

# Revue de presse américaine

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



Liberté • Égalité • Fraternité

RÉPUBLIQUE FRANÇAISE

Mardi 23 mai, réalisation : Josselin Brémaud



5-21-17

## **FRANCE – EUROPE .....3**

Newsweek: Emmanuel Macron and Vladimir Putin Schedule Versailles Meeting to Mend Russia-France Ties .....	3
French President Macron to Meet Vladimir Putin Next Week (online) .....	3
Macron tries to sell plan to reform France's labor market (online).....	3
Macron Tackles French Labor Law in First Push to Fix Economy .....	3
Business Insider : France's Macron acts on pledge to clean up politics .....	4
Fortune : French Minister 'Confident' About Reaching Greece Deal in June .....	4
Chef Jacques Pépin talks about his life in France and opportunities for immigrants in the American kitchen today .....	5
Trump told he risks 'lasting damage' to ties between U.S. and Europe .....	5
At Least 22 Killed at U.K. Concert; Police Investigating as Terror (UNE) .....	6
Explosion Rocks Concert in Manchester, At Least 19 Dead in Suspected Suicide Attack .....	7
Trump promises solidarity with U.K. against 'evil loser' terrorists .....	8
Ariana Grande Manchester Concert Ends in Explosion, Panic and Death (UNE) .....	8
At least 19 people dead following 'terrorist incident' at Ariana Grande concert in Manchester (UNE).....	9
ISIS Claims Responsibility For Manchester Terrorist Attack.....	10
Kayyem: We want our kids to be fearless. Then this happens .....	11

## **INTERNATIONAL..... 11**

Bolton : The New Foreign Policy, Same as the Old .....	11
Editorial : President Trump's Mideast Contradictions ..	12
Editorial : Trump's fresh approach to the Middle East..	13
Podesta : Trump is taking historic steps — backward..	13
Mead: A Debate on America's Role—25 Years Late... ..	14
Trump Comes to Israel Citing a Palestinian Deal as Crucial (UNE).....	14
In Israel, Trump urges new Middle East harmony but faces old suspicions (UNE).....	15
Trump, Netanyahu Cast Iran as Common Enemy (UNE).....	17
President Donald Trump's Visit to Western Wall Highlights Differences With Israel .....	18
Trump's Middle East Policy Shift Prompts Unease in Iraq, Lebanon .....	18

Israel Announces Plans to Help Palestinians as Trump Visits .....	19
Trump Says He Didn't Mention Israel in Meeting With Russian Officials .....	20
Russia's Hearts-and-Minds Campaign in Syria Is Aimed at Home .....	20
Secor: The Patient Resilience of Iran's Reformers .....	21
North Korea's Whirlwind Progress on Missile Sharpens Threat.....	22
U.S. Nuclear History Offers Clues to North Korea's Progress .....	22
U.N. Panel Releases Draft of Treaty to Ban Nuclear Arms.....	24
Turkey Summons U.S. Ambassador Over Security During Erdogan Visit .....	24
Pope Francis says he won't 'make a judgment' about Trump without 'listening to him first' .....	25
McGurn: The Pontiff and the President .....	26
Editorial : The U.N.'s Complicity in a Congo Murder ..	27
Editorial : The Trump administration takes encouraging steps against Venezuela's corrupt regime ..	27

## **ETATS-UNIS..... 28**

Trump asked intelligence chiefs to push back against FBI collusion probe after Comey revealed its existence (UNE).....	28
Mike Flynn Won't Cooperate With Senate Russia Probe .....	29
Michael Flynn Mised Pentagon About Russia Ties, Letter Says.....	30
Gerson : In Trump's house of betrayal, leaks are business as usual. That's a big problem. ....	31
Palmieri: Robert Mueller will force Donald Trump to reckon with the truth on Russia.....	31
Trump's budget proposal slashes spending by \$3.6 trillion over 10 years (UNE) .....	32
Trump's Budget Seeks Cuts to Taxes, Safety-Net Programs .....	33
Trump's Budget Cuts Deeply Into Medicaid and Anti- Poverty Efforts (UNE) .....	34
Trump approval falls 4 points in new survey .....	35
Editorial : Another bad budget from Trump targets the poor .....	36
Editorial : A Budget That Promises Little but Pain .....	36
Secretary Acosta: Deregulators Must Follow the Law, So Regulators Will Too.....	37
Many Illegal Immigrants Arrive Legally .....	37
Editorial : Voting Rights Confusion .....	38
Brooks : The Alienated Mind.....	38
Editorial : The absurd conspiracy theory around Seth Rich's death causes real harm .....	39
Monica Lewinsky: Roger Ailes's Dream Was My Nightmare.....	40

# FRANCE – EUROPE

## Newsweek: Emmanuel Macron and Vladimir Putin Schedule Versailles Meeting to Mend Russia-France Ties

By Reuters On 5/22/17 at 12:58 PM  
2 minutes

French President Emmanuel Macron will receive Russia's Vladimir Putin at the palace of Versailles outside Paris on May 29 to inaugurate an exhibition marking 300 years of Franco-Russian diplomatic ties, a French presidency official said Monday.

Relations between Paris and Moscow were increasingly strained under former President Francois Hollande with

Putin cancelling his last planned visit in October after Hollande said he would see him only for talks on Syria.

The two countries have been at odds on Syria and Moscow's backing of President Bashar al-Assad. France has also been one of the key European Union countries to push for sanctions on Russia over the Ukraine crisis.

Subscribe to Newsweek from \$1 per week

During the presidential election campaign, Macron was viewed as having a tougher line on Russia than

his main rivals, although he has said it was vital to continue talking to Moscow.

He backed expanding sanctions against Russia if there was no progress in implementing the long-stalled Minsk peace accords for eastern Ukraine, where Kiev's forces have been battling pro-Russian separatists.

But despite their conflicting views, Putin and Macron agreed in their first phone call on May 18 to continue discussions on Ukraine and Syria. They will also discuss

"efforts to combat terrorism", the Kremlin said in statement Monday.

In an interview with Challenges magazine on May 18, Russia's Ambassador to France Alexander Orlov said Moscow hoped Macron would show his autonomy compared to Hollande.

"Russia is ready to take the first step with the new French president ... to overcome the reciprocal mistrust of recent years," he said.

**THE WALL  
STREET  
JOURNAL**

1-2 minutes

May 22, 2017 11:38 a.m. ET

PARIS—French President Emmanuel Macron will meet Russian President Vladimir Putin next week, their first meeting since Mr. Macron

## French President Macron to Meet Vladimir Putin Next Week (online)

Matthew Dalton

accused Moscow of meddling in the French presidential election.

Mr. Putin will travel to Versailles outside Paris on May 29 for an exposition commemorating the 300th anniversary of Russian Emperor Peter the Great's visit to Paris in 1717.

In February, Mr. Macron accused Russia's state-sponsored media of spreading smears about his character. Days before the election, a huge cache of emails and documents stolen from Mr. Macron's political party was posted anonymously on the internet. French officials and some cybersecurity

experts suspected Russian agents in the hacking.

The Kremlin denied that it was responsible for the hacking or that it tried to smear Mr. Macron

Write to Matthew Dalton at Matthew.Dalton@wsj.com

**The  
Washington  
Post**

2-3 minutes

By Sylvie Corbet|AP May 23 at 7:23 AM

PARIS — French President Emmanuel Macron is holding meetings with unions and business organizations to discuss reforming the country's labor market, which many blame for France's sub-par economic performance over recent years.

Government spokesman Christophe Castaner told France 2 television that Tuesday's meetings aim at opening a "dialogue" but that the "unions must

## Macron tries to sell plan to reform France's labor market (online)

By Sylvie Corbet|AP

understand the need for changing lines."

During his presidential campaign, Macron pledged to make reform of the labor market a top priority as part of an effort to boost job hiring. French unemployment has hovered around 10 percent for years.

Macron's proposed reforms, which include moving France's collective wage bargaining from the industry to the company level, have prompted concerns from unions fearing they would weaken workers protections.

Macron's plan may hinge on legislative elections next month.

Unions have called on the government not to rush to reform.

Macron vowed to implement his labor plan by the end of summer, through a special procedure involving decrees, on condition the government gets parliamentary approval.

Economy & Business Alerts

Breaking news about economic and business issues.

The head of the CGT union, Philippe Martinez, called on a "loyal" negotiation between the government and the unions, suggesting the reform's agenda might not be as quick as previously announced.

Laurent Berger, the general secretary of the CFDT union, said

Macron seemed "determined ... but at the same time receptive."

Following his meeting with the president, Berger said a tight deadline wouldn't give "enough time to the necessary concertation on weighty issues."

Labor minister Muriel Penicaud will have the daunting task of supervising the reform. She notably worked as vice president, in charge of human resources for food group Danone.

Copyright 2017 The Associated Press. All rights reserved. This material may not be published, broadcast, rewritten or redistributed.

**Bloomberg**

@gviscusi More stories by Gregory Viscusi

5-7 minutes

by

22 mai 2017 à 23:00 UTC-4 23 mai 2017 à 03:17 UTC-4

- French president to meet unions, business leaders Tuesday

- Previous French governments have stumbled on simplifying rules

Emmanuel Macron begins work on Tuesday on what may be one of the defining issues of his presidency: simplifying France's labor code.

On his 10th day in office, Macron and Labor Minister Muriel Penicaud are starting a round of meetings with

France's unions and business organizations to see if there's any common ground for distilling the country's byzantine labor rules and letting individual companies negotiate wages rather than being subject to industrywide agreements. The draft text of any new law isn't expected until after legislative elections in June.

The issue has frustrated French presidents for at least two decades

as the country's powerful unions opposed efforts to reduce job protection for their members. Yet Macron has signaled that shifting the French labor market onto a more flexible footing will be central to his strategy for boosting growth, keeping populism in check in the long term and winning the trust of the German government in shorter order.

France needs to "improve the access to the labor market for job seekers, notably the less qualified workers and people with a migrant background," the European Commission said Monday in its annual economic-policy recommendations. The government should "further reduce the regulatory burden for firms," it added.

### Hollande's Attempt

The French Labor Code runs some 3,000 pages and beyond issues such as labor negotiations and firing procedures, includes statutes on bathroom breaks and the dimensions of windows in work spaces. Penicaud, named to Macron's first government last week, is a former head of human resources at food company Danone.

"I'm delighted to see the president fully take on this issue that has been left to fester for far too long," Finance Minister Bruno Le Maire said at a press conference in Brussels Monday, after his first meeting with his European counterparts. "We all know that

reforming the labor code is the key to allowing companies create more jobs."

Get the latest on global politics in your inbox, every day.

Get our newsletter daily.

As economy minister under former President Francois Hollande, Macron helped write a labor law that would have limited severance payments and made it easier for companies to fire workers during a downturn. The law was watered down after protests from unions and Macron ended up leaving the government in August 2016 to create his own political movement, the jumping off point for his presidential campaign.

The law, now called the El Khomri law after Hollande's labor minister, was pushed through by decree that same month. The government of former President Jacques Chirac in 2006 also backed down on a proposed law that would have made it easier to fire young workers after street protests.

### Government by Decree

Philippe Martinez, head of France's second largest union, the CGT, on Monday signaled that Macron's ambitions are again going to face opposition.

"For the moment we've just had the comments the president made during the campaign, but to discuss you need a text and we have no text," Martinez said on Europe1. "If he wants salaries to be negotiated at the company level, then we are against."

Thibault Lanxade, vice-president of business lobby Medef, said the restrictions on firing workers made entrepreneurs reluctant to take on staff, even if that meant passing up opportunities to expand.

"Small company owners want to be able to hire but not when it's very difficult to let people go when the economic situation changes," Lanxade said on France Inter. "Growth is there, and we can benefit from this dynamic with a labor code that is more flexible."

Macron has said he plans to discuss the labor bill with union and business leaders, but will then enact the resulting laws via decree to avoid parliamentary debate and amendments. Martinez said he has no opposition to using decrees, as long as it's for measures that the unions have agreed to.

"Using decrees is not the problem in itself," he said. "But you can't say you want dialogue, and then say you want to go fast, and during the vacations."

The French government spokesman Christophe Castaner said Tuesday he doesn't expect the same level of opposition that Hollande faced when he tried to loosen labor laws.

"The Khomri Law came at the end of the term, and was never part of his mandate," Castaner said on France2 television. "Emmanuel Macron was elected with a plan to free up labor in this country."

## Business Insider : France's Macron acts on pledge to clean up politics

Reuters

4-5 minutes

French President Emmanuel Macron waits for a guest on the steps at the Elysee Palace in Paris Thomson Reuters

By Emmanuel Jarry

PARIS (Reuters) - President Emmanuel Macron's new government moved quickly on Monday to act on a campaign promise to tighten up on ethical standards in French politics after an election race marred by a embezzlement scandal.

Justice Minister Francois Bayrou held talks with leading anti-corruption organizations Transparency International and Anticor and with a Socialist lawmaker who is expert in the field as he gathered ideas for a new law to clean up politics in France, which has a long history of corruption scandals.

"We want this document to deal with all the questions which have been pending, unresolved, for so long ...

That means we will perhaps shake up some habits," Bayrou told reporters after the talks.

Macron, who beat far-right leader Marine Le Pen on May 7 to become president, pledged during the campaign to put forward a draft law on ethics in public life before the mid-June parliamentary elections.

The election campaign was jolted by allegations against conservative candidate Francois Fillon, who was placed under formal investigation in mid-campaign in March on suspicion of embezzling state funds.

Once the favorite, Fillon failed to reach the second round of the election after media disclosures that he had paid his wife Penelope and two children hundreds of thousands of euros of public funds for work they may not have carried out.

Under present practice, it is not illegal for French parliamentarians to employ a family member in their office and Fillon has denied any wrongdoing.

Le Pen also had legal woes, with French judges asking the European parliament to lift her parliamentary immunity from prosecution to allow further investigation into allegations she misused EU funds to pay for National Front party assistants.

Both the president and prime minister who ruled France in the mid-1990s, Jacques Chirac and Alain Juppe, were found guilty of misusing public funds.

They were convicted, Juppe in 2004 and Chirac in 2011 after retiring, of misusing public money to keep political allies on the payroll of Paris City Hall for jobs they did not do.

Macron, a centrist whose victory broke the decades-old grip of traditional right and left-wing parties on power in France, has said his new law will ban legislators from paying salaries to their relatives and make all their income liable to tax.

Socialist lawmaker Rene Dosiere gave Bayrou his proposals for a new ethics law, including stricter conditions to qualify as a political party to counter an explosion of

small parties whose main goal is often to gather funds.

He also proposes making public the names of people who give more than 2,500 euros to politicians and to limit legislators to a maximum of three parliamentary terms. There is no current limit.

Le Pen criticized his idea to ban political parties from granting loans to their candidates at below market rates, calling it a "padlocking of political life".

"It is the banks that will decide who has the right to be a candidate or not," Le Pen said on franceinfo radio.

Le Pen complained during the campaign that banks were refusing to lend to the National Front.

(Writing by Adrian Croft; Editing by Richard Balmforth)

Read the original article on Reuters. Copyright 2017. Follow Reuters on Twitter.

## Fortune : French Minister 'Confident' About Reaching Greece Deal in June

Reuters

1-2 minutes

France is confident that Greece and its international lenders can reach a deal on additional measures of debt

relief for Athens in June, the French finance minister said on Monday at the end of a eurozone meeting that ended with no agreement.

"I am quite confident we can reach an overall agreement on the Greek debt at the next Eurogroup meeting in three weeks," Bruno Le Maire told

reporters after a meeting of eurozone finance ministers in Brussels, the first since he was appointed finance minister.

The next meeting of the so-called Eurogroup is scheduled for June 15 in Luxembourg.

For more about Greece, watch Fortune's video:

The meeting in Brussels ended without an agreement on disbursing new loans to Greece, which the country will need to pay debts due in July. But Le Maire underlined that Greece will receive the needed



financial aid and said there was no reason for concern.

He said that France is working for an overall deal that will keep the International Monetary Fund on

board. He insisted Germany played a constructive role during talks and

made steps towards a final compromise.

Los  
Angeles  
Times

## Chef Jacques Pépin talks about his life in France and opportunities for immigrants in the American kitchen today

Hilary Eaton

8-10 minutes

PBS' newest culinary edition of the "America Masters," a series of comprehensive profiles on American culture's most creatively notable, is about to give us a never-before-seen view into the life of Jacques Pépin, the French American chef who pioneered cooking for television alongside Julia Child on "Jacques and Julia."

The documentary will focus on Pépin's childhood in France, how he fell in love with America and came up in the food world — the story of how a French immigrant became one of America's most celebrated chefs. The documentary airs May 27 at 10 p.m. on PBS. Recently I talked to Pépin by phone. This interview has been edited for length and clarity.

**What was the dish that initially showed you that there's more to food than sustenance? That it could be an art or something more?**

Interestingly, this moment is what the show begins with. During the war in France, I was about 6 years old, and my father left to go in the resistance and my mother took me to a farm for the summer. School was over, so she took me on her bicycle there for 35 miles, and I was left there on that farm. I was kind of sad, so the wife of the farmer took me to the barn to feed a cow and make me milk the cow, put my hand on the teat and all that. I had that first bowl of fresh milk, and in a sense, that was it. I was very young. But still, in my memory now, that really changed me.

**You were a chef on TV long before the Food Network. What was the initial experience of being on TV?**

As long as I was cooking, I felt relatively comfortable. But it didn't happen all of a sudden. The first series that I did was in Florida for a TV station in Jacksonville, and that was in 1980 or something like that. We went there with my wife and a friend of mine, Gloria Zimmerman, and the three of us, we did a series

of 13 shows in about five days. I kind of felt comfortable because by then, I had been teaching a little bit all over the country, and I looked at it like the class that I was doing, teaching, except that it was for hopefully more people than 40 people or whatever. I think if you talk about something you love, talk about something you know something about, then you're just talking to people, and trying to help them and make them happy, and make them understand.

**When you first came to America in 1959, what was the food world like?**

When I came to America at the end of 1959, six months after I was here I had made friends with Julia Child and James Beard, and Craig Claiborne had just started at the New York Times. That shows you how very small and very little the food world was. It was so small, in fact, I did not know one single American chef that was white. I worked for Howard Johnson and all the kids that I worked with in the kitchen at Howard Johnson and in the commissary were all black kids. White American chefs — I didn't know any. All the big restaurants in New York that I knew were either French, Italian, Swiss, German and so were all of the executive chefs. No one went into that business, and then of course it started changing with the CIA, the Culinary Institute of America, and so forth, in the '60s. It slowly became another world altogether.

**How do you feel food culture in America has changed in your lifetime?**

I was told a few weeks ago by a food historian that there are 405 cookery shows on television. I don't know whether this is accurate, but I think of it a lot. It's just amazing, and now a great deal of them are reality shows. I'm very happy in one way because the cook used to be really at the bottom of the social scale. Certainly during all my years it was this way, and apparently now we are seen as kind of genius. I don't know what happened. It's kind of crazy. Chefs are celebrities now. I think it's also maybe because, in our time of political correctness, we cannot talk about gender, about race, about religion, about anything, so people

feel comfortable with food. That's about the only thing that you can talk about and have a good time.

Look at how many places you can eat now. Look at the diversity of food. The amazingly diverse food that we have in this country. It's unmatched anywhere in the world. It makes it probably the most exciting cuisine going on now in the world. Jacques Pépin and Julia Child. (From Jacques Pépin)

**Do you see any downside to the celebrization of food?**

It's not particularly good for young people who want to go into that business to become famous because it's likely that it's not going to happen. There are 24,000 restaurants in New York, and of course you can list probably 100 restaurants that are very famous, but what happened to the other 23,900? When someone asks me, "You know my daughter or my son, has an interest in cooking. What do you think I should do?" I say, "Well, they are in high school. During their summer vacation put them in a little restaurant, diner, cafeteria, whatever you find where you live and let them work in the kitchen as a dishwasher and in the dining room, in the kitchen and so forth and after the summer if they still have the bug, then maybe, yes, you can think about cooking school."

Because young people don't realize it is not as glamorous as on television. You still work very long hours, you don't get that much pay and you work the holidays and weekends and so forth. Unless you really love it and you have the bug, then you should not go into that business.

**You recently started work with FareStart to help people get back on their feet through work in the kitchen. What drew you to that?**

What we wanted to do with that foundation is to create a kind of program with basic cooking techniques that we could give to people who have been a bit disenfranchised by life. People coming out of jail or veterans. I'm not talking about kids of 15 or 20 years old, I'm talking about 30-, 40-, even 50-year-olds. People who want to get into that business and could learn maybe those basic techniques

so that they would be able to work in or open a little restaurant. A little eatery to redeem your life. So, I think it could work, I hope it works. We're working with different organizations for that.

**You've said you were only supposed to visit New York but stayed because of the spirit and freedom of the country. You were an immigrant chef in America, and you were able to use hard work in the kitchen to succeed. Do you still feel the kitchen provides the same opportunity and possibility for young immigrants today?**

Yeah, I still think so, but I don't know with the new government that we have. I mean, I know that my friend José Andrés was supposed to do a restaurant in the Trump Tower, but he refused to do it for his politics surrounding immigrants, so the president is suing him. I've put my support for him because I've been in the kitchen so long and I know what it is to work hard and I know what it is to struggle. But still I feel that, yes, there is opportunity in America, maybe more than the other parts of the world. If you come and you're willing to work and give some of yourself, yes.

