "[Islamist radicals] are seeking radicalization, division and civil war. You are falling

French President-Elect Macron, In His Own Words

Updated May 7, 2017 9:48 p.m.

into their trap. I will never go down that road."

May 1, in an interview with the British Broadcasting Corp.: "We have to face the situation, to listen to our people, and to listen to the fact that they are extremely angry today, impatient and the dysfunction of the [European Union] is no more sustainable."

April 17, at a rally in Paris: "Some candidates want us to become Cuba without the sun, or Venezuela without the oil."

Feb. 14, in Algiers, where he urged France to apologize for crimes committed in the Algerian war of independence: "Colonization is part of the history of France. It's a crime, a crime against humanity. It's truly barbaric."

January 2015, in an interview with financial daily Les Echos: "We need young French people who want to become billionaires. I'm not one of those people who is going to stigmatize big companies."

Appeared in the May. 08, 2017, print edition as 'The President-Elect, In His Own Words.'

THE WALL
STREET
JOURNAL

French Companies Cheer Emmanuel Macron's Victory

Nick Kostov

5-6 minutes

PARIS—The victory of Emmanuel Macron is a relief to French business executives who welcomed the election of a president they see as strongly business-friendly.

As economy minister under a Socialist president, the 39-year-old former investment banker said that France needs young people who “want to become billionaires.” He believes that France should embrace the European Union and not fear globalization, vowing unpopular overhauls of labor laws to make the country more competitive.

That kind of rhetoric made him an easy target for rivals who used his four years as a banker at Rothschild & Cie. to attack him with populist jabs as an agent of global finance. Voters, however, made clear they preferred those policies to those of his defeated opponent, Marine Le Pen, who pledged to pull France from the EU and the euro, as well as shut borders to immigrants and cheap imports, which she says harm the French economy.

“Macron is indisputably pro-business and the French generally don’t like those who are pro-business,” Maurice Lévy, chief executive of advertising giant Publicis Groupe SA, said Sunday. “He knows that profitable businesses are the way to create jobs. He’s

dynamic and—as long as he chooses the right team—he’s going to provide France with a boost.”

Among other things, Mr. Macron’s economic plan centers on cuts to welfare spending and a €50 billion (\$55 billion) investment plan. Mr. Macron said the plan would focus on renewable energy and training programs for young people and the unemployed, taking advantage of the low cost of government borrowing.

Mr. Macron’s tax proposals also have a pro-business slant with cuts to corporate tax and employers’ social-security contributions. But Mr. Macron says that he wouldn’t raise sales taxes and would adjust, rather than abolish, France’s wealth tax. The center-right candidate, François Fillon, who was eliminated in the first round, would have gone much further in shifting the tax burden to households from businesses and the wealthy.

The last pro-business government in France came under Nicolas Sarkozy when he rose to power in 2007, but analysts say Mr. Sarkozy abandoned this stance as unemployment rose and companies cut investment in the wake of the financial crisis. Before that, you have to go back to the presidency of Valéry Giscard d’Estaing—who

served from 1974 to 1981—to find another truly pro-business government in France, analysts said.

In 2012, François Hollande won the presidency with promises of taxing the rich and rolling back government spending cuts. Faced with a stagnating economy and rising unemployment in 2014, Mr. Hollande promised tax breaks for businesses to encourage them to hire and invest.

As economy minister in Mr. Hollande’s government, Mr. Macron made several incursions into French corporate life that worried French executives. In the case of Renault SA, the French government took the role of activist investor, buying shares just weeks before a 2015 shareholder vote that would have reduced the state’s influence at the car manufacturer. The bigger stake essentially gave the French government a veto power.

Mr. Macron also intervened in a proposed €10 billion deal for Bouygues SA’s telecommunications unit last year that would have reduced the number of telecoms operators in the country from four to three. As monthslong negotiations entered the final stretch, Mr. Macron tried to extract commitments that were unacceptable to Martin

Bouygues, the seller, and the deal fell apart in the weeks thereafter.

Pierre Gattaz, the head of Medef, France’s biggest business lobby, said in the run-up to the first round of voting that Mr. Macron’s economic program goes in the right direction, but that “there are a number of half measures.”

“Mr. Macron still needs to explain to us how he would really reduce the cost of labor in France. I remind you that for two French engineers, you can pay for three German ones,” he said.

France’s startups have perhaps been most vociferous in their support for Mr. Macron. Drawn by his youth and enthusiasm, as well as his views on the economy, they have thrown their weight behind his campaign.

“I voted for him because he has a program that’s friendly to entrepreneurs,” said Pierre Morsard, a 29-year-old who lives in the East of Paris and founded a small company making films for corporations.

Appeared in the May. 08, 2017, print edition as ‘Business Hails Election Outcome.’

THE WALL STREET JOURNAL

Euro Bolstered as Focus Turns to Growth

Mike Bird

5-7 minutes

Updated May 8, 2017 3:46 a.m. ET

The euro touched a seven-month high in a short-lived rally against the dollar after Emmanuel Macron won the French presidency on Sunday, a victory that should help to boost the currency as political concerns fade and investors focus on the eurozone’s economic recovery.

The euro climbed to as high as \$1.1021 in the hours after voting closed, rising by around 0.3% from Friday’s close. Though the common currency gave up most of its postelection gain in Asian trading on Monday and was down 0.2% in early European trading.

European stocks also opened slightly lower, with the broad Euro Stoxx index down 0.3%. The index had already rallied by more than 6% in the two weeks following the first round of the presidential election.

Despite the muted initial reaction, many analysts and investors believe that with uncertainty lifting and the economy doing well, the European Central Bank is more likely to taper the massive stimulus program that

has helped keep pressure on the euro.

Mr. Macron, a pro-European Union former banker, won 66.1% of the vote.

“Populism hasn’t gone away, but for now it’s been pushed onto the back burner,” said Jane Foley, senior foreign exchange strategist at Rabobank. “It’s going to be more economics and less politics for the next six, eight, nine months,” she said, predicting the euro will end the year at around \$1.10.

The single currency fell to as low as \$1.035 in late December, and many analysts were betting it would fall to parity with the dollar by the end of this year.

The euro already has risen in recent months, forcing investment banks to boost their outlook for the common currency. The currency closed up 1.2% the day after Mr. Macron finished higher than Ms. Le Pen in the first round of the election. Last week, Bank of America Merrill Lynch and Deutsche Bank both raised their forecasts for the euro, to \$1.08 and \$1.02 at the end of 2017, from \$1.05 and 97 cents respectively.

“As Emmanuel Macron is a centrist, pro-European reformist, who aims to

reduce public deficits and boost economic growth, his election should ease global concerns about political risks in Europe,” said Vincent Durel, a fund manager at Fidelity International.

Ahead of Sunday’s election, investors were reducing their short positions against the single currency as they began to bet that anti-euro candidate Marine Le Pen’s chances of being French president were fading.

Fewer investors are now shorting the euro than at any time in the past three years, according to data from the U.S. Commodity Futures Trading Commission. In the week to May 2, there were only 1,653 more short than long contracts against the euro, sharply down from 127,434 in November.

The number of short contracts peaked at 127,434 in November and is now near its lowest levels since the middle of 2014, before the ECB’s bond-buying program began.

The ECB is still buying €60 billion (\$65.5 billion) in government and corporate bonds each month. Minutes from the ECB’s governing council meetings show that officials’ worries about political uncertainty

were one reason they were keeping monetary policy unchanged.

Investors now expect the central bank to signal in June that it is closer to tapering its buying program, so-called quantitative easing.

The central bank’s negative-interest-rate policy and asset buying has put pressure on the euro because it pushes down bond yields, making the region less attractive for foreign money looking for income and driving up the local currency in the process.

A faster reversal of the program would likely mean a stronger euro, analysts say.

“If you see strong growth we could see a very sharp cliff for quantitative easing, meaning very little QE in 2019,” said Alain Zeitouni, senior portfolio manager at Russell Investments. “That’s not our base case, but it would create big volatility in fixed income and currency markets.”

Few doubt, though, the brighter economic prospects. Core inflation reached its highest level in four years in January and business surveys suggest the stronger economic growth is continuing.

That has helped spur better prospects for equities in the region, which will also buoy the euro as they attract foreign money.

Foreign investors fled European equities in 2016. According to data provider EPFR Global, \$7.66 billion has entered European equity funds in the year to date.

To be sure, not all forecasters see the euro powering higher from here, or even holding its current gains.

For a start, political and economic risks haven't completely gone away. Italy needs to call a national election before May 2018 in an election that could see anti-euro candidates gain ground in a country beset by economic problems.

Joe Prendergast, a strategist at Credit Suisse, also points out that interest rates in the eurozone remain way below those in the U.S.

U.S. two-year bond yields are now 2 percentage points higher than their German equivalents, near the highest levels on record. As recently as the end of 2011, German short-

term yields were higher than their U.S. peers.

Write to Mike Bird at Mike.Bird@wsj.com

Appeared in the May. 08, 2017, print edition as 'Euro Gains As Focus Turns to Growth.'

THE WALL STREET JOURNAL

Greg Ip

5-7 minutes

Updated May 7, 2017 7:48 p.m. ET

Emmanuel Macron should thank the euro. While there were a lot of things French voters didn't like about Marine Le Pen, leader of the National Front, perhaps foremost was her promise to ditch the common currency and bring back the franc, with the implicit threat of inflation and devaluation.

Yet there is an irony to this. While Ms. Le Pen never offered a plausible path out of the euro and the European Union, her critique of both was sound. The rigidity of the euro coupled with strict budget rules enforced by Brussels impose one-size-fits all macroeconomic policy on every country in the union no matter how divergent its circumstances. That planted the seeds of the last crisis and could create the conditions for another.

The eurozone today remains fragile, like a building constructed on an earthquake fault. Ms. Le Pen's solution, to simply tear it down, was brutal. But it was no less logical than the status quo, which amounts to hoping another earthquake doesn't happen. Mr. Macron's plan is to reinforce it against future earthquakes by deepening its governance and economic ties. Yet that risks inflaming the grievances that sustain nationalist movements like Ms. Le Pen's.

The low inflation and steady growth

THE WALL STREET JOURNAL

Washington

5-6 minutes

French President-elect Emmanuel Macron, a consummate internationalist, heads into office primed for clashes with two nationalist rivals on the world stage:

Emmanuel Macron's Win in France Offers a Reprieve for Europe's Single Currency

of the euro's early years masked growing imbalances. Until 2000, French and German labor costs largely tracked each other. But with the introduction of the euro and German labor market reforms, French costs began to rise much more sharply, and those in Spain, Italy, Portugal and Greece even more so. The result was a large and growing trade imbalance in Germany's favor which its neighbors couldn't cure through the usual mechanism, devaluation.

The public and private debts taken on to finance those trade deficits proved unsupportable, yet member countries' central banks could no longer act as lender of last resort to guarantee that governments and their biggest banks wouldn't default. The euro crisis was the result.

The acute phase of the crisis subsided once the European Central Bank decided it would act as lender of last resort to its members. Since then, a moderate recovery has ensued. Trade imbalances have also closed sharply; the current account, which includes trade and investment income, is in surplus in Spain, Ireland and Italy and the deficits of Greece and Portugal have narrowed dramatically. Only in France has the deficit deepened. Germany's surplus has grown, though largely with the rest of the world rather than Europe.

But those imbalances have been replaced by others. Unemployment has fallen to historic lows in Germany yet remains in double digits throughout the southern periphery and in France.

Government debt has fallen steadily in Germany thanks to balanced budgets while rising relentlessly elsewhere. It has stabilized at more than 100% in Italy and around 100% in Spain. It is just below 100% in France, and still climbing. It isn't a stretch to think that a few years from now the ECB will be raising interest rates because Germany is overheating. Yet those same rates saddle its highly indebted and still moribund neighbors with snowballing interest costs that must be met with another dose of austerity.

That probably won't produce another sovereign debt crisis. The ECB will remain lender of last resort, a €500 billion European Stability Mechanism now exists to bail out indebted governments and banks, and a more independent regionwide bank supervisor ensures banks are better insulated from their governments' troubles. This "makes potentially a huge difference," says Nicolas Veron, an expert on the eurozone at Bruegel, a Brussels-based think tank. Even a severe fiscal crisis will be "much more manageable."

But flaws will persist: the failure of the eurozone's underlying economies to converge and their inability to calibrate macroeconomic policy to their own needs.

Mr. Macron, the projected winner of the French election, would address the euro's flaws by deepening its governance and creating a common budget that can stimulate growth as needed via infrastructure spending financed by Eurobonds. His

approach would also stop members such as Germany from using fiscal policies, such as tax changes, that hurt their neighbors. At the same time, he will try to complete the work he began under departing president François Hollande : injecting more flexibility into France's labor market. In theory, this will allow French unemployment to fall and productivity to catch up to Germany's, closing the competitiveness gap.

But labor reform is deeply unpopular in France. Moreover, Ms. Le Pen struck a chord with working class voters by linking France's industrial decline to the impositions of the European Union: free trade, immigration and prohibitions on government intervention. In an interview with Foreign Affairs last year she blamed French unemployment on "completely free trade, which puts us in an unfair competition with countries that engage in social and environmental dumping, leaving us with no means of protecting ourselves and our strategic companies."

Mr. Macron has five years to prove her wrong by overhauling both the French labor market and the EU. If he fails, voters at the next election may find Ms. Le Pen's siren song of nationalism irresistible.

Write to Greg Ip at greg.ip@wsj.com

Appeared in the May. 08, 2017, print edition as 'Win Offers Reprieve for Common Currency.'

France's Emmanuel Macron Set to Clash With Rivals on World Stage

Matthew Dalton in Paris and Paul Sonne in

U.S. President Donald Trump and Russian President Vladimir Putin.

From climate change to the war in Syria, international trade and the conflict in Ukraine, Mr. Macron has staked out positions at times at odds with the two leaders and clashed at a distance with both on the campaign trail. Though he didn't offer a formal endorsement during the French campaign, Mr. Trump had cheered on Mr. Macron's

vanquished rival, far-right nationalist Marine Le Pen, calling her "strongest on borders" and "the strongest on what's been going on in France."

"[Mr. Trump] should have a little more humility," Mr. Macron said in January, defending the European Union from the U.S. president's criticisms. "Mr. Trump, never forget what you owe us, liberty, your existence. Mr. Trump look at your

history, it's that of Lafayette, it's ours!"

Messrs. Trump and Macron are poised to meet for the first time in late May at the North Atlantic Treaty Organization summit in Belgium.

Mr. Macron takes control of one of the world's foremost military powers, a nuclear-armed state with a permanent seat on the U.N. Security Council. His convincing win against Ms. Le Pen amounts in part to a

broad rejection of her foreign-policy program, which called for France to close its borders, withdraw from the EU and NATO, and align itself more closely with Russia.

Now, Mr. Macron has a mandate to pursue a foreign-policy program that largely maintains the status quo under current French President François Hollande.

Despite that continuity, France's relationship with Russia in particular is at risk of deteriorating under Mr. Macron.

During the campaign, his party accused the Russian government of using state-funded media to spread smears about his character.

Tensions could escalate further if French authorities conclude that a massive hack of Mr. Macron's party in the waning days of the campaign was carried out by Russian agents. The Kremlin has denied intervening in the French campaign.

"We will not submit to Russia or Mr. Putin's values, which are not the same as ours," Mr. Macron said

during a debate last week with Ms. Le Pen.

Mr. Macron has pledged to keep EU sanctions on Russia for interfering in Ukraine until a peace process negotiated in Minsk last year is fulfilled. On the Syrian war, he has showed little desire to keep Putin ally Bashar al-Assad in power, saying "the Syrian people have one enemy, that's Bashar al-Assad."

Despite criticizing Mr. Trump, Mr. Macron has pledged to work with the U.S. president. And while they are likely to clash on policy, Mr. Macron has done something that Mr. Trump respects: win big.

"Congratulations to Emmanuel Macron on his big win today as the next President of France," Mr. Trump said on Twitter. "I look very much forward to working with him!"

Climate change is likely to be one of the sharpest disagreements between Mr. Macron and Mr. Trump. In February, Mr. Macron released a video inviting American climate scientists to move to France

because of the Trump administration's stance on global warming.

"I do know how your new president now has decided to jeopardize your budget, your initiatives, as he is extremely skeptical about climate change," Mr. Macron said. "I have no doubt about climate change and how committed we have to be regarding this issue."

White House Press Secretary Sean Spicer has said the administration is currently reviewing the U.S.'s position on the Paris climate treaty.

Mr. Macron will face many of the same challenges German Chancellor Angela Merkel confronted in building relations with the U.S. president, who last year cheered the U.K.'s exit from the EU and predicted the EU would break up with other countries following suit.

While they disagree starkly on trade, globalization, climate change and immigration, Mr. Macron and Mr. Trump have both expressed a

desire to step up NATO's counterterrorism efforts and intensify the fight against Islamist extremism—a critical challenge for the new French leader, whose country faces one of the most acute threats of homegrown terrorism in Europe.

"I think the two will have a strong opportunity to focus on counterterrorism," said Heather A. Conley, director of the Europe Program at the Center for Strategic and International Studies in Washington. "The French are certainly very proactive in fighting terrorist activity in the Sahel in North Africa. Clearly, though, President Trump and Mr. Macron have deep differences on an open economy and open borders."

Write to Matthew Dalton at Matthew.Dalton@wsj.com and Paul Sonne at paul.sonne@wsj.com

Appeared in the May. 08, 2017, print edition as 'Macron at Odds With Trump, Putin.'

THE WALL STREET JOURNAL

Thomas Grove in Moscow and Matthew Dalton in Paris

4-5 minutes

Russian Link Cited in Hacked Macron Party Files

The digital fingerprints of a man with onetime ties to a Russian government-linked cybersecurity firm are on some of the files hacked from the political party of French election winner Emmanuel Macron, a cybersecurity expert said Sunday.

The name of the employee appeared nine times as the last person to have modified some of the files that contain thousands of party emails and documents, said Selahaddin Karatas, CEO of the San Francisco-based cybersecurity company SAASPASS, who examined the metadata of some of the caches of hacked records.

No one in the Macron campaign has accused Russia of involvement in the hacking, but an official in the French president's office who examined metadata of the hacked documents said Sunday that "it points directly to Russia."

After Mr. Macron's party En Marche, or On the Move, disclosed late Friday the hacking of its computer systems, Kremlin spokesman Dmitry Peskov vigorously denied any Russian involvement in it, saying such accusations "mean nothing in

and of themselves and are pure slander."