**What parts of American food culture have infiltrated and changed your classic French cuisine over the years?**

I live in the East Coast, so you know from, I don't know, lobster rolls to clam chowder to whatever. I'm married to a woman for 51 years who was born in New York City, with a Puerto Rican mother and a Cuban father, so you know, I have had a lot of influence from her background. In fact, I'm often considered as a quintessential French chef, and then you open my book and you see a black bean soup with banana and cilantro on top and then the next, southern fried chicken and the next chirashi sushi. I'm probably the quintessential American chef after all of those years in America because I've got so many other types of things that my cooking is not necessarily French. I'm not trying to be French, but at the same time I'm not trying not to be French. I don't really think much in those terms anymore.

The  
Washington  
Post

Trump told he risks 'lasting damage' to ties between U.S. and Europe

By Sophie Yeo

7-9 minutes

By Sophie Yeo May 22 at 7:40 PM

The Trump administration risks causing "lasting damage" to relations with key European allies if the United States abandons the Paris climate agreement, a key German official has warned.

Shortly before Trump is due to join G-7 leaders for a summit in Sicily, Germany's environment minister, Barbara Hendricks, said in a letter to EPA Administrator Scott Pruitt that the U.S. would face serious repercussions if it chooses to leave the landmark deal.

The letter, seen by The Washington Post, comes amid growing pressure on Trump to reconsider his campaign promise to "cancel" the deal agreed to by nearly 200 countries to fight climate change.

"I am very concerned that a U.S. withdrawal from the Paris Agreement would cause lasting damage to the long-standing mutual trust and close cooperation between our two countries and between the U.S. and other countries in Europe and elsewhere," Hendricks wrote in the May 5 letter.

*[The Trump White House is at war with itself over climate change]*

The Trump administration remains deeply divided over whether the U.S. should remain in the Paris agreement — but has promised a decision after the G-7 summit, which opens in Sicily on Friday.

Diplomats attending the meeting are in "daily contact" with the Trump administration in an effort to secure its commitment to the accord. Hendricks has offered to talk to Pruitt at any time about the future of the agreement, German officials said.

In her letter, Hendricks argued that it would be economically prudent for the U.S. to remain a party to the deal, as the world makes progress on renewable energy, creating jobs and other opportunities.

Hendricks also noted the U.S. could help shape the details and implementation of the deal, and had latitude to adjust its own targets, without having to withdraw from the deal.

With the White House and Cabinet split over the future of the Paris agreement, diplomats from G-7 countries remain optimistic they can persuade the Trump administration against withdrawal.

Secretary of State Rex Tillerson and senior adviser Jared Kushner support remaining in the agreement.

Pruitt and Energy Secretary Rick Pery are opposed.

"We are not pessimistic or resigned to the fate of the U.S. position," said one G-7 diplomat close to the process. "We are exploring every way possible to communicate with the U.S. and to express our key interest for the U.S. to stay involved in the climate negotiation process. There are many channels we are utilizing."

"We are genetically positive," added Jochen Flasbarth, state secretary at the German environment ministry, speaking at the conclusion of a United Nations climate conference held in Bonn earlier this month. "We work very hard together with many other friends of the world to convince the U.S. that staying in the Paris Agreement is the right way to go."

The administration is likely to face further pressure this week at the Petersburg Climate Dialogue, an annual ministerial event hosted by the German government. The U.S. will number among the 35 nations present in Berlin, expected to be represented by a low-level official.

At a March 16 meeting between Tillerson and Japanese Foreign Minister Fumio Kishida, the two nations agreed to "continue to communicate" regarding the Paris agreement.

Despite the weight of international pressure, the Trump administration is remaining tight-lipped about its position.

*[Uncertainty over Trump decision on Paris accord clouds Arctic meeting]*

Diplomats left the United Nations climate headquarters in Bonn last week with no further indications of where the U.S. might land on the issue. Trigg Talley, the deputy special envoy for climate change who headed the U.S. delegation, was "actively engaged, participating in the discussions" while repeating that their position remained under review, said Patricia Espinosa, the U.N.'s climate chief.

Meanwhile, efforts on the part of the Italian hosts and other G-7 members to craft a climate-friendly communique to conclude the Sicily summit are faltering, as nations struggle to find the compromise language acceptable to all participants.

"The climate part is still much under discussion and we don't have something particularly concrete to work on at this juncture," said the G-7 diplomat who is close to the process.

The U.S. successfully weakened language on climate change in the recent Fairbanks Declaration of the Arctic Council, leaked drafts of the document show, and gave no hints as to their position on the Paris accord. The U.S. requested six last-minute changes to the statement on climate change, seeking to downplay the implementation of the Paris agreement and the impact of warmer temperatures on the Arctic, according to InsideClimate News.

The move by the United States to weaken the document was seen as a test case for larger international meetings dealing with climate change.

Announcing that their decision would only be taken after the summit could indicate obstinacy in the face of international pressure, suggests Andrew Light, a senior fellow at the World Resources Institute, and former climate specialist at the State Department. "They want to make this decision for themselves, rather than having a position forced on them," he said.

Success on climate change could depend on how far the other G-7 members are willing to make trade-offs on other issues important to Trump, such as security and the economy — although the diplomat said each issue will be discussed on its "own merit" and that such compromises could be a "hard sell" — as well as Trump's willingness to make peace with his peers abroad amid domestic difficulties.

The Energy 202 newsletter

Your daily guide to the energy and environment debate.

"It really depends on how far the Italians in particular, and how far the other European parties are willing to go, in terms of denying other sorts of language that Trump might want to see come out of the communique on other issues entirely," Light said.

Meanwhile, eyes are pivoting to China — not a member of the G-7, but the country most likely to fill the vacuum of power left by the U.S. on climate change — and the European Union.

Donald Tusk, Jean-Claude Juncker and Chinese Prime Minister Li Keqiang are said to have been preparing a statement on climate change since February, to be released at a summit in Brussels on June 1, covering topics such as E.U.-China cooperation and international policy.

"They are really trying to meet in the middle, and that doesn't really happen that frequently between the E.U. and its member states with China. It has traditionally been the E.U. trying to reach a hand, but the reception was not always as smooth," said Li Shuo, senior climate and energy policy officer at Greenpeace China.

"The very clear sense that I'm getting in Beijing is that there is a very clear intention from the climate policy community in the country that the vacuum left in the U.S. is an opportunity, and the importance of maintaining the Paris Agreement momentum is clearly registered by them," he said.

**THE WALL  
STREET  
JOURNAL**

and Del Quentin Wilber

8-10 minutes

Updated May 23, 2017 2:46 a.m. ET

At least 22 people were killed, including children, and 59 injured by a suspected suicide bomber at a

## At Least 22 Killed at U.K. Concert; Police Investigating as Terror (UNE)

Wiktor Szary,  
Jason Douglas

concert hall in Manchester, England, according to U.S. and U.K. authorities.

Just after American pop singer Ariana Grande was closing a show at the Manchester Arena, a loud explosion outside the venue sent screaming fans, many of them young girls, streaming toward the exits, according to witnesses and British authorities.

The explosion went off near the arena's box office around 10:33 p.m. local time, the Greater Manchester Police said. Manchester Arena tweeted that the explosion happened in a "public space" outside the venue, which is one of the largest concert arenas in Europe with a capacity of 21,000. The incident happened "as people were leaving" the concert, it said.

A U.S. law-enforcement official said British police had found what they believe are the remains of the male bomber and have tentatively identified him.

"That is the leading theory—a suicide bomber—based on the forensic clues," the official said. Police said early Tuesday they were trying to determine whether the suspected perpetrator was acting

alone or as part of a network, calling it a fast moving investigation.

British police believe that some victims were killed or hurt in the resulting stampede of frantic concertgoers, the official said.

If confirmed as a terrorist attack, it would be the second in the U.K. this year and the deadliest since suicide bombers attacked the London transport system in 2005, killing 52 people. The U.K.'s terror threat alert has been at "severe," meaning an attack is highly likely, since 2014. The only higher ranking is "critical," which means an attack is expected imminently.

U.K. Home Secretary Amber Rudd described the explosion as a "barbaric act."

"The full details of exactly what happened are still emerging, but I am proud of the police and first responders who reacted to this tragic incident so swiftly," she said in a statement.

Greater Manchester Police Chief Constable Ian Hopkins said the injured were being treated at eight hospitals across the area. He added that more than 400 police officers were deployed through the night and that visible patrols, including armed officers, would be deployed Tuesday.

The explosion happened around five minutes after Ariana Grande had closed her concert with the song "Dangerous Woman," said Stefan Petrovic, who was in a hospitality box with some 15 other people.

Mr. Petrovic described the atmosphere of the concert as lively with the mainly teenage audience getting "carried away" with the music. The lights were on and people had risen to leave, playing and hitting pink balloons that had been let out during the show, he said.

Then he heard an explosion and at first assumed it was a large balloon that had burst. But people began running from the back of the concert hall to the front of the stage, the 27-year-old said.

An employee from the arena came into the box and shouted "you need

to get out," he said. At that point people started to cry.

"As we left we could smell some sort of explosive," he said.

Pictures taken on mobile phones showed concertgoers running from the back of the arena, with pink balloons rising above the crowd. On social media, users posted dozens of photos of people missing after the explosion. The hashtag #roomformanchester was trending on Twitter through the night, with locals offering accommodation and car rides to anybody stranded in the city. There were reports on Twitter and Facebook that taxis in the city center were offering free rides.

Ms. Grande, according to a spokesman for her management company, said that "she is OK." The singer early Tuesday tweeted, "broken. from the bottom of my heart, i am so so sorry. i don't have words."

The suspected terrorist attack comes in the middle of political campaigning ahead of a general election called for June 8. An earlier attack this year in March left six people dead, after a car driver killed four people near the Houses of Parliament in London and then stabbed a police officer to death in London before being shot by police. It also took place four years to the day after a British soldier Lee Rigby was hacked to death outside an army barracks in south London by two Islamic extremists.

U.K. Prime Minister Theresa May will chair a meeting of the government's emergency "Cobra" committee at 9.00 a.m. Tuesday to discuss the suspected terror attack in Manchester, according to a person familiar with the matter. The panel meets in response to crises. A spokeswoman for Ms. May's ruling Conservative Party said campaigning for the general election would be suspended Tuesday.

Manchester Victoria train station, the city's second-largest mainline rail hub, located near the arena where the apparent bombing took place, was evacuated and is expected to remain closed Tuesday, according to Network Rail, the organization that manages Britain's trainlines.

"Victoria is located near the arena, the station has been evacuated and all lines closed," Network Rail said. "Trains are unable to run" to and from the station, it said.

Early Tuesday, police said they had carried out a controlled explosion on a suspicious object near the arena. They later said it turned out to be discarded clothes.

Karen Orchard was waiting to collect her daughter and a friend from the concert at Victoria Station, next to the arena.

"Then there was a huge booming bomb-like sound. I saw people drop down, ducking, then screaming and running," said Ms. Orchard.

"I saw one man running down the stairs carrying a girl in his arms, blood pouring from her face and leg," she added. "As soon as we found each other we grabbed hands and ran."

Paula Robinson, a hospital worker, was out with her husband celebrating their 13th wedding anniversary. Waiting for a train at the Victoria station next to the arena, Ms. Robinson said they heard a loud explosion and ran out.

"There was a huge bang and next thing I saw were people running everywhere, screaming, shouting" she said. "Everybody was panicking."

Outside, Ms. Robinson saw dozens of children running away from the concert venue. She took a large group and walked them to a nearby Holiday Inn hotel and started reaching out to parents.

"I must have had about 500 phone calls with parents," she said. "Hopefully we were able to help a bit in this awful night."

Anne Hidalgo, the mayor of Paris, said in a message on her official Twitter account that "Paris stands with Manchester."

Ninety people were killed in Paris at the Bataclan theater during a rock concert in November 2015, as part of a coordinated terror attack on that city.

"My thoughts go out to the victims and their families," she said.

The greater Manchester metropolitan area, Britain's second-largest urban population with more than two million inhabitants, has suffered previous terrorist attacks in during a bombing campaign that spanned decades by the Irish Republican Army. The last occurred in 1996 when the Provisional Irish Republican Army detonated a truck-bomb in the center of the city injuring more than 200 though none died.

Manchester is home to many of the U.K.'s largest international events because of the success of its two local soccer clubs, City and United, which regularly compete on the global stage. The city's airport is the busiest outside of London with direct links to cities such as New York, Orlando, and Hong Kong.

The bombing comes as the Department for Homeland Security is considering widening to Europe a ban on carrying large electronic devices, such as laptops, in the cabin of U.S.-bound planes for fear terrorists are trying to smuggle bombs onboard in consumer devices.

The U.S. government late Monday said it was "closely monitoring the situation" in Manchester and working with its counterparts in the U.K. to gain more information on what transpired.

The U.S. Department for Homeland Security, said it wasn't aware of "a specific credible threat involving music venues" in the U.S. Still, it said that "the public may experience increased security in and around public places and events as officials take additional precautions."

—Alistair MacDonald, Mike Bird, Georgi Kantchev and Robert Wall contributed to this article.

**Write to** Wiktor Szary at Wiktor.Szary@wsj.com, Jason Douglas at jason.douglas@wsj.com and Del Quentin Wilber at del.wilber@wsj.com

Appeared in the May. 23, 2017, print edition as 'U.K. Blast Leaves 19 Dead In Suspected Terror Attack.'



Paul McLeary | 48 mins ago

4 minutes

An explosion immediately after an Ariana Grande concert Monday evening in Manchester, England

## Explosion Rocks Concert in Manchester, At Least 19 Dead in Suspected Suicide Attack

killed as many as 19 and injured over 50.

U.K. authorities suspect it was caused by a suicide bomber and announced they will treat the incident as a terrorist attack until authorities collected more

information. U.S. officials also said they suspect a terrorist attack, and told *NBC News* President Donald Trump had been briefed on the incident.

The *BBC* reported the U.K.'s senior counter-terrorism officials are

assembling in London to respond to the incident. The government put the country on the second-highest alert level, "severe," possibly indicating perpetrators of the attack are still at large.



"We are working to establish the full details of what is being treated by the police as an appalling terrorist attack," British Prime Minister Theresa May said in a statement released Monday night. "All our thoughts are with the victims and the families of those who have been affected," she said.

The mayor of Greater Manchester, Andy Burnham, also issued condolences:

Police at the scene are still clearing the area, a scene of chaos and carnage according to eyewitness accounts.

"There was a loud bang at the end of the concert. The lights were already on so we knew it wasn't part of the show. At first we thought it was a bomb. There was a lot of smoke. People started running out. When we got

outside the arena there were dozens of police vans and quite a few ambulances," Erin McDougle told *The Guardian*.

U.K. officials also told the *BBC* there was another suspected explosive device in the vicinity of the first explosion. They carried out a controlled explosion of the device after clearing the area.

Eyewitnesses captured the aftermath on their phones, showing chaotic footage of people screaming and running from the scene.

The explosion occurred at the Manchester Arena, which has a capacity of 21,000 people. Many of the concert-goers were children and teens. Local hotels offered shelter for youth separated from their parents, and social media was plastered with desperate requests

for information on children who went missing in the chaos.

The attack will rock domestic and international politics. The U.K. is facing a general election June 8, and border security was a huge issue during last year's referendum on leaving the European Union. A terrorist attack would almost certainly push security concerns front and center in the election, elbowing aside the economic, Brexit-related questions that have dominated public debate. Theresa May had said that the United Kingdom was safer inside Europe when she was home secretary, before becoming prime minister.

Trump, who campaigned on a tough stance against Islamist terrorism, is in Israel in the midst of his first foreign trip. Over the weekend, in Saudi Arabia, the president exhorted

Muslim leaders to do more to fight extremism.

The White House hasn't yet issued a response to the incident, nor has Trump tweeted.

The United Kingdom is no stranger to terrorist attacks, suffering decades of violence at the hands of the Irish Republican Army and its offshoots, as well as from Islamist militants. In 2005, an al Qaeda subway and bus bombing killed 52. In March of this year, an Islamic State attack outside of Westminster left five dead and 50 injured.

*This post will be updated as more information comes in.*

Photo credit: Dave Thompson/Getty Images

## POLITICO Trump promises solidarity with U.K. against 'evil loser' terrorists

By Annie Karni

5-6 minutes

President Donald Trump pauses as he makes a statement on the terrorist attack in Manchester, after a meeting with Palestinian President Mahmoud Abbas on May 23 in the West Bank City of Bethlehem. | AP Photo

The president refused to call the Manchester attacker a monster because 'they would like that term.'

JERUSALEM — President Donald Trump on Tuesday called the suspected terrorist who killed 22 people at an Ariana Grande concert in Manchester an "evil loser" and said he stands in "absolute solidarity" with victims in the United Kingdom.

Speaking in Bethlehem following a bilateral meeting with Mahmoud Abbas, the president of the Palestinian Authority, Trump added his remarks about the terrorist attack to the top of a pre-planned statement about his quest to broker peace between the Israelis and the Palestinians.

Story Continued Below

"So many young, beautiful, innocent people living and enjoying their lives

murdered by evil losers in life," Trump said of the explosion that targeted an adolescent audience. "I won't call them monsters, because they would like that term. They would think that's a great name. I will call them, from now on, losers. They're losers. And we'll have more of them. But they're losers. Just remember that."

"Loser" is one of Trump's favorite insults for people he views as his personal enemies. On Twitter over the years he has used the term to describe Karl Rove, Mark Cuban, Rosie O'Donnell, Graydon Carter and Cher, among others.

Trump called the Manchester attack a "horrible morning of death" and linked the suspected suicide mission, which injured 59 at the tail end of an upbeat pop concert, to the major theme of the first four days of his trip: uniting the civilized world together to combat and drive out terrorists.

Civil society "cannot stand a moment longer for the slaughter of innocent people. This wicked ideology must be obliterated — I mean completely obliterated — and the innocent life must be protected," Trump said, standing at a podium at the presidential palace in Bethlehem.

He said that "all civilized nations must join together to protect human life and the sacred right of our citizens to live in safety and in peace."

White House press secretary Sean Spicer on Tuesday also tweeted that Trump had spoken with U.K. Prime Minister Theresa May to offer "condolences and support on behalf of the U.S."

According to a readout of the call, Trump offered to assist in Britain's investigation and both leaders denounced the attack.

"The two leaders agreed that this attack—which targeted teenage children and their friends at a joyous event—was particularly wanton and depraved," according to the White House.

British authorities have yet to identify the Manchester attacker, who police said died in the blast. The motive for the attack remains unconfirmed, but the Associated Press on Tuesday reported that ISIS claimed responsibility for the attack.

U.S. Secretary of State Rex Tillerson also expressed condolences to the victims.

"Our hearts go out to the families of those who have lost loved ones and

to those injured," he said, according to the State Department.

Trump's reaction to the attack was in line with the theme of his first foreign trip, where he has sought to unite the Arab world and Israel in a joint fight against terrorism — and capitalize on the common threat of Iran to bring together the rest of the Middle East.

In a bilateral meeting at the King David Hotel on Monday with Israeli Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu, Trump said that "because of the aggression of Iran, it's forcing people together in a very positive way. I could see a much deeper path to friendship with Israel and I think a lot of it spurred on — whatever it takes — but a lot of it's spurred on by what's happening in Iran."

And during his first major foreign policy address in Riyadh earlier this week, Trump called on the leaders of more than 50 Arab states to: "Drive out the terrorists. Drive them out of the extremists. Drive them out of your places of worship. Drive them out of your communities. Drive them out of your holy land and drive them out of this Earth."

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 Ariana Grande Manchester Concert Ends in Explosion, Panic and Death (UNE)

Rory Smith and Sewell Chan

4-6 minutes

MANCHESTER, England — An explosion that appeared to be a suicide bombing killed at least 22 people on Monday night and wounded 59 others at an Ariana Grande concert filled with adoring

adolescent fans, in what the police were treating as a terrorist attack.

Panic and mayhem seized the crowd at the Manchester Arena as the blast reverberated through the

building, just as the show was ending and pink balloons were dropping from the rafters in a signature flourish by Ms. Grande, a 23-year-old American pop star on an international tour.



Traumatized concertgoers, including children separated from parents, screamed and fled what appeared to be the deadliest episode of terrorism in Britain since the 2005 London transit bombings.

Speaking to reporters early Tuesday, Manchester's chief constable, Ian Hopkins, said the police learned of the explosion around 10:33 p.m. Children were among those killed, he added, and the wounded were taken to eight hospitals.

Chief Constable Hopkins said that a man had detonated "an improvised explosive device" and had been killed in the blast. He said the police believed that the man had acted alone, but that they were trying to determine whether he had been part of a wider network. Other officials said the police were investigating reports that the device had used nuts and bolts as shrapnel.

The scene in central Manchester immediately evoked the terrorist attacks in Paris in November 2015, which included a deadly assault inside the Bataclan concert hall, where the Eagles of Death Metal had been playing. But unlike the Bataclan show, the Manchester concert was filled with young teenagers.

"This is currently being treated as a terrorist incident until the police know otherwise," the Manchester police said in a Twitter post.

Prime Minister Theresa May said her thoughts were with the victims and their families in "what is being treated by the police as an appalling terrorist attack." She was scheduled to lead a meeting of the government's crisis response committee on Tuesday morning.

At least one explosion went off in the foyer of the arena, according to the British Transport Police, the force that protects the Manchester Victoria train station next to the arena. The station was evacuated.

Photo

Police officers at the Manchester Arena on Monday. People at the arena said they had heard what

sounded like explosions at the end of the show, around 10:30 p.m. Credit Peter Byrne/Press Association, via Associated Press

Early Tuesday morning, Sky News reported that a bomb disposal team had arrived on the scene as part of the investigation and that the security cordon around the arena had been widened.

Gary Walker, who was at the show with his wife and two daughters, said he "heard a massive bang and saw a flash" just as the concert concluded. He turned and realized that his wife had been hurt. Mr. Walker, who is from the northern city of Leeds, said she had a stomach wound and possibly a broken leg. He said he lay down on the floor beside her and saw "metal nuts on the floor."

Ms. Walker was taken to a hospital, Mr. Walker said while standing with his daughters in Deansgate, the main shopping street in Manchester.

#### Breaking News Alerts

Sign up to receive an email from The New York Times as soon as important news breaks around the world.

Another concertgoer, Sasina Akhtar, told The Manchester Evening News that there had been an explosion at the back of the arena after the last song. "We saw young girls with blood on them," she said. "Everyone was screaming, and people were running."

Ms. Grande, a singer with a big voice who started her career as a star on a Nickelodeon TV series, is on an international tour supporting her 2016 album, "Dangerous Woman." Two additional acts, Victoria Monét and Bia, performed as openers on Monday. The tour was scheduled to continue on Thursday at the O2 Arena in London.

Ms. Grande was not hurt. TMZ, the entertainment news website, reported that she was "in hysterics" over the deadly blast.

Her manager, Scooter Braun, said on Twitter, "We mourn the lives of children and loved ones taken by this cowardly act."

Parents separated from their children during the mayhem were told to go to a Holiday Inn, where many youngsters had taken refuge. A number of hotels, including the Holiday Inn and a Travelodge, opened their doors to concertgoers trapped inside the police cordon, providing them with drinks and phone chargers to enable them to contact family members. Residents also offered stranded concertgoers places to stay in their homes.

The confusion and fear in the hours afterward were reflected on social media. One Twitter post asked: "Did anybody see my girlfriend? I lost her in the chaos."

SMG, the Pennsylvania-based company that manages the Manchester Arena, and Wes Westley, the company's president and chief executive, described the precautions at the site.

"It is obviously as tight security as anywhere in the States," he said in an interview. "Backpacks are not allowed. Drinks are taken away from people. You have to go through very strict security to enter the arena."

Concertgoers waiting Tuesday morning after a blast that is believed to have occurred in a space connecting Manchester Arena and Victoria Station. Paul Ellis/Agence France-Presse — Getty Images

The BBC interviewed a man who was waiting outside the arena to pick up his wife and daughter. He recounted that the "whole building shook," that there was "carnage everywhere," and that the explosion appeared to come from near the stadium's ticket area.

Videos posted on Twitter showed concertgoers running and screaming. Hannah Dane, who attended the performance, told The Guardian that she had heard "quite a loud explosion."

"It shook," she said. "Then everyone screamed and tried to get out."

The Manchester Arena opened in 1995 and can hold up to 18,000 concertgoers; it was not clear how many people were in this crowd for the concert.

Karen Ford told the BBC that she had been leaving the show when the blast occurred. "Everyone was just

getting out of their seats and walking toward the stairs when all of a sudden a huge sound, which sounded like an explosion, went off," she said.

"Everyone tried to push people up the stairs," Ms. Ford recalled, adding that in the chaos, people tried to push past a woman in a wheelchair as children screamed.

She said there was no smoke, just one very loud bang. "It was very, very loud," she said, adding that her husband thought he had heard a second explosion. "There were shoes on the floor" left behind by people who had fled, she recalled.

"Just chaos," she added. "I was trying to tell people to calm down." She said the masses of people trying to flee created a perilous situation: "We were being crushed."

Outside, Ms. Ford said, parents awaited children who had attended the concert, checking their smartphones in a panic. "Everyone was trying to find each other," she said.

While the country and the world reacted to the news of the explosion and deaths with dismay, anger and grief, the British authorities, who have foiled numerous terrorist plots, were probably not surprised.

The terrorist threat level set by MI5, the domestic intelligence service, has been at "severe," the second-highest level, for months now, meaning officials considered an attack "highly likely."

While disenchanted young people can be radicalized through extremist websites, officials are particularly worried about the return of hundreds of battle-trained fighters who had left Britain or other European countries to join jihadist groups in Syria and Iraq.

Voters in Britain will go to the polls on June 8 in a general election, but the governing Conservatives — along with Labour, the Scottish National Party, and the Liberal Democrats — agreed to suspend campaigning because of the attack.

With the election approaching, however, the Manchester assault seems bound to become part of the political discourse.

The  
Washington  
Post

## At least 19 people dead following 'terrorist incident' at Ariana Grande concert in Manchester (UNE)

<https://www.facebook.com/peter.holley.923>

9-11 minutes

[Updated story: Islamic State claims responsibility for suicide attack that left 22 dead]

LONDON — An explosion described by police as a likely terrorist attack ripped through a crowd of teenagers

and other concertgoers late Monday after a performance by an American pop singer in the English city of Manchester, leaving at least 19 people dead and about 50 injured.

Initial evidence at the scene suggested the attack may have been a suicide bombing, according to two U.S. security officials, who spoke on the condition of anonymity to discuss an ongoing investigation. British authorities, who were

meeting in emergency sessions in Manchester and London, did not immediately confirm those reports.

The bombing appeared intended to inflict the maximum possible damage on young concertgoers — many of them in their early teens — who were making their way out of the Manchester Arena. Police said the blast occurred about 10:30 p.m., minutes after pop star Ariana Grande had finished her set.

The explosion set off a panicked reaction as fans struggled to flee and parents and teens searched for each other amid the carnage. Well into Tuesday morning, fathers and mothers who had lost contact with their children posted desperate pleas for information on social media.

British Prime Minister Theresa May issued a statement in the early hours of Tuesday saying that authorities were “working to establish the full details of what is being treated by the police as an appalling terrorist attack.”

Greater Manchester Police said the blast was being “treated as a terrorist incident until police know otherwise.”

There was no immediate claim of responsibility for the blast, and police did not speculate about possible motives.

If confirmed as a terrorist attack, it would be the worst strike on British soil since 2005, when Islamist extremists bombed the London subway and a bus, killing 54 people.

The U.S. Department of Homeland Security said late Monday that there was “no information to indicate a specific credible threat involving music venues in the United States,” but added that Americans may see “increased security in and around public places and events as officials take additional precautions.”

Britain has been on high alert for a major attack for several years, with authorities saying that a mass-casualty attack was likely.

Manchester police said they were working closely with national authorities to determine the cause of the explosion. Among the priorities for investigators will be to figure out whether it was part of a broader plot.

Grande, who is wildly popular both in Britain and the United States, was

not injured in the attack. She expressed her sorrow in a tweet hours after the explosion, saying she was “broken. from the bottom of my heart, i am so sorry. i don't have words.”

Cellphone video showed chaotic scenes of people screaming and running in the aftermath of the blast. The arena was packed with attendees and pink balloons that had fallen from the ceiling during the final song. Initially, concertgoers said they thought popping balloons had set off a panic, or that the screams were those of fans who had caught a glimpse of Grande.

But witnesses later reported seeing the prone bodies of those who had been wounded and killed, as well as others who were streaked with blood and were staggering away from the scene. Some were injured in the rush to get out, with people being trampled as thousands sought to escape.

In video of the moment that the explosion detonated, a concussive boom breaks through the chatter of fans heading for the exits. “Oh my god, what just happened?” a female voice can be heard asking. “What’s going on?”

Later video showed people diving over railings. Concertgoers said that they saw nuts and bolts littering the ground near the blast scene and that the smell of explosives hung in the air.

The local hospital, Wythenshawe, said it was dealing with “mass casualties.” Five other hospitals across the city were activated to treat the injured, and emergency supplies of blood were rushed in.

Heavily armed police and emergency services swarmed the arena, with ambulances — their blue lights flashing — rushing to the scene. The local emergency-response service advised the public to call only “for life-threatening emergencies.”

Many of those attending the concert were teenagers going to their first concert. Witnesses reported that outside the arena, parents were frantically attempting to locate their children. Many parents and teens later gathered at a nearby Holiday Inn that was established as a meeting point.

Fans of Grande had come from across northern England to see the

concert. On Twitter, people offered a place to stay for those stranded in the city, using the hashtag #RoomForManchester.

Parents posted pictures of missing children on social media, pleading for information. Police set up a hotline for those looking to connect with missing relatives.

A father told the BBC that he was leaving the arena with his wife and daughter when the blast blew him through a set of doors. Afterward, the man, identified as Andy, said he saw about 30 people “scattered everywhere. Some of them looked dead.”

Separated from his wife and daughter, he said, he “looked at some of the bodies trying to find my family.”

He later found them, uninjured.

Other witnesses described a loud bang, followed by terrified shouts. “It was really scary,” Michelle Sullivan, who was attending the concert with her 12- and 15-year-old daughters, told the BBC. “Just as the lights have gone down, we heard a really loud explosion. ... Everybody screamed.”

“When we got out, they just said, ‘Keep on running, keep on running.’”

Karen Ford, a witness, told the BBC that “there were kids outside, crying on the phone, trying to find their parents.”

About 1:30 a.m., police announced that there would be a controlled explosion after a suspicious object was found. A loud bang was heard minutes later. Police later said the item that had been found was discarded clothing, not an explosive device.

The arena is one of the largest indoor venues in Europe and has a capacity of 21,000. Manchester transport police said the explosion occurred in the arena’s foyer, where people were congregating to buy concert merchandise. Manchester Arena said the attack took place just outside the facility, in a public space.

Although nobody immediately asserted responsibility for Monday’s violence, scenes of bloodied, panicked concertgoers running for safety brought to mind similar images at the Bataclan theater in Paris in November 2015.

The concert hall became the scene of extreme carnage after multiple gunmen burst in during a show by the American rock band Eagles of Death Metal and began shooting. The attack — for which the Islamic State later asserted responsibility — killed 89 people and injured hundreds more, becoming the deadliest event on French soil since World War II.

Britain has had fewer terrorist attacks in recent years than several of its European neighbors. Monday night’s blast came two months after a speeding driver left four people dead on London’s Westminster Bridge, then stabbed to death a police officer at the gates of Parliament.

Monday was the fourth anniversary of the killing of Lee Rigby, a British soldier who was attacked with a machete on the streets of southeast London. The two assailants, who were convicted of murder, said they were acting to avenge the killing of Muslims by British soldiers.

Today’s WorldView

What’s most important from where the world meets Washington

Monday’s blast comes with just over two weeks to go before Britain holds a national election. Campaigning was suspended Tuesday, and perhaps beyond. Security has not featured as a prominent part of the debate, although that may change when campaigning resumes.

Grande is a 23-year-old pop singer and actress who has been in the public spotlight since 2010, when she began appearing on the Nickelodeon television show “Victorious.” More recently, the former teen idol has been touring to promote her third studio album, “Dangerous Woman.” She has sold more than 1.7 million albums in recent years.

The singer has more than 45 million followers on Twitter. Grande is also one of the most popular people on Instagram, with 105 million followers — more than even Beyoncé, Taylor Swift or Kim Kardashian. She was scheduled to play two shows in London later this week before traveling to Belgium, according to her tour dates.

Holley reported from Washington. Devlin Barrett in Washington contributed to this report.



## ISIS Claims Responsibility For Manchester Terrorist Attack

Kate Samuelson

3 minutes

ISIS has claimed responsibility for the deadly attack at an Ariana Grande concert in Manchester, northern England, on Monday

evening. The attack, which killed at least 22 people, including an 18-year-old college student, and left around 59 injured, was described by

British Prime Minister Theresa May as “the worst attack the city has experienced.”

The news comes after outlets reported that ISIS supporters were celebrating the bombing on social media, hailing it as a victory against "the crusaders" of the West and framing it as a response to airstrikes in Iraq. According to the *Daily Telegraph*, one video showed an English-speaking ISIS supporter holding up a sign reading 'Manchester' with the date of the attack.

A statement made via ISIS channels on the messaging app Telegram said that "one of the soldiers of the caliphate placed explosive devices in a gathering of crusaders in the

middle of the British city of Manchester," hinting that the terrorist incident was not a suicide attack, as it is believed to have been. It said the bombing was a response to Britain's "transgressions against the lands of the Muslims." Pro-ISIS accounts had earlier celebrated the attack on social media, framing it as a response to airstrikes in Iraq.

The propaganda statement did not clarify whether the attack had been carried out by an ISIS member, executed with ISIS assistance, or simply inspired by the group. In the past, ISIS has claimed responsibility

for attacks where the assailants had no direct connection to the extremist group, but either acted in its name, or where the ISIS attached their brand to the killing after the fact.

The statement came through the militant group's central media arm, rather than its official news agency. A daily rundown of military activities released by the group earlier on Tuesday did not mention the Manchester attack.

An image of the statement was shared on Twitter by Rita Katz, Director of SITE Intelligence Group, a company that tracks the online activity of white supremacist and

jihadi organizations. In another tweet, Katz said that ISIS released instructions on how to manufacture a bomb in November.

The United Kingdom has been a target for the militant group for some time. In March, the group claimed responsibility for an attack in London when a lone assailant struck a group of pedestrians with an SUV on Westminster Bridge.

*With reporting by Jared Malsin / Istanbul*



## Kayyem: We want our kids to be fearless. Then this happens

By Juliette Kayyem, CNN

National Security Analyst

Updated 7:38 AM ET, Tue May 23, 2017

Mom: I don't know if daughter is dead or alive 01:22

### Story highlights

- Juliette Kayyem: Every parent fears leaving a child at a show and never seeing her again
- She says what we can do is empower kids with a plan for such situations; make them fearless

CNN national security analyst Juliette Kayyem is the author of the best-selling "Security Mom: An Unclassified Guide to Protecting Our Homeland and Your Home." She is a professor at Harvard's Kennedy School, a former assistant secretary of the Department of Homeland Security in the Obama administration, host of the national security podcast "The SCIF" and founder of Kayyem Solutions, a security consulting firm. The

opinions expressed in this commentary are hers.

(CNN)No victim of terror is deserving. But the attack at the Ariana Grande concert in Manchester, England, on Monday night feels different. It reaches into the core fear of any parent -- that you could send your child off to an event and for reasons that are cruel and evil never see them again.

Dashcam captures moment of the explosion 00:53

By now, if you follow the news, you know the drill in these situations: a potential suspect and possible suicide bomber; a search for his colleagues and family; an emerging likelihood that he was known to authorities before. I am a national security analyst. This is the zone I work in.

But I also have three children. Grande plays often on our car radio. She is not a typical pop star: she is tough and feisty, she represents everything we want our daughters to become. Fearless.

No parent is thinking about raising fearless kids right now. Their kids will be tied to them by their metaphoric leashes for the

foreseeable future. That's the real power of this attack: not only are the victims so particularly undeserving, they are also among the most vulnerable in the immediate aftermath when terror like this strikes.

They are searching for their parents and in many cases their parents are not there. Some of the images that have been cropping up on social media and TV show waiting parents -- waiting just like I have for my kids at events -- standing outside the auditorium, banished to the other side. It is a source of humor -- "mom, you wait here" -- and we send our kids off to enjoy themselves. Because we want them to be fearless.

I have worked a lot of disasters in my lifetime as a homeland security official. And the pictures from Manchester show what is the case in all of these attacks: the undeniable, unbearable need for family unification.

Are my children OK? When families are unified, the sense of panic disappears. They are then willing to leave the site. Indeed, in reviews of the Boston Marathon bombing response, the quick action of police

officers to move remaining and uninjured runners to impromptu sites for family reconciliation did immeasurable good in limiting the panic and moving the city forward.

So, if we are to learn anything from this, it is not to never leave your kids out of your sight. We need them to be resilient and fearless. It is to take the necessary precautions beforehand and empower yourself and them should something happen. Where will you meet? Who will they be with? Is there a home or nearby area to reconvene? Teach them to see something and say something. Empower them as you would empower yourself.

I've heard it before: what a horrible world that such a thing like this could happen. I know. But we cannot wish, hopelessly, for some alternative world where our kids are free from harm. We will be wishing forever.

What we can do is work to manage our own safety and security, to bring it home with our kids in ways that they can understand. Empower them. Make them fearless in a world with too much fear.

## INTERNATIONAL



### Bolton : The New Foreign Policy, Same as the Old

John Bolton  
7-8 minutes

May 22, 2017 6:59 p.m. ET

The White House decided last week to continue President Obama's waiver of significant economic sanctions against Iran. The news, coming hard on the heels of Secretary of State Rex Tillerson's April 18 certification that Iran is

complying with the 2015 Vienna nuclear agreement, was both revealing and distressing. New missile-related sanctions, simultaneously imposed, were small consolation.

This continuity with Obama-era policies fits a larger pattern. Despite generally tougher rhetoric against Iran and North Korea—including the president's weekend speech in Saudi Arabia—the Trump administration's actions against the

proliferation of weapons of mass destruction increasingly resemble its predecessor's.

Rhetoric doesn't faze Iran so long as the nuclear deal's goodies keep coming, and the ayatollahs have had the effrontery to complain they aren't flowing fast enough. President Obama and Tehran crafted the Vienna accord in ways that front-loaded the benefits for Iran, intending to lock America and Europe into economic ties that

would be too costly to untangle. Every passing day validates that strategy.

Meanwhile, Iran's violations—regarding uranium enrichment, heavy-water production, ballistic-missile testing and concealed military dimensions such as warhead development—continue unimpeded. Unexpected, unnecessary and divorced from reality, Mr. Tillerson's certification of Iranian compliance blindsided the



White House, which responded by toughening up the final presentation but lacked the wherewithal to reverse the decision. Friday's election returning Hassan Rouhani to Iran's presidency changed nothing, since the nuclear and ballistic-missile programs are controlled by Supreme Leader Ali Khamenei and Iran's Revolutionary Guard Corps.

A similar policy continuity can be seen regarding North Korea. Unlike his predecessors, Mr. Obama did not obsess over negotiations with North Korea (preferring to obsess over negotiations with Iran). Instead, he propounded the doctrine of "strategic patience," a synonym for doing nothing, which proved equally as dangerous as making foolish concessions. Predictably, Pyongyang took advantage of American passivity. It concentrated on making steady, significant progress on both nuclear weapons (a sixth test is reportedly being readied) and long-range missiles.

Mr. Trump's current policy differs little from that of Bill Clinton, George W. Bush or Mr. Obama, relying mistakenly on China to pressure Pyongyang. As before, Beijing is feigning pressure, but as yet there is no evidence it will be any tougher than is necessary to quiet America down. South Korea has just thrown Kim Jong Un a lifeline by electing a president eager to return to the "sunshine" policy—appeasement by another name. And the full scope of

Pyongyang's cooperation with Tehran remains unknown.

Why do President Trump's proliferation policies increasingly echo his predecessor's? Although Mr. Obama's aides derided Washington's foreign-policy establishment as "the blob," they were part of it, and, progressively, so are Mr. Trump's. The failure to make decisive changes in policy during the administration's early days, coupled with delays in making presidential appointments in the national-security departments, is taking its toll. Washington's political distractions aren't helping.

Mr. Trump's "new" power elites are increasingly succumbing to (or were already adherents in good standing of) the conventional wisdom, as their respective agency bureaucracies define it. The "capture" problem (more pointedly known as "clientitis" or "going native") is hardly new. Jim Baker once wisely said about becoming secretary of state under President George H.W. Bush: "I intended to be the president's man at the State Department, not State's man at the White House."

The State Department is Washington's most sophisticated bureaucracy in capturing political appointees and acculturating them to accept existing policies, but the military and intelligence bureaus are no slackers. The policies they pursued on Jan. 19, the day before Mr. Trump's inauguration, are the

same they pursue on Jan. 21, and Jan. 22, and so on until their direction is changed. Pushing through that change is what presidential appointees are needed to do.

What is true in proliferation policy is also true more broadly. Example: Before Mr. Trump's current trip to the Middle East, senior administration officials repeated the mantra that Jerusalem's Western Wall was not "in Israel" because Jerusalem's final status remained to be negotiated. The White House responded that the wall is "clearly in Jerusalem"—a point no one has disputed for several thousand years.

Curiously, the State Department's incantation apparently never reached U.S. Ambassador to the United Nations Nikki Haley, who cheerily opined that the wall was in Israel. Likewise, Mr. Trump's campaign promise to move the U.S. Embassy from Tel Aviv to Jerusalem remains in limbo, just like his predecessors' pledges did.

Despite the furor over Mr. Trump's purported Moscow connection, his administration's policy regarding sanctions on Russia over its Ukraine adventure is essentially the same as Mr. Obama's. When Mr. Trump exhorted NATO allies to meet their commitments to increase defense expenditures to at least 2% of gross domestic product, critics acted as if the barbarians had breached the gates of civilized

national-security discourse. But Barack Obama previously characterized many of these same allies as "free riders."

There are exceptions to this policy continuity. Proposed increases in Washington's defense budget are a major example. But even there critics like Sen. John McCain have rightly argued that the increases need to be significantly larger.

But by default, and perhaps by accident, the Trump White House has left Mr. Obama's flawed and otherworldly strategic vision in place. It isn't enough for the administration to say that a strategy is being written. The strategy must come first, with the clerical task of writing it down coming last, reflecting what is actually being done day by day. That isn't happening.