In the program of a computer conference held in the southern Russian city of Rostov-on-Don in 2014, the Russian man said to have left his digital signature on the hacked documents was listed as an employee of the Russian internet firm Evrika.

There was no response to questions sent to his email address listed in the program, and it isn't known whether he is still employed by Evrika.

A businessman in Russia's cyber community said the man could have handled the information without necessarily being responsible for the hacking.

Mr. Karatas said it would be unusual for someone with such abilities to leave their digital fingerprints on the data.

"This is a schoolboy error and looks very strange to see it coming from someone who works at a government contractor. Attribution and provenance are hard to pinpoint, and it's very easy to create fake trails to throw people off from those who may really be working with the data," he said.

Mr. Karatas said that Evrika isn't mentioned in the metadata that he examined.

Evrika didn't answer telephone calls seeking comment or respond to written questions. Mr. Peskov didn't respond to written questions about the possibility that an Evrika employee was involved with the hacked documents.

Cybersecurity firm Trend Micro said late last month that hackers matching the profile of a pro-Kremlin group had attempted repeatedly to break into Mr. Macron's campaign email accounts. The company said the campaign had been targeted by a multipronged phishing attack that started in mid-March.

U.S. intelligence agencies have accused Kremlin-backed groups of hacking the email accounts of Democratic Party officials and leaking their contents in an effort to tilt last fall's U.S. presidential election in favor of Donald Trump.

In response to the allegation, Russian President Vladimir Putin said the Russian state didn't engage in hacking but added that it was important that the information had been made public.

To avoid any such meddling, however, French officials warned that Paris would retaliate against any foreign involvement in France's elections.

During the presidential campaign in France, Mr. Macron repeatedly pointed to Marine Le Pen's ties to

Russia. The National Front's candidate visited Moscow earlier this year and publicly met with President Vladimir Putin. Her party received a loan of about 9 million euros from the now defunct Moscow-based First Czech-Russian Bank in 2014.

Evrika has offices in Moscow, St. Petersburg and Kursk. A document on its website that shows the company has been contracted by Russia's Defense Ministry and the Federal Security Service, or FSB, doesn't describe the nature of its work for the two agencies.

The FSB has retained outside companies to infiltrate the computer and email systems both in Russia and abroad, both to use as blackmail against its domestic enemies and further the Kremlin's foreign-policy goals, a person close to the Kremlin and cyber analysts said.

The Kremlin frequently denies that the Russian government hacks foreign targets.

Write to Thomas Grove at thomas.grove@wsj.com and Matthew Dalton at Matthew.Dalton@wsj.com



Brigitte Trogneux: From Macron's teacher to France's first lady

By Angela Dewan, CNN

Updated 6:57 AM ET, Mon May 8, 2017

Inside Macron's unconventional love story 02:39

Story highlights

- Macron was a student in a school play when he met Trogneux
- President-elect has said his wife will have a role in government

(CNN)The relationship between French President-Elect Emmanuel Macron and his wife Brigitte Trogneux has captivated the world.

There is nothing cliché about their story, which began when a 15-year-old Macron took part in a school play directed by Trogneux, 24 years his senior.

Trogneux went from being Macron's teacher to his partner, and eventually his wife. But through each phase, she has been his mentor and inspiration.

"Without her, I wouldn't be me," Macron, 39, declared after winning the first round of voting in April.

Macron kisses his wife after winning the first round in April.

Trogneux -- now 64 with seven grandchildren -- will become France's next first lady. Unlike in the United States, the spouses of French leaders have traditionally held more negligible roles in public affairs.

But there is nothing traditional about Trogneux, nor her presidential muse. Macron has said that if he is

elected, he will likely give his wife an official role in his administration.

MORE: France rejects far-right in landslide

'Love took everything in its path'

Trogneux was born to a bourgeoisie family of chocolatiers, the youngest of six children. Like Macron, her hometown is Amiens in northern France.

Before she met Macron, she was on the path to living a relatively conventional life. She had a stable career teaching French literature, Latin and drama, and married a banker, Andre Louis Auziere, with whom she had three children.

"Love took everything in its path and led me to divorce. It was impossible to resist him," Trogneux told Paris Match magazine in 2016.

She divorced Auziere in 2006 and married Macron a year later, moving to Paris to work as a teacher.

Before she met Macron, Trogneux was on the path to a relatively conventional life.

In 2015 she gave up her career to focus on her husband, who was at the time the country's economy minister.

In a documentary by France3 TV, Trogneux is depicted as Macron's coach. In one scene, she guides him through a practice run of a speech, cutting in to tell him to lift his voice.

"Every night we debrief together and we repeat what we have heard about each other," she told Paris Match.

"I have to pay attention to everything, do the maximum to protect him."

Her adult children, Sebastien, Laurence and Tiphaine, are reported to have a good relationship with their stepfather and have been seen campaigning for Macron in T-shirts bearing En Marche!, the name of Macron's party.

OPINION: Macron's victory is reassuring ... kind of

Trogneux (C) with her daughters Tiphaine Auziere (R) and Laurence Auziere-Jourdan at a campaign meeting in Paris.

In fact, Macron made sure to get the blessing of Trogneux's children before proposing.

"It was a powerful act because not everyone would have taken that precaution, to come and ask us for her hand in marriage. I mean, it wasn't quite like that, but he did want to know if this was something we could accept," Tiphaine Auziere told BFMTV.

Celebrating an atypical family

It's not clear when a serious romance began between the two, but Macron appeared to be a young man who knew what he wanted -- at 17, he professed his love for Trogneux.

"Whatever you do, I will marry you," he told her as he left Amiens to study elsewhere.

But Macron's parents didn't approve of their son's romance with Trogneux. His father told Trogneux to back off until his son was at least 18, Reuters reported, citing the book "Emmanuel Macron: A perfect young man," by Anne Fulda.

"Nobody will ever know at what moment our story became a love story. That belongs to us. That is our

secret," Trogneux was quoted as saying.

Philippe Besson, a friend of the couple, acknowledged that not everyone was so accepting of their relationship.

How Emmanuel Macron won the French presidency 01:50

"They both had to face hostile looks, even the reluctance of their respective families and also the view of our society about the age difference," Besson told BFMTV.

"Especially when the woman is older, (people are) always suspicious."

To put things in perspective, US President Donald Trump is 24 years older than Melania Trump, but few people are making a fuss about their age gap.

Macron and Trogneux have been determined to ensure that their relationship is not painted as some sort of scandal.

They have made a point of making their relationship public, posing in glossy French magazines and describing their marriage as a celebration of an atypical but loving modern family.

"We do not have a classic family, it's undeniable," Macron said at a recent En Marche! event.

"But do we have less love in this family? I do not think so. Maybe there's even more than conventional families."

CNN's Holly Yan, Melissa Bell and Judith Vonberg contributed to this report.

THE WALL STREET JOURNAL

William Horobin

5-6 minutes

Updated May 8, 2017 6:02 a.m. ET

PARIS—Far-right nationalist Marine Le Pen suffered a stinging defeat at the hands of centrist Emmanuel Macron in the final round of France's presidential elections.

But her showing at the polls, combined with the disarray of mainstream Socialist and conservative parties, positions the vociferous critic of the European Union to take command of France's political opposition.

The 48-year-old Ms. Le Pen, who blames the EU and the euro for

After Defeat, Marine Le Pen Emerges as Leader of French Opposition

David Gauthier-Villars and

economic and security woes in France, won 35% of the vote, according to preliminary results. That is more than the 21.3% she garnered in the first round, but significantly short of the 40% pollsters had predicted.

Speaking on Sunday night, Ms. Le Pen vowed to make her National Front the "the No. 1 opposition force" to Mr. Macron and said she would work to transform the party ahead of June legislative elections.

Ms. Le Pen's performance was a measure of the strength of anti-globalization sentiment in France, part of the swell of antiestablishment currents that fueled Donald Trump's election in the U.S. and Britain's referendum vote to leave the EU last year.

And it showed that the appeal of her pledge to lead a "patriotic revolution" to restore France's control of its borders and currency resonated with voters beyond the traditional strongholds of her once-fringe National Front.

Ms. Le Pen's duel with Mr. Macron—who says French people shouldn't fear globalization, but instead roll up their sleeves and embrace it—showed how France's traditional left-right divide has been replaced by a new split between globalists and nationalists, and pro- and anti-EU voters.

Building on her enlarged base, Ms. Le Pen could impose herself as the lead architect of a broader nationalist platform, opening her arms to both conservatives—who dislike Mr. Macron's liberal social ideas, and leftist politicians—who

abhor the president-elect's pro-business agenda.

The Socialist and conservative parties were thrown in disarray after their respective candidates were ejected from the presidential race in the April 23 first round.

To consolidate a role as opposition leader, Ms. Le Pen would need to quell rebellious party voices that have challenged her incendiary rhetoric against Europe in general, and the euro in particular.

Party members such as Marion Maréchal-Le Pen, Ms. Le Pen's niece, have said proposing to replace the euro with a new French franc risked alienating large swaths of voters, fearful that a currency swap would hammer their savings.

In the last stretch of the campaign, Ms. Le Pen said she would take time to consult the population before making any decision on the euro if she were elected. But Ms. Maréchal-Le Pen said the move may have come too late.

"I think it was necessary to reassure French people," Ms. Maréchal-Le Pen told television Sunday evening.

Ms. Le Pen also needs to improve the National Front's ability to convert its support into legislative seats. Voters are due to cast ballots in parliamentary elections next month. The party now has just two affiliated members in the current 577-seat National Assembly.

"We need to organize ourselves differently," said Jean-Lin Lacapelle,

a senior National Front official. "The National Front has seen its limits." National Front interim leader Steeve Briois said: "It's not a real defeat tonight. It's a semi-victory." said Steeve Briois, interim leader of the National Front.

A European lawmaker, Ms. Le Pen also stands to become the flag-bearer of a nationalist wave that has swept across Europe in recent years. But her standing on the French and European scenes could suffer depending on the outcome of a French investigation into whether she misused EU funds.

French authorities suspect Ms. Le Pen cut checks to senior party officials using funds earmarked for European parliamentary assistants,

according to French prosecutors. Ms. Le Pen has dismissed the allegations.

Ms. Le Pen's showing Sunday is also a gauge of what progress she has made in a six-year drive to transform the National Front—a protest party known for its anti-Semitic rhetoric when it was led by her father, Jean-Marie Le Pen, from 1972 to 2011—into a major political force.

When Mr. Le Pen reached the second round of presidential elections in 2002, French voters determined to keep him out of office rallied behind the conservative Jacques Chirac, who won with 82% of the vote.

Most mainstream leaders sought to form a similar coalition ahead of Sunday's vote, urging voters to block Ms. Le Pen by supporting Mr. Macron, even if they disagreed with his proposed policies.

But her 35% result highlights how Ms. Le Pen has been successful in tapping into deepening voter discontent over high unemployment, immigration, and a perception of France's diminished standing in the world.

Write to David Gauthier-Villars at David.Gauthier-Villars@wsj.com and William Horobin at William.Horobin@wsj.com

Appeared in the May. 08, 2017, print edition as 'Le Pen Grows in Stature.'

TechCrunch : Emmanuel Macron and how political campaigns will never be the same

Romain Dillet

4-5 minutes

Emmanuel Macron has been elected as the president of France. While you'll be able to read plenty of profiles about him over the next few days, I wanted to use this opportunity to look back at the campaign and how technology has profoundly changed politics.

Every major campaign brings its set of changes. Barack Obama used big data and micro-targeting in his 2008 campaign. Then social networks became a great way to address messages to voters directly. But the political campaigns of 2016 and 2017 have been something different altogether.

The internet has become so big that trolls started to have a significant influence on the results of the elections. If you're American or British, I'm sure you know this story. Fake news and Facebook hysteria have played such an important role that it has been frustrating for many.

But it's hard to understand this as an outsider. Sure, I wrote a plea asking Facebook to fix the plague of fake

news before the French election. But I had no idea fake news could be this nerve-racking until the French election. I'm insanely happy that Emmanuel Macron came out ahead and Marine Le Pen didn't win this election. But I was worried until the very last day.

The last week of the campaign has been dominated by hackers sharing a ton of emails from Macron's team, Marine Le Pen's team and supporters tweeting fake news all day long and stupid memes going viral on Facebook. The most popular fake story was that Macron had a secret bank account in the Bahamas.

With blogs and forums, the most interesting people became the most influential people. With Facebook, the loudest people have become the most influential people

If you think Macron's election proves that Facebook, Twitter, YouTube, 4chan, Reddit and other social media platforms don't have a fake news problem anymore, you're wrong. It's been a nightmare, and it's still going to be a nightmare for future elections.

Even more important, Facebook is still the digital megaphone we don't need.

With blogs and forums, the most interesting people became the most influential people. With Facebook, the loudest people have become the most influential people.

Sure you could say it's a good thing that everyone now has a say. But I've never seen so many stupid, factually incorrect messages on a single website. You can unfriend the biggest offenders but you risk separating yourself from people who disagree with you and surround yourself with people in the same bubble as you.

Propaganda pages optimize their reach and chase likes and shares, bots increase engagement on each post, and everything becomes a test on collective intelligence. It feels like Facebook's algorithm is turning citizens into guinea pigs to test the limits of democracy.

It's so scary to see it happen a second time. And it's even scarier to see that many French people discovered the concept of fake news last week. Nobody learns from our collective mistakes.

And then, there's all the hacking. Thousands of emails and documents were shared hours before election day. So far, it's a pretty dull story as it seems like these documents don't show any conspiracy or shameful secrets.

But Macron's team was aware that there was big risk. My guess is that hackers managed to access those email accounts thanks to phishing campaigns and password reuse, because it's still hard to fix all your security weaknesses.

It's clear that all elections are going to be like that now. Political team members will all need to take a course on "Encryption 101" before joining a campaign. At least it's a good way to educate politicians so that they stop asking for backdoors.

Now, it's time for tech cheerleaders to stop saying that tech is a good thing and will always fix itself. Technology has changed politics and there's no coming back. Instead of fighting that, let's embrace it and fix the internet before it completely messes up with our stupid monkey brains.

Featured Image: David Ramos/Getty Images

The New York Times

5-6 minutes

Angela Merkel's Party Wins Unexpectedly in German State Elections

Melissa Eddy

A voter filled out his ballot papers at a polling station in Kiel during the regional state elections in Schleswig-Holstein, Germany. Morris Macmatzen/Getty Images

BERLIN — Voters in Germany's northernmost state, Schleswig-

Holstein, handed Chancellor Angela Merkel's party an unexpected victory in a state election on Sunday, suggesting that Germans were willing to back the center-right in a year when the chancellor is seeking a fourth term.

Local issues like education, traffic and security dominated the race, in which the largely unknown Daniel Günther, 43, led Ms. Merkel's Christian Democratic Union to

victory. The loss was the second in a row for the incumbent Social Democrats, after another state, Saarland, voted the conservatives into power in March.

"Nobody will argue that the Christian Democrats are the clear winners tonight," said Mr. Günther, the party's top candidate in Schleswig-Holstein, who will now face the task of forming a government. "We won

with clear points that spoke to voters."

The Christian Democrats won about 32 percent of the vote, while the Social Democratic Party trailed with about 27 percent, and the Green Party finished third with about 13 percent, according to official preliminary results.

The Social Democrats expressed disappointment with the results. "It is

something that gets under your skin and makes us all sad," Martin Schulz, the party's leader, told supporters at its headquarters in Berlin. "We had counted on a better result."

Mr. Schulz had appeared to have revived the center-left party, which is the junior partner in a coalition with Ms. Merkel's conservatives at the national level, when he took over its leadership three months ago. But the popularity of Mr. Schulz, a former European Parliament president, spiked in February and has since fallen, and the latest polls show Ms. Merkel to be leading by about eight points.

Germans in the country's most populous state, North Rhine-Westphalia, will vote next week in

another state election seen as an indicator of the mood before the national race on Sept. 24.

The top candidates in the state election in Schleswig Holstein, Germany, Torsten Albig, left, of the Social Democratic party, and Daniel Guenther, of the Christian Democratic party before a TV debate in April. Carsten Rehder/DPA, via Associated Press

THE WALL STREET JOURNAL

The outcome in Schleswig-Holstein "confirms a nationwide trend that is giving wings to the Christian Democrats across the country that many of the Merkel critics within the Christian Democrats had considered impossible," the Süddeutsche

Zeitung newspaper wrote in a political analysis on Sunday. "Even though it is not clear who will become governor in Kiel, the chancellor and her supporters in the party have scored points that should help her in next week's election in North Rhine-Westphalia."

Even as their European partners have expressed displeasure with a more centralized European Union and the threat of increased immigration from the Middle East and Africa, Germans have largely tended to support stability at the ballot box. In March, voters in Saarland, Germany's smallest state, returned Ms. Merkel's party to power with 40.7 percent of the vote.

That was the first indication that Mr. Schulz might not be able to maintain momentum through the fall, despite

driving support for his party over the Christian Democrats at the start of the year.

The nationalist, populist Alternative for Germany party passed the 5 percent vote threshold needed to make it into the state legislature in Schleswig-Holstein, entering the 12th of 16 state legislatures. But partial results showed that the party had earned only 5.9 percent of the vote.

The upstart party rode a wave of anger and uncertainty to considerable popularity in several eastern states last year, after Ms. Merkel's decision to take in nearly one million refugees, but it has failed to perform as strongly in elections in the western states this year.

The New York Times

E.U. Leader Says (in English) That English Is Waning

James Kanter and Michael Wolgelenter

3 minutes

BRUSSELS — Jean-Claude Juncker couldn't resist a little dig, and it drew a big laugh.

Speaking on Friday at a conference in Florence, Italy, he began his remarks in English — but only to explain that he would be switching to French.

Why? "Because slowly but surely, English is losing importance in Europe."

He was kidding, of course, as an aide confirmed later. But then again, maybe he wasn't.

Mr. Juncker, you see, is the man with the "Brexit" problem on his desk. As the president of the European Commission, he helps oversee the back and forth with London over how, to the irritation of its neighbors, Britain will go about withdrawing from the European Union over the next two years.

The union has 24 official and working languages, but for practicality's sake it does most of its business in just a handful, and in recent years, English has usually been the first choice.

That's not surprising. English is the leading language of global commerce, diplomacy, technology and tourism, and it is the most-taught second language in Europe. If anything, its influence is growing, with or without the blessing of Brussels bureaucrats, who will go on using it after Britain pulls out partly because Ireland and Malta, which have English as an official language, will still be members of the union.

All that doesn't stop many French speakers from resenting English's primacy, though, nor from hoping that the language might recede a bit after Britain leaves the European Union, the process known as Brexit. That is the sentiment that Mr. Juncker mined in Florence, to the applause of the audience.

Mr. Juncker is from Luxembourg, where everyone is fluent in several tongues because almost no one

else understands Luxembourgish. When he speaks in public, he noted, he is "always hesitating between two or three languages."

In French, he offered more serious remarks aimed at French voters, who on Sunday chose Emmanuel Macron, a pro-European centrist, over Marine Le Pen, an anti-European from the far right, as their next president.

"I would like them to understand what I'm saying about Europe and about nations," he said.

He listed the European Union's achievements, including the creation of the euro currency, and said the bloc had unified the Continent peacefully for the first time in history. Realistically, with its share of the world population dwindling, Europe can wield significant influence in the world only by sticking together, he said.

Mr. Juncker's English jest might be viewed by some in Brussels as ill advised after the cross-Channel war of words that raged this past week over leaked details of a tense dinner

attended by Mr. Juncker and the British prime minister, Theresa May.

Mrs. May said the leak misrepresented her country's negotiating position in the Brexit talks and amounted to meddling in Britain's general election on June 8. It seemed to indicate that she and Mr. Juncker were far apart on major issues and that Mrs. May would have a hard time reaching the kind of deal she has promised to British voters.

Donald Tusk, the president of the European Council, took to Twitter on Thursday to call for "moderation & mutual respect" in the talks, which were "difficult enough" and risked becoming "impossible."

Mr. Juncker's zinger on Friday did not seem to do much to unruffle British feathers. The Daily Express, a right-wing newspaper, called it an "outrageous SWIPE at Britain" in a headline online.

INTERNATIONAL

U.S. Wants to Spend Added Billions on Military in Asia

Gordon Lubold

6-8 minutes

WASHINGTON—The Pentagon has endorsed a plan to invest nearly \$8 billion to bulk up the U.S. presence in the Asia-Pacific region over the next five years by upgrading military infrastructure, conducting additional

exercises and deploying more forces and ships.

The effort is seen by backers as one way to signal more strongly the U.S. commitment to the region as Washington confronts an increasingly tenuous situation on the Korean peninsula, its chief security concern in the area.

The Trump administration is still formulating its larger policy for Asia after essentially discarding former President Barack Obama's so-called Asia pivot, which was disparaged by critics as thin on resources and military muscle, and dropping U.S. support for the Trans-Pacific Partnership, a 12-nation trade deal.

Given President Donald Trump's recent overtures to Chinese President Xi Jinping, any plan to expand the U.S. military presence in Asia eventually may require steps to reassure Beijing that new military measures aren't directed at the Chinese. A spokesman for China's embassy in the U.S. didn't immediately respond to a request for comment.

The proposal, dubbed the Asia-Pacific Stability Initiative, was first floated by Sen. John McCain (R., Ariz.) and has been embraced by other lawmakers and, in principle, by Defense Secretary Jim Mattis and the head of U.S. Pacific Command, Adm. Harry Harris. Proponents haven't developed details of the \$7.5 billion plan.

"This initiative could enhance U.S. military power through targeted funding to realign our force posture in the region, improve operationally relevant infrastructure, fund additional exercises, pre-position equipment and build capacity with our allies and partners," Mr. McCain told Adm. Harris in an April hearing.

Dustin Walker, a spokesman to Mr. McCain, described the plan in an email as a way to make the American posture in the region more "forward-leaning, flexible, resilient and formidable."

Supporters liken the initiative to an Asia version of the European Reassurance Initiative, or ERI, begun after Russia's 2014 intervention in Ukraine and funded at \$3.4 billion in this year's U.S. budget.

Backers have not spelled out how they plan to get funding. The Trump administration has asked for additional money for defense spending in the current fiscal year, and are seeking a \$54 billion increase for fiscal 2018.

U.S. officials and congressional

staffers, citing the uncertainties of federal budget deliberations, said it is unclear how much will be immediately available for the new Asia initiative. But they also point out that the spending would take place over five years.

Mr. Mattis has voiced support for the concept of the plan. "I don't understand all the details in Senator McCain's plan, but I support the themes that he outlined and the importance he assigned to that region," said Mr. Mattis during a recent congressional hearing.

Cmdr. Gary Ross, a Pentagon spokesman, said the Defense Department "supports in principle" Mr. McCain's proposal.

"The Asia-Pacific is a top priority for the United States, and the Department is committed to ensuring that U.S. forces are as capable and ready as possible to face the evolving challenges in the region," Cmdr. Ross said in a statement.

A former top Pentagon policy official in the Obama administration said the initiative could have value if it is used for a specific purpose and is part of a broader American policy in Asia.

"If used strategically, it can help stem the tide of the military challenges we face in the Pacific," Kelly Magsamen, who was an acting assistant secretary of defense for Asian and Pacific Affairs under Mr. Obama, said in an email.

But it has to be tied to specific requirements for U.S. Pacific Command, she said. "It shouldn't just be a slush fund for PACOM."

Mr. Obama's Asia pivot, later termed a "rebalance," fell short of expectations, experts said.

"Conceptually, it was the right thing," said Richard Fontaine, president of the Center for a New American Security, a think tank in Washington, and onetime McCain aide who supports the McCain initiative. "The point was to spend more time, attention and resources on our interests in Asia, but the rhetoric also raised expectations there, expectations that were higher than what actually materialized."

Still, the effort produced visible changes under Mr. Obama. More than 1,200 Marines have been stationed on a rotating basis in Darwin, Australia, the U.S. began the deployment of Littoral Combat Ships to Singapore, and U.S. access to military bases in the Philippines was restored.

In the meantime, the deployment of a Thaad missile defense system to South Korea, years in the making, was just completed days ago, according to U.S. and South Korean defense officials.

Mr. Trump met his Chinese counterpart in Florida last month, discussing a range of economic and security issues and saying afterward that he believes Mr. Xi wants to help address regional

problems. Chief among the challenges cited by Mr. Trump is North Korea, which has continued to defy world powers with nuclear weapons and missile tests.

Pyeongyang also has continued detaining U.S. citizens in that country, arresting another American on Saturday, the fourth now held.

The U.S. military under Mr. Obama pressured China by conducting "freedom of navigation" operations in which U.S. naval vessels passed through some waters claimed by Beijing near where China has developed military facilities on islands and other land structures.

Secretary of State Rex Tillerson said during his confirmation hearing that the U.S. would go further, possibly moving to deny China access to disputed islands and other areas. Thus far, however, no such steps have been taken and no new freedom of navigation operations have been disclosed under Mr. Trump, although administration officials have said the operations will continue.

China maintains it is not seeking to militarize the area and that any disputes can be worked out through one-on-one diplomacy.

Write to Gordon Lubold at Gordon.Lubold@wsj.com

Appeared in the May. 08, 2017, print edition as 'Pentagon Backs Added Spending on Asia.'

**The
Washington
Post**

<https://www.facebook.com/fhiatt1>

5-7 minutes

By Fred Hiatt Editorial Page Editor May 7 at 7:40 PM

China is bent on world domination — not with its missiles and aircraft carriers, but by controlling solar energy, cloud computing and other industries of the future.

That is an only slightly exaggerated version of a warning coming from the American chamber of commerce in China. It sent a delegation to Washington last week to warn that "China's aggressive mercantilist policies are one of the most serious threats facing the future of U.S. advanced technology sectors," as their policy paper says — and that the U.S. government isn't doing enough to counter the threat.

Hiatt : China is bent on world domination — but not in the way you think

<https://www.facebook.com/fhiatt1>

The warning is especially startling coming from AmCham China, as it calls itself, which for years flexed its advocacy muscle persuading the United States to let China into the world trading system and rebutting Americans who it felt were too hard on China.

Read These Comments

The best conversations on The Washington Post

"Now we're saying that things are really lopsided, and the government needs to wake up and take action," James McGregor, chairman of APCO Worldwide in China and part of last week's delegation, told me during a visit to The Post. "This is aimed at domination of the industries of the future. We're talking about artificial intelligence and all the things that are important to the American economy."

Given President Trump's anti-China rhetoric during the campaign, you might expect U.S. executives in Beijing and Shanghai to feel

optimistic about the prospects for a U.S. response. They are hopeful — but they are also nervous, for reasons I'll get to in a minute, that the administration may miss this opportunity to course-correct.

First, though: Why has AmCham changed its tune so dramatically since the upbeat days of China's entry into the World Trade Organization?

The chamber's answer: China has changed, not us. Its policy has shifted, McGregor said, from "reform and opening" to "reform and closing." The Communist regime still wants economic growth and market mechanisms, in other words, but without subjecting its economy to open competition from outside. In fact, a recent survey showed that more than 80 percent of the chamber's members "feel less welcome than before," another delegation member, Lester Ross of the WilmerHale law firm, told me.

China has a well-developed, long-term industrial strategy, the chamber says. It limits U.S. firms' access to its market; demands that American companies share their advanced technology to get even that limited access; buys foreign companies that possess technology it needs while preventing U.S. firms from investing in China; shovels resources to Chinese companies as they ramp up; and then, once those Chinese firms have fattened on the vast and protected Chinese market, sends them out to compete in the world.

"The economic relationship is critical to both the United States and China," said William M. Zarit, a former U.S. diplomat and now senior counselor at the Cohen Group and chairman of AmCham China. "But as strong as it might be, we have an investment and trade relationship that is out of whack. ... We need to address this."

During the campaign, Trump maintained that China was “ripping us left and right.”

“There are people who wish I wouldn’t refer to China as our enemy,” he wrote in 2015. “But that’s exactly what they are.”

But will his earlier skepticism translate into smart policy?

Since meeting Chinese President Xi Jinping, Trump has seemed very taken with the Communist leader and the budding U.S.-China relationship, which he described as “something very special, something very different than we’ve ever had.”

This could be a prelude, U.S. executives worry, to economic concessions

designed to win cooperation on North Korea. They also worry that, to the extent the administration remains focused on the economy, it is on iron, steel and other heavy manufacturing sectors rather than technologies that will be crucial in the future.

Most of all they worry, though, because it wouldn’t be easy for anyone to come up with an intelligent response to the uneven relationship.

“Our systems are fundamentally different,” explained Timothy P. Stratford, a delegation member who worked in the U.S. trade representative’s office from 2005 to 2010. “We follow process. . . . China is focused on outcomes.”

If U.S. law allows a Chinese company to buy an American one, in other words, the U.S. government isn’t going to interfere — even if U.S. firms are being blocked in China and the overall situation seems unfair.

The delegation did not come with detailed policy proposals, though several members called for new levels of review for proposed Chinese investments. Mostly they want a recognition that the Chinese economy is not operating as Americans hoped it would during the push to open the global trading system — and that waiting for it to “evolve” is no longer a viable option.

“The solution has to be some combination of offense and

defense,” said Randal L. Phillips, Asia managing partner for the Mintz Group. “China has to face some consequence.”

Read more from Fred Hiatt’s archive, follow him on Twitter or subscribe to his updates on Facebook.

Fred Hiatt is the editorial page editor of The Post. He writes editorials for the newspaper and a biweekly column that appears on Mondays. He also contributes to the PostPartisan blog.

Follow @hiattf

**The
Washington
Post**

gin

5-6 minutes

Rogin : Taiwan arms deal in limbo as Trump courts China

<https://www.facebook.com/josh.rogin>

Read These Comments

The best conversations on The Washington Post

“I think it’s important we keep our commitments under the Taiwan Relations Act and under Ronald Reagan’s ‘Six Assurances,’” House Foreign Affairs Committee Chairman Edward R. Royce (R-Calif.) told me. “This helps keep the peace and stability in the Taiwan Strait.”

The 1979 law to which Royce referred states that U.S. policy will be to “provide Taiwan with arms of a defensive character,” and Reagan’s 1982 “assurances” made clear that there was no end date for U.S. arms sales to Taiwan and that the United States is not required to consult with Beijing on the issue. These two documents have been the bedrock of bipartisan U.S. strategy on Taiwan ever since.

Following the successful summit between Trump and Chinese President Xi Jinping last month, many expected the administration to quickly approve the still-pending package and notify Congress. Now, administration and congressional officials say the White House has not provided clear policy direction to the national-security agencies or Congress, causing significant confusion.

Adding to those concerns were the president’s comments last month that he would consult with Xi before speaking again with the Taiwanese president. Trump said he would not want to be “causing difficulty” for Xi

while seeking his help with North Korea.

One possibility is that the administration is preparing to bundle the limited Obama Taiwan arms package with more robust weapons. The Taiwanese government is expressing interest, for example, in acquiring the F-35 Joint Strike Fighter. But doing so might complicate the surrounding diplomacy even more and cause further delays.

Some U.S. officials want Trump to move forward with the smaller arms package now, to establish that the United States is still committed to aiding Taiwan’s defenses in the Trump era. Many are advocating for a return to a more regular process whereby requests are considered and sales notified on an annual basis.

“This is the only way to avoid the speed bumps of the U.S.-China relationship stalling arms packages for years on end,” one U.S. defense official said. The State Department said it does not comment on pending arms sales. The White House did not respond to requests for comment.

No matter which route the Trump administration takes, congressional support is assured. “I will strongly support any arms package the Trump administration will put forward for our friend and ally, Taiwan,” said Sen. Cory Gardner (R-Colo.), who chairs the Senate Foreign Relations subcommittee on East Asia.

Gardner was one of seven senators who visited Taiwan last year and pressed President Tsai Ing-wen to increase Taiwan’s own defense spending to 3 percent of its gross domestic product. Lawmakers worry that U.S. calls for Taiwan to spend more on defense will ring hollow if Washington won’t sell Taiwan the defense items it needs.

Even if Tsai reaches her goal, Taiwan cannot keep pace with Beijing. Taiwan will spend about \$11.6 billion on defense this year, compared with \$146 billion spent by the Chinese government, according to official figures. The Pentagon’s 2016 report on China’s military states that the nation’s “primary emphasis” is to develop capabilities for a potential conflict with Taiwan.

China must be reminded that it cannot push the United States away from its commitments to partners in the region with vague promises of help on North Korea that may never come. If China really does believe that helping to solve that crisis is in its interest, no Taiwan arms package will change that.

The Trump administration must resist the temptation to sacrifice long-term objectives for short-term aspirations. There will always be some imperative with Beijing that seems more urgent. But as Reagan well understood, the U.S. commitment to Taiwan’s defense is too important to deal away.

Read more from Josh Rogin’s archive, follow him on Twitter or subscribe to his updates on Facebook.

**THE WALL
STREET
JOURNAL**

North Korea Detains Fourth U.S. Citizen for ‘Hostile Acts’

Jonathan Cheng

5-6 minutes

Updated May 7, 2017 10:23 p.m. ET

SEOUL—North Korea’s state media said officials detained a U.S. citizen tied to a Christian-backed university

in North Korea, two weeks after arresting one of his colleagues.

Saturday's arrest of Kim Hak-song for committing "hostile acts" brings the number of known U.S. citizens detained in North Korea to four, adding another twist to troubled relations between Washington and Pyongyang as the U.S. seeks to slow the North's nuclear and missile program.

According to Sunday's report by North Korea's official Korean Central News Agency, Mr. Kim works for the Pyongyang University of Science and Technology, a university founded in 2010 by James Kim, a Korean-American Christian businessman.

Two weeks ago, North Korea detained Tony Kim, a Korean-American accounting professor at PUST, as he was preparing to depart North Korea at Pyongyang's main international airport, citing "hostile acts."

PUST, while not officially Christian, hires largely Christian faculty, and says on its website that "churches can support PUST through prayer and through spreading the news about this project among congregation members."

North Korea has arrested a number of U.S. citizens doing Christian-related work in the isolated country. Kenneth Bae, a Korean-American missionary, was sentenced to 12 years' hard labor for hostile acts, and was freed after two years in November 2014.

In 2014, American Jeffery Fowle

was detained and held for six months after leaving a Bible in a nightclub bathroom.

A spokesman for PUST's leadership confirmed Kim Hak-song's arrest on Saturday, just as he was about to leave North Korea after a visit of several weeks. The spokesman said Mr. Kim was at PUST to do agricultural work at an experimental farm operated by the university.

"We understand that this detention is related to an investigation into matters that are not connected in any way with the work of PUST," the spokesman said. "Life on campus and the teaching at PUST is continuing as normal for the spring semester."

A U.S. State Department official said the government was aware of the reports of a U.S. citizen detained in North Korea, but declined further comment, citing privacy considerations. "The security of U.S. citizens is one of the department's highest priorities," the official said.

While North Korea is officially atheist, the state glorifies its founder Kim Il Sung, his son Kim Jong Il and his grandson, the current leader Kim Jong Un as quasi-deities. The country has also long maintained ties with Christian groups, many of which conduct humanitarian aid work in the country.

A delegation of North Koreans arrived in Canada last week for meetings with the Mennonite

Central Committee, which conducts aid work in North Korea.

Billy Graham, the U.S. evangelist, visited North Korea twice in the early 1990s and met with Kim Il Sung.

James Kim, the founder of PUST, has been the object both of Pyongyang's favor and of its displeasure. In 1998, Mr. Kim was detained for six weeks by North Korean authorities, who accused him of being a spy for South Korea.

In 2000, it approached Mr. Kim, who in 1992 founded the Yanbian University of Science and Technology in northeastern China, not far from the North Korean border, about opening a sister school in Pyongyang.

"The missionary zeal is what carries them through, but it may also be their undoing. They do have genuine religious ambition," said Christopher Green, a researcher in North Korean studies at Leiden University in the Netherlands.

While North Korea doesn't tolerate rival ideologies, Mr. Green says Pyongyang likely allows PUST's work, within the confines of restrictions on open evangelism, because "it brings ideas and technology into the country."

Suki Kim, a Korean-American writer who taught at PUST for six months, said in a book about her experiences that the teachers at PUST were permitted to hold regular Bible studies and Sunday

services among themselves, as long as they didn't openly evangelize.

Ms. Kim, who isn't a practicing Christian, said authorities had to approve every lesson plan at the school.

The detention of Kim Hak-song comes days after North Korea accused the U.S. Central Intelligence Agency of paying a North Korean overseas laborer to assassinate leader Kim Jong Un.

In addition to the two Messrs. Kim from PUST, North Korea last year sentenced Otto Warmbier, a University of Virginia undergraduate arrested for allegedly trying to steal a political poster from a hotel, and Kim Dong-chul, a Korean-American businessman, to terms of 15 years and 10 years of hard labor, respectively.