The Trump administration has not yet passed the point of no return on these critical issues, but it is getting perilously close. Warning flags are multiplying. Ronald Reagan once said he wanted a Republican Party that stood for "bold colors, no pale pastels." Mr. Trump should get out his paintbrush.

*Mr. Bolton is a senior fellow at the American Enterprise Institute and author of "Surrender Is Not an Option: Defending America at the United Nations and Abroad" (Simon & Schuster, 2007).*

Appeared in the May. 23, 2017, print edition.

**The  
New York  
Times**

## Editorial : President Trump's Mideast Contradictions

The Editorial Board

4-5 minutes

President Trump arriving in Saudi Arabia on Saturday. Stephen Crowley/The New York Times

Given President Trump's appetite for spectacle, Saudi Arabia could not have been a more fitting opening for his first overseas trip. The palaces, the fancy robes of King Salman and his court, the sword dance, even the creepy glowing orb used to inaugurate Saudi Arabia's new counterterrorism center, seemed just the right props for a former television celebrity. His hosts went out of their way to indulge his weakness for flattery and deal-making. Mr. Trump tried hard to make amends to the Muslim world he had spent many months insulting.

This was necessary and long overdue. Mr. Trump's indictment of

an entire religion had disfigured his campaign and his presidency, undermined America's long commitment to freedom of religion and gave fresh ammunition to the extremists Mr. Trump cannot defeat without the support of Muslim leaders.

Much of the rest of his message was more problematic. He said nothing about the need to advance the cause of human rights in Muslim societies that discriminate against women and minorities. He sketched an unsettling path forward in which the United States and the Sunni Muslims would join in common cause against not only the extremists but against Iran, a position that could come back to haunt him.

The man who once complained that "Islam hates us" described it as "one of the world's great faiths." He said the fight against terrorism was not a "battle between different faiths," as some of his advisers had argued, but a struggle "between barbaric criminals who seek to

obliterate human life and decent people, all in the name of religion." He urged Muslim leaders to drive extremists "out of your places of worship," "out of your communities," "out of your holy land" and "out of this earth."

But he provided no guidance as to how the war against extremism could be won, and showed no appreciation for the fact that Wahhabism, the fundamentalist Sunni orthodoxy that gives legitimacy to Saudi Arabia's royal family, has inspired ISIS and most other regional terrorist groups. Nor did he suggest, as President Barack Obama often did, that Muslim countries are unlikely to wipe out extremism until they reform their economies and political systems so their people have ways to address their grievances, to participate in governing, to obtain an education and jobs.

Mr. Trump chose instead to single out Iran, the leading Shiite-majority state and Saudi Arabia's main enemy, as a threat because of its

support for militias in Lebanon and Yemen and for its backing of President Bashar al-Assad in Syria. Many of Iran's activities are indeed destabilizing; but Mr. Trump's friend Vladimir Putin has been no less responsible for keeping Mr. Assad in power.

In some ways Iran is an easy political target. Sunni Arabs feel threatened by Iran and are competing with Iran for regional influence. Israel detests Iran and so do many members of Congress. Yet to see Iran as implacably hostile is much too simple. Even as Mr. Trump reaffirmed America's partnership with the conservative Saudi royals, Iranians were re-electing a moderate, Hassan Rouhani, as president and reaffirming their interest in engagement with the West.

While Mr. Trump was explicitly not lecturing Sunni Arab leaders on human rights, Secretary of State Rex Tillerson responded to the Iranian election by advising Mr. Rouhani to restore the rights of

Iranians to freedom of speech and organization. The Saudi human rights record is no better than Iran's.



The Christian Science Monitor

3-4 minutes

May 22, 2017 —By example as much as by words, President Trump has used his maiden trip abroad to demonstrate a fresh direction for the Middle East, one that could be called ecumenical diplomacy. First he visited Islam's birthplace, Saudi Arabia. Then he was off to Israel, the center of Judaism. And finally on May 24, he visits the Vatican, governing entity for about half the world's Christians.

This tour de faiths is based on Mr. Trump's hope that leaders in the three religious hubs will find some unity based on a shared Abrahamic conception of a loving God.

How is his approach different from other presidents in the post-9/11 era?

Mr. Trump's determination to forge an anti-Iran alliance with the Sunni Arab states and isolate Iran could drift into military confrontation. The

nuclear agreement negotiated between Iran and the United States could unravel, causing a split with America's European allies. These

are consequences that Mr. Trump, in his enthusiasm for Saudi Arabia, seems to have thought little about.

## Editorial : Trump's fresh approach to the Middle East

President George W. Bush mainly pushed for political rights in the region, even by the use of force in Iraq. President Barack Obama emphasized human rights, even by use of force in Libya. While Trump did strike the Syrian military for its use of chemical weapons, the focus of his trip has been on the common principles of the main monotheistic faiths. He even said the Middle East, as the birthplace of the three religions, is waiting for "a new renaissance."

Yet to achieve that goal, the president had to label groups such as Al Qaeda and Islamic State as outside religion. The struggle against terrorists, he stated in a speech in the Saudi capital of Riyadh, "is not a battle between faiths, different sects, or different civilizations." It is simply a "battle between good and evil."

He asked the region's religious leaders to make clear to those who purposely kill innocent people that

their "life will be empty." The path of terror brings "no dignity."

In other words, the common theology of Islam, Judaism, and Christianity must bring light and cannot tolerate terrorism's dark ideology. In an action along those lines, he convinced the six Arab nations in the Gulf Cooperation Council to agree to new ways to cut off sources of money for radical groups.

Trump also fingered those leaders in Iran who support the killing of civilians by such foreign groups as Hezbollah in Lebanon and the Bashar al-Assad regime in Syria. One early test of Trump's approach will be in how he deals with a few leaders in Iran who oppose the government's support of foreign radicals. The last two elections for president in Iran, while rigged in the selection of candidates, did reflect strong public opinion against extremism and for a focus on the economy and individual rights.

In fact, in reelecting President Hassan Rouhani on May 19 by a wide margin, Iranians suggest they seek a voice in choosing the replacement for Supreme Leader Ali Khamenei and a curb on the military forces of the Iranian Revolutionary Guard Corps (IRGC).

In his victory remarks, Mr. Rouhani said the election showed that Iran seeks "a path which is distant from extremism and violence." And during the campaign he called for "freedom of thought" and criticized the IRGC's test-firing of a missile inscribed with a call for Israel's destruction. A Shiite cleric, he offered talks with his Sunni counterparts in Arab states.

With Trump's alternative approach, moderate religious leaders in the Middle East could now seek some agreement on divisive issues, especially terrorism. The enemy lies not in other religions but rather each faith's inability to see the common good in each other.



## Podesta : Trump is taking historic steps — backward

By John Podesta

6-8 minutes

By John Podesta May 22 at 7:49 PM

*John Podesta, the chair of Hillary Clinton's 2016 presidential campaign, served as counselor to President Barack Obama and chief of staff to President Bill Clinton.*

As President Trump makes his first foreign trip as commander in chief, his erratic behavior and mounting political-legal woes aren't the only cause of the United States' declining prestige in the eyes of foreign governments. On issue after issue involving international aid, development and governance, Trump's missteps — executed or planned — are contributing significantly to allies' skepticism and worries about U.S. policy.

When he sits down with his Group of Seven partners in Sicily on Friday, Trump will have to defend the fact that his administration is pursuing an unrelenting war on the poorest of the poor in the developing world, particularly women. Last week, the administration made good on one of Trump's first acts in office — to widely expand what is known as the "global gag rule" — placing

draconian restrictions not only on the operations of family planning organizations, but even on health workers dealing with issues unrelated to abortion and reproductive rights, such as malaria and HIV/AIDS. The end result will inevitably be tens of thousands of easily preventable deaths, if not more, and, ironically, hundreds of thousands more abortions around the globe, as poor women in the developing world are denied access to contraception and other essential health services.

Trump has also proposed slashing international development funding by nearly a third, a cut so deep that it would likely force the U.S. Agency for International Development to shutter its presence in 30 or more countries. Not surprisingly, more than 120 retired three- and four-star generals and admirals wrote to Congress soon after these cuts were proposed, warning that U.S. development agencies "are critical to preventing conflict and reducing the need to put our men and women in uniform in harm's way." The recently concluded budget negotiation for the remainder of this fiscal year rejected Trump's retreat from global leadership, but the cuts remain on the table in the president's first full-year budget.

[Read These Comments](#)

The best conversations on The Washington Post

Equally concerning has been the Trump administration's approach to governance and the corrosive impact it will have on the many groups and individuals fighting for representative and accountable institutions in the developing world. Trump has showered praise on Philippine President Rodrigo Duterte even as Duterte has bragged about personally conducting extrajudicial killings. Trump appears unconcerned about the steady slide toward authoritarianism in Turkey, and his attraction to Russian President Vladimir Putin is now the source of nearly daily White House crises. (Putin will surely applaud Trump's desire to cut aid to Ukraine by two-thirds.)

With little public fanfare, Trump and his allies have dismantled key regulatory frameworks and multilateral initiatives that have been an important bulwark for increased international transparency and the protection of human rights, such as the Extractives Industry Transparency Initiative, the conflict minerals disclosure requirement in the Dodd-Frank law, and the Open Government Partnership (OGP). To date, the White House has not

acknowledged the OGP's existence or signaled whether it will continue to participate in the initiative. Given the administration's general hostility to transparency and ethics, it seems unlikely that it will commit itself to additional open-government reforms through the submission of a new OGP national action plan, which is due in June. Trump has also called the Foreign Corrupt Practices Act a "horrible law" and has appointed a public critic of the FCPA to chair the Securities and Exchange Commission, which enforces the law. In each of these instances, Trump seems to be making the case that sunlight is to be feared — and indeed, for fans of authoritarianism, cronyism and corruption, it is.

The business dealings of the Trump family and the raft of conflicts of interest that accompany them continue to send a clear signal to every would-be despot in the developing world that profiting from government service is an acceptable norm. Who would take seriously a lecture from Washington on the impact of corruption these days? What are the ultimate costs to this nation and to the world of a U.S. president so quick to squander our moral leadership and power of example?

In August 2015, all 193 member states of the United Nations agreed to an ambitious new agenda, the Sustainable Development Goals. The core of the agenda: to eradicate extreme poverty within 15 years, end hunger and make major strides against global killers such as malaria and HIV/AIDS.

But what was revolutionary about the goals was the willingness of nations such as China and Russia to concede that such sweeping social and economic ambitions would not become a reality unless the international

community supported peaceful and inclusive societies, promoted the rule of law, combated corruption, ensured public access to government information and enforced the law in a nondiscriminatory fashion. Getting every nation to recognize that lasting prosperity comes from strong and accountable institutions was a historic step forward.

President Trump reinstated a rule Jan. 23 that advocates call "the Mexico City Policy." Opponents call it "the Global Gag Rule." Here's what you need to know about it.

President Trump reinstated a rule Jan. 23 that advocates call "the Mexico City Policy." Opponents call it "the Global Gag Rule." (Sarah Parnass/The Washington Post)

(Sarah Parnass/The Washington Post)

Unfortunately, the Trump administration's approach to development, and to governing in general, appears to be an equally historic step — backward.

If there is a silver lining to all this, it is that the Sustainable Development Goals are owned not by any single

nation or group of actors. They represent a global call to action to combat despair, poverty and disease. Everyone, from governments to civil society to the business community, has a part to play in advancing these goals — even if Trump's abdication of U.S. leadership makes everyone else's job that much harder.

## THE WALL STREET JOURNAL

### Mead: A Debate on America's Role—25 Years Late

Walter Russell Mead

5-6 minutes

May 22, 2017 6:43 p.m. ET

Watching Donald Trump on the world stage must be surreal for the academics, politicians, diplomats and soldiers of the foreign-policy establishment. They haven't been this alarmed since the Senate failed to ratify the Treaty of Versailles. Yet Mr. Trump is merely a symptom of America's greatest problem in international affairs, and the crisis in foreign policy will not disappear when he leaves office.

The roots of the problem go back to the late 1940s, when the U.S. set out to build a global order in the aftermath of World War II. America helped create a long period of integration and growth by rebuilding Europe, promoting development in the decolonizing Third World, encouraging free trade, and providing safe passage for global commerce across the seas.

When the Soviet Union collapsed in 1991, the bipartisan foreign-policy establishment was united in seeing a historic opportunity to deepen the liberal order and extend it into the rest of the world. Yet the public had always been skeptical about this project.

Jacksonians in particular believed that American global policy was a response to the Soviet threat, and that once the threat had disappeared, the U.S. should retrench.

After World War I, and again at the start of the Cold War, Americans had held great debates over whether and how to engage with the world. But that debate didn't happen after the Soviet collapse. Elites felt confident that the end of history had arrived, that expanding the world order would be so easy and cheap it could be done without much public support. Washington thus embarked on a series of consequential foreign-policy endeavors: enlarging the North Atlantic Treaty Organization to include much of Central and Eastern Europe, establishing the World Trade Organization in the mid-'90s, promoting a global democracy agenda whenever possible.

American voters have never shared the establishment's enthusiasm for a foreign policy aimed at transforming the post-Cold War world. When given the choice at the ballot box, they consistently dismiss experienced foreign-policy hands who call for deep global engagement. Instead they install untried outsiders who want increased focus on issues at home. Thus Clinton over Bush in 1992, Bush over Gore in 2000, Obama

over McCain in 2008, and Trump over Clinton in 2016.

Today the core problem in American foreign policy remains the disconnect between the establishment's ambitious global agenda and the limited engagement that voters appear to support. As Washington's challenges abroad become more urgent and more dangerous, the divide between elite and public opinion grows more serious by the day.

The establishment is now beginning to discover what many voters intuitively believed back in the 1990s. Building a liberal world order is much more expensive and difficult than it appeared in a quarter-century ago, when America was king. Further, Washington's foreign-policy establishment is neither as wise nor as competent as it believes itself to be.

Meantime, the world is only becoming more dangerous. North Korea threatens to take America hostage. The Middle East burns. Venezuela descends into chaos. Jihadist groups develop new capacities. A failing Russia lashes out. The European Union risks breaking apart. China presses toward regional hegemony. Trade liberalization grinds to a halt. Turkey turns away from democracy. And the U.S. still lacks a strong

consensus on what its foreign policy should be.

Washington's foreign policy needs more than grudging acquiescence from the American people if it is to succeed. How to build broad support? First, the Trump administration should embrace a new national strategy that is more realistic than the end-of-history fantasies that came at the Cold War's conclusion. The case for international engagement should be grounded in the actual priorities of American citizens. Second, Mr. Trump and other political leaders must make the case for strategic global engagement to a rightfully skeptical public.

For much of the establishment, focusing on the Trump administration's shortcomings is a way to avoid a painful inquest into the failures and follies of 25 years of post-Cold War foreign policy. But Mr. Trump's presidency is the result of establishment failure rather than the cause of it. Until the national leadership absorbs this lesson, the internal American crisis will deepen as the world crisis grows more acute.

*Mr. Mead is a fellow at the Hudson Institute, a professor of foreign affairs at Bard College, and editor at large of the American Interest.*

Appeared in the May. 23, 2017, print edition.

## The New York Times

Ian Fisher

11-13 minutes

President Trump at a welcoming ceremony in Tel Aviv on Monday. Amir Cohen/Reuters

JERUSALEM — President Trump began a two-day visit to Israel on Monday with a blunt assessment for Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu: If Israel really wants

### Trump Comes to Israel Citing a Palestinian Deal as Crucial (UNE)

Peter Baker and

peace with its Arab neighbors, the cost will be resolving the generations-old standoff with the Palestinians.

For years, Mr. Netanyahu has sought to recalibrate relations with Sunni Arab nations in a mutual bid to counter Shiite-led Iran, while subordinating the Palestinian dispute as a secondary issue. But as Mr. Trump arrived in Jerusalem after meetings in Saudi Arabia, the president indicated that he and those Arab states see an

agreement with the Palestinians as integral to that new regional alignment.

"On those issues, there is a strong consensus among the nations of the world — including many in the Muslim world," Mr. Trump said. "I was deeply encouraged by my conversations with Muslim world leaders in Saudi Arabia, including King Salman, who I spoke to at great length. King Salman feels very strongly and, I can tell you, would

love to see peace with Israel and the Palestinians."

Mr. Trump added that line to the remarks prepared for him, in effect tying the future of the anti-Iran coalition to the Palestinian issue despite Mr. Netanyahu's longtime efforts to unlink the two. "There is a growing realization among your Arab neighbors that they have common cause with you in the threat posed by Iran, and it is indeed a threat, there's no question about that," Mr. Trump said.



## Trump Shifts Stances on Key Israeli Issues

The president has backtracked on several issues that are key to Israel, including the location of the U.S. Embassy and settlement-building.

By CAMILLA SCHICK and IAN FISHER on May 22, 2017. Photo by Stephen Crowley/The New York Times. Watch in Times Video »

The president's arrival here opened a new chapter in Middle East peacemaking, one that will test whether a career of business-deal-making can translate to success in the world of international diplomacy.

Mr. Trump sought to showcase his friendship with Mr. Netanyahu as the two shared dinner with their wives and called each other "Donald" and "Bibi," the prime minister's nickname.

But neither publicly cited any concrete steps in pursuing a peace agreement. Mr. Trump did not formally recognize Jerusalem as the capital of Israel, as some Israeli officials hoped he would do since he has shelved his promise to move the American Embassy here from Tel Aviv. Nor for that matter did he publicly press Israel to curb settlement construction in the West Bank as Palestinians hoped.

Mr. Netanyahu offered nothing more than a few modest gestures like extending the hours at the border crossing between the West Bank and Jordan, recycled from previous moments in the long-running dispute with the Palestinians. During his most extended comments, toward the end of the day, Mr. Netanyahu skipped right over the Palestinian question to focus on Iran.

He, too, saw the possibility of an accommodation with Arab neighbors but did not tie it to the Palestinian dispute. "For the first time in my lifetime, I see a real hope for change," he told Mr. Trump. "The Arab leaders who you met yesterday could help change the atmosphere, and they could help create the conditions for a realistic peace."

Even as they talked, the pressures that underscore the complexities of any negotiation were evident. More than 1,000 Palestinians in the occupied West Bank marched to the Qalandiya checkpoint from Ramallah, carrying posters of

Palestinian inmates on hunger strike in Israeli prisons, and setting off clashes with Israeli soldiers, who fired tear-gas containers, rubber bullets and live ammunition.

In a separate episode, Israeli authorities reported that a Palestinian teenager who tried to stab police officers near a Palestinian town on the outskirts of Jerusalem was shot to death.

On the other side of the equation, Mr. Netanyahu came under continuing pressure from the right wing of his governing coalition not to make concessions. Naftali Bennett, a pro-settler cabinet minister, used the opportunity of meeting Mr. Trump in an airport receiving line to press him to recognize Jerusalem as Israel's capital.

President Trump, center, with Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu, right, and President Reuven Rivlin of Israel. Jim Hollander/European Pressphoto Agency

"He can be the one who goes into history," Mr. Bennett told an Israeli radio station. Mr. Trump's reported reply was noncommittal. "Trump said, 'That's an idea,'" Mr. Bennett recalled.

To some on the political left, the president's message linking an anti-Iran coalition to peace with the Palestinians seemed a chance that Mr. Netanyahu should seize.

"The regional opportunity is ready and ripe," Isaac Herzog, head of the opposition Labor Party, said in an interview after meeting Mr. Trump in the same receiving line. "I was very pleased as one who leads the Israeli opposition and the peace camp in Israel. We were very pleased that the president showed he is trying to break the impasse."

Mr. Trump arrived on what was believed to be the first open, direct flight to Israel from Saudi Arabia, which do not have diplomatic relations, a sign of the possibility he sees for what he has called "the ultimate deal."

Mr. Trump at a bilateral meeting with Mr. Rivlin in Jerusalem. Stephen Crowley/The New York Times

After meeting with Reuven Rivlin, who holds the largely ceremonial position of president of Israel, Mr. Trump toured the Church of the

Holy Sepulcher, home of what is believed to be the tomb of Jesus Christ. He then became the first sitting president to visit the Western Wall, the holiest site for Jewish prayer, where he donned the traditional skullcap and left a note in a crevice.

On Tuesday, Mr. Trump is to travel the short distance to Bethlehem, in the West Bank, to meet with President Mahmoud Abbas of the Palestinian Authority. Mr. Trump is then scheduled to return to Jerusalem to lay a wreath at Yad Vashem, the Holocaust remembrance center, and to deliver a speech at the Israel Museum.

At the airport arrival ceremony, Mr. Netanyahu repeated his longstanding position that he "shares the commitment to peace" but with the same conditions as always. "Israel's hand is extended in peace to all our neighbors, including the Palestinians," he said. "The peace we seek is a genuine and durable one, in which the Israeli state is recognized, security remains in Israel's hands and the conflict ends once and for all."

No previous American president has come to Israel this early in his tenure. Bill Clinton visited in his second year in office and Jimmy Carter in his third, while Richard M. Nixon, George W. Bush and Barack Obama all waited until their second terms to make the trip.

Mr. Trump and his wife, Melania, visiting the Church of the Holy Sepulcher in Jerusalem on Monday. Stephen Crowley/The New York Times

But a visit that was once anticipated as a powerful expression of solidarity between two like-minded leaders, Mr. Trump and Mr. Netanyahu, has become more complicated amid a series of logistical and political stress points.