A Korean-Canadian pastor, Lim Hyeon-soo, has also been detained in North Korea since February 2015. He was accused of committing "state subversive plots and activities" and sentenced to life in prison with hard labor.

—Paul Sonne in Washington contributed to this article.

Write to Jonathan Cheng at jonathan.cheng@wsj.com

Appeared in the May. 08, 2017, print edition as 'Pyongyang Detains Fourth American.'

THE WALL STREET JOURNAL.

Jeremy Page and Jay Solomon

8-10 minutes

Updated May 7, 2017 10:50 p.m. ET

DANDONG, China—For most of the past decade, a Chinese state-owned company had a joint venture with a North Korean company under sanctions for involvement in Pyongyang's atomic-weapons program, Chinese corporate and government records show.

China's Limac Corp. and North Korea's Ryonbong General Corp. set up a joint venture in 2008 to mine tantalum, niobium and zirconium, minerals that are useful in making phones and computers but also nuclear reactors and missiles.

The partnership of nearly a decade, not previously reported, shows how easily North Korea has skirted sanctions to do business with

Chinese-North Korean Venture Shows How Much Sanctions Can Miss (UNE)

Chinese firms, a vital lifeline for the regime. A February report by United Nations sanctions experts said North Korea had acquired rocket parts and light aircraft via China and used front companies there to access the international financial system.

The U.S. sanctioned Ryonbong in 2005 and the U.N. did so in 2009, both saying the North Korean company was involved with weapons of mass destruction. Just six weeks ago, Washington added three Ryonbong employees to the U.S. sanctions list individually, two of them based in China.

The scope of the Limac-Ryonbong joint venture and its current status are unclear. It was incorporated in North Korea, which doesn't disclose corporate records. The Ryonbong-Limac link was identified by Sayari Analytics, a financial-intelligence firm that works for banking and U.S. government clients and didn't publicize its findings.

Ryonbong couldn't be reached for comment. Limac said by email that the venture "never launched regular business activities" and that Limac has been trying to dissolve it since 2009.

Still, Chinese corporate records show the joint venture maintained a registered office in China until this past February. And Limac's website said Limac and Ryonbong executives held talks in 2011 on advancing their partnership. Information about the venture disappeared from Limac's website in recent days after The Wall Street Journal inquired about it.

The Chinese company has a U.S. affiliate in Houston through which it seeks investment opportunities, according to the affiliate's chief executive. In another U.S. connection, Limac, which manufactures and trades nuclear-energy and other industrial machinery, imported Canadian nuclear-power equipment to China

in 2013 by way of the U.S., customs records show.

U.S. legislation passed last year obliges the White House to sanction entities doing business with blacklisted North Korean entities or explain to Congress why it hasn't. The Limac-Ryonbong joint venture has been discussed inside the Trump administration, said people familiar with the matter.

North Korea has conducted three missile tests since Donald Trump took office. Secretary of State Rex Tillerson said last week the U.S. has been "leaning hard into China" over North Korea and might impose secondary sanctions on countries that don't enforce current ones. "If you can't take care of it or you simply don't want to take care of it for your own internal political reasons, we will," he said.

China's commerce ministry, foreign ministry and government information office didn't respond to requests for comment. China has

said in the past it complies fully with U.N. sanctions on North Korea but opposes U.S. unilateral sanctions. The North Korean embassy in Beijing didn't respond to requests for comment.

Last September, the U.S. indicted a Chinese businesswoman on charges that she and her trading company, Dandong Hongxiang Industrial Development Co., helped blacklisted North Korean companies evade U.S. sanctions, according to the Department of Justice and court records. China said in January she was under investigation. The businesswoman, Ma Xiaohong, couldn't be reached for comment, and her company didn't respond to comment requests. A Justice Department spokesman, Marc Raimondi, said Ms. Ma hasn't filed a plea and "is believed to be a fugitive and at large in China."

Some current and former U.S. officials who have worked on North Korea, including in the Obama and George W. Bush administrations, said the Limac case shows China's role as by far the weakest link in the international campaign to pressure Pyongyang. "It's stunning that a Chinese company involved in the nuclear trade would so openly cooperate with North Korea and that the U.S. didn't sanction the Chinese parent and legally pursue the U.S. affiliate," said David Asher, who served as a point man on North

Korea in the George W. Bush administration.

Anthony Ruggiero, a former State and Treasury Department official specializing on North Korea, said, "Chinese companies conduct business with sanctioned entities because they know nothing will happen."

A spokesman for the Treasury, which oversees U.S. sanctions, declined to comment on Limac but said the administration is targeting North Korea's operations in China, and Ryonbong in particular.

Ryonbong is the trading arm of a committee in North Korea's ruling party that oversees its defense industry, according to U.S. officials. A 2006 State Department memo released by WikiLeaks said North Korea tried to procure chemicals for solid-fuel for rockets via Ryonbong's office in Russia.

Limac, the Chinese company, was founded in 1953. The industrial-machinery company's website said it expanded into mining in North Korea in 2006, which was also the year of North Korea's first nuclear-arms test. Limac Chairman Wu Yan, a Communist Party member and former provincial trade official, visited North Korea the next year with a team of mining specialists.

In 2008, a time when North Korea was engaged in international talks about potentially dismantling its

nuclear program, China's commerce ministry approved the joint venture, according to a government notice. The notice said the agreement was for a 20-year mining venture in North Korea's Kangwon province. Mr. Wu became the joint venture's chairman and a Ryonbong executive his deputy, said Limac's website.

In 2013, the venture set up an office in the Chinese city of Dandong, on the North Korean border, appointing to lead it a North Korean who used the Chinese name Jin Zhezhu, according to Chinese public records.

The office's address is an apartment in a rundown block near the Yalu River that forms the border. Mr. Jin lived there for several years but left a few months ago, said the current occupant, neighbors and a former employee of the venture. Mr. Jin couldn't be reached for comment.

Limac said the venture never began regular operations because the North Koreans didn't comply with the contract.

Limac denied knowledge of a joint-venture office in Dandong and said staff members hadn't obtained North Korean visas since 2009. Fourteen Limac employees visited North Korea for a company-sponsored vacation in 2014, the website said. It is unclear whether

they had visas; Chinese nationals sometimes don't need them for short trips.

The Dandong office had its registration revoked in February 2017 for failing to file its 2016 inspection paperwork, according to Chinese corporate registry officials. Ryonbong has an office in another Chinese city, Zhuhai, records show.

About 90% of North Korea's recorded trade passes through China. Sayari Analytics says it has identified more than 600 Chinese companies that trade with North Korea. Much of the trade may be legal under U.N. guidelines, because sanctions apply to specific industries, companies and people, not to everything North Korean.

Some diplomats say Beijing struggles to keep track of the cross-border commerce. Beijing wants to maintain an economic lifeline to make sure the Pyongyang regime doesn't collapse, potentially triggering a flood of refugees into China.

—Chun Han Wong, Junya Qian and Jonathan Cheng contributed to this article.

Write to Jeremy Page at jeremy.page@wsj.com and Jay Solomon at jay.solomon@wsj.com

Appeared in the May. 08, 2017, print edition as 'Chinese, North Korean Companies Teamed Up.'

THE WALL STREET JOURNAL

Israeli Politicians Pressure Trump on Mideast Promises

Jay Solomon
4-5 minutes

Updated May 7, 2017 7:35 p.m. ET

NEW YORK—President Donald Trump came under increased pressure from the Israeli government to follow through on foreign policy pledges he made during the election campaign, including moving the U.S. embassy to Jerusalem, just days before he embarks on his inaugural trip to the Middle East.

Israeli Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu warmly welcomed Mr. Trump's election, following eight years of butting heads with former U.S. President Barack Obama on issues ranging from Israel's building in disputed territories to the nuclear deal with Iran.

But Mr. Trump's pledge this month to resume Mideast diplomacy has unnerved members of Mr. Netanyahu's cabinet, many of whom spoke at a conference Sunday in New York. The U.S. leader is scheduled to visit

Saudi Arabia, Israel and Europe beginning on May 19, and peace between Israel and the Palestinians is expected to be high on his agenda.

Some of Mr. Netanyahu's top aides questioned the nature of the Mideast peace process, which for decades has sought to establish an independent Palestinian state on lands in the West Bank and Gaza Strip. They sharply criticized the leadership of Palestinian Authority President Mahmoud Abbas, whom Mr. Trump welcomed to the White House last week.

"Can the Palestinian Authority be a genuine partner for peace in the Middle East?" asked Yuval Steinitz, Israel's energy minister, who sits on Mr. Netanyahu's national security cabinet. He accused Mr. Abbas of leading a government that was corrupt, anti-Semitic and divided.

Other members of Mr. Netanyahu's cabinet were more blunt on Sunday. "As long as I'm a minister, the Palestinian state won't be created," said Ofir Akunis, Israel's minister of science and technology.

Another, more pressing issue, is the status of the American embassy in Israel.

Mr. Trump repeatedly pledged during the campaign to move the U.S. embassy to Jerusalem from Tel Aviv once he took office. Both Israel and the Palestinians claim Jerusalem as the capital of their states, making its status among the most contentious issues in the peace process.

Arab leaders, including Jordan's King Abdullah, have warned Mr. Trump in recent months that moving the U.S. embassy to Jerusalem would stir unrest in the Palestinian territories and the broader Arab world and would undercut hopes for a peace deal.

White House officials have said in recent weeks that the status of the embassy was still under review. They have been noncommittal as to whether Mr. Trump plans to go ahead with the move.

Top members of Mr. Netanyahu's government on Sunday pressed Mr. Trump to follow through on his pledge.

Justice Minister Ayelet Shaked cited U.S. law that requires American presidents to renew waivers each year to keep the embassy in Tel Aviv. "President Trump doesn't need to do anything," Ms. Shaked told a conference organized by the Jerusalem Post. "On June 1, if he doesn't sign a waiver, the embassy will need to move to Jerusalem according to American law."

A senior adviser to Mr. Trump, Sebastian Gorka, didn't address the issue of the embassy at the conference but pledged strong U.S. support for Israel and for the fight against international terrorism.

Some Jewish groups have criticized Mr. Gorka's role in the Trump White House, due to allegations that his family has ties to a fascist movement in Europe dating to World War II. Mr. Gorka denied the charge, calling it "fake news," and said the Trump administration was committed to fighting Islamic extremism and fascism.

"Jihadists are linked to fascists, because they're both totalitarian," Mr. Gorka said. "We will know when we have won when the black flags



The Mother of All Terrorist Groups Isn't the Islamic State

Emily Tamkin |
24 mins ago

11-14 minutes

On April 13, the U.S. military dropped a huge bomb on caves and tunnels used by Islamic State fighters in eastern Afghanistan. The resulting blast reverberated several miles away, reportedly killed dozens of terrorists, and exposed the poverty of U.S. policy in Afghanistan.

The "mother of all bombs" was devastating — but it was used against the wrong target, for the wrong reasons. Analysts and Trump administration officials, including Vice President Mike Pence, have suggested that the bomb was targeted more at intimidating North Korea and Syria than battlefield objectives in Afghanistan.

It's true that Islamic State-affiliated militants in Afghanistan have claimed a series of attacks over the last few years — including, most recently, a hit on a NATO convoy in Kabul on May 2 that killed eight civilians. Still, they've struggled to carve out a major presence in the country. They've alienated locals with their savagery and made the Taliban look gentle in comparison. Punishing and sustained U.S. strikes, often undertaken jointly with Afghan forces, have already killed their leaders and badly degraded their ranks.

But the Islamic State's savagery has drawn eyes away from the true danger: the Taliban and al Qaeda, which continue to sit pretty after nearly 16 years of unsuccessful efforts at elimination.

But the Islamic State's savagery has drawn eyes away from the true danger: the Taliban and al Qaeda, which continue to sit pretty after nearly 16 years of unsuccessful efforts at elimination. Although dethroned by U.S. military action in 2001, the Taliban has remained a tenacious opponent.

Now, according to top U.S. officials, that threat is backed by another old foe, Russia. On April 24, Gen. John Nicholson, the top U.S. commander in Afghanistan, said during a visit to Kabul by Secretary of Defense James Mattis that he was "not refuting" multiple reports that Moscow is funneling arms to the Taliban. In congressional testimony back in February, Gen. Nicholson had already said that Russia is

"overtly lending legitimacy to the Taliban." But his allegations of direct material aid this time went much further.

The Taliban threat, now perhaps backed by Russian arms, is rising as rapidly as that of the Islamic State is declining. The Taliban controls more territory than at any time since 2001, civilian casualties are the highest they've been since these figures were first tracked in 2009, and fatality rates of beleaguered Afghan security forces are soaring. An April 21 assault on an Afghan military base in the province of Balkh, which killed nearly 150 Afghan troops in a region far from the Taliban's traditional bastion in the south, underscores the serious nature of the threat.

Alongside (and not to be confused with) the Taliban is another persistent foe, al Qaeda. It's been six years since the death of Osama bin Laden, but the group remains a powerful threat. Back in 2012, Gen. John Allen, then head of U.S. forces in Afghanistan, said that al Qaeda had reemerged in Afghanistan. Media reports stated that the group was fighting U.S. troops, spreading propaganda, fundraising, and recruiting young Afghans. That was confirmed in 2015, when the U.S. military discovered an al Qaeda training camp in southern Afghanistan stretching a whopping 30 square miles.

The extent of al Qaeda's presence in Afghanistan today can be gleaned from Gen. Nicholson's recent congressional testimony. He reported that in 2016, U.S. forces killed the al Qaeda leader in eastern Afghanistan, his deputy, and more than 200 al Qaeda and affiliated fighters.

He also said that about 50 al Qaeda and affiliated "leaders, facilitators, or key associates" were killed, captured, or transferred to the Afghan government. The pattern has continued into this year. The Pentagon confirmed that a March 19 drone strike had killed Qari Yasin, who was implicated in a 2008 attack on the Marriott Hotel in Islamabad, Pakistan, that killed more than 50 people, including two Americans. And on April 19, Afghan officials announced that airstrikes had killed three al Qaeda members.

Some might seize on these figures to argue that the al Qaeda threat in Afghanistan is being robustly tackled, or at least being kept under

control. While that may be true on a short-term, tactical level, it misses a broader, more troubling point: Battlefield successes against al Qaeda won't make the group go away any more than it did in 2001. In other words, killing off al Qaeda fighters and leaders won't kill off the organization.

The same goes for the Taliban. The war in Afghanistan can't be won militarily; 100,000 U.S. troops couldn't end the insurgency during the height of the surge in 2010 and 2011. Today, with far fewer U.S. troops in theater, the Taliban's battlefield successes give it few incentives to launch a peace process with Kabul.

Meanwhile, both groups have benefitted in paradoxical ways from the emergence of their more extreme rival, the Islamic State. Hundreds of U.S. airstrikes targeted the Islamic State in Afghanistan in 2016, with U.S. troops and Afghan special operations forces continuing to fight them fiercely this year, leading to the deaths of three U.S. servicemen in April. Although there have been simultaneous pushes against other groups, the presence of the Islamic State has given al Qaeda and the Taliban some breathing room. Terrorism analysts Daveed Gartenstein-Ross and Nathaniel Barr have written how the emergence of the Islamic State has enabled al Qaeda to rebrand itself as a more moderate outfit.

While the Islamic State is unrelenting and indiscriminate in its use of terror, al Qaeda has increasingly demonstrated a more refined targeting strategy that singles out "worthy targets" that appeal to potential recruits. Those murdered include progressive and secular thinkers and those harshly critical of Islam. Gartenstein-Ross and Barr also note that al Qaeda leader Ayman al-Zawahiri has called on regional leaders in Syria to cultivate better ties with local communities.

We don't typically associate terror groups with marketing campaigns, but al Qaeda is clearly trying to reinvent itself. In the words of counterterrorism expert Ali Soufan, writing in the *Wall Street Journal* on April 21, al Qaeda "has transformed itself from a close-knit terrorist outfit with a handful of struggling affiliates into a vast network of insurgent groups spread from Southeast Asia to northwest Africa."

According to Soufan, this is part of al Qaeda's broader goal, originally implemented in 2011, to shift away from a focus on the United States ("the far enemy") and instead "join the popular battle to bring down" local regimes. The hope of the late Osama bin Laden, Soufan contends, was to strengthen al Qaeda for "an eventual showdown" with the United States.

And what better ally for al Qaeda in the Indian Subcontinent (AQIS) to pursue this hearts-and-minds strategy than the Afghan Taliban, one of the world's most effective insurgent organizations? As Gartenstein-Ross has pointed out, AQIS has already engaged in "insurgent-style warfare" in Afghanistan to help support Taliban goals. Al Qaeda's resilience there can also be attributed to its relationships with powerful local partners. It enjoys close ties to the most active and lethal terror groups in the Afghanistan-Pakistan region. These actors include the Haqqani Network, a branch of the Taliban that has committed several high-casualty attacks against U.S. troops in Afghanistan in recent years.

The sustained alliance between the Taliban and al Qaeda isn't just a threat to Kabul, but also to U.S. interests far beyond Afghanistan.

The sustained alliance between the Taliban and al Qaeda isn't just a threat to Kabul, but also to U.S. interests far beyond Afghanistan. In April 2013, members of a secret committee formed by al Qaeda's core leadership, known as the Khorasan Group, traveled to Syria to investigate the growing rivalry between their then-affiliate, the Nusra Front, and the Islamic State, which was expanding its presence in Syria. After reporting to Pakistan-based al Qaeda leader Ayman al-Zawahiri, the Khorasan Group focused its efforts on stemming the tide of defections and by 2014 was planning out-of-area terrorist attacks. In September 2014, Khorasan Group members were targeted in one of the first U.S. airstrikes in Syria — an indication of the deep concern with which the Obama administration viewed this faction. U.S. air power hit them again there in 2016.

And while all eyes are on the Islamic State, al Qaeda still has very real potential to target the United States directly. Nearly 16 years after 9/11, it still poses a bona fide threat to the U.S. homeland. Al

Qaeda may be trying to pass itself off as your local friendly insurgent group, but it continues to subscribe to the ideology of global Islamist terrorism — and there's no reason to believe the organization has given up on its long-standing desire to stage another spectacular attack on American soil.

With the Taliban controlling large swaths of territory in Afghanistan, opportunities abound for al Qaeda to reconstitute its former sanctuaries and plot another attack on the United States. To be sure, a safe haven doesn't necessarily facilitate the ability to coordinate faraway attacks, and particularly if one has to worry about defending territory from state security forces. However, consider the current state of play in Afghanistan: Overmatched Afghan forces and depleted foreign

troops have been unable to penetrate many areas of Taliban control, some of which are located in difficult-to-navigate terrain in places like Uruzgan, Helmand, and Kandahar provinces.

One of America's mistakes after waging war on Iraq in 2003 was taking its eye off the ball in Afghanistan following early successes. This time around, Washington needs to maintain a laser-like focus on depriving al Qaeda of new Taliban-shielded sanctuaries in Afghanistan. In so doing, it must make a better effort to understand what makes al Qaeda tick these days — and particularly how it has undergone a strategic shift that aims to win over populations it may have previously preferred to ignore. More attention must be paid to the ideologies of hate that fuel terrorism, no matter

how many terrorists are shot down or smoked out. While ample analysis has rightly been dedicated to understanding the success of the Islamic State's use of social media to radicalize Westerners, there remains a need to better understand the continued clout of al Qaeda ideology in the developing world, both in Afghanistan and beyond.

But the relentless campaign being waged by Afghan and U.S. forces against al Qaeda on the battlefield shouldn't be put on hold. On the contrary, it should be intensified. Short-term tactical victories against al Qaeda matter, but they can't be the endpoint of strategy.

Ramping up the counterterrorism fight shouldn't be difficult. U.S. military officials have urged Washington to deploy more troops

to Afghanistan, and President Donald Trump should send several thousand more. When he announces the decision, he shouldn't justify it merely on the grounds of providing more support to Afghan forces. Such a rationale won't sit well with an understandably war-weary American public.

Instead, he should underscore that more troops are being sent to Afghanistan to help prevent another attack on the U.S. homeland. That's an "America First" justification if there ever was one. And it's a more prudent move than dropping the mother of all bombs on a declining threat, just to telegraph a message of bravado to faraway foes.

THE WALL STREET JOURNAL

U.S. Military Says Troops Killed Islamic State Leader in Afghanistan

Jessica Donati

4 minutes

KABUL—The U.S. military on Sunday said its forces killed Sheikh Abdul Hasib, Islamic State's leader in Afghanistan, in a joint raid with Afghan soldiers in the eastern Nangarhar province.

A combined force of U.S. Army Rangers and Afghan Special Forces—who were dropped into the Mohmand valley near the border with Pakistan by helicopter—carried out the operation on the night of April 26 in which a number of the extremist group's top commanders were also killed, according to a U.S. military statement.

The U.S. military has since said it is investigating whether the two U.S. soldiers that died in the operation were killed by friendly fire.

"This successful joint operation is another important step in our relentless campaign," said General

John Nicholson, the top commander of U.S. forces in Afghanistan. "This is the second ISIS-K emir we have killed in nine months, along with dozens of their leaders and hundreds of their fighters."

The operation took place in the same area where the U.S. military dropped one of the largest nonnuclear bombs in its arsenal, nicknamed the "Mother of All Bombs", on an Islamic State tunnel-and-cave complex that was being used as a base.

In the weeks leading up to the blast, U.S. and Afghan forces killed more than a dozen Islamic State fighters, driving the militants out of villages that had been occupied for years into the mountains, according to Afghan special forces that were camped by a river in the valley there during a recent visit to the area.

Residents there were returning home for the first time in years to inspect the damage. Locals interviewed by The Wall Street Journal during the visit to the area

were supportive of the strike and hoped for compensation after years of hardship.

The Islamic State Khorasan, as the Afghan affiliate is known, emerged in Afghanistan in late 2014, as most coalition troops were withdrawing from the country.

The group established a foothold in the east and has been working to win pockets of support in other parts of the country, targeting disgruntled Taliban commanders and other armed groups.

The U.S. military said Islamic State's Afghan leader was responsible for a recent attack on a military hospital in Kabul that killed over a hundred people. It was the worst in a series of high-profile attacks claimed by the group in capital.

Islamic State's presence in the area has shrunk dramatically in the weeks since U.S. and Afghan forces have pressed an offensive into its eastern stronghold, but its profile

has risen since it started claiming attacks in the capital last year.

A number of other militant groups have also pledged allegiance to Islamic State, including, for example, the Islamic Movement of Uzbekistan, which cooperates with the Taliban in north Afghanistan and has become a growing concern to neighbors in Central Asia.

While the Taliban remain by far the greatest threat to the U.S.-backed government in Afghanistan, there are concerns that Islamic State could expand if left unchecked.

Coalition officials also worry that Islamic State fighters fleeing the conflict in Iraq and Syria could seek safe haven in Afghanistan's vast ungoverned spaces.

Write to Jessica Donati at Jessica.Donati@wsj.com

Appeared in the May. 08, 2017, print edition as 'Islamic State Leader In Afghanistan Killed.'

THE WALL STREET JOURNAL

O'Grady : Colombia's Perilous Deal With the FARC

Mary Anastasia O'Grady

5-6 minutes

When Colombian President Juan Manuel Santos unilaterally declared amnesty for the Revolutionary Armed Forces of Colombia, or FARC, as part of a 2016 "peace" deal crafted in Havana, he promised that it meant an end to the group's terrorism and criminality.

It's not turning out that way. Instead the Santos-FARC agreement appears to have legalized the group's thuggery. Among the more alarming aspects of the so-called peace process is the failure of the drug-trafficking rebels to turn in their arms. Neither the United Nations, which is charged with independent verification of the weapons surrender, nor the Santos government seems concerned about the FARC's noncompliance.

Colombia's democracy is being stolen right out from under the

nation's nose thanks to an agreement that is as silly and naive as the one Barack Obama made with Iran. Donald Trump may not be able to stop this crime. But he doesn't have to underwrite it. Last week the undemocratic Mr. Santos tweeted that the new U.S. budget includes \$450 million to support his FARC deal. This despite the free rein it gives the country's largest drug cartel.

Colombians turned down the FARC agreement in a national plebiscite in October. They did so because they

reject key elements of the deal including amnesty for war criminals and drug traffickers, the legalization of FARC leaders as politicians, the designation of unelected seats in Congress for FARC representatives, and putting the Colombian army on the same judicial plane as terrorists.

Mr. Santos refused to accept his defeat. Rather than withdraw the agreement as he had promised to do if he lost, he made cosmetic changes to it. Then he used his majority in Congress to declare it

law and to enshrine it above the constitution.

We may never know if Mr. Santos actually believed that the guerrillas were ready to abandon their barbarism and learn to eat with knives and forks. It may be that his personal ambition for international recognition as the progenitor of a FARC deal clouded his judgment. In either case he has unleashed a monster that now threatens to devour the democracy.

The latest proof that Mr. Santos was snookered by FARC is the discovery last week of another cache of FARC arms that were supposed to be handed in. Hidden weapons are like cockroaches. If you discover one, you can be sure there are many others unseen.

On Wednesday the Colombian army found 16 FARC rifles and 39

grenades near the border of the departments of Meta and Guaviare. The army said that the weapons had been used for extortion and to attack government teams eradicating coca. Last month another find in the same area included one M16, six magazines and 1,300 rounds of ammunition.

On April 20 the minister of defense announced the discovery of a FARC weapons cache in Putumayo. It included 54 rifles, six machine guns, three grenade launchers, 100 kilos of explosives, 200 land mines and 3,600 detonators. Two weeks earlier, the minister said, authorities had found 600 mortar grenades in Tumaco, in the department of Nariño.

As if to show who's in charge, FARC leader Iván Márquez took to Twitter to characterize the discovery of the FARC weapons in Putumayo

as an "assault," complaining that it violated the agreement. In fact, according to the deal the FARC was supposed to provide the government with the coordinates of all its stored weapons by Dec. 11, 2016. By Feb. 1, all explosive-material caches were to be destroyed. Now that it has been caught lying, FARC says it needs more time to abide by the agreement.

Hidden FARC weapons in Colombia are not likely to be the only problem. Writing in Colombia's *Semana* magazine on April 22, former Colombian vice minister of justice Miguel Ceballos Arévalo noted that the governor of the Venezuelan state of Amazonas claims that there are 4,000 FARC rebels in his territory. Mr. Ceballos Arévalo observed: "If there are 4,000 FARC in Venezuela, there are also 4,000

arms," since presumably every guerrilla has a weapon.

The deal also calls for the FARC to return thousands of child soldiers, whose average recruitment age has been estimated at less than 13. Yet this has not happened and no FARC leader is held accountable, though enlisting underage boys and girls is an international crime against humanity. As if to further prove its unrepentant attitude, the FARC kidnapped a United Nations worker in the department of Guaviare last week.

If this is how the FARC behaves during its reconciliation honeymoon with the Colombian people, it's not hard to imagine what the country will look like after a few years of a well-armed, well-funded, drug-trafficking FARC in politics.

Write to O'Grady@wsj.com.

**The
New York
Times**

John McCain: Why We Must Support Human Rights

John McCain

5-6 minutes

Alex Nabaum

Washington, D.C. — SOME years ago, I heard Natan Sharansky, the human rights icon, recount how he and his fellow refuseniks in the Soviet Union took renewed courage from statements made on their behalf by President Ronald Reagan. Word had reached the gulag that the leader of the most powerful nation on earth had spoken in defense of their right to self-determination. America, personified by its president, gave them hope, and hope is a powerful defense against oppression.

As I listened to Mr. Sharansky, I was reminded how much it had meant to my fellow P.O.W.s and me when we heard from new additions to our ranks that Mr. Reagan, then the governor of California, had often defended our cause, demanded our humane treatment and encouraged Americans not to forget us.

In their continuous efforts to infect us with despair and dissolve our attachment to our country, our North Vietnamese captors insisted the American government and people had forgotten us. We were on our own, they taunted, and at their mercy. We clung to evidence to the contrary, and let it nourish our hope that we would go home one day with our honor intact.

That hope was the mainstay of our resistance. Many, maybe most of us, might have given in to despair, and ransomed our honor for relief from abuse, had we truly believed we had been forgotten by our government and countrymen.

In a recent address to State Department employees, Secretary of State Rex Tillerson said conditioning our foreign policy too heavily on values creates obstacles to advance our national interests. With those words, Secretary Tillerson sent a message to oppressed people everywhere: Don't look to the United States for hope. Our values make us sympathetic to your plight, and, when it's convenient, we might officially express that sympathy. But we make policy to serve our interests, which are not related to our values. So, if you happen to be in the way of our forging relationships with your oppressors that could serve our security and economic interests, good luck to you. You're on your own.

There are those who will credit Mr. Tillerson's point of view as a straightforward if graceless elucidation of a foreign policy based on realism. If by realism they mean policy that is rooted in the world as it is, not as we wish it to be, they couldn't be more wrong.

I consider myself a realist. I have certainly seen my share of the world as it really is and not how I wish it would be. What I've learned is that it

is foolish to view realism and idealism as incompatible or to consider our power and wealth as encumbered by the demands of justice, morality and conscience.

In the real world, as lived and experienced by real people, the demand for human rights and dignity, the longing for liberty and justice and opportunity, the hatred of oppression and corruption and cruelty is reality. By denying this experience, we deny the aspirations of billions of people, and invite their enduring resentment.

America didn't invent human rights. Those rights are common to all people: nations, cultures and religions cannot choose to simply opt out of them.

Human rights exist above the state and beyond history. They cannot be rescinded by one government any more than they can be granted by another. They inhabit the human heart, and from there, though they may be abridged, they can never be extinguished.

We are a country with a conscience. We have long believed moral concerns must be an essential part of our foreign policy, not a departure from it. We are the chief architect and defender of an international order governed by rules derived from our political and economic values. We have grown vastly wealthier and more powerful under those rules. More of humanity than

ever before lives in freedom and out of poverty because of those rules.

Our values are our strength and greatest treasure. We are distinguished from other countries because we are not made from a land or tribe or particular race or creed, but from an ideal that liberty is the inalienable right of mankind and in accord with nature and nature's Creator.

To view foreign policy as simply transactional is more dangerous than its proponents realize. Depriving the oppressed of a beacon of hope could lose us the world we have built and thrived in. It could cost our reputation in history as the nation distinct from all others in our achievements, our identity and our enduring influence on mankind. Our values are central to all three.

Were they not, we would be one great power among the others of history. We would acquire wealth and power for a time, before receding into the disputed past. But we are a more exceptional country than that.

We saw the world as it was and we made it better.

A Republican Principle Is Shed in the Fight on Health Care (UNE)

Jeremy W.
Peters

7-9 minutes

WASHINGTON — As they take their victory lap for passing a bill that would repeal and replace much of the Affordable Care Act, President Trump and congressional Republicans have been largely silent about one of the most remarkable aspects of what their legislation would do: take a step toward dismantling a vast government entitlement program, something that has never been accomplished in the modern era.

Fighting the expansion of the so-called welfare state is a fundamental premise of the American conservative movement. But as tens of millions of Americans have come to rely on coverage under the 2010 health law, Republicans have learned the political risks of being seen as taking a hatchet to the program, however imperfect it may be.

So conservatives have now cast aside their high-minded arguments of political principle, replacing them with dense discussions of policy. Pre-existing conditions, risk pools and premium costs — not the more conventional Republican disquisitions in favor of the free market, personal responsibility and smaller government — dominate the debate today.

This dramatic shift in focus has confirmed what conservatives said they always feared when Democrats granted the government expansive new powers over health care. The government can give, they said, but it can almost never take away.

The health care law, said Thomas Miller, a fellow at the conservative American Enterprise Institute, has underscored how new entitlements inevitably become part of what he called the “demilitarized zone” of politics.

“One of the problems Republicans have had in 2017 is that the narrative and the discussion have changed,” Mr. Miller said.

“The territory could not be liberated — you could only contain its expansion,” he added. “Unlike a speculative law which had not been fully unloaded, put in place with money starting to flow, people have

gotten checks, they’ve gotten benefits. It’s taking away from what’s already there.”

But it is not just the tenor of the debate that has changed. The bill that the House passed last week was less ambitious than the full-on repeal that conservatives have argued for since President Barack Obama signed the law seven years ago.

Conservatives had pushed Congress to pass a clean repeal bill in the first days of Mr. Trump’s presidency. They feared that the longer they waited, the more time Democrats would have to argue that Republicans wanted to callously rip benefits away from hard-working Americans.

“There’s a reason this has never been done before in the modern era,” said Tim Phillips, president of Americans for Prosperity. With new government benefits, he said, comes incredible political power.

“It builds constituencies, you have powerful special interests whose jobs suddenly depend on it, and the left fights intensely to protect government power once they’ve established it,” added Mr. Phillips, whose group, which is backed by the billionaire brothers David H. and Charles G. Koch, was one of the most ardent foes of the law from the moment Mr. Obama started pursuing it in 2009. “We knew then and we know now that this is not going to be easy.”

As politically useful as it may be to retain parts of the law, many conservatives have started asking whether the Republican Party is abandoning its core principles.

“If you can’t unbuild this structure, then what the hell are you doing here?” said William Voegeli, a senior editor at the Claremont Review of Books, a conservative journal.

Mr. Voegeli pointed to a long list of government programs that Republicans have promised to defund or eliminate — the National Endowment for the Arts, public broadcasting, the Department of Education and, of course, the Affordable Care Act — amid the expansion of the liberal “administrative state,” to use a term popular inside the Trump administration.

The Republican whip, Representative Steve Scalise of

Louisiana, center, before voting on the health care bill last week in Washington. Gabriella Demczuk for The New York Times

“You run on election cycle after election cycle with Republicans complaining but never taking the obvious next step,” he said. “And eventually you’re going to get a lot of restless conservatives out there.”

On Fox News over the weekend, the conservative columnist Charles Krauthammer said Republicans had basically given up on arguing for a more purely free-market health care system.

“They have sort of accepted the fact that the electorate sees health care as not just any commodity, like purchasing a steak or a car,” Mr. Krauthammer said. “It’s something now people have a sense the government ought to guarantee.”

The complexity of unraveling the Affordable Care Act became evident to Republicans even before Mr. Trump was sworn in, as they started planning their legislative agenda for his first 100 days. Led by Speaker Paul D. Ryan, the party assumed that a repeal would be one of the first items — if not the first — on its calendar.

Then Mr. Trump, who had campaigned on preserving programs, like Social Security, Medicare and Medicaid, that his party had aimed at in the past, said on Twitter less than two weeks before Inauguration Day that a replacement must accompany a repeal — much to the surprise of Mr. Ryan and the party leadership on Capitol Hill.

To the dismay of many conservatives, the promise to repeal had morphed into a pledge to replace. Even worse, some Republicans started talking about another dreaded R word: repair.

Mr. Ryan, speaking on Sunday on ABC News, used language not ordinarily heard from free-market, anti-entitlement conservatives like himself. The speaker, perhaps his party’s most vocal proponent of bringing down the cost of entitlements, argued for the House bill not on the basis of how much money it would save — in part because he rushed the vote before a proper accounting could be completed — but how many people would be left covered.

He called Republicans’ efforts a “rescue mission” to provide affordable health insurance, “especially and including to people with pre-existing conditions.”

The health and human services secretary, Tom Price, sounded a similar note, telling NBC News that the goal was something that Republicans usually dismissed as utopian fantasy: universal coverage.

“What we’re trying to do is to make certain that every single person has health coverage,” he said.

Even if the official party line is merely to provide access to coverage, the bill that the House passed aims to preserve some of the most popular parts of the 2010 law. For instance, Republicans say they have kept protections for people with health conditions that would have allowed insurers to deny them coverage before, though critics say they may face higher costs.

“They’re basically taking Obamacare and changing it around the margins,” said Adam Jentleson, a former senior aide to Harry Reid, who led Senate Democrats when the law was passed.

Also lost in the debate today is much of the disagreement over the proper scope of government authority. Republicans in the past often framed the debate in terms of personal freedom, choice and liberty — as opposed to the soft tyranny that can come through well-meaning laws.

“The debate over power and authority here is really a slugfest over who makes key decisions,” said Robert E. Moffit, a senior fellow at the Heritage Foundation, “and whether the key decisions in health care ultimately should end up in the hands of a government office or in the hands of individuals who are exercising free choice.”

Some saw another lesson for Republicans: that the general and philosophical are merely that.

“Republicans are strongest on these issues on the level of generality as opposed to the pragmatics,” Mr. Miller, of the American Enterprise Institute, said. That explains why their arguments have shifted to explaining how the law is failing rather than how it is a betrayal of the American tradition.

"What they were making was a consequential argument. It needed to be replaced because it wasn't

working, it wasn't doing what people wanted," he added, "as opposed to trying to say: 'You know, we think

this will work in a better way, but there are values at stake here. You

need to be in control of your choices."