Among other things, Mr. Trump last week disclosed to Russia's foreign minister and ambassador some classified information that came from Israel about an Islamic State plot, potentially jeopardizing the Israeli intelligence source and deeply angering some Israeli security officials.

Determined not to spoil the visit, Mr. Netanyahu had resolved not to mention the intelligence breach publicly. When a reporter asked the

two leaders about it on Monday, the prime minister brushed it off. "Intelligence cooperation is terrific," he said. "It's never been better."

Mr. Trump, who said last week that he had every right to disclose the information, denied identifying Israel as the source. "I never mentioned the word or the name Israel," he said. "Never mentioned during that conversation. They're all saying I did, so you have another story wrong. Never mentioned the word Israel."

Mr. Trump at the Western Wall. Stephen Crowley/The New York Times

The stories did not report that he had mentioned Israel by name. Instead, they quoted current and former intelligence officials as saying that he had mentioned enough details about the intelligence to potentially expose the source.

The \$110 billion in arms sales that Mr. Trump announced in Saudi Arabia was also a source of concern in Israel. Secretary of State Rex W. Tillerson sought to reassure the Israelis. "There has been nothing entered into with the arms sales agreements with the kingdom of Saudi Arabia or any of the other countries that do not fully allow us to fulfill our commitments to Israel and the longstanding security arrangements we have with Israel," he told reporters on Air Force One.

Still, much as he was in Saudi Arabia, Mr. Trump was greeted by many in Israel as a welcome change from Mr. Obama, whose relationship with Mr. Netanyahu soured early on after Mr. Obama called for a settlement freeze, and only worsened when he struck an agreement with Iran intended to curb its nuclear program.

Mr. Trump repeated his criticism of the nuclear deal on Monday with Mr. Netanyahu standing by his side. He also credited Mr. Netanyahu with being serious about peace with the Palestinians, an assessment the prime minister's critics do not share, and expressed optimism about reaching an agreement.

"I've heard it's one of the toughest deals of all," he said, "but I have a feeling we're going to get there eventually. I hope."

The  
Washington  
Post

## In Israel, Trump urges new Middle East harmony but faces old suspicions (UNE)

<https://www.facebook.com/william.booth.5074?fref=ts>

11-14 minutes

JERUSALEM — President Trump and Israeli Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu sketched the broad

outlines of a new architecture for the Middle East here late Monday, declaring common cause among

the United States, Israel and Arab nations such as Saudi Arabia to roll back Iranian aggression and defeat Islamist terrorism.

Their joint cooperation could “create conditions for realistic peace” in the region, a beaming Netanyahu said as he praised Trump for what he called a changed U.S. policy toward Iran. In their talks earlier in the day, he said, Trump had “noted so succinctly that common dangers are turning former enemies into partners.”

Trump, who arrived here Monday after two days in the Saudi capital, where he spoke of his ambitions to dozens of Muslim leaders, predicted “many, many things that can happen now that would never been able to happen before.”

Sweeping in its promise, Trump’s approach is the latest iteration of his classic dealmaking style: set an audacious target but instead of charting a step-by-step road map, rely on what he sees as his negotiating skill and power of personal persuasion to eventually achieve it.

In this case, it is likely to take years to see whether those personal relationships are enough to untangle decades of suspicion and competing objectives in the region.

Here is President Trump’s May 22 joint news conference in Jerusalem with Israeli Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu, in less than two minutes. Here is President Trump’s May 22 joint news conference in Jerusalem with Israeli Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu, in less than two minutes. (The Washington Post)

(The Washington Post)

For now, Trump’s approach is short of details. On the eve of his visit to the nearby West Bank city of Bethlehem on Tuesday to meet with Palestinian Authority President Mahmoud Abbas, he referred only vaguely to “a renewed effort at peace” between the Palestinians and Israel.

“I’ve heard it’s one of the toughest deals in the world,” Trump said of the peace process. “But I’m sure we’re going to get there eventually.” Trump and Netanyahu, speaking for the television cameras but taking no questions, then posed for photographs with their wives before the foursome retired for a private dinner.

In a symbolic move earlier in the day, Trump visited the Western Wall in East Jerusalem, Judaism’s holiest prayer site, spending a moment of silence before following tradition and slipping a private note between the stones.

*[Trump summons Muslim nations to confront ‘Islamic terror of all kinds’]*

Netanyahu made no mention of the Palestinians in his remarks Monday evening with Trump. He began by welcoming the president to “the eternal capital of the Jewish people, the united capital of the Jewish state.” Both descriptions are rejected by the Arab world, including the Saudis, who back Palestinian demands for a Palestinian capital in this city and a two-state solution that would remove Israeli settlers from most of the West Bank territory they occupy.

While a Palestinian peace deal is an obvious precursor for closer Arab-Israeli cooperation, Trump has not stated firm positions on the bedrock Arab demands of a Palestinian state and a Palestinian capital in Jerusalem, although he has gently urged Israel to slow down settlement construction in the West Bank.

Working in Trump’s favor are the strained relations Netanyahu and Arab leaders had with President Barack Obama at the end of his administration. Obama discomfited many in the region by signing a nuclear agreement with Iran, while holding the Israelis to account for failing to recognize Palestinian rights and the Arabs for civil and human rights abuses in their own countries.

In the second of their three public appearances during the day, Trump and Netanyahu joined to condemn Islamist terrorism and Iran. “We not only gave them a lifeline — we gave them wealth and prosperity,” Trump said of Obama’s Iran nuclear agreement. “And we also gave them the ability to continue with terror.”

Netanyahu welcomed Trump to Ben Gurion International Airport at midday Monday, fresh from quarrels within his coalition government over how much Israel is prepared to compromise for peace and wary of the bilateral deals the U.S. president struck over the weekend with Saudi Arabia and other Arab leaders in Riyadh.

A \$110 billion U.S. arms deal with the Saudis and Trump’s eagerness to lock the Arabs and Israelis in a reciprocal counterterrorism embrace set off alarms, although the administration has insisted it will continue to honor the U.S. commitment to Israeli military superiority in the region.

Trump’s lack of action on his promise to move the U.S. Embassy from Tel Aviv to Jerusalem is also a source of anxiety.

But Netanyahu has clearly decided to buy into whatever deal Trump is trying to arrange, at least for now.

He was effusive in his praise of the president at every opportunity, emphasizing the newfound camaraderie of their wives, Melania and Sara. Welcoming the Trumps, Netanyahu’s wife talked about “the people” who love their husbands — “unlike the media,” she said — in a shared moment on the arrival tarmac caught by an open mic. The two leaders called each other Donald and Bibi, Netanyahu’s nickname.

*[Trump at the airport: An awkward selfie and bonding over media gripes]*

Netanyahu has warned hard-line ministers in his coalition government that Trump is a president who needs to be handled carefully. He has repeatedly cautioned them not to push Trump into a corner with bold ultimatums, saying that the new American leader is a natural friend but that the relationship with the White House should be deftly managed.

He wants Trump to apply as much pressure as possible on Iran. He also wants as much leverage as possible to keep his right wing at his side and so does not want Trump to publicly press him — not too much, at least — about the expansion of Jewish settlements.

Netanyahu is always ready to say he wants to negotiate peace with the Palestinians, but without saying what that peace would look like.

The only apparent black cloud of the day came via a shouted question about Trump’s relationship with Russia. Trump was asked about classified information on the Islamic State in Syria, obtained from Israel, that Trump shared with Russian Foreign Minister Sergei Lavrov during his visit to the Oval Office earlier this month.

“I never mentioned the word or the name Israel,” he said. “Never mentioned during that conversation” with Lavrov.

Reports about the meeting have said not that Trump named Israel as the source but that his revelation about the nature of the secrets and the city where the information was obtained, both relayed to Lavrov, would have allowed Russian intelligence to determine the source.

Netanyahu said Israel was unconcerned about the incident, calling U.S.-Israeli intelligence cooperation “terrific.”

On Tuesday afternoon, after his Bethlehem visit and a speech at the Israel Museum in Jerusalem, Trump will fly to the Vatican to meet early Wednesday with Pope Francis, completing his tour of three religious capitals that he has said he wants

to bring together in a new atmosphere of tolerance.

*[Here’s where Trump will stay during his Jerusalem visit]*

In addition to visiting the Western Wall, Trump honored the Christian community with a visit to the ancient Church of the Holy Sepulchre, built to commemorate the location where Jesus is thought to have been crucified and buried. He and his family and aides strolled the Old City, led by Orthodox church leaders in thick robes carrying large staffs that they beat rhythmically on the cobblestones. Market stalls were closed and the streets largely emptied by heavy security.

Later, at the plaza bordering the Western Wall, Trump and his son-in-law, Jared Kushner, who is Jewish, donned yarmulkes and listened to explanations of the wall’s history and its importance in Judaism, according to the White House.

The Trump group was then divided by gender, with the first lady, the president’s daughter Ivanka Trump and female aides walking to the women’s side of the wall, in accordance with religious protocols dictated by Jewish Orthodox rabbis. Trump’s wife and daughter approached their side of the wall and stood silently.

On the men’s side, Trump stood alone, swaying gently for several seconds before slipping a note among the stones.

Trump was the first sitting president to visit the Western Wall, although Obama did so during his 2008 presidential campaign. In 2012, Republican Mitt Romney also prayed at the wall during his campaign.

*[When the Western Wall, Trump and Aerosmith share a headline]*

The Old City of Jerusalem is considered “occupied territory” by most of the world, although Israel disputes this. Israeli forces captured it, along with the rest of East Jerusalem and the West Bank, during the 1967 Six Day War against three Arab armies.

Air Force One’s trip here is thought to be the first direct flight from Saudi Arabia to Israel, a reflection of the long Arab-Israeli estrangement that Trump hopes to fix. “I hope that one day an Israeli prime minister will be able to fly from Tel Aviv to Riyadh,” Netanyahu told Trump.

Although other presidents have landed here from Arab capitals that have no diplomatic relations with Israel, none has come from Saudi Arabia before. But at least one high-level U.S. political flight has gone

from Israel to Saudi Arabia. In 1998, Vice President Al Gore flew from Israel to a Saudi air base near Jiddah.

Early this month, Trump told Abbas during an Oval Office visit that he wanted to be a "mediator" for peace between the Palestinians and Israel. While agreement has eluded administrations for decades, Trump declared it a task that would be "not as difficult as people have thought over the years." The administration has not committed itself to supporting the two-state solution

that has been bedrock U.S. policy for decades.

"We need two willing parties," he told Abbas. "We believe Israel is willing. We believe you're willing. And if you are willing, we are going to make a deal."

Since then, the administration has been preoccupied with problems at home and has made little obvious progress toward that goal, leaving Netanyahu and his governing coalition, especially the hard-right pro-settlement ministers, unsure of Trump's intentions.

## THE WALL STREET JOURNAL

6-8 minutes

Updated May 22, 2017 7:33 p.m. ET

JERUSALEM—President Donald Trump and Israeli Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu said Monday that Iranian aggression has united Israelis and Arabs and brought Middle East peace closer than ever, but Mr. Trump's warm reception in the region masks risks that have derailed his predecessors' bids for decades.

"I've heard it's one of the toughest deals of all, but I have a feeling that we're going to get there eventually," Mr. Trump said Monday as he met with Mr. Netanyahu. "I hope."

Mr. Netanyahu cited Iran as a unifying force in the region, saying "common dangers are turning former enemies into partners" and adding that Mr. Trump's meeting with Arab leaders a day earlier in Saudi Arabia "could help create the conditions for a realistic peace."

"For the first time in my lifetime, I see a real hope for change," Mr. Netanyahu said.

Israelis and Palestinians remain fundamentally divided on what a peace deal might entail, and both Mr. Netanyahu and Palestinian leader Mahmoud Abbas must contend with pressure from their constituents that could block potential compromises. Mr. Trump plans to travel to the West Bank on Tuesday to meet Mr. Abbas.

Mr. Trump's trip so far has been peppered with symbolism. He was the first president to fly from Riyadh to Tel Aviv, between two countries that have no diplomatic relations. The Saudi government gave him a red-carpet reception, and the U.S. and Saudi Arabia signed \$109 billion in new arms deals.

## Trump, Netanyahu Cast Iran as Common Enemy (UNE)

Carol E. Lee and Rory Jones

And Mr. Trump spent hours Monday with Mr. Netanyahu, who had a frosty relationship with Mr. Trump's predecessor, former President Barack Obama.

Mr. Trump also became the first sitting U.S. president to visit the Western Wall in Jerusalem—and threaded a diplomatic needle in the process. The shrine is holy to Jews, and Mr. Netanyahu expressed appreciation to Mr. Trump for the visit.

But by appearing without Israeli officials at his side, Mr. Trump avoided frustrating Palestinians and Arabs who would have seen that as an implicit endorsement of Israel's claim to the site, which lies in territory Israel captured from Jordan in the 1967 Six Day War and that Palestinians want as part of a hoped-for future capital.

As Mr. Trump flew to Tel Aviv, Secretary of State Rex Tillerson tempered expectations, telling reporters traveling with the president that a three-way meeting between the U.S., Israeli and Palestinian leaders is "for a future discussion."

"I think there will certainly be opportunities for that in the future," Mr. Tillerson said.

Mr. Netanyahu faces limits on his ability to negotiate the establishment of a Palestinian state, in that he has political coalition partners unwilling to consider such an outcome.

Palestinians, on the other hand, are unwilling to accept anything less than a Palestinian state. Nor are other nations in the Arab world, despite positive overtures to Israel amid shared concerns about Iran.

"Iran isn't enough to bring people together over the table," David Makovsky, a fellow at the Washington Institute and veteran peace negotiator. "The more people talk about the Gulf standing shoulder to shoulder with Israel,

Checkpoint newsletter

Military, defense and security at home and abroad.

Trump's decision to travel first to Saudi Arabia, and the euphoria he and his aides expressed after that stop, appeared to signal an unexpected U.S. equality of attention and treatment between Israel and the Arab world.

"I don't think there's been a time in for quite some time where all of the nations — the Arab nations, Israel, the United States — we're all facing

people will ask whether there can be more overt ties."

Mr. Makovsky said the best the U.S. president could currently hope for would be to get Messrs. Abbas and Netanyahu to agree to direct talks without either side demanding something first.

Israel offered a gesture to Palestinians on Monday, announcing a set of measures aimed at improving the Palestinian economy. Palestinians said it would be important to see how the Israelis follow through on the move.

Israelis for their part hope to hear positive comments from Mr. Abbas during his meeting with Mr. Trump. Mr. Netanyahu has been pushing for the Palestinians, as a gesture toward peace, to stop making payments to families of Palestinians killed or caught while attacking Israelis.

Mr. Trump is focusing on pressing Israeli and Palestinian leaders to negotiate in good faith. White House officials say leaders from both sides have agreed in principle to direct talks, though it is unclear whether or when those would begin.

The U.S. president began speaking hopefully about peace from the moment he arrived in Tel Aviv. Later, in a meeting with Mr. Netanyahu, Mr. Trump described Saudi leaders as "very positive" in their feelings about Israel, with relations between the two countries shaped by a mutual desire to counter Iranian aggression.

"It's forcing people together in a very positive way," Mr. Trump said. "I could see a much deeper path to friendship with Israel and...a lot of it's spurred on by what's happening in Iran."

Mr. Netanyahu expressed hope that one day he could fly between Tel Aviv and Riyadh, as Mr. Trump did.

Saudi Arabia doesn't recognize Israel's right to exist, even though it

this common threat. ... The rise of terrorist organizations, the export of extreme views, extremism, is a threat to all of us," Secretary of State Rex Tillerson told reporters traveling here with Trump aboard Air Force One.

"That is unifying. ... I think that creates a different dynamic," Tillerson said.

Ruth Eglash in Jerusalem and Brian Murphy in Washington contributed to this report.

has privately worked with the country in recent years.

The meeting between the U.S. and Israeli leaders centered on the budding rapprochement between Israel and the Arab world, playing down risks posed by disagreements between Israel and the U.S.

But the new U.S.-Saudi arms deal raised concerns in Israel. The U.S. has long committed to a policy of maintaining Israel's superior defense capabilities—or "qualitative military edge"—compared with its neighbors in the Middle East. The Obama administration agreed to \$3.8 billion in annual military aid last year, increasing the size of the package for a 10-year period.

Israel's energy minister Yuval Steinitz on Sunday questioned the size and scope of the U.S.-Saudi deal.

"Hundreds of millions of dollars in arms deals is something we need to get an explanation for," he told Israeli media in comments confirmed by his spokeswoman. "We need to ensure Israel's qualitative military edge is maintained."

Mr. Tillerson said that the deal wouldn't affect the longstanding U.S. commitment to Israel's security. Mr. Tillerson said the president and other U.S. officials could address any concerns the Israeli government has about the deals.

**Corrections & Amplifications**  
A headline in an earlier version of this article incorrectly spelled Israel. (May 22, 2017)

**Write to** Carol E. Lee at [carol.lee@wsj.com](mailto:carol.lee@wsj.com) and Rory Jones at [rory.jones@wsj.com](mailto:rory.jones@wsj.com)

Appeared in the May. 23, 2017, print edition as 'Trump, Netanyahu Unite on Iran.'



## President Donald Trump's Visit to Western Wall Highlights Differences With Israel

Rory Jones and Carol E. Lee

6-8 minutes

Updated May 22, 2017 4:29 p.m. ET

JERUSALEM—President Donald Trump on Monday became the first serving U.S. leader to visit the Western Wall, a shrine holy to Jews that has emerged as a source of discord between the U.S. and Israel.

The disagreement between the two allies over sovereign claims to the wall touches on a profoundly sensitive subject—not only for Israel but for other Middle East nations, including Jordan, Egypt and Gulf states. It comes as Mr. Trump is trying to broker a peace deal between the Israelis and Palestinians as well as a broader warming of relations between Israel and its Arab neighbors.

The wall lies in territory that Israel captured from Jordan in the 1967 Six-Day War, land that Israel considers its own and that Palestinians want as part of a hoped-for future capital city. The White House has refused to acknowledge that the wall is in Israeli territory, instead saying it is located in Jerusalem.

Israeli media last week reported that Israeli Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu requested to join Mr. Trump at the Western Wall, but was told by U.S. officials organizing the trip that the wall wasn't in Israeli territory.

Mr. Netanyahu's office then issued a statement saying it was shocked by the reported U.S. comments. The State Department responded by questioning the accuracy of Israeli media reports that outlined a bitter argument between Israeli and U.S. officials.

"All indications are U.S. officials' actions were in accordance with longstanding U.S. policy on coordination for such official visits to Jerusalem," the State Department said in a statement.

Secretary of State Rex Tillerson on Monday again refused to say the wall is inside Israel. "The wall is part of Jerusalem," he said on a plane to Tel Aviv from Riyadh.

Mr. Trump was accompanied to the wall by a Jewish rabbi. Wearing a kippah head covering, he placed his right hand on the wall and rocked back and forth, seemingly in prayer. The U.S. president then left a personal note in the crevices of the wall, a common gesture by guests at the holy shrine.

He was joined by first lady Melania Trump, his daughter and son-in-law, as well as other senior White House aides. After Mr. Trump stepped back from the wall, his son-in-law and senior White House adviser Jared Kushner, economic adviser Gary Cohn and national security adviser H.R. McMaster, as well as Mr. Tillerson, approached the wall in a group and said their own prayers.

When he was a candidate for the presidency, Barack Obama also made a trip to the site and left a note, but Mr. Trump is the only serving president to do so.

As part of his first foreign trip, Mr. Trump is highlighting the three largest monotheistic religions. He flew from Saudi Arabia, the custodian of holy mosques in Mecca and Medina, and will visit Vatican City later this week.

In a meeting later, Mr. Netanyahu expressed appreciation to the U.S. President for visiting the Western Wall, a stop most U.S. leaders avoided in office so as not to disrupt peace negotiations. The Israeli leader also steered clear of the

controversy that surrounds visits to the Western Wall.

"You're the first acting American president to do that," Mr. Netanyahu said. "I have to express our appreciation."

In the current climate, Mr. Trump's visit to the wall walked a fine line. The U.S. leader showed he supports the Jewish connection to Jerusalem while not endorsing Israel's claim to the holy site.

Such an endorsement—even one that was made implicitly by inviting Israeli officials along—would have frustrated Palestinians and Arabs who want Jerusalem's status to be decided in negotiations over a two-state solution.

"He gave a gesture to the Jewish people but didn't want to anger the people who he had just left [in Riyadh]," said Gadi Wolfsfeld, a political scientist at Israeli university IDC Herzliya.

Palestinians said the visit to the Western Wall was a religious issue and didn't mean the president supported Israeli claims over the site. Palestinian media reported the fact that the president didn't invite Mr. Netanyahu indicated the U.S. leader also understood the sensitivity of the subject.

Nabil Kukali, head of the Palestinian Center for Public Opinion, said the U.S. recent request for Israel to halt settlement construction in existing boundaries and decision not to move the embassy to Jerusalem from Tel Aviv were more significant issues for Palestinians.

The Western Wall is the last of the four walls that once abutted the Temple Mount compound in Jerusalem's Old City, where an ancient Jewish temple once stood.

The Temple Mount, known as Haram al Sharif to Muslims, is also

now the location of the Al Aqsa mosque, one of Islam's holiest sites. The compound is often the center of clashes between Israelis and Palestinians due to the sensitivity of the site. It is administered by a Jordanian body, called the Waqf.