**THE WALL
STREET
JOURNAL**

Michael C. Bender

7-9 minutes

White House Presses Insurance-Market Woes in Health Fight

Louise Radnofsky and

addition, some GOP senators have specifically cited the insurance markets' fragility in the past as a reason to tread carefully and postpone major changes to the health law.

Updated May 7, 2017 9:50 p.m. ET

WASHINGTON—The White House is hoping to harness insurance-market woes in some states to help lift the GOP's health-care measure over the remaining hurdles in Congress, a strategy that reflects President Donald Trump's own high-stakes approach to deal-making.

With the House GOP health bill now before the Senate, White House aides say their job may become easier as health insurers in the next few weeks make final decisions about where to sell coverage next year and how to price it. Early signals have raised the prospect of no insurers offering coverage in parts of Iowa and Tennessee, and of premium surges in states such as Virginia and Maryland.

Democrats say that Mr. Trump has stoked uncertainty that is to blame for many of the problems. Mr. Trump, for his part, has cited those problems as a reason to pass the GOP bill.

"Republican Senators will not let the American people down! ObamaCare premiums and deductibles are way up—it was a lie and it is dead!" Mr. Trump said Sunday on Twitter. Last week, he noted potential market disruptions in Iowa, writing, "It's time to fix this broken system!"

White House officials say that more bad news coming from states in the coming weeks could help them move the health-care bid across the finish line in the Senate, where statewide issues will come to the fore.

"It does encourage members to act," a senior White House official said. "As it continues to happen, it helps put an urgency" in lawmakers' minds.

The strategy carries risks. It isn't immediately clear whether Americans would blame the administration of former President Barack Obama, or that of Mr. Trump, for market shocks. In

Building a sense of urgency is a tactic Mr. Trump regularly leans on to make his political points. He justified a ban on Muslim immigration during the campaign by warning that more Sept. 11-style attacks were imminent, and he has warned the Islamic State terror group would infiltrate the country without a southern border wall. In a speech on April 28 to the National Rifle Association, he cautioned against political complacency by noting "these are dangerous times, these are horrible times."

On Sunday, his team used similarly ominous tones to describe the health-care debate.

"We have two options: Continue down the road we're on with the failing, collapsing system that most people don't think is going to work," White House Chief of Staff Reince Priebus said on Fox. "Or, start the process with a better system with more choices, more options, lower premiums."

A potential counterweight to the administration pressure is a coming estimate from the Congressional Budget Office of the revised GOP health bill. The estimate of the first bill, in March, said that measure would increase the number of people without health insurance by 24 million by 2026, which contributed to its collapse. House Republican leaders moved their bill last week without the CBO "score" of the latest revisions, but some senators have said they would wait to see the new estimates before proceeding.

Democrats say the better course is to shore up the Affordable Care Act, also known as Obamacare, rather than to replace it.

Sen. Joe Manchin, a West Virginia Democrat, said people in his state would be "absolutely slammed" by changes to the health system brought on by the GOP bill. Speaking Sunday on CBS, Mr. Manchin said he would cooperate with Republicans on the legislation if they "get rid of the word

'repeal' and start talking about the word 'repairing,'" but that he had received no overtures.

The federal government has set a late June deadline for insurers to make decisions about which plans they will sell and how much they will charge next year. But state deadlines can vary, and state and federal laws may delay the release of information in some parts of the country, so senators can expect a drumbeat of insurance-market snapshots on an almost weekly basis between now and the fall.

Insurers have cited a combination of reasons for their decision to pull out of markets or raise rates. Most prominent among them: a sicker-than-expected group of enrollees under the ACA and the turbulent early years of implementation of Democrats' law—but also, in some cases, a lack of conviction that the law would remain in place and make their risk-taking worthwhile.

A few insurers have also said they have raised rates in response to indications by the Trump administration that it would use administrative powers to pare back the 2010 health law's requirement that people obtain insurance or pay a penalty. Such a change would increase the likelihood that healthier people would forgo coverage.

Many insurers have complained of prolonged uncertainty over reimbursement they get to subsidize deductibles and other cost-sharing payments by low-income enrollees. Mr. Trump and his administration have sent mixed signals about whether they intend to continue making those payments; insurers say their filed 2018 proposals are contingent on the payments continuing.

Republicans control 52 Senate seats and can afford to lose no more than two to pass the health-care measure, assuming no Democrats back the measure. Already, at least three members on either side of the GOP spectrum have signaled misgivings.

Republican senators are especially divided over Medicaid, because GOP-led states split almost evenly down the middle over how to approach the program under the 2010 health law. The half that

expanded eligibility for the program, which provides coverage for the poor, face billions of dollars in funding curbs over the next 10 years; the half that didn't face the prospect of continuing to at least partly fund expansion in states that they believe made the wrong choice.

In its appraisal of the initial GOP health bill in March, the CBO estimated federal Medicaid spending would be \$880 billion less over the next 10 years than it would have been under the 2010 health law.

White House aides have also concluded that they need to better build coalitions with lawmakers, including conservatives who had felt shut out of the early process and responded by strafing the first health-care vote, as well as business groups that could offset the opposition to the bill from groups representing health insurers, hospitals, doctors and patients.

The intricacy of the deal revealed to Mr. Trump a significant difference between the private sector and his new job, a senior administration official said. "The number of players involved complicates things in a way he wasn't accustomed to," that official said.

Senate leaders have indicated they plan to start from scratch with the health-care legislation passed out of the House, and the delicate compromises it includes.

The White House played down that prospect. Mr. Priebus said he had talked in the past day with six of the 13 or so Republican members of a working group drafting the Senate bill, and that he didn't think changes they might make would undermine support in the House for the final legislation.

"I think that everyone is committed to getting this thing done and getting it done as soon as possible," Mr. Priebus said.

Write to Louise Radnofsky at louise.radnofsky@wsj.com and Michael C. Bender at Mike.Bender@wsj.com

Appeared in the May. 08, 2017, print edition as 'Republicans Put Focus on Insurers.'

POLITICO Obama urges 'political courage' to save Affordable Care Act

By Edward-Isaac Dove

7-8 minutes

Former President Barack Obama listens to singer James Taylor perform before being presented the 2017 John F. Kennedy Profile In Courage Award at the John F. Kennedy Library on May 7 in Boston. | Getty

'It takes great courage to champion the vulnerable and the sick and the infirm.'

BOSTON — Barack Obama on Sunday night called on members of Congress to exercise the "political courage" to not repeal Obamacare — his first public comments about the law since the House voted to repeal it on Thursday, and a rare entry into the current political debate since leaving office.

"I hope they understand that courage means not simply doing what's politically expedient, but doing what, deep in our hearts, we know is right," Obama said, in a speech here at the John F. Kennedy Library accepting the Profiles in Courage award in honor of what would have been Kennedy's 100th birthday.

Story Continued Below

"I expect to be busy, if not with a second career, at least a second act," Obama said, promising more involvement.

Citing those who lost their seats after voting for the healthcare law in 2010, Obama described his "fervent hope" that current members "recognize it takes little courage to aid those who are already powerful, already comfortable, already influential — but it takes some courage to champion the vulnerable and the sick and the infirm, those who often have no access to the corridors of power."

The contrast of an Obama celebration days after the House vote on his signature law and President Donald Trump's repeated assertions that it's "dead," was on the minds of many in the room.

"It's ironic, isn't it?" said former interim Massachusetts Sen. Mo Cowan on his way into the event earlier in the evening.

"I think it is altogether fitting that we're here this evening," said Sen. Ed Markey (D-Mass.). "Barack Obama was able to pass the Affordable Care Act, a continuation of the vision of President Kennedy and Ted Kennedy. Today, Donald Trump is trying to destroy that vision."

Some of that seemed to be on the mind of Arizona Sen. Jeff Flake, the lone Republican member of Congress who joined the library for the event, held in a white-and-gold draped tent behind the library building. A moderate who had a good relationship with Obama in the White House and is now one of Democrats' top two Senate targets for next year, Flake said he wants to start the Obamacare conversation from scratch.

"I wouldn't expect the House bill to come through intact," he said, also repeating that he opposes Trump's border wall. "We'll see. It'll be a long process."

Flake said he's been happy to see Obama's overall approach since the morning after the election to move toward unifying the country. Asked if he feels Trump has been unifying, Flake said, "at times. At times, not so much."

Obama avoided any explicit comments about Trump, though he also made a passing mention of immigration reform, praising "Dreamers," as the children brought undocumented by their parents to America whom he protected from deportation via executive orders while in office, "who push down their fears to keep working and striving in the only country they've ever called home."

And lamenting politics "filled with division and discord," Obama said, "everywhere, we see the risk of

falling into the refuge of tribe and, and anger at those who don't look like us or have the same surnames, or pray like we do."

Obama has been edging slowly back into public after going dark for the first few months after leaving office. He made his first appearance, at a discussion with young leaders at the University of Chicago two weeks ago, and has since started doing paid speeches. Sunday was his first major speech as a former president, and he will now depart for an event at the Milan food summit with his friend and former White House chef Sam Kass and several other private events. He last week publicly endorsed French presidential winner Emmanuel Macron, and will travel to Berlin at the end of the month for an event with his friend and soul sister German Chancellor Angela Merkel, facing her own election campaign in the fall.

Like many Democrats, Obama found his own understanding of American politics challenged by Trump's election, and continues to oppose the path that the new president is taking, demanding to see it as a hiccup rather than a new reality. He delivered the political but non-partisan call to action that he's trying to thread, tying that to the spirit of Kennedy, calling the current environment a turning point in world history that demands the courage that the award is meant to recognize.

"At such moments, we need courage to stand up to hate — not just in others, but in ourselves," Obama said. "At such moments, we need courage to believe that together, we can tackle big challenges like inequality and climate change."

As he did at the Chicago event, Obama spoke about the need for more people to get involved in their communities and in politics, with a particular emphasis on young people.

The Kennedy family was happy to hear that message.

"One of the heartbreaking parts of our current political dynamic at the moment is that so many young people feel that politics isn't a constructive path to address those concerns," said Rep. Joe Kennedy III. "Yet many of those same young people looked at President Obama as somebody who inspired them and was willing to take on those challenges and was energized by them."

As for Obama's own record, historian David McCullough said, "We'll have to wait 50 years for the dust to settle." "It really takes a great deal to chip away at a mountain — I think he built quite a mountain over time," Cowan said.

The event was largely an Obama celebration, complete with James Taylor mini-concert — "It's frankly a relief" to be with Obama and not thinking about Trump, the musician said as he kicked off a set that ended with a rendition of the French national anthem in honor of Macron's win.

David Letterman, in blue-tinted glasses and the raggedy mass of a beard he's grown since retiring from his late night show, said of the award, Obama "should get it every year."

Despite his own dismay at Trump, Letterman said he didn't need to hear Obama talk about the new president, but did want to hear Obama talk about inspiring a new generation to get involved.

"If you don't have people doing this," Letterman said, "it'll turn into a dictatorship."

Missing out on the latest scoops? Sign up for POLITICO Playbook and get the latest news, every morning — in your inbox.

**The
New York
Times**

Obama Defends Affordable Care Act, but Leaves Trump Out of It

Michael D. Shear
4 minutes

WASHINGTON — Days after President Trump boasted in the White House Rose Garden about the House's vote to dismantle the Affordable Care Act, the law's biggest champion, Barack Obama, left the jibes virtually unanswered Sunday night during his first major address since leaving the presidency.

Mr. Obama, accepting a "Profile in Courage" award from the John F. Kennedy Presidential Library and Museum in Boston, offered only a glancing reference to Thursday's repeal vote and the efforts by Mr. Trump to unwind his legacy.

The former president told an audience of supporters that when it came to health care in America, "the great debate is not settled, but continues." He said he hoped that members of Congress, "regardless of party, are willing to look at facts and speak the truth, even when it contradicts party positions."

Mr. Obama defended the 2010 health measure, his signature domestic achievement, as the right thing to do, and he praised Democratic members of Congress for voting to pass it despite the risks to their political future.

"It takes little courage to aid those who are already powerful, already comfortable, already influential," Mr. Obama said, "but it takes great courage to champion the vulnerable and the sick and the infirm."

On Thursday, Mr. Trump celebrated with House members who had

voted to repeal major parts of the Affordable Care Act, declaring, "Welcome to the beginning of the end of Obamacare." But Mr. Obama did not mention Mr. Trump during his speech on Sunday, and he did not directly address the attempts to unravel the Affordable Care Act. As he has throughout his three months out of office, he also avoided any hint of criticism of Mr. Trump's sometimes chaotic debut.

To weigh in, Mr. Obama believes, would be a violation of his duty as a past president to let his successor operate without hindrance from him.

That determination has frustrated some of Mr. Obama's longtime supporters, who are eager to see him challenge Mr. Trump's policies.

Instead, Mr. Obama used his address to speak broadly about the need for politicians and citizens to be courageous.

He said that Americans were living in a time of "great opportunity, but also great uncertainty and inequality," made more difficult because of the political discord in Washington and the anger among citizens throughout the country.

"At such moments, courage is necessary," Mr. Obama said. "We need courage to stand up to hate, not just in others, but in ourselves. At such moments, we need the

courage to stand up to dogma, not just in others, but in ourselves."

The award, which recognized Mr. Obama's accomplishments during his eight years in the White House, is meant to evoke the spirit of Kennedy's 1957 book, "Profiles in Courage." In that work, Kennedy told the stories of eight senators who took unpopular positions despite the risk to their political careers.

"The Kennedys symbolized a set of values," Mr. Obama said to the audience, which included Caroline Kennedy, the former president's daughter, and Jack Schlossberg, her son. Mr. Obama said the Kennedy family epitomized "the idea that politics in fact could be a noble and worthwhile pursuit."

A statement on the library's website called Mr. Obama "a moral leader, offering hope and healing to the country," and described him as a president who "consistently reflected in so many ways, big and small, the definition of courage that John F. Kennedy cited in the opening lines of *Profiles in Courage*: 'grace under pressure.'"

Kennedy's family created the award in 1989 to honor him. Past recipients have included Presidents Gerald Ford and George Bush; Senator John McCain, Republican of Arizona; and Representative John Lewis, the Georgia Democrat and civil rights leader.

Mr. Obama's remarks were his second in public in the past two weeks, after months of post-

presidential vacationing. He has been criticized for agreeing to deliver private, paid remarks; he reportedly earned \$400,000 for a discussion with Doris Kearns Goodwin, a historian. He is also set to receive \$400,000 for a speech at a Wall Street health care conference in September.

A spokesman for Mr. Obama said in a statement issued late Sunday that the former president would travel to Milan on May 8 and 9 to visit former Prime Minister Matteo Renzi, participate in a dinner hosted by the Institute for International Political Studies, and give a speech at a global food conference.

The New York Times **Blow : Republican Death Wish**

Charles M. Blow

4-5 minutes

Once again, the party that is vehemently "pro-life" for "persons" in the womb demonstrates a staggering lack of empathy for those very same lives when they are in the world. What is the moral logic here? It is beyond me.

Let's cut to the quick: Access to affordable health care keeps people alive and healthy and keeps families solvent. Take that away, and people get sick, run up enormous, crippling debt and in the worst cases, die. It is really that simple.

People may conveniently disassociate a vote cast in marbled halls from the body stretched out in a wooden box, but make no mistake: They are linked.

In House Speaker Paul Ryan's feckless attempt to defend this moral abomination of a bill during his floor speech last week, he said, "Let's give

people more choices and more control over their care."

But this so-called restoration of choice would be in practice, for many, a sentence to death.

Republicans like the Idaho congressman and House Freedom Caucus member Representative Raúl R. Labrador deny this most basic of truths. Labrador said last week at a town hall, "Nobody dies because they don't have access to health care." It was a stunning expression of idiocy.

According to a 2009 study conducted by Harvard Medical School and Cambridge Health Alliance, "nearly 45,000 annual deaths are associated with lack of health insurance," and "uninsured, working-age Americans have a 40 percent higher risk of death than their privately insured counterparts."

An analysis last month by the Center for American Progress estimates removing price protections for pre-existing conditions would mean that

"individuals with even relatively mild pre-existing conditions would pay thousands of dollars above standard rates to obtain coverage."

Republicans are likely to pay dearly for this outrage. Nate Silver expressed his thoughts in a piece headlined: "The Health Care Bill Could Be A Job-Killer For G.O.P. Incumbents," pointing out that the Republican bill is even more unpopular than the Affordable Care Act was when it was being debated, and if Republicans face the same electoral backlash that Democrats faced, "it could put dozens of G.O.P.-held seats in play." Silver acknowledges that there are "mitigating factors" that could soften the blow for Republicans, but conversely adds, "There's even a chance that Republicans could suffer a bigger penalty than Democrats did."

On Friday, The Cook Political Report changed its ratings in 20 districts "all reflecting enhanced opportunities for Democrats" and pointed out:

"House Republicans' willingness to spend political capital on a proposal that garnered the support of just 17 percent of the public in a March Quinnipiac poll is consistent with past scenarios that have generated a midterm wave."

Not only is the bill unpopular among voters, it's also unpopular in the medical establishment. As The New York Times reported on Thursday: "It is a rare unifying moment. Hospitals, doctors, health insurers and some consumer groups, with few exceptions, are speaking with one voice and urging significant changes to the Republican health care legislation that passed the House on Thursday."

Whatever eventually comes of the bill, the *death threat* it poses for many Americans may well be a *death wish* Republicans have just issued for their own careers. As House Democrats sang as their Republican colleagues made their self-immolating votes: "Na, na, na, na, hey, hey, hey, goodbye."

The New York Times **Binder : A Disaster Wrapped in Victory**

Sarah Binder

5-7 minutes

Republicans in the White House Rose Garden after the House's passage of a health care plan, with the health secretary, Tom Price, at the lectern. Stephen Crowley/The New York Times

WASHINGTON — After voting to repeal and replace Obamacare last week, House Republicans rode up Pennsylvania Avenue to celebrate with President Trump in the Rose Garden. The reveling was

premature: The bill still has to go to the Senate and back to the House, and analysts have already highlighted the immense electoral risks that come with rushing through an overwhelmingly unpopular bill.

But there's another, more immediate, level of risk involved in the bill's passage: what it means for the rest of the party agenda. Far from unifying Republicans behind a strong president, it may end up driving them apart.

First of all, the real takeaway from the week was not the political prowess of Paul Ryan or President

Trump, but the intensity of Republican infighting, even on an issue where the party was supposedly unified. In shooting down the first version of the American Health Care Act and pushing through a more draconian revision, the hard-right House Freedom Caucus showed that it, not the White House or Speaker Ryan, was the determining factor on this issue within the party.