The issue of whether the Western Wall lies in Israeli territory is particularly relevant this week as Israelis are celebrating 50 years since the war when Israel captured the Old City.

Many Israelis say the city was then liberated and reunified after Israel annexed the territory. Palestinians consider Israel an occupier in the eastern half of the city.

The United Nations and much of the international community also consider Israel an occupier in East Jerusalem. The U.N. in December reiterated that position in a Security Council resolution that labeled as illegal all Israeli settlement beyond the 1967 borders, known as the Green Line, including in the eastern part of Jerusalem.

Mr. Trump's visit to the wall tracks with his unconventional approach to the presidency. He has veered from the standard playbook in his approach to Israeli-Palestinian peace, such as naming someone with no diplomatic experience as his chief envoy on the issue. White House officials say the site was simply one he wanted to visit. He didn't learn he was the first sitting president to visit the wall until after he had left.

"He was in Jerusalem," a White House official said. "And it was important to him to be able to pray at the Western Wall."

**Write to** Rory Jones at [rory.jones@wsj.com](mailto:rory.jones@wsj.com) and Carol E. Lee at [carol.lee@wsj.com](mailto:carol.lee@wsj.com)

## Trump's Middle East Policy Shift Prompts Unease in Iraq, Lebanon

Maria Abi-Habib in Beirut and Margherita Stancati in Riyadh

6-7 minutes

May 22, 2017 8:00 p.m. ET

President Donald Trump's overture to Muslim leaders in Saudi Arabia has raised concern and anger in Shiite-majority Iraq and among the Christian, Shiite and Sunni

population in Lebanon, two of America's most important regional partners in the war on terror, which maintain good relations with Shiite Iran.

The president's speech Sunday—which singled out Tehran and its proxy, the Lebanese Shiite militia Hezbollah, while cementing the U.S. alliance with Sunni power Saudi Arabia—marked a departure from the Obama administration's efforts to engage Iran and drew rebukes

from Shiite and Christian lawmakers, as well as rights activists.

Lebanon stands to be most affected by the new U.S. policy. Hezbollah wields significant political power at home and is fighting in Syria to keep ally Bashar al-Assad in power. Mr. Trump's approach could end up alienating the government and its army, which the U.S. considers one of the most adept in the region in

the fight against Sunni terror groups al Qaeda and Islamic State.

Lebanese politicians expressed concern their government would be drawn further into the bitter regional power struggle between Iran and its allies and the Saudis and theirs. Although Hezbollah has government positions and a powerful militia, the rest of the government and national military try to remain neutral in regional affairs.

"We seek friendship with everyone, but not at the stake of our own nation," said Alain Aoun, a Christian Lebanese member of parliament. "We're worried. If U.S. and Iranian relations deteriorate dramatically, it will definitely sweep up Lebanon."

In Iraq, which has close ties to both Iran and the U.S., lawmakers were angered by Mr. Trump's comments, which they said would undermine their country's security by threatening Iran's. Iraqi forces are currently fighting alongside American troops against Islamic State.

Iraqi lawmakers called for the Saudi ambassador to be summoned and rebuked for the Riyadh conference that Mr. Trump addressed on Sunday. Parliamentarian Mohamed al-Saihood on Monday called the forum a "sectarian summit" aimed against Shiites.

Mr. Trump's speech glossed over the Gulf's past role in spreading religious extremism and played down U.S. interests in protecting human rights in the region.

Newly re-elected Iranian President Hassan Rouhani responded defiantly on Monday. He stood by Hezbollah. He also said the path to peace in the region was through dialogue, but warned at the same time that Iran would strike back if struck first.

"Who gives money and supports terrorists?" Mr. Rouhani said at a news conference. He then referred to the Sept. 11, 2001 attacks on America in which 15 of 19 hijackers were Saudi nationals. "They can't pretend to be fighting terrorism. I don't think the American people would accept trading the blood spilled on September 11 for billions of dollars through weapons purchases."

During Mr. Trump's visit, the U.S. signed a new \$109 billion arms deal with Saudi Arabia and committed to a further \$350 billion in arms over the next decade.

Politicians in Lebanon, Iraq and elsewhere in the region said they fear the Saudis will be given a blank check for their own increasingly aggressive policy in the Middle East.

Sectarian rivalries are already helping to fuel multiple wars in the Middle East. And Saudi Arabia has a history of interference in its neighbors' affairs and stoking sectarian tensions—notably in its current war against the Iran-linked Houthis in Yemen.

"The region needs less Saudi and less Iran. Otherwise it'll be two models of governance, two geopolitical contenders that can deploy religion as a weapon if and when needed," said Emile Hokayem, a senior fellow at the

International Institute for Strategic Studies.

Secular citizens of the region and human rights activists also said they were dismayed by Mr. Trump's speech, which signaled the U.S. would not push for the Gulf to improve its human rights record. Human rights concerns were a point of contention between the Obama administration and America's traditional allies in the region.

"The speech oversimplified the problems in the region or ignored others altogether. Trump didn't talk about governance or the responsibility of states to their citizens, issues which have fueled extremism," said Mr. Hokayem, the analyst.

Saudi Shiite citizens and activists said they are worried the U.S. government's pro-Gulf tilt and less focus on human rights issues would embolden discrimination against a minority group already caught in the power struggle between the Saudis and Iran.

Mr. Trump's attempt to send a conciliatory message to the Muslim world in his speech on Sunday had the opposite effect on many Shiites, they said.

"The message was: 'We are not accepting Shiites,'" said a Shiite activist based in Saudi Arabia's east, where Shiite militants and security forces frequently clash.

Peaceful dissent is not tolerated either, prompting criticism from human rights groups.

"Sunnis were ecstatic, but Shiites will be the victims," added the activist, who did not want to be named for fear of government reprisal.

Syed Ahmed Alwadaei, a London-based activist with the Bahrain Institute for Rights and Democracy, an opposition group, warned that green-lighting arms sales without putting human rights on the agenda risks empowering Gulf monarchies to repress dissidents without fear of reprisal. Bahrain's monarchy violently suppressed peaceful pro-democracy protests in 2011 and tensions between the government and the mostly Shiite population persist.

"Trump is giving leaders in Bahrain a blank check. It's extremely alarming," he said. "He is playing a dangerous role is polarizing sectarian tensions in a region where this is already a problem."

—Ghassan Adnan in Baghdad and Asa Fitch in Dubai contributed to this article.

Appeared in the May. 23, 2017, print edition as 'U.S. Shift Prompts Angst in Iraq, Lebanon.'

## THE WALL STREET JOURNAL

# Israel Announces Plans to Help Palestinians as Trump Visits

Rory Jones

4-5 minutes

Updated May 22, 2017 1:53 p.m. ET

TEL AVIV—Israel agreed to economic measures aimed at improving the lives of Palestinians in the West Bank ahead of a visit by U.S. President Donald Trump, whose administration has pushed for such initiatives to help restart peace talks.

The measures, decided at a meeting of the government's security cabinet on Sunday, include allowing construction of Palestinian residences in the area of the West Bank under Israeli control, Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu's office said Monday, a controversial issue for right-wing Israelis who don't want to give up the land.

The government also agreed to smooth operation of border crossings from the West Bank into Israel; determine land that could be used for Palestinian industrial use; and examine an extension of a train

line from Israel to the Palestinian territory that could increase commerce and the flow of people between them.

The security cabinet said it would create a committee to manage the measures over a three-year period.

White House officials have said that improving the lives of Palestinians is a key policy goal, as the Trump administration looks to bring the two sides together. The president has made such concessions a key tenet of his peace platform since taking office in January.

Mr. Trump arrived in Israel on Monday afternoon for a two-day visit. He met with Mr. Netanyahu in Jerusalem and will meet on Tuesday with Palestinian Authority President Mahmoud Abbas in the West Bank city of Bethlehem.

Husam Zomlot, the Palestinian diplomatic representative to Washington, welcomed the Israeli moves as long as they are genuinely enacted. But he expressed skepticism that Israel would follow through with the measures given that Mr. Netanyahu

won't express support for the two-state solution.

"Whenever there is an international movement towards political solution, Israel approves a set of reversible measures," Mr. Zomlot said. "If Netanyahu really wants to show goodwill, [he could] endorse a peace agenda and the two-state solution."

Israeli conservative opposition to the measures illustrates the delicate task facing Mr. Trump.

Lawmakers from the right-wing Jewish Home party voted against the measures at the cabinet meeting, according to a person familiar with the matter.

Influential Jewish Home leader Naftali Bennett doesn't support the establishment of a Palestinian state, and has said that he will support U.S.-brokered talks only if they don't include offering concessions to Palestinians.

He has made implicit threats to pull out of Mr. Netanyahu's coalition government should the Israeli leader make overtures to

Palestinians or commit to Palestinian statehood.

His party's departure from the coalition could precipitate its collapse.

Mr. Netanyahu didn't commit to a Palestinian state in a February meeting with Mr. Trump, the last time the two leaders met.

Both Mr. Netanyahu and the Palestinian Authority's President Abbas face domestic pressure not to take steps towards appeasement.

The U.S. and Israel have urged Mr. Abbas to end payments to families of Palestinian prisoners and those killed trying to attack Israelis, which they say incentivizes terrorism.

Palestinians have warned that Mr. Abbas will lose credibility and legitimacy to rule should he stop the payments.

The Palestinian Prisoners Club, a nongovernmental group that helps Palestinian prisoners inside Israeli jails, organized a general strike Monday across the entire West Bank to coincide with Mr. Trump's visit.

Government offices and public transport closed in solidarity with hundreds of

Palestinian prisoners currently on their 36th day of a hunger strike for better conditions in Israeli jails.

Write to Rory Jones at [rory.jones@wsj.com](mailto:rory.jones@wsj.com)

## THE WALL STREET JOURNAL

2-3 minutes

May 22, 2017 12:30 p.m. ET

JERUSALEM—President Donald Trump said Monday that he never mentioned Israel in his meeting with Russian officials earlier this month at the White House but didn't address whether he shared highly sensitive Israeli intelligence, as U.S. officials have maintained.

Mr. Trump was reacting to a question shouted by reporters to Israeli Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu, whom Mr. Trump was



46 mins ago

11-13 minutes

MOSCOW — Earlier this year, Zakyat, a prominent Muslim charity based in Moscow, was dispatched from the Russian capital to the refugee camps of Lebanon, bearing gifts.

Its staff distributed bright pink mattresses, pillows, and Russian chocolates to Syrian children. Their work was later showcased by Russia's grand mufti, Ravil Gainutdin, to a small crowd of mainly Muslim journalists inside Moscow's new grand mosque, where 15,000 worshippers flock weekly for Friday prayers.

Since that trip in February, cash donations to Zakyat have flowed in from Russian Muslims. These, in turn, are making their way to the Middle East: A school is being built for the refugee camps in Lebanon, and plans are in place for Muslims from Chechnya to go to Syria to help rebuild historic minarets and establish shelters for orphans in the country.

"When our people see the situation in Syria, they seriously suffer, they really worry. They know they must help," said Rifat Izmaylov, director of Zakyat. "As Russians, you could tell not everyone welcomed us, but as Muslims, praise be to God, everything turned out alright," he told me in Zakyat's recently refurbished offices, whose walls are elaborately decorated with quotes from the Quran.

## Trump Says He Didn't Mention Israel in Meeting With Russian Officials

Carol E. Lee

meeting with Monday, as to whether Mr. Netanyahu was concerned about intelligence sharing with the U.S.

Mr. Trump responded by saying he "never mentioned the word or the name Israel" when he met with Russian Foreign Minister Sergei Lavrov and Russia's ambassador to the U.S., Sergei Kislyak, in the Oval Office on May 10.

"They're all saying I did," Mr. Trump said. "So you have another story wrong. Never mentioned the word Israel."

U.S. officials have never said that Mr. Trump mentioned Israel explicitly in the meeting, rather that

he shared information provided by Israel. Mr. Trump's national security adviser has subsequently said Mr. Trump didn't know the source of the information when he shared it.

Mr. Netanyahu said "intelligence cooperation is terrific" between the U.S. and Israel, "and it's never been better."

The classified information that Mr. Trump shared concerned terrorist threats against airlines. It was only meant for U.S. officials.

Israel provided it to the U.S. as part of a longstanding intelligence-sharing agreement that is predicated on mutual assurances of secrecy, U.S. officials have said.

Mr. Trump's national security adviser, Lt. Gen. H.R. McMaster, said last week that the counterterrorism information that Mr. Trump shared in the meeting with Russian officials "was wholly appropriate." Gen. McMaster said that the president "wasn't even aware of where this information came from. He wasn't briefed on the source."

Write to Carol E. Lee at [carol.lee@wsj.com](mailto:carol.lee@wsj.com)

## Russia's Hearts-and-Minds Campaign in Syria Is Aimed at Home

Paul McLeary |

One of the Kremlin's biggest domestic challenges has always been to manage relations with Russia's 14 million Muslims, who comprise one-tenth of the total population. This has only grown more difficult since Russia became directly involved in the Syrian war two years ago, with the goal of propping up the regime of President Bashar al-Assad. Moscow has been protecting a Shiite government prosecuting a ruthless, largely sectarian war, despite the fact that Russia's own Muslims are overwhelmingly Sunni (though sectarian identity has not, to date, been very salient in Russian Islam). Tens of thousands of Syrian civilians, many of whom are Sunni, have been killed in air campaigns by the Syrian government, with Russian support that some suggest amount to war crimes. Meanwhile, thousands of Russian speakers have gone to Syria to join the Islamic State.

Authorities from within Russia's Muslim community have refrained from criticizing the Syria campaign publicly — the community officially adheres to government-prescribed notions of patriotism, which place country before religion or ethnicity.

But the relationship requires constant maintenance: The Kremlin has remained wary of alienating Muslims, particularly at a time when the influence of the Orthodox Church within the government is on the rise. Few have forgotten that Putin oversaw two extensive and bloody wars against independence in the Muslim-majority republic of Chechnya; Muslims are also not proportionately represented in the upper echelons of the Russian

government, which does little to combat widespread social and economic discrimination against ordinary Muslims.

Wary of pushing tensions with its own Muslim population past the breaking point, the Russian government has combined its military escalation in Syria with efforts to help Russian Muslims coordinate a growing humanitarian effort to aid local victims of the war. Together with a raft of other carefully targeted PR measures, the Kremlin is hoping to demonstrate to Russia's own Muslim population that the country operates "in solidarity with the Muslim world," said Alexei Malashenko, chief researcher at the Moscow-based Dialogue of Civilizations Research Institute and an expert on Islam in the region.

Muslim community representatives say there is no connection between their humanitarian efforts and the Russian government's military involvement in Syria. But little is done here without the permission of — if not at the behest of — authorities, analysts say.

"Nothing Russia does in the Middle East happens without government approval," Malashenko said. "Islam in Russia is not just about mosques. It's about politics."

"Nothing Russia does in the Middle East happens without government approval," Malashenko said. "Islam in Russia is not just about mosques. It's about politics."

So far, the aid from Russian Muslims has been directed toward Syrian refugee children and women in Lebanese camps, and the

distribution is fairly indiscriminate: Recipients have been victims of the Assad regime (and its Russian backers), the Islamic State, and rebel groups.

According to a major study released this month by the Pew Research Center, 60 percent of Russia's Muslims said they feel a strong bond with other Muslims in the world, with 70 percent saying they have a social responsibility to help others who share their religion. Russia as a whole has not done much on the official level to help Syrian Muslims: It has taken in almost no Syrian refugees and has been criticized for providing little aid compared with other large countries, though the aid it does provide — typically fuel, bread, and sacks of flour wrapped in bags displaying the Russian flag and often doled out by servicemen and women in the regime-held areas of the Aleppo and Latakia provinces — is given widespread coverage on Russian state-run news outlets. The country's Muslim leaders and clerics, such as Moscow Mufti Ildar Alyautdinov, have also visited the Syrian refugee camps on well-publicized trips.

With the military intervention in Syria, the relationship between Muslims and the Russian state has reached a critical juncture. "The Russian authorities want to show Muslims at home that they're not against them," said Akhmed Yarlikapov, senior researcher at the foreign ministry-linked Moscow State Institute of International Relations (MGIMO). "The Syrian aid is not propaganda, but it's a way of mobilizing people towards thinking a



certain way without the use of force.”

Six thousand Russian speakers from Russia itself and from former Soviet Central Asia have joined the Islamic State, by Malashenko’s estimate, and the mood in Russia is becoming increasingly tense. Last month’s suicide bombing on the St. Petersburg metro, in which 14 people were killed, was carried out by a native of Kyrgyzstan who had ties with radical Islamists, and the country appears to be bracing itself for more attacks: After the St. Petersburg blast, large government-organized marches against terrorism were held across Russia, and the police presence on the metro in the Russian capital increased sharply. Russian state TV has taken to showing dramatic coverage of arrests of Central Asians allegedly connected to the bombing.

Raising money for Muslims abroad is not unique to Russia, but “the fact it is so organized, and suddenly directed towards Syria, is pure symbolism designed to benefit the Russian government,” said Malashenko. In addition to the aid push, the government has taken other measures to mollify Russian Muslims. In 2015, Putin opened Moscow’s sprawling Cathedral Mosque — one of the largest in Europe — whose golden minarets now punctuate the city’s skyline. Putin has also been vocal in his support of a major new Islamic academy slated to open in central Russia this

autumn. Moscow authorities said this month they are considering a request to open a Muslim-only beach on the riverbank, where the genders would be separated.

Some of the Russian government’s efforts to facilitate ties between Russian Muslims and Syria are unambiguously in service of supporting the Russian war effort. In late April, an official delegation from Chechnya traveled to Damascus to meet Assad, after Syrian officials visited the Russian region in March. Chechnya’s strongman leader Ramzan Kadyrov, who has not gone to Syria since the war started, posted a photo to his popular Instagram account of Chechen Mufti Salakh-Haji Mezhiev, crowned with a lamb’s wool hat and flanked by a beaming Assad in a suit and tie and the Syrian minister for religious affairs, Mohammed Abdul Sattar. “The Syrian president ... gave his gratitude to the Chechens for their help and support in these difficult days,” Kadyrov wrote under the picture in late April, adding that several promises “at my request” were also discussed, including the restoration of the historic and now destroyed mosques in Homs and Aleppo. Plans were also laid down for the opening of a branch of Damascus University in the Chechen capital of Grozny. The meetings follow the Kremlin’s quiet deployment several months ago of 1,000 Muslim special forces from Chechnya and neighboring Ingushetia.

Russia’s Muslim North Caucasus region is also at the heart of a new Russian-Syrian film co-production. *Palmyra*, the psychological thriller will be shot in St. Petersburg and the ancient city in central Syria — security situation allowing — and is scheduled to come out next year. The film features a Russian Muslim protagonist — a man from Dagestan — who ventures to Syria in search of his wife, who has joined the Islamic State. “It’s a metaphor: If you save your family, you save the world,” said the film’s director and screenwriter Ivan Bolotnikov.

Russia’s ministry of culture, often the arbiter of state-approved narratives in art, is making the film with Syrian actress and stalwart Assad supporter Sulaf Favakerji. Known across the Arab world for her soap operas, Favakerji’s public backing of the Syrian regime has dampened her popularity in the region, but the raven-haired starlet has found a new fan base in Russia, where she was warmly welcomed last month when she officially signed off on the film. “Muslims are not portrayed in a negative light in the film despite the ISIS element,” Bolotnikov said. “In fact, they come out on top.”

In the Pew study, almost half of Russian Muslims polled said they give a portion of their wealth to those in need, a principle core of Islamic teaching. (By comparison, only 7 percent of Orthodox Christians in Russia perform *tithe*, or giving part of their salary to charity). In the grand scheme of

Russia’s war effort in Syria, the amounts being raised by Russian Muslims can’t make much of a difference. According to Zakyat, \$250,000 worth of donations so far this year will go toward children in Gaza and from Syria, mostly the latter. Besides distributing essentials to refugees, the funds are also going toward a mobile school that will open in August, roving between camps in Lebanon, where almost 2 million Syrian refugees live. Izmaylov said donors were “local, simple people” who worship at the new mosque in central Moscow, “carrying out their Muslim duty.”

Small charities in the Muslim-majority Dagestan region bordering Chechnya have also started collections for Syrian refugees, according to their profiles on Russian social networking site VKontakte. The Moscow-based Solidarity Fund, a nominally secular charity run by Muslim principles, widened its portfolio beyond Palestinians last summer to include \$80,000 for Syrians, creating a computer lab for children in the Lebanese camps.

Its director, Lilia Mukhamedyarova, scoffed at the idea of the Kremlin playing a hand in whom it supports. “The desire (to help Syrians) came from society,” she said. “It’s not our fault that Muslims are so active in philanthropy.”

Photo credit: ALEXANDER UTKIN/AFP/Getty Images

**The  
New York  
Times**

## Secor: The Patient Resilience of Iran’s Reformers

Laura Secor  
6-8 minutes

Supporters of President Hassan Rouhani of Iran on Saturday celebrating his re-election. Ebrahim Noroozi/Associated Press

While President Trump basked in the flattery of Saudi Arabia’s absolute monarchy on Friday, about 75 percent of Iranian voters turned out to repudiate an authoritarian populist and re-elect their moderate president, Hassan Rouhani. Mr. Rouhani ran against extremism and on the promise of human rights, civil liberties, rational economic management and engagement with the world — a platform that won him 57 percent of the vote to his opponent’s 38.5 percent.

It wasn’t the first time Iranian voters expressed their preference for these values. They have done so repeatedly, overcoming every obstacle a repressive state can thrust in their way. The fact that

such demands may not be met — and may even result in significant sacrifice for those who make them most vociferously — does not make them less meaningful, but more so.

It’s true that the Iranian system offers limited choice and the president has limited power. The regime has policed its boundaries and eliminated true challenges to the entrenched interests of its security apparatus and clerical elite. But that is precisely why Iranian voter behavior deserves attention. Because the vehicles that carry the popular will to the highest echelons of the Iranian regime are imperfect, the electorate and the politicians seeking its favor have learned, over the course of decades, to play a long game, wedging the system open with the force of their numbers and refusing to acquiesce silently in their exclusion. The patience and persistence of Iranian civic culture is the longer story of Iran’s revolution, and one of the longest stories in the Middle East, having outlived many uprisings and protest movements.

Mr. Rouhani, a pragmatic centrist when he came to the presidency in 2013, ran to his own left this year. Having concluded the historic nuclear agreement with world powers in 2015, he now emphasized priorities he’d abandoned in his first term: rights, freedoms and the release of the opposition leaders held under house arrest since 2010. He directly challenged the abuses of the judiciary and the political overreach of the Revolutionary Guards Corps, with which he has vied for authority throughout his presidency. What he hadn’t accomplished already, he claimed, he hadn’t been permitted to do. Whether he will be permitted now is a legitimate question, as is the extent of his willingness to battle the judiciary and Revolutionary Guards. But meeting the voting public where it stood meant staking his political capital on the promise to try.

The footage from Mr. Rouhani’s rallies showed a sea of purple, his official campaign color, intermingled with just as much green, the color of

the uprising the regime violently quashed in 2009. People held up pictures of that movement’s leaders on their cellphones. Mr. Rouhani has inherited this constituency, and while his embrace of it was tepid in 2013, he seems more comfortable in the role today.

The conventional wisdom about a week before the election held that with youth unemployment over 30 percent, voters were susceptible mainly to pocketbook appeals, cash blandishments of the sort that got Mahmoud Ahmadinejad elected in 2005. And Mr. Rouhani was vulnerable on the economy. He could point to no dramatic dividend from the nuclear deal. Ebrahim Raisi, a hard-line cleric who served on a committee that condemned thousands of political prisoners to death in 1988, dusted off the Ahmadinejad playbook in a campaign that was supposed to galvanize the poor, the religious and the rural villagers. He didn’t lose only in cosmopolitan north Tehran: He performed poorly across the country. This, despite the fact that

2017 by all appearances belongs to the world's authoritarian populists and the fact that Mr. Raisi enjoyed the apparent favor of the security establishment and of the supreme leader, Ayatollah Ali Khamenei.

There are as many possible reasons for Mr. Raisi's failure as there are for Mr. Rouhani's success. Among them is the fact that Iran has abundant experience with populism. There is a whiff of it in the country's post-revolutionary politics as a whole, whether from left, right or center. But the country has also had a very recent and well-remembered run with a president who made populism his calling card and then proceeded to drive the economy into the ground. Mr.

## THE WALL STREET JOURNAL

8-9 minutes

Updated May 22, 2017 10:35 a.m.  
ET

SEOUL—North Korean leader Kim Jong Un's call to mass produce a relatively new missile that it test-launched for the first time just three months ago underscores the isolated country's rapid progress in building up a range of capabilities for its growing missile arsenal.

While most U.S. policy makers remain concerned about North Korea's ability to deliver a nuclear-tipped missile to the continental U.S., the speedy development of the Pukgukson-2, or the Polaris-2, highlights how quickly North Korea is mastering other critical missile technologies that are making Pyongyang a bigger threat to the U.S. military and its allies in East Asia.

The missile, while not designed to reach beyond most of the U.S. bases in South Korea and Japan, can be fired with almost no preparation time from the back of a mobile launcher, giving North Korea more stealth in its launches, as well as the ability to retaliate in the case of a strike against it, experts say.

The North first publicly tested the Polaris-2 in February, in a successful

Ahmadinejad's 2005 rhetoric was politically potent, but the memory of his two terms in office is potent, too.

No election will produce wholesale change in a top-heavy, autocratic regime that has invested everything in its own survival. But the strength of Iran's evolving civic culture is that it no longer appears to expect this. Twenty years ago, when it first appeared on Iran's political scene, the reform movement made extravagant promises of democratic development. When President Mohammad Khatami and his idealistic coterie failed to materialize such change during their years in office, from 1997 to 2005, the public turned on them. Widespread voter apathy, cynicism and anger helped

bring Mr. Ahmadinejad the presidency in 2005.

Bitter experience has since brought reform-minded voters back to the electoral arena, and the flexible but firm insistence of those voters appears to have brought at least some politicians back to their side. As we saw in last year's parliamentary election, which turned on a campaign to defeat extremists even at the cost of electing some deputies whom voters found abhorrent, voters have grown savvy about the usefulness of their votes even when their hearts' desires are not on the ballot. To vote is to exercise leverage, even in a system that checks the power of elected institutions. This is not representative democracy, but it is a

dialogue marked by inventiveness, substance and dogged commitment.

This year, it is also something more. With the succession to 77-year-old Ayatollah Khamenei quite possibly on the line, the election sent a clear message to Iran's clerical leadership about the temperament and priorities of the country's people. Washington, for its part, isn't listening — perhaps because the populist authoritarian in the White House prefers the company of his own kind to a civic culture that refuses to surrender its dignity to dictatorship.

## North Korea's Whirlwind Progress on Missile Sharpens Threat

Jonathan Cheng

launch of a missile that it said it had adapted from a submarine-launched ballistic missile it launched last year.

It test-launched the Polaris-2 again in April, the same month that it paraded the missile through the streets of central Pyongyang for the first time.

Just weeks later, on Monday, Mr. Kim declared the Polaris-2 "very accurate" and ordered mass production of the missile for military deployment, according to the state-run Korean Central News Agency.

The head-turning progress, just three months from first public test to mass production, is a reminder of North Korea's commitment to its missile program, in defiance of international condemnation and sanctions pressure.

"The North Koreans put their best brains on this one," said Joshua Pollack, a senior research associate at the Middlebury Institute of International Studies in Washington.

The declaration of success with the Polaris-2, which the U.S. calls the KN-15, comes just a week after North Korea launched a new missile, the Hwasong-12—which experts say is capable of flying 2,800 miles, more than enough to reach the U.S. base in Guam and farther than any weapon that North Korea has successfully fired to date. Both the Polaris-2 and Hwasong-12 are capable of carrying nuclear warheads, North Korea says.

The Polaris-2 has a shorter range than the Hwasong-12, flying roughly 310 miles in each of its two successful launches. The Polaris-2 missile was fired on Sunday at a steeper-than-usual trajectory, and would have flown 780 miles if it were launched at a lower angle, David Wright, co-director of the Global Security Program at the Union of Concerned Scientists, wrote in an analysis of the launch.

But unlike the Hwasong-12 and the vast majority of the missiles in North Korea's arsenal, the Polaris-2 is a solid-fueled missile. Traditional liquid-fueled missiles require substantial fueling time, making them potential targets for a pre-emptive U.S. airstrike.

In contrast, solid-fueled missiles such as the Polaris-2 can be wheeled out on the back of a truck and fired off with virtually no fueling time. That gives North Korea more capabilities, in particular giving Pyongyang the ability to fire back in the event of a U.S. pre-emptive strike on its main nuclear and weapons sites.

If the Polaris-2 is reliable, says Daniel Pinkston, a North Korea expert and professor at Troy University in South Korea, "it gives them greater survivability since the launch preparation time is greatly reduced compared to liquid-fueled missiles."

Mr. Pinkston estimates that North Korea has about 1,000 missiles, with new ones constantly in production. The bigger limiting factor for North Korea, he added, is the number of launchers, which is much smaller.

Mr. Pollack, of the Middlebury Institute, said the Polaris-2 marks "a big breakthrough" for North Korea, since Pyongyang also appears to have designed launch vehicles to deploy the missile.

Because North Korea can make these launch vehicles at home, it makes the country less reliant on imports, which are vulnerable to sanctions restrictions.

"They can expand the operational missile force pretty much to their hearts' content," Mr. Pollack said. "It addresses one of the key bottlenecks that they had in terms of their operational capability."

The Polaris-class missiles, he added, would complement the North's existing shorter-range Scud and Nodong missiles, bolstering Pyongyang's ability to threaten South Korea and all of Japan, except for Okinawa.

**Write to** Jonathan Cheng at [jonathan.cheng@wsj.com](mailto:jonathan.cheng@wsj.com)

Appeared in the May. 23, 2017, print edition as 'Pyongyang Revs Up Missile Work.'

## The New York Times

William J. Broad

9-12 minutes

It started with Einstein. His famous  $E = mc^2$  revealed a vast asymmetry in the cosmic relationship between

matter and energy. In time, experts looked into the possibility of exploiting the disparity.

Today, North Korea is hard at work on that agenda. Its nuclear program has succeeded in producing blasts in the Hiroshima range. In each

case, trillions of atoms in a tiny smidgen of matter — estimated at roughly one gram, the weight of a dollar bill — broke their nuclear bonds in violent bursts of primal energy.

The North now seeks to turn bits of nuclear fuel into even more powerful blasts. Experts say its ultimate goal is to transform an ordinary atom bomb into a hydrogen bomb, which can raise its destructive force by 1,000 times.

"I can't imagine they're not working on true thermonuclear weapons," said Siegfried S. Hecker, a Stanford professor who from 1986 to 1997 directed the Los Alamos weapons laboratory in New Mexico, the birthplace of the atom bomb, and whom the North Koreans in seeking recognition as a nuclear power have repeatedly let into their atomic facilities.

"But that's a big step," Dr. Hecker cautioned. "You have to pay attention to what they're doing but take their claims with a grain of salt."

Continue reading the main story

On Sunday, the North fired a medium-range missile in an act of defiance, its second in a week. Both tests were successful and seen as demonstrating the slow improvement of its nuclear arsenal.

Photo

Lise Meitner as a doctoral student in Vienna in 1906. Later, Dr. Meitner did a calculation estimating how much energy a split atom might release. The discovery, called nuclear fission, led to a global race to split heavy atoms in chain reactions. Credit Atomic Heritage Foundation

Experts say atomic history — especially that of the American program, the world's most successful, which other nations often seek to mimic — can help distinguish North Korea's credible accomplishments from bluster and empty threats.

The nuclear age began in 1938 over a snowy Christmas holiday in Sweden when Lise Meitner and her nephew, Otto Frisch, tried to make sense of a colleague's puzzling experiments on uranium. During a hike, the physicists sat on a tree trunk and discussed the unlikely possibility that its atoms had split in two.

Dr. Meitner knew Einstein's equation. She did a calculation estimating how much energy a split atom might release. Suddenly, all the experimental facts fell into place.

"It was beautiful," her biographer wrote. "Everything fit."

The discovery, called nuclear fission, led to a global race to split heavy atoms in chain reactions. The fuels of the first atom bombs were either uranium or plutonium, both heavier than lead.

Soon, scientists found another way to free the hidden energy — by fusing two light atoms into one. The fuels were deuterium and tritium, rare forms of hydrogen. They were known as thermonuclear because

their ignition required the blistering heats of an exploding atom bomb, which acted like a match.

Fusion — which powers the sun and the stars — turned out to release far more energy. It led to history's most powerful blasts as well as decades of superpower brinkmanship with thousands of nuclear arms.

The United States in 1951 injected a tiny amount of thermonuclear fuel into the core of an atom bomb, boosting its power. The explosion was roughly three times stronger than the Hiroshima blast.

What beckoned was the idea of installing near the atom bomb a separate capsule that would hold much more thermonuclear fuel.

In 1954, on Bikini Atoll in the Pacific, the United States tried that approach. The fireball expanded for miles. The shock wave swept neighboring atolls clean of vegetation and animals. In minutes, the mushroom cloud rose some 25 miles. Slowly, its radioactivity spread around the globe.

The destructive force of that single hydrogen device turned out to be far greater than all explosives used in World War II, including the atom bombs dropped on Hiroshima and Nagasaki. The blast, code-named Bravo, was 1,000 times more powerful than the Hiroshima bomb. It was the nation's most violent thermonuclear test ever.

But as Einstein foretold, the amount of matter that Bravo converted into energy was mind-bogglingly small — on the order of 1,500 grams, or about three pounds.

Few experts think North Korea will get close to mastering the secrets of true hydrogen bombs any time soon, if ever. But they cite a range of evidence suggesting that the isolated nation is now working hard to raise the destructive force of its nuclear arsenal with thermonuclear fire.

"It's possible that North Korea has already boosted," Gregory S. Jones, a scientist at the RAND Corporation, said of the first step down the thermonuclear road.

The prospect of the North making strides in missiles topped with nuclear arms that could threaten the United States has prompted the Trump administration to increase pressure on Kim Jong-un, the North's leader.

Norris Bradbury, an American physicist, next to the Gadget, the world's first atom bomb, tested in 1945 in the New Mexican desert. Department of Energy

Last month, Washington sent warships into the Sea of Japan as a deterrent to the North's conducting a new atomic detonation. Satellite images show that preparations may be complete at Mount Mantap, the site of five previous blasts.

In South Korea, a new uncertainty is Moon Jae-in, a liberal who favors talks with the North. He recently won the race to succeed the nation's ousted president.

Much of the technical debate over North Korea — and estimates of the global threat it poses — turn on the degree to which the nation has succeeded in miniaturizing its nuclear arms. As usual, the United States set the standard.

A hydrogen bomb derived from the Bravo test was more than 24 feet long and weighed 21 tons. That was no problem for a big aircraft. But it was way beyond the lifting capacity of any missile the military had in mind to strike distant targets.

So American experts sought to devise small, light, highly efficient hydrogen arms weighing just a few hundred pounds — not tons. Eventually, they were able to fit more than a dozen atop a single missile. In short, the size of nuclear weapons dropped significantly as their destructive power rose.

Even so, they were quite large given that the amount of matter they converted into energy was so small. Why? A main reason was that designers used massive parts to keep the exploding bomb intact as long as possible. Otherwise, the arms would tear themselves apart before much fuel got burned up.

The world's first atom bomb, the Gadget, tested in 1945 in the New Mexican desert, had a fuel efficiency of less than 20 percent. Thereafter, over years and decades of experimentation, designers learned how to raise the burn rate. Exactly how far is a federal secret.

The North, like most countries with nuclear ambitions, has followed the American playbook. The question is how much progress it has made since its first atomic test more than a decade ago.

Two detonations last year helped clarify the picture. The first, in January, was about as powerful as the Hiroshima blast. With typical swagger, the North declared it had detonated a hydrogen bomb — a claim experts universally rejected. The explosion was far too small.

Still, emerging clues suggested the North was indeed going down the thermonuclear road — particularly in enhancing its atom bombs.

Experts found evidence that it had modified a reactor to make tritium, built a plant that could gather up the radioactive gas, and produced a thermonuclear fuel ingredient in such abundance that it was selling it online.

David Albright, a former United Nations weapons inspector and the president of the Institute for Science and International Security, a private group in Washington that tracks nuclear arms, said the findings "add credibility to North Korea's claims that it has been developing thermonuclear or boosted-fission weapons."

That March, another clue emerged. It was a photo of Mr. Kim and his entourage gathered around a shiny ball described as a miniaturized bomb meant to fit inside a missile warhead. Some Western analysts belittled it as the disco ball. Nonetheless, many said it appeared to be a realistic mock-up.

While propaganda photos from the North are often doctored, analysts said this one was conspicuously unretouched. The North said the shiny device was "designed for thermonuclear reaction."

Kim Jong-un, North Korea's leader, with a ball described as a miniaturized bomb. Some Western analysts belittled it as the disco ball, but many said it appeared to be a realistic mock-up. Korean Central News Agency, via European Pressphoto Agency

Size alone made the claim plausible. The Gadget was about five feet wide. In contrast, the disco ball was much smaller — perhaps two feet wide. That was the width of America's first boosted atom bombs. Boosting can either raise a blast's destructive power or lessen the need for atomic fuel, making a weapon much easier to diminish in size.

Soon after the photo emerged, American and South Korean intelligence officials concluded the isolated country had indeed finally succeeded in its efforts to shrink some of its nuclear arms.

"I think it's pretty clear they've weaponized and miniaturized," Bruce Klingner, a former head of the Central Intelligence Agency's Korea branch, recently told a group in Washington.

The finding went to warheads for short- and medium-range missiles able to hit much of Japan and South Korea. Experts say the North still has a long way to go in perfecting warheads for its intercontinental ballistic missiles, none of which have undergone flight testing.



Last September, the North set off another blast — its fifth. By some estimates, the explosion was twice as strong as the Hiroshima bomb. That suggested its designers had used more atomic fuel, had achieved a higher rate of burning, or had engaged in thermonuclear boosting.

Mr. Albright of the Institute for Science and International Security has argued for another possibility. The North, he says, may be pursuing an intermediate stage of thermonuclear arms design known as layering.

In that step, weapon designers wrap alternating layers of thermonuclear fuel and uranium around atom bombs. That

burns more hydrogen than simple boosting. When the Russians first tried that approach, Mr. Albright noted in a recent report, the test device produced a blast over 25 times stronger than the Hiroshima bomb.

All of which leads to the question of what to expect if the North decides to detonate another nuclear device — which would be its sixth.

In March, scientists at the Los Alamos weapons lab reported an expanded range of possibilities. After studying satellite images of the North's Punggye-ri nuclear test site, they concluded that the mile-high mountain could withstand a nuclear explosion of up to roughly 20 times

the Hiroshima blast. That was much larger than previous estimates.

New tests, they wrote, could in theory feature "significantly higher explosive yields," helping North Korea advertise its possession of the world's deadliest arms.

A month ago, 38 North, a research arm of the Johns Hopkins University School of Advanced International Studies, said the mountainous site was "primed and ready."

Conceivably, delays in the detonation could stem from the stepped-up pressures that Beijing and Washington are trying to exert, though experts note that the North often tries to defy coercion.

Whether the nuclear test is big or small, delayed or scrapped, botched or successful, experts say the North's program is now moving steadily beyond the rudiments of nuclear arms design, raising not only global alarms but the geopolitical stakes.

For his part, Einstein was horrified by the spread of nuclear arms and often spoke out against them. He worried that the human race had insufficient wisdom to free the primal energies.

"The unleashed power of the atom has changed everything save our modes of thinking," he remarked, "and we thus drift toward unparalleled catastrophe."

## The New York Times

### U.N. Panel Releases Draft of Treaty to Ban Nuclear Arms

Rick Gladstone

4 minutes

A United Nations disarmament panel presented the first draft on Monday of a proposed global treaty to ban nuclear weapons, which advocates called an important step that could hasten completion of a final text by early July.

Nuclear powers including the United States have boycotted the negotiations for such a treaty, calling its goals naïve and unattainable — especially at a time when North Korea has threatened to launch nuclear-armed missiles at its enemies.

But those nations' longstanding argument for deterrence — that the best way to keep nuclear arms from being used is to hold the ability to retaliate in kind — has failed to halt the momentum in the negotiations. The first round was held in March, and the effort is supported by more than 120 countries.

Treaty supporters have argued that if enough countries ratified an international agreement outlawing nuclear weapons, the political and moral coercive pressure would eventually persuade holdouts to reconsider.

Similar strategies were pursued in negotiations that

led to global treaties banning other indiscriminate weapons, including chemical arms, cluster bombs and land mines. As more countries have joined those treaties, the shaming effect has grown on those that decline.

The nuclear draft text would commit treaty signers to "never use nuclear weapons" and never "develop, produce, manufacture, otherwise acquire, possess or stockpile nuclear weapons or other nuclear explosive devices."

Signers would also promise to never "carry out any nuclear weapon test explosion or any other nuclear explosion."

Less clear from the draft text is precisely how nuclear-armed countries that renounce those weapons could join the treaty, and under what conditions.

But language in the draft specifies that the treaty is intended to strengthen — and not replace — the existing treaties meant to stop the spread and testing of nuclear weapons.

The draft's preamble specifies that the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons, the landmark agreement that entered into force in 1970, would remain "an essential foundation for the pursuit of nuclear disarmament."

The draft is now subject to revision at a three-week round of negotiations at the United Nations scheduled for mid-June.

Supporters of the negotiations said the draft's existence by itself was significant.

"The draft language is strong and categorically prohibits nuclear weapons," Beatrice Fihn, executive director of the International Campaign to Abolish Nuclear Weapons, said in a statement.

The disarmament group called the draft "an essential milestone in the yearslong effort to ban these indiscriminate weapons of mass destruction and an important step toward their eventual elimination."

Elayne G. Whyte Gómez, Costa Rica's ambassador to the United Nations in Geneva and chairwoman of the conference that is overseeing the negotiations, said in a telephone interview that she expected revisions to the draft.

Ms. Gómez, who was responsible for writing the draft, said she had sought to "synthesize the many areas where the views of states converged."

There was no comment from the United States ambassador to the United Nations, Nikki R. Haley, who led a group of envoys from member states who had publicly rejected the

negotiations when they began two months ago.

Aides to Ms. Haley said that she was traveling but that the American position had not changed.