The bill established a template: devise legislation based on Freedom Caucus priorities, then add just enough concessions to bring in the minimal number of

centrists needed to pass — and swiftly, before Congress's nonpartisan scorekeepers can estimate the impact of the bill.

The problem is, that's a terrible way to write legislation. Even after amending the bill to put more money into high-risk insurance pools, the final deal pulled the plan sharply to the right, with provisions that critics say will increase premiums for older and sicker Americans, deprive millions of low-income Americans of coverage and undermine the quality of insurance mandated by Obamacare.

Legislating from the right will become harder as the 2018 midterm elections approach. Vulnerable Republicans who voted yes this time, like Darrell Issa of California, could find it harder to do so six months from now.

There's another problem with outside-in deal making: It results in bills that can't pass the Senate.

True, it's too early to tell how the Republican plan will fare in the Senate. But Senate Republicans have already said that they will likely write their own, more centrist bill, possibly including provisions objectionable to the Freedom Caucus. This is hardly the easy path to legislative success, and yet it seems to be the one that the White House and House Republican leadership prefer.

Moreover, the challenge of push-me pull-me legislating among rival factions will

continue into summer and fall, just as Republicans attempt to write a new budget and work on the president's call for major tax cuts. Not only does that mean less time for each item, but tensions over one could easily bleed into the other.

At least some Republicans see the risks. Last week the chairman of the House tax panel called for party lawmakers and the White House to get on the same page before trying to legislate. If the strategy works, it might smooth the waters for congressional passage of a deal. It would also help to tame the influence of competing factions that are likely to emerge over whether or how to pay for trillions in promised tax cuts. But that's a big if.

The bill isn't just a problem for House Republicans, but for the White House as well. Whatever he now says, Mr. Trump has allowed far-right conservatives to undermine

his legislative agenda on a signature item from his campaign.

The bill he championed in the Rose Garden runs completely counter to his promises that he would negotiate a "beautiful" replacement for Obamacare in which the government would take care of everybody, insurance would be cheaper and better and Medicaid would be protected from cuts. Instead, most expect that the House bill would skewer the president's electoral base, since it would be especially harmful to older white Americans and rural, white working-class families.

Of course, Mr. Trump's supporters might say a deal on health care was needed to get victories on what he really cares about, trade and infrastructure. But few House Republicans of any stripe are interested in those, and he has now shown that he will let fighting among

party factions set the terms of any legislation. An emboldened Congress, dominated by the right, might start aggressively pursuing conservatives' quest to roll back entitlements like Medicare, something the president campaigned against.

Unified party control rarely lasts long in American politics. Mr. Trump and the party have a small window for both fulfilling promises to their base and proving to a broader electorate that they can be trusted to govern. No matter the outcome of Obamacare repeal, last week in the House confirms how tough it is to govern with slim, divided majorities, even when your party controls the government.

The New York Times

Krugman : Republicans Party Like It's 1984

Paul Krugman

4-5 minutes

Before taking back the White House, Republicans attacked Obamacare for many things. For one thing, they claimed that it was rushed through without proper debate.

They also claimed that Americans were getting a raw deal. Deductibles were too high, they claimed; so were premiums. They promised to bring these costs down, to provide, as Donald Trump insisted he would, coverage that was "much less expensive and much better."

And meanwhile, they promised to keep the things people liked about Obamacare (whether or not voters knew they were getting those good things because of Obamacare). Nobody would be thrown off Medicaid; nobody would be denied affordable coverage because of pre-existing conditions.

Then came the reality of Republican legislation. Obamacare was debated and analyzed for many months; Trumpcare was thrown together so fast

it's hard to believe any significant number of those voting for it even had time to read it. And it was, of course, pushed through the House without giving the Congressional Budget Office a chance to estimate its costs, its effects on coverage, or anything else.

Even without a proper analysis, however, it's clear that Trumpcare breaks every promise Republicans ever made about health. Deductibles will rise, not fall, as insurers are set free to offer lower-quality coverage. Premiums may fall for a handful of young, healthy, affluent people, but will rise and in many cases soar for those who are older (because age spreads will rise), sicker (because protection against discrimination based on medical history will be taken away), and poorer (because subsidies will go down).

Many people with pre-existing conditions will find insurance either completely unavailable or totally out of their financial reach.

And Medicaid will be cut back, with the damage worsening over time.

The really important thing, however, is not just to realize that Republicans are breaking their promises, but to realize that they

are doing so with intent. This isn't one of those cases where people try to do what they said they would, but fall short in the execution. This is an act of deliberate betrayal: Everything about Trumpcare is specifically designed to do exactly the opposite of what Trump, Paul Ryan and other Republicans said it would.

Which raises two questions: Why are they doing this, and why do they think they can get away with it?

Part of the answer to the first question is, presumably, simple greed. Tens of millions would lose access to health coverage, but — according to independent estimates of an earlier version of Trumpcare — people with incomes over \$1 million would save an average of more than \$50,000 a year.

And there is a powerful faction within the G.O.P. for whom cutting taxes on the rich is more or less the only thing that matters.

And on a more subjective note, don't you get the impression that Donald Trump gets some positive pleasure out of taking people who make the mistake of trusting him for a ride?

As for why they think they can get away with it: Well, isn't recent history on their side? The general shape of what the G.O.P. would do to health care, for the white working class in particular, has long been obvious, yet many people who were sure to lose, bigly, voted Trump anyway.

Why shouldn't Republicans believe they can convince those same voters that the terrible things that will happen if Trumpcare becomes law are somehow liberals' fault?

And for that matter, how confident are you that mainstream media will resist the temptation of both-sides-ism, the urge to produce "balanced" reporting that blurs the awful reality of what Trumpcare will do if enacted?

In any case, let's be clear: What just happened on health care shouldn't be treated as just another case of cynical political deal making. This was a Freedom is Slavery, Ignorance is Strength moment. And it may be the shape of things to come.

The New York Times

E.P.A. Dismisses Members of Major Scientific Review Board (UNE)

Coral Davenport

5-7 minutes

WASHINGTON — The Environmental Protection Agency has dismissed at least five

members of a major scientific review board, the latest signal of what critics call a campaign by the Trump administration to shrink the agency's regulatory reach by reducing the role of academic research.

A spokesman for the E.P.A. administrator, Scott Pruitt, said he would consider replacing the academic scientists with representatives from industries whose pollution the agency is supposed to regulate, as part of the wide net it plans to cast. "The

administrator believes we should have people on this board who understand the impact of regulations on the regulated community," said the spokesman, J. P. Freire.

The dismissals on Friday came about six weeks after the House passed a bill aimed at changing the composition of another E.P.A. scientific review board to include more representation from the corporate world.

President Trump has directed Mr. Pruitt to radically remake the E.P.A., pushing for deep cuts in its budget — including a 40 percent reduction for its main scientific branch — and instructing him to roll back major Obama-era regulations on climate change and clean water protection. In recent weeks, the agency has removed some scientific data on climate change from its websites, and Mr. Pruitt has publicly questioned the established science of human-caused climate change.

In his first outings as E.P.A. administrator, Mr. Pruitt has made a point of visiting coal mines and pledging that his agency will seek to restore that industry, even though many members of both of the E.P.A.'s scientific advisory boards have historically recommended stringent constraints on coal pollution to combat climate change.

Mr. Freire said the agency wanted "to take as inclusive an approach to regulation as possible."

"We want to expand the pool of applicants" for the scientific board, he said, "to as broad a range as possible, to include universities that aren't typically represented and issues that aren't typically represented."

Some who opposed the dismissals denounced them as part of a broader push by the E.P.A. to downgrade science and elevate business interests.

"This is completely part of a multifaceted effort to get science out of the way of a deregulation agenda," said Ken Kimmell, the president of the Union of Concerned Scientists. "What seems to be premature removals of members of this Board of Science Counselors when the board has come out in favor of the E.P.A. strengthening its climate science, plus the severe cuts to research and development — you have to see all these things as interconnected."

The scientists dismissed from the 18-member Board of Scientific Counselors received emails from an agency official informing them that their three-year terms had expired and would not be renewed. That was contrary, the scientists said, to what they had been told by officials at the agency in January, just before Mr. Trump's inauguration.

"Most of us on the council are academic people," said Ponisseril Somasundaran, a chemist at Columbia University who focuses on managing hazardous waste. "I think they want to bring in business and industry people."

Courtney Flint, a professor of natural resource sociology at Utah State University who has served on the board since 2014, said she was surprised by the dismissal.

"I believe this is political," said Dr. Flint, whose research focuses on how communities respond to major disruptions in the environment, such as exposure to toxic pollution, forest fires and climate change. "It's unexpected. It's a red flag."

Another of the dismissed scientists made his grievances public. "Today, I was Trumped," Robert Richardson, an environmental economist at Michigan State

University, wrote on Twitter. "I have had the pleasure of serving on the EPA Board of Scientific Counselors, and my appointment was terminated today."

The board is charged with reviewing and evaluating the research conducted by the agency's scientists. Those studies are used by government regulators to draft rules and restrictions on everything from hazardous waste dumped in water to the emissions of carbon dioxide that contribute to climate change.

Members of the board say they have reviewed the E.P.A.'s scientific research on the public health impact of leaking underground fuel tanks, the toxicity of the chemicals used to clean up oil spills, and the effects of the spread of bark beetles caused by a warming climate.

A larger, corresponding panel, the 47-member Science Advisory Board, advises the agency on what areas it should conduct research in and evaluates the scientific integrity of some of its regulations.

Both boards, which until now have been composed almost entirely of academic research scientists, have long been targets of political attacks. Congressional Republicans and industry groups have sought to either change their composition or weaken their influence on the environmental regulatory process.

Representative Lamar Smith, the Texas Republican who is the chairman of the House Committee on Science, Space and Technology, wrote the House-passed bill intended to restock the Science Advisory Board with more members from the business world.

"In recent years, S.A.B. experts have become nothing more than rubber stamps who approve all of the E.P.A.'s regulations," Mr. Smith said at a House hearing in February. "The E.P.A. routinely stacks this board with friendly scientists who receive millions of dollars in grants from the federal government. The conflict of interest here is clear."

As a witness, Mr. Smith brought in Kimberly White, senior director of chemical products and technology at the American Chemistry Council, which lobbies for chemical corporations and, like other industry groups, has pushed for more representation on the E.P.A.'s science boards.

"We have also seen situations where peer reviewers have suggested discounting a study solely based on the funding source, without any considerations being given to the quality of the study," Ms. White said. "Also, E.P.A. staff often comment throughout peer review meetings, essentially participating as peers, while industry experts are typically excluded from the dialogue."

Several members of the Scientific Advisory Board contacted by The New York Times said that they had not received dismissal notices, but that they were aware their board was a political target.

"I see the dismissal of the scientists from the Board of Scientific Counselors as a test balloon," said Joseph Arvai, an environmental scientist at the University of Michigan who is on the Scientific Advisory Board. "This is clearly very political, and we should be very concerned if it goes further."

THE WALL STREET JOURNAL

Del Quentin
Wilber and Byron Tau

11-14 minutes

Sally Yates Testimony to Shine Public Light on Russia Probes

Updated May 7, 2017 3:07 p.m. ET

Testimony from a former acting attorney general on Monday could shed new light on the largely secretive investigations into Russia's alleged interference in the 2016 election.

Sally Yates, a top Justice Department official in the Obama administration, was serving as President Donald Trump's acting attorney general when she told a White House official about conversations between former national security adviser Mike Flynn and a Russian diplomat. The White

House has said Ms. Yates provided a "heads up" to the official, White House counsel Donald McGahn, about the conversations, without describing the nature of them.

Ms. Yates, who had access to intelligence transcripts of the calls, will say that she told Mr. McGahn explicitly that Mr. Flynn hadn't been truthful about the conversations and that his actions could put him at risk of being compromised by Russian intelligence services, according to people familiar with her account.

Ms. Yates will be joined by James Clapper, Mr. Obama's director of national intelligence, at a hearing before a Senate Judiciary subcommittee headed by Sen. Lindsey Graham (R., S.C.) to examine alleged Russian interference in the election. Mr.

Graham last year urged congressional leaders to create a special committee to investigate Russia's purported role, but they declined.

The Federal Bureau of Investigation is leading a probe into any collusion between members of the Trump campaign and Russian operatives. The House and Senate Intelligence Committees are also conducting high-profile inquiries into any Russian interference, but those investigations have been slow to gain momentum.

Mr. Graham, more than most other Republicans, has been outspoken in calling for an in-depth examination of Moscow's actions.

"Based on evidence presented by our intelligence and law

enforcement communities, I believe Russia interfered in our election," Mr. Graham said in a statement late last week, adding, "I think it's important we hold them accountable."

Russia has denied any election interference, and Mr. Trump has rejected allegations that anyone connected to his campaign coordinated with Russian officials to influence the election.

Mr. Graham was coy recently when pressed by reporters on why he was holding Monday's hearing, given the intelligence committee probes, and inviting journalists to attend the session. "We have jurisdiction over the Department of Justice and FBI," Mr. Graham said. Later he added, "Y'all need to stop asking me about

hearings. Come. I'm not going to talk about them."

The hearing is likely to focus intensely on the actions of Mr. Flynn, who isn't testifying, and Ms. Yates. Mr. Flynn spoke to the Russian envoy, Sergei Kislyak, on Dec. 29, the same day the Obama administration levied sanctions on Moscow for alleged meddling in the U.S. election.

U.S. intelligence intercepts of Mr. Kislyak's cellphone revealed that the two discussed sanctions, according to former U.S. officials familiar with the calls.

Ms. Yates is expected to testify that she expressed alarm to Mr.

McGahn about the conflict between what transpired in the phone calls and how the White House was describing the conversations, according to people familiar with her account.

Vice President Mike Pence, relying on Mr. Flynn's assurances, had told CBS that Mr. Flynn hadn't discussed sanctions. After the nature of the contacts and Mr. Flynn's misleading of Mr. Pence became public, the national security adviser was forced from his job on Feb. 13.

The White House has said Mr. McGahn informed Mr. Trump about the matter, and the president

ultimately asked Mr. Flynn for his resignation.

The general outlines of Ms. Yates's account of the events have been reported, but Monday will be the first time she airs them in public. Ms. Yates, deputy attorney general under Barack Obama, was elevated to acting attorney general after the departure of Attorney General Loretta Lynch at the end of the last administration.

Sen. Dianne Feinstein of California, ranking Democrat on the Judiciary Committee, said she expects Ms. Yates to explain what was known about Mr. Flynn's interactions with Russia.

"She is very widely respected, and she apparently has some information as to who knew what when that she is willing to share," Ms. Feinstein said in an interview Sunday on NBC.

Ms. Yates, who couldn't be reached for comment, was fired Jan. 30 for refusing to defend Mr. Trump's executive order on visas and refugees, which has since been suspended by courts.

Write to Del Quentin Wilber at del.wilber@wsj.com and Byron Tau at byron.tau@wsj.com

**The
Washington
Post**

Tillerson to staff: State changes 'really stressful' but ultimately 'satisfying'

<https://www.facebook.com/joe.davidson.1654>

7-8 minutes

Follow Federal Insider Stories

In more than 6,500 words to State Department employees, Secretary Rex Tillerson traveled the world, citing its hot spots, as America's top diplomat should do.

But unlike what many top managers of agencies would do, he didn't mention the disputed territory of budget cuts, that uncertain place where Foreign Service officers and other staffers live.

After listening to his 40-minute speech in the department's Dean Acheson Auditorium, employees don't know any more than they did before about where the Trump administration's policy of "America first" leaves them.

President Trump's fiscal 2018 budget proposal would leave a big hole at State and the U.S. Agency for International Development (USAID), slicing funding by about 30 percent. It also calls for "the need ... to pursue greater efficiencies through reorganization and consolidation." Exactly what that means is unknown.

Tillerson said nothing about the budget reduction and the 2,300 positions Bloomberg reported would be eliminated. Perhaps he'll learn what staffers think about that through the online survey he urged them to take and the interviews planned with 300 employees.

Without citing the cuts, he did acknowledge the anxiety Trump's proposals bring.

"I know change like this is really stressful for a lot of people," he told

colleagues. "There's nothing easy about it, and I don't want to diminish in any way the challenges I know this presents for individuals, it presents to families, it presents to organizations. I'm very well aware of all of that."

His remarks about an ultimately better life were reminiscent of that old saying that "the beatings will continue until morale improves."

"All I can offer you on the other side of that equation is an opportunity to shape the future way in which we will deliver on mission," Tillerson continued, "and I can almost promise you ... that when this is all done, you're going to have a much more satisfying, fulfilling career, because you're going to feel better about what you're doing because of the impact of what you are doing."

Tillerson seems more in touch with the tension reorganization can generate among employees than the union representing them. A statement from American Foreign Service Association President Barbara Stephenson didn't address worker apprehension as she said "this reorganization effort offers a rare opportunity to make American diplomacy stronger."

Emphasizing a different note, letters to Congress from the American Academy of Diplomacy, an organization of former diplomats, and the Council of American Ambassadors said, "The current budget proposals will damage American national security and should be rejected."

If the planned changes, including cuts and reorganization, can make State and USAID employees more satisfied and fulfilled, as Tillerson suggested, then he would have found a unique way to improve employee morale. But he didn't

explain how slashing foreign assistance would do that.

USAID's mission is to help "end extreme poverty and promote resilient, democratic societies." In doing so, it advances America's diplomatic and foreign policy goals, while reducing conflicts that could lead to military intervention and lives lost.

While plans to cut foreign aid and staffing, and Tillerson's decision not to mention those, might make employees anxious, two retired staffers are a bit more understanding of his tactics.

Academy President Ronald E. Neumann described the cuts as "stupid," but he thinks Tillerson was right not to address them in his speech. "None of this stuff is final, and much of it has yet to be fought out," Neuman said, "so not only would it be politically rash to address the budget, but whatever he said might not stand the test of time."

Joseph Mussomeli, also a retired Foreign Service officer and former ambassador to Slovenia and Cambodia, said he is of two minds about foreign aid. "Given the wealth and power we have, we ought to be spending more," he said. "As a share of our GNP, our assistance levels are a moral embarrassment."

Yet "much of our assistance budget is squandered on high salaries for our employees and outside contractors who 'manage' our AID programs ... " he added. "As for staffing, our bureaucracy is bloated, and reducing certain staffing — more so in D.C. than in our embassies — would be sensible."

Despite popular misconception to the contrary, foreign aid is a tiny part of the budget, about 1 percent. Nonetheless, cutting that is an

important part of Trump's plan because it's doesn't fit with his notion of "America first."

Explaining the "dramatic reduction" in State's budget, Office of Management and Budget Director Mick Mulvaney said: "The president ran saying he would spend less money overseas and more money back home. So when you go to implement that policy, you go to things like foreign aid, and those get reduced."

There was no talk about the benefits of foreign aid during his budget briefing in March. To the contrary, Mulvaney said he was comfortable with the risks that come with cutting international assistance.

"There's no question this is a hard-power budget," he added. "It is not a soft-power budget. This is a hard-power budget. ... The president very clearly wants to send a message to our allies and our potential adversaries that this is a strong-power administration. So you have seen money move from soft-power programs, such as foreign aid, into more hard-power programs."

Yet hard-power masters, more than 120 retired general and admirals, have opposed a foreign aid cut in letters to Congress.

"Diplomacy is most often the first line of America's defense," the Academy and the Council said. The retired military leaders "recognize that when diplomacy is not permitted to do its job the chances of Americans dying in war increase. When the number of employees in military commissaries or military bands exceeds the number of U.S. diplomats, the current budget proposal is indeed not a cost-effective way to protect America and its interests."

Updated May 7, 2017 11:55 p.m. ET

WASHINGTON—With Justice Neil Gorsuch now sitting on the Supreme Court, President Donald Trump is preparing to turn to the nomination of a slate of conservatives for judgeships to the lower federal courts.

Mr. Trump as soon as Monday will announce a batch of picks for 10 judicial posts, including five nominees for the powerful federal appeals courts, according to a person familiar with the matter.

While the appeals courts attract less public attention than the Supreme Court, judges

Trump Set to Name Slate of Federal-Court Judges

Brent Kendall and Michael C.

who serve at that level play a significant role in shaping the law. The high court only hears about 70 cases a year, meaning the federal appellate level is the final stop for the overwhelming majority of cases filed in the federal system.

Mr. Trump's new nominees will include two judges whom he had placed on his Supreme Court shortlist during his presidential campaign, the person familiar with the matter said. He will nominate Michigan Supreme Court Justice Joan Larsen for a seat on the Sixth U.S. Circuit Court of Appeals in Cincinnati, and Minnesota Supreme Court Justice David Stras for a seat on the Eighth Circuit in St. Louis.

Both previously served as law clerks to conservative Supreme Court justices.

The other imminent appeals court nominees are Louisville, Ky., lawyer John K. Bush for the Sixth Circuit,

University of Notre Dame law professor Amy Coney Barrett for the Chicago-based Seventh Circuit and Alabama lawyer Kevin Newsom to the Atlanta-based 11th Circuit, the person said.

Mr. Trump will also nominate four people to serve as judges at the federal district courts, and one for the U.S. Court of Federal Claims. District court nominees typically don't spark as much political wrangling because they serve at the trial level and aren't usually the final word on disputed areas of the law.

To date, the president has announced only one lower-court nominee: U.S. District Judge Amul Thapar for the Sixth Circuit appeals court. Judge Thapar had his confirmation hearing last month and is awaiting a vote in the Senate.

Senate Democrats and Republicans have on occasion succeeded in

blocking a judicial pick from a president of the opposing party, thanks to the use of the filibuster as a procedural hurdle to prevent final confirmation votes. That option, however, is no longer available to the minority party.

Democrats ended the use of filibusters for lower-court nominations in 2013, when they held the Senate majority. Republicans then barred the filibuster this year for Supreme Court picks, a move that cleared the way for Justice Gorsuch's confirmation.

Mr. Trump's list was earlier reported by the New York Times.

Write to Brent Kendall at brent.kendall@wsj.com and Michael C. Bender at Mike.Bender@wsj.com

Updated May 7, 2017 4:25 p.m. ET

President Trump will soon decide whether to withdraw the U.S. from the Paris Agreement on climate change. His top advisers are huddling Tuesday, likely for a final time, to consider the decision, which has been promised by the end of the month. I endorsed Mr. Trump last April because I believed in his America First agenda, and I advised him on energy policies during the campaign.

I was wary of Paris and used to favor pulling out, but I've changed my mind for two reasons. First, in future climate talks the U.S. will benefit from having Mr. Trump, an experienced negotiator, at the table. Second, the Trump administration can legally scrap President Obama's emission-reduction pledge without leaving the Paris agreement.

It is abundantly clear that the agreement, which is and will remain legally nonbinding, does not prohibit lowering the American pledge. In a May 1 memo, Sierra Club lawyer Steve Herz wrote that "it would be extremely difficult to prevail" in any lawsuit arguing that the U.S. was bound by its pledge, or by the agreement itself.

Rep. Cramer : Remake the Paris Climate Deal to Promote American Energy

Thus any renegotiation would be the easiest deal Mr. Trump has ever made: He would simply submit a new pledge. Then if somehow the U.S. was blocked from changing its commitment, Washington could simply leave the Paris agreement that same day.

Regardless, EPA Administrator Scott Pruitt would be able to rescind the woefully constructed Clean Power Plan and other harmful Obama-era regulations, since they all preceded the climate deal reached in Paris in December 2015. Those regulations and the Paris agreement are legally unrelated.

There has been spirited debate among House Republicans on the best move to make. Several of my colleagues on the House Energy and Commerce Committee—including conservatives from energy-rich states such as Oklahoma, Missouri and Pennsylvania—agree that the smart strategy is to try to work out a more beneficial deal for the U.S. under the Paris agreement rather than walk away and let China and others take over the discussions. Eight of my fellow Republicans joined me in signing a letter to President Trump laying out specific conditions that would turn Paris into a good deal:

First, revise the U.S. pledge so it doesn't harm the economy and comes to reflect America First energy policies.

Second, cease Washington's transfers to the Green Climate Fund, and ensure the existing money isn't spent on wasteful projects.

Third, negotiate through the Paris Agreement to defend American interests, particularly by advancing technology for clean coal and pushing for increased investment and a better regulatory environment—all of which will create more foreign markets for American clean coal technology.

Mr. Obama's Paris pledge was a bad deal, as Mr. Trump explained forcefully during the campaign. But the situation has changed. The new White House can replace those harmful policies with an America First energy vision, and a Paris pledge and negotiations that reflect it.

What could Paris become with President Trump and his negotiators at the table? Energy Secretary Rick Perry has already aggressively touted the virtues of nuclear and clean coal at a recent Group of Seven energy meeting. That view faces stiff opposition from some of America's allies in Europe, who will work hard to promote a radical and unrealistic all-renewables vision for global energy policy. The U.S. needs to take them on in every available forum, Paris included.

Since Paris went into force, many nations in Eastern Europe and the Mediterranean have built clean coal plans into their Paris pledges. The White House can build on these pragmatic approaches, using Paris to help the U.S. energy industry and American workers. If Washington were to up and leave, Beijing would fill the leadership vacuum. It isn't wise to cede that ground.

Neither America nor the world can afford a European energy future, with skyrocketing prices, or a Chinese energy future, with bureaucratic control and unfair dumping of state-subsidized resources.

If Mr. Trump can fix Paris, it will be an example of the emerging Trump Doctrine. He would manage to get international credit for staying in the talks and ensuring they aren't led by China, while at the same time protecting America's economy.

Voters elected Donald Trump because they trusted him to drive hard bargains and help America start winning again. I trust that President Trump can negotiate the Paris Agreement into a good deal and deliver yet another win—for North Dakotans and American workers everywhere.

Mr. Cramer, a Republican, represents North Dakota in the U.S. House.

Editorial : Mr. Zinke, Keep Channeling Teddy Roosevelt

The Editorial
Board

5-6 minutes

Wren McDonald

On his first day on the job, Ryan Zinke, President Trump's secretary of the interior, rode a horse to work, in plain imitation of Teddy Roosevelt, who as president used to gallop around Washington, and whose admirable record as a conservationist Mr. Zinke says he hopes to emulate. By all accounts, Mr. Zinke, a former Navy SEALs member and congressman from Montana, is not a dope. He therefore knows that he cannot possibly match Mr. Roosevelt if he embraces the dismaying anti-environmental agenda Mr. Trump has saddled him with.

As David Roberts of Vox has pointed out, that agenda is both plutocratic and lazy. It seeks to confer new benefits on oil and gas interests that are already richly favored. Yet it requires nothing of Mr. Trump himself. All he has done is issue executive orders that tell someone else to do the work. He cannot scrap the clean power rule or President Barack Obama's aggressive fuel efficiency standards; the relevant federal agencies will have to face the laborious and uncertain process of

writing new rules and whatever court challenges those rules bring.

In similar fashion, in two separate orders, Mr. Trump has instructed Mr. Zinke to review Obama policies designed to protect important landscapes for the enjoyment of future generations and the oceans from catastrophic oil spills. The wording in both orders makes it clear that Mr. Trump wants the policies revised or jettisoned altogether, and in the end, great damage could be inflicted on the environment. It's up to Mr. Zinke to make sure that does not happen.

One order instructs Mr. Zinke to review all national monument designations made under the Antiquities Act after Jan. 1, 1996, that encompass 100,000 or more acres. Since Mr. Roosevelt signed the law in 1906, eight Republican (including T.R.) and eight Democratic presidents have used it to unilaterally protect threatened landscapes from commercial intrusion. Mr. Trump complains that such designations prohibit new mining and drilling projects that could create jobs, but a close look at his order shows that it makes no economic sense and is little more than cynical genuflection to the Utah congressional delegation.

The order's bookends are the 1.9 million-acre Grand Staircase-Escalante National Monument,

established by President Bill Clinton in 1996, and the 1.35 million-acre Bears Ears National Monument established just last year by Mr. Obama. The designations have stuck in the craw of two Republican warhorses, Senator Orrin Hatch and Representative Rob Bishop.

Both monuments contain magnificent landscapes and priceless artifacts. Neither contains significant oil and gas reserves, and the Grand Staircase designation has led to a big growth in tourism. Bears Ears is likely to do the same. Both have popular support, and both are best left alone.

The second order deals with oil and gas exploration. The United States is producing robust supplies, from both federal and private lands, but the oil industry wants more, and so does Mr. Trump. He has therefore ordered Mr. Zinke to draw up a new five-year exploration plan, roll back an Obama rule from last December withdrawing America's Arctic waters from drilling, and "reconsider" several safety regulations implemented after the disastrous BP oil spill.

Five-year plans come and go; every nearly every administration draws up a new one. Mr. Trump's plan calls for drilling in the Atlantic, an idea Mr. Obama rejected after protests from coastal states. The instructions on Alaska and safety

precautions are simply irresponsible. Mr. Obama withdrew Alaskan waters using existing legal authority and for a very good reason: An oil spill in the inhospitable waters of the Arctic would be a disaster. Further, after Shell's bumbling and ultimately fruitless \$7 billion attempt to find oil, companies have been abandoning old leases right and left, and, whatever their ambitions elsewhere, do not seem to be seeking new ones in the Arctic.

As for revising and presumably weakening the safety regulations — common-sense efforts to strengthen specific pieces of offshore drilling equipment, like blowout preventers, that failed in the 2010 gulf disaster — it's hard to believe that even industry wants something that stupid.

Back to Mr. Zinke's first day on the job. The day after he got off his horse, he addressed his employees and promised to defend them against brutal budget cuts that Mr. Trump had already threatened. That's all well and good, but the real measure of his leadership is whether he will also defend the crucially important work his employees are involved in, and, like Mr. Roosevelt, decide to protect and add to the public lands and waters instead of diminishing them.

Editorial : Same-sex marriage is the law of the land. A Kentucky judge must have missed that.

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

4-5 minutes

The Post's View

Opinion

Opinion A column or article in the Opinions section (in print, this is known as the Editorial Pages).

By Editorial Board

The Post's View

Opinion

Opinion A column or article in the Opinions section (in print, this is known as the Editorial Pages).

May 7 at 7:26 PM

W. MITCHELL NANCE, a family court judge in Kentucky, has enfolded himself in a cocoon of principled self-righteousness by declaring that, "as a matter of conscience," he will refuse to hear

any adoption cases initiated by gay or lesbian parents. The judge is entitled to his opinions. However, having declared his unwillingness to enforce the law and his open prejudice against an entire class of Americans — including litigants who may bring other cases before him — he is not entitled to remain on the bench.

The law of the land is clear. The Supreme Court ruled in 2015 that same-sex marriage must be permitted in all states. Kentucky, like every one of the 50 states, allows adoption by gay couples. What Mr. Nance regards as "a matter of conscience," then, is in fact in direct defiance of settled law. If a judge cannot accept the law, and in fact is, by his own account, incapable of impartial and fair adjudication of that law, he is, as "a matter of conscience," duty-bound to seek a new line of work.

There are widely accepted criteria by which judges can and must recuse themselves; the conviction

that the law itself is illegitimate is not one of them.

Opinions newsletter

Thought-provoking opinions and commentary, in your inbox daily.

A judge should recuse himself if he or an immediate family member has a personal interest in a case, by dint of financial, personal or family relationship. He should recuse himself if he is plainly biased against one or the other party in a case that comes before him in a proceeding. Bias against a whole slice of the population is a different, and disqualifying, matter, and renders Mr. Nance unfit to serve.

The law does not tolerate discrimination based on race, religion or sexual orientation, but Mr. Nance does, by his own admission. He acknowledged to a local journalist that homosexuals might have legitimate reservations about appearing before him, which they might in custody or divorce cases, among other proceedings.

The judge is as heedless of fact as he is of his duty. In a written order explaining his blanket recusal, he wrote that "under no circumstance" would the best interest of a child be served in an adoption by a "practicing homosexual." In fact, the vast bulk of research shows that children adopted by gay parents fare as well as those adopted by heterosexual couples.

Mr. Nance's stance is akin to that of Kim Davis, the Kentucky county clerk who, on religious grounds, refused to issue marriage licenses to same-sex couples following the Supreme Court ruling that they must be allowed nationwide. In Ms. Davis's case, her so-called conscientious objection was rendered moot by legislation in Kentucky that scrapped the requirement that county clerks sign marriage licenses. In Mr. Nance's case, no such work-around is possible or justified. Family court judges must hear adoption cases. And if Mr. Nance cannot fulfill that

duty, he is no longer equipped to do his job.

**THE WALL
STREET
JOURNAL**

Lazear : Trump's Tax Plan Would Spur Growth

Edward P.
Lazear

5-7 minutes

President Trump's tax plan leaves many details undefined, but there is plenty to evaluate. The administration claims its proposed changes would encourage growth and make the tax system more efficient. History suggests they will.

Less certain is the claim that the tax cuts will pay for themselves. Although budget concerns should always be paramount when cutting taxes, revenue neutrality does little to guarantee that this—or any—administration will exercise fiscal responsibility.

Most economists favor moving away from taxing capital and toward taxing consumption through value-added or sales taxes. Taxing capital squelches growth because capital is mobile and can cross borders in search of the highest risk-adjusted, after-tax return. Economists in both parties have scored the effects of eliminating capital taxation in favor of a pure consumption tax. Estimates range from a 5% to 9% total increase in gross domestic product.

There are a number of ways to move toward a consumption tax and reduce taxes on capital without instituting a national sales tax or VAT. One is to lower tax rates on corporate profits and "pass-through" income, as the president proposes. Another is to permit full expensing—to let companies deduct the entire cost of investments immediately.

Expensing creates a positive incentive for corporations because they receive the tax benefit only when they invest in themselves. A Treasury Department analysis done while I was chairman of the Council of Economic Advisers showed that a given dollar of tax cuts through expensing is more powerful than rate cuts in the short run by about a factor of four.

Rate cuts, on the other hand, benefit new and old capital alike and confer tax benefits on companies that have invested in the past. This saves companies money, but provides no direct incentive for new investment. In the long run, the distinction between expensing and rate cutting disappears because all capital is new capital and so is taxed at the lower rate.

Tax-rate cuts on pass-through income will have additional growth effects, but the administration hasn't released enough details to score them. Separating capital income from wage income may add some complexity, but that's not a new problem. Defining income and profit is not straightforward. Tax accountants already struggle to determine true costs, including business owners' implicit wages.

State and local taxes would no longer be deductible under Mr. Trump's plan. Much has been said about the cross-subsidization of high-tax states such as New York and California by low-tax states such as Florida and Texas. Removing this deduction would mean that overall federal personal income-tax rates can be lower and generate the same revenue.

Beyond that, there is a subtle and positive growth effect of eliminating state tax deductions.

The deductibility of state taxes provides incentives to raise overall taxes at the state level. Californians and New Yorkers bear only part of the cost of their tax increases; the rest is passed on to other states' taxpayers through the deduction. This leads state governments to overtax their citizens, resulting in economic distortions and reduced overall growth.

Tax cuts enacted through the Senate's budget-reconciliation process must sunset after 10 years, although this may not be the roadblock to lasting reform that it seems. Recall that the Bush tax cuts of 2001 had the same sunset provisions, but most are still in effect. Congress renewed them in 2010 and again—apart from those on the highest earners' rates—in 2012.

The Trump administration's plan may get the economy about halfway to a pure consumption tax. That could generate a GDP gain of between 2.5% and 4.5%. In 2016, the Congressional Budget Office estimated that corporate income-tax payments were \$415 billion, or about 12% of federal tax receipts. Rate cuts that spurred 4% growth would generate total tax revenues of about \$120 billion—assuming no other tax reductions—which is not quite enough to offset the loss of income to the government. Cutting individual income taxes makes the revenue-neutrality task more difficult because personal tax-rate cuts do

not generate the same growth effect as rate cuts on capital.

The net effect of the proposed corporate tax cuts would be to increase the deficit by about 0.5% of GDP. This is significant, but revenue neutrality should not be the standard by which a tax plan is judged. Even revenue-neutral tax changes do not solve our budgetary problems. The CBO projects growing deficits, exceeding 7% of GDP annually, in two decades. Unless we are willing to accept major tax increases in the future—most likely through the introduction of a VAT—we will need to reduce government spending significantly to narrow the gap. This means re-examining entitlements, particularly Medicare, Medicaid and other health programs. Even a revenue-neutral tax reform plan would not come close to achieving fiscal responsibility.

The strongest argument in favor of the Trump administration's plan is that it moves in the right direction on capital taxation and will achieve growth. Because there is a direct connection among GDP growth, productivity growth and wage growth, the Trump proposals will help raise incomes and thereby benefit Americans overall.

Mr. Lazear, who was chairman of the President's Council of Economic Advisers from 2006-09, is a professor at Stanford University's Graduate School of Business and a Hoover Institution fellow.