Daryl G. Kimball, executive director of the Arms Control Association, a disarmament research and advocacy group in Washington, said he regarded the minimum number of ratifications to put the treaty into effect — 40 — to be relatively low, possibly limiting its coercive impact. Mr. Kimball also noted that the text of the treaty draft did not explicitly prohibit the financing of nuclear weapons or the issuing of nuclear threats. Nonetheless, he said he supported the negotiations and objective.

"The vast majority of world states say nuclear weapons are not essential for security, and that we want to reduce their salience by banning them," he said. "That is a contribution to the goal of a world without nuclear weapons."

Besides the five permanent members of the United Nations Security Council — the United States, Britain, China, France and Russia — four countries are known to possess nuclear weapons: India, Pakistan, North Korea and Israel. None support the negotiations.

## THE WALL STREET JOURNAL

### Turkey Summons U.S. Ambassador Over Security During Erdogan Visit

Ned Levin and Felicia Schwartz

6-7 minutes

Updated May 22, 2017 5:51 p.m. ET

ISTANBUL--Turkey's Ministry of Foreign Affairs summoned the U.S. ambassador to protest what it called "aggressive and unprofessional actions" by U.S. security toward Turkish bodyguards during President Recep Tayyip Erdogan's visit to Washington last week.

Clashes involving Turkish security personnel, supporters of Mr. Erdogan, protesters, and District of Columbia police sent nine people to the hospital.

Mr. Erdogan's visit was marred by competing accounts from U.S. and

Turkish officials about the violent confrontation, and tensions between the two sides have continued to escalate over the incident.

Local police, U.S. lawmakers and demonstrators said members of Mr. Erdogan's security detail took part

in an unprovoked attack on protesters outside the Turkish ambassador's residence in Washington.

The U.S. State Department said it summoned the Turkish ambassador last week to express its concern over the incident, which D.C. police, the Secret Service and the State Department are investigating.

The summoning of U.S. Ambassador John Bass on Monday added to Turkey's challenges of the prevailing narrative in Washington by casting blame on U.S. security personnel for unprofessionalism outside the Turkish Embassy, as well as unspecified "lapses of security" throughout Mr. Erdogan's visit.

In a statement, the Ministry of Foreign Affairs called for an investigation into the behavior of U.S. security toward the bodyguards of Turkish Foreign Minister Mevlut Cavusoglu in front of the Turkish Embassy, which it said was "contrary to diplomatic rules and practices." It wasn't clear whether that criticism covered the incident outside the ambassador's residence, which is in a different location.

The ministry also condemned "the inability of U.S. authorities to take sufficient precautions at every stage of the official program." A spokesman for the ministry declined to further specify Turkey's complaints, pending the

investigation it requested.

Last week, the Turkish Embassy said Turkish-Americans who had gathered to greet and support Mr. Erdogan had responded in self-defense to aggressive provocations by protesters. The embassy didn't mention the Turkish security detail. A narrative of the incident published by Turkey's state-run Anadolu news agency said the fight started after protesters threw water bottles at Turkish citizens.

The Turkish government cast the anti-Erdogan demonstrators as sympathizers with the PKK, the Kurdish separatist group classified as a terrorist organization by the U.S. and Turkey.

On Monday, Turkey's ambassador to the U.S. defended his government's response to the protest and said he was "disappointed" to see what he called sympathizers of the PKK demonstrating outside his residence in Washington.

"There is a big difference between freedom of expression and expression of solidarity with terrorism and terrorists," Amb. Serdar Kilic said at a speech at the Trump Hotel to people gathered for a conference on U.S.-Turkey business relations. "We do not take it as freedom of expression, it's expression of solidarity with terrorism."

After Mr. Kilic spoke, Tom Shannon, the undersecretary of State for political affairs, thanked the Turkish

ambassador for helping to defuse tensions last week, but said Americans were "concerned and disturbed" by the violence.

"It is important to note that, in the United States, such protests are legal, protected and customary," Mr. Shannon told the same business conference, where he sat next to the Turkish ambassador during the lunch. "In this regard, we found the attack to be deplorable and lacking in the respect for our laws that we expect from visitors."

Mr. Bass reiterated strong U.S. concerns about the violence in his meeting with Turkish officials on Monday, a senior State Department official said.

Mr. Bass and Turkish officials didn't agree on what prompted the outbreak of the violence, the official said.

"We're looking into what happened, and we want to understand what happened and why," the senior official said, adding that Mr. Bass reiterated "strong concerns about the behavior of the Turkish security personnel and the extent to which that's at variance with U.S. law and protected speech and protected assembly in the United States."

While there are several videos of the clashes, U.S. officials still aren't sure what happened, which is part of what they are looking to determine in the investigation.

"In terms of time sequence, there's some pieces at the front end

obviously that there probably isn't video of, like what precipitated it from the outset," the senior official said.

State Department Spokeswoman Heather Nauert confirmed that Turkey summoned Mr. Bass to discuss the violence between Turkish security personnel and protesters on May 16.

"As we noted previously, the conduct of Turkish security personnel last week was deeply disturbing. The State Department has raised its concerns about those events at the highest levels," she said.

Secretary of State Rex Tillerson on Sunday said the violent confrontation last week and the behavior by Turkish security officials "is simply unacceptable."

Sen. John McCain (R., Ariz.), last week called for expelling Turkey's ambassador to the U.S., but Mr. Tillerson said the U.S. would wait until the investigation by the State Department and law-enforcement officials wraps up before taking further action.

—Dion Nissenbaum contributed to this article.

**Write to** Ned Levin at [ned.levin@wsj.com](mailto:ned.levin@wsj.com) and Felicia Schwartz at [Felicia.Schwartz@wsj.com](mailto:Felicia.Schwartz@wsj.com)

Appeared in the May. 23, 2017, print edition as 'Turkey Summons U.S. Envoy Over Clash.'

## The Washington Post

# Pope Francis says he won't 'make a judgment' about Trump without 'listening to him first'

<https://www.facebook.com/julie.zauzmer>

7-9 minutes

VATICAN CITY — When Pope Francis and President Trump, arguably the most influential voices in the West, meet on Wednesday, two men with radically different approaches on everything from migrant rights to climate change to the rhetoric of politics itself will be face to face.

Nevertheless, the U.S. president and the head of the Roman Catholic Church will try to find common ground in a meeting ripe with potential benefits and risks, particularly for Trump. Should they pull off a congenial discussion, it could serve as a much-needed diplomatic salve for the American leader. A gaffe, meanwhile, could quickly stoke fresh controversy for a president facing a mounting crisis at home.

Francis this month seemed to acknowledge their differences. In a candid comments to journalists, he said that he would not "make a judgment" on Trump before "listening to him first."

Pope Francis said he would be "sincere" with President Trump over their sharp differences on subjects such as immigration and climate change when the two hold their first meeting at the Vatican. Pope Francis said he would be "sincere" with President Trump over their sharp differences on subjects such as immigration and climate change. (Reuters)

(Reuters)

"Always, there are doors that are not closed," he said. "Look for the doors that are at least a little bit open, enter and talk about common things and go on."

The Vatican appears to be playing down the meeting. The extent to which it will offer a detailed after-

the-fact description of the encounter is in doubt.

That is partly, observers say, because there is one attribute that both Trump and Francis do share: unpredictability.

"At this moment, there is a great caution in the Vatican, a sort of embarrassment because nobody knows how the meeting will develop," said Marco Politi, a Rome-based Vatican watcher and author of "Pope Francis Among the Wolves: The Inside Story of a Revolution."

"The Vatican is just concentrating to see how and if there will even be a final communique," he said. "For me, this meeting is only the beginning of what is becoming a difficult and complex relationship between the Holy See and the American presidency."

To be sure, relations between Washington and the Vatican have always had their rough spots. John

Paul II was so adamantly against the first Persian Gulf War that he denounced it as a "a darkness" that "cast a shadow over the whole human community." But Vatican observers say they have never seen anything quite like the stormy relationship between Francis and Trump.

In a high profile back-and-forth last year, the pope suggested that a person who wants to build walls instead of bridges is "not Christian."

Trump replied by calling any religious leader who would say such thing "disgraceful."

Since then, Francis, while largely avoiding mentioning Trump by name, has vocally opposed anti-migrant populism. This month, Francis also blasted the name of the U.S. military's "mother of all bombs" — a massive explosive device dropped on suspected Islamic State fighters in

Afghanistan in April in an operation hailed by Trump.

"I was ashamed when I heard the name," Francis told a group of students. "A mother gives life and this one gives death, and we call this device a mother? What is happening?"

If Francis has been indirect, senior Vatican advisers have not — offering in recent months blunt criticism of Trump's position on migrants and climate change.

This week, the White House said it would nominate Callista Gingrich as ambassador to the Holy See. Her husband, Newt Gingrich, is one of the strongest advocates of right-wing politics in the United States, and that could pose a challenge to a Vatican City that has seen a decidedly progressive tint under Francis.

"I don't think the Vatican will have any objection, but what you're getting is not just Callista with her husband," said Kenneth Francis Hackett, U.S. ambassador to the Vatican under President Barack Obama. "What you're getting is Newt."

White House strategist Stephen K. Bannon, a Catholic, has been seen

to be critical of the pope. In April 2014, when he headed Breitbart News, Bannon sought out a meeting in Rome with the Rev. Raymond Burke, a conservative American cardinal based in Rome who is widely viewed as the pope's greatest internal detractor.

Some suggest that the meeting, however, will find the two leaders engaging in a frank discussion. Archbishop Thomas Wenski of Miami predicted Francis will not shy away from major themes — arguing that he is likely to raise the subject of immigration reform, a key priority of the U.S. bishops and a point of contention between the White House and the Vatican.

As the first Latin American pontiff, Francis may also try to discuss with Trump the importance of issues facing that region.

"Really, right now, the crisis in our hemisphere is what's happening in Venezuela," said Wenski, adding that the Vatican has tried to get involved in brokering an agreement between protesters and the government, while Trump seems less focused on the country.

"Venezuela could end up being the Syria of Latin America unless cooler heads prevail and exert some

influence over the Maduro government to return to a democratic order," he said.

On the plus side for both men, papal visits are not designed for controversy. They typically last 20 to 30 minutes — with anything longer seen as a sign that the discussion may have taken a deeper path. After the broad-brush discussion with the pope, Trump is set to discuss finer points later that morning with senior Vatican officials, including the secretary of state, Cardinal Pietro Parolin.

"It's in nobody's interest to try to win arguments," said a senior Vatican official who spoke on the condition of anonymity given the sensitivity of the issue. "The Holy See and the U.S. government will have their differences -- as they always do -- but there's a whole range of issues they can work together on, and this kind of meeting can serve to get them off to a good start."

Not all such meetings go like clockwork, though. Francis was said to have been very displeased after Russian President Vladimir Putin showed up late to their June meeting in 2015.

Though Vatican officials aren't saying much, a few thoughts have

slipped out — including the suggestion that Francis may seek to sway Trump on issues such as climate change. It is an issue dear to the pope, who has called for a global fight to curb emissions.

Today's WorldView

What's most important from where the world meets Washington

Trump's beliefs "are against science, even before being against what the Pope says," the Rev. Marcelo Sanchez, chancellor of the Pontifical Academy of Sciences, recently told the Italian news agency ANSA. "In the election campaign he even said it was a Chinese invention. ... But this president has already changed [his mind] on several things, so perhaps on this as well."

Sanchez added that he believed Trump would heed Francis.

"They will come to an agreement. Since the president claims to be a Christian, he will listen to him," Sanchez said.

Zauzmer reported from Washington. Stefano Pitrelli in Rome also contributed to this report.

## THE WALL STREET JOURNAL

### McGurn: The Pontiff and the President

William McGurn  
5-6 minutes

May 22, 2017 6:43 p.m. ET

Is Pope Francis the Donald Trump of popes?

The Argentine pontiff and the American president meet for the first time at the Vatican on Wednesday. In the run-up to this meeting, the press has been playing up the contrasts: the brash billionaire who celebrates his wealth versus the humble Jesuit who calls the unfettered pursuit of money "the dung of the devil."

The irony here is that Pope Francis and President Trump are more alike than commonly supposed. The similarity begins with how insulting both can be to folks they disagree with. In his presidential bid, Mr. Trump turned name-calling into an art. Jeb Bush became "Low Energy Jeb," Marco Rubio "Little Marco," Ted Cruz "Lyin' Ted," and, most notable of all, Hillary Clinton "Crooked Hillary."

But the Holy Father casts a mean first stone himself. The same man who famously said who-am-I-to-judge had no problem—in the thick of a U.S. presidential election—

anathematizing anyone who would even think of building a border wall as "not Christian." Scarcely a year later, just as Mr. Trump was being inaugurated, the pope was back at it, saying he didn't like "to judge people prematurely" even as he invoked Hitler as a warning about the danger of electing populist leaders.

Mr. Trump is not the only one to feel the papal sting. Manifestly Pope Francis regards a good part of his own flock as deplorables. Whether he's warning Catholic women not to "breed like rabbits" or suggesting that anyone who disagrees with him must suffer from some psychological defect, there is something distinctively Trumpian about the way Pope Francis speaks about his critics.

With all this, the penchant for insults is not nearly as dispiriting as another Francis-Trump commonality that gets almost no attention: The zero-sum mentality each brings to the debate about trade and a liberalized global economy.

Mr. Trump famously rails against trade deals such as the North American Free Trade Agreement as helping Mexicans and other foreigners at the expense of Americans. Long before he arrived in the Oval Office, he campaigned

on the idea that U.S. companies were unpatriotic if they relocated factories overseas. In this cramped view, whether they labor in these factories on their home soil or come here to find work, Mexicans are no more than job-stealers.

Alas, the pope is the other side of the same materialist coin. He treats commerce from North America as but the latest form of *yanqui* imperialism rather than the liberating investment ordinary Latin Americans so desperately need. He betrays not the slightest understanding of the difference between a genuine free market—in which a little guy with a good idea can challenge the business status quo—and the crony variety that predominates in his native Argentina and much of his home continent.

Typical is the pope's railing against "unfettered" or "unbridled" capitalism—an abstraction that exists nowhere on this planet. Typical too is this line from his apostolic exhortation "Evangelii Gaudium," in which he excoriates a world where "it is not a news item when an elderly homeless person dies of exposure, but it is news when the stock market loses two points?"

Awkward question for His Holiness: Isn't this a perfect description of the silence on the human tragedy that is today's Venezuela, a once-rich nation whose people are now reduced to picking through garbage heaps to ward off starvation? The pope complains about "an economy that kills," but it isn't free-market Hong Kong where citizens are being killed by their economy. It's socialist Venezuela.

For his part, Mr. Trump sees Mexican workers as a threat. But the Mexican people have as much of a moral right to compete for their place in a global economy as we do—which includes competing for U.S. investment and manufacturing. As for Mexicans coming here to work, no one likes illegality, but Mr. Trump would have a far better time addressing the problem if he could first acknowledge the reality that, at least in free societies, human beings are assets and not liabilities.

Unfortunately, Mr. Trump's low view of Latin American labor is matched by the pope's crude and materialist understanding of North American capital and capitalism. Never does it occur to Pope Francis that one reason economies supposedly based on greed do better by the poor than socialist or "third way" rivals is that, in a system of *voluntary* exchange, competition



means that to succeed businesses must please their customers.

No one would ever confuse the Golden Rule with the breaking down of barriers that stop people from

voluntarily exchanging their goods and services across borders. But for the poor struggling to build a future of hope and dignity and possibility for their families, the two are not as far apart as thought. The real

tragedy of Wednesday's Vatican get-together is that neither the president nor the pope is in a position to let the other in on it.

Write to [mcgurn@wsj.com](mailto:mcgurn@wsj.com).

Appeared in the May. 23, 2017, print edition.

**The  
New York  
Times**

## Editorial : The U.N.'s Complicity in a Congo Murder

The Editorial Board

3-4 minutes

The Democratic Republic of Congo, formerly Zaire, has endured a remarkably cruel history, with successive presidents, rebels and foreign powers endlessly pillaging its rich resources and leaving behind a trail of massacres, rapes and devastation. The military has contributed its share of atrocities, and the current president, Joseph Kabila, has compounded the chaos by refusing to step down or hold elections since his term ended last December.

Peacekeepers in a United Nations truck in the Democratic Republic of Congo in November. Eduardo Soteras/Agence France-Presse — Getty Images

So when a pair of United Nations contract investigators were kidnapped and murdered in March, it was fair to ask how they came to ride into a remote and violence-torn area on motorbike taxis with only an interpreter at their side and without much training, safety equipment or even health insurance. An article by Times reporters Kimiko de Freytas-Tamura and Somini Sengupta on Saturday details an astoundingly irresponsible approach by the United Nations to an obviously dangerous and hugely important task.

Zaida Catalán, a 36-year-old Swedish-Chilean, and Michael Sharp, a 34-year-old American, are only two of millions of people who have lost their lives to Congo's endemic strife, all victims of senseless greed in a rich and fertile land that could be among the most prosperous on the African continent. The tragedy is that Ms. Catalán and

Mr. Sharp represented the organization that is meant to combat lawlessness and thus give the Congolese hope for the future. Their deaths did the opposite.

Neither of the investigators appears to have been prepared for the dangerous world they were assigned to investigate. Ms. Catalán had worked for the Swedish Green Party and as an expert on sexual violence for a European Union mission in Congo. Mr. Sharp had come to Congo in 2012 on a Mennonite humanitarian mission, and signed on with the United Nations in 2015. They were assigned to investigate a massacre in the remote Kasai region of central Congo, where the government has been trying to put down yet another tribal uprising. They had neither adequate training, nor safety equipment, nor even health insurance. Their bodies were

discovered in a shallow grave, Ms. Catalán's decapitated.

Whether the United Nations really has the tools to intervene usefully in a country as chaotic as Congo is debatable. A peacekeeping force has been in Congo since 1999, but it has little to show for the billions it has cost. What is not debatable is that when the United Nations sends people into harm's way, it must ensure that they are properly trained and equipped.

The Times's article said almost two months passed before the world organization assembled a panel to look into what went wrong, and the Security Council, which could order a more formal investigation, has done nothing. The United Nations must take far greater responsibility for the security and preparation of the people it sends to the hellholes of the world. Their lives depend on it, as does their mission as symbols of justice and hope.

**The  
Washington  
Post**

## Editorial : The Trump administration takes encouraging steps against Venezuela's corrupt regime

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

4-5 minutes

corrupt clique around him are hanging on by the brute force of tear gas, water cannons, mass arrests and shootings by snipers. Forty-nine people had died as of Monday.

The opposition says it will continue the protests until the regime gives in, and it appears to have the popular support to do so. But Venezuelans are also desperately hoping for help from outside actors, including the United States. To its credit, the Trump administration is responding — breaking with a long-standing and self-defeating U.S. policy of avoiding confrontation with the movement founded by Hugo Chávez.

Last week, the Treasury Department announced sanctions against eight members of the Venezuelan supreme court, including its chief, while President Trump correctly described Venezuela's dystopic food shortages and violence as "a disgrace to humanity." The court was an apt target: Its members are not legal experts but political hacks and worse — the court president, a former state intelligence officer, is widely reported to have served time for murder. The Maduro regime has

used the court to strip powers from the National Assembly, which has had a two-thirds opposition majority since the last election was held in 2015. The court's last and most blatant move against the assembly triggered the current wave of street protests.

Opinions newsletter

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

Though the United States has punished senior Venezuelan officials in the past for involvement in drug trafficking, the administration's new step rightly singled out those involved in political repression. It sent a tough message to the Chavista elite, which depends on dollar-denominated bank accounts and shopping trips to Miami. Predictably, the move prompted hand-wringing from defenders of the previous policy of passivity, who argue that the United States must not take the lead in confronting Latin America's rogue regimes, lest it be accused of imperialism. Yet Caracas and its regional allies have been invoking that imperialist accusation for years in any case — and polls show that Venezuelans don't buy it.

There are limits to what the United States can do to rescue Venezuela. Military action is out of the question; collaboration with like-minded countries in the Organization of American States remains essential. But there are other steps Mr. Trump could order, including several outlined in pending bipartisan congressional legislation. The Drug Enforcement Administration and FBI should publicly report what they know about the criminal activities of senior government leaders, which include drug trafficking and profiteering on desperately needed food imports. Washington should seek to open channels for humanitarian aid, including for the many thousands of Venezuelans who have fled to Colombia and Brazil.

Eventually Venezuela may need help brokering a deal for elections and the orderly transfer of power. For now, however, the Maduro regime, tutored by Cubans from Fidel Castro's hard-line camp, appears intent on installing a dictatorship by force. The United States should make clear that anyone who collaborates in that effort will be a target for sanctions.

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 22 at 7:31 PM

HUNDREDS OF thousands of Venezuelans thronged the streets of Caracas and other cities Saturday in the 50th consecutive day of protests against the regime of Nicolás Maduro, which has plunged Venezuela into chaos and threatens to convert it into a Cuban-style dictatorship. Though polls show that some 70 percent of the population support the protesters' demand for free elections, Mr. Maduro and the

## Trump asked intelligence chiefs to push back against FBI collusion probe after Comey revealed its existence (UNE)

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

9-11 minutes

The Washington Post's Adam Entous explains how President Trump asked two top ranking intelligence officials to publicly deny any connection between his campaign and Russia. The Washington Post's Adam Entous explains how President Trump asked two top ranking intelligence officials to publicly deny any connection between his campaign and Russia. (Whitney Leaming/The Washington Post)

(Whitney Leaming/The Washington Post)

President Trump asked two of the nation's top intelligence officials in March to help him push back against an FBI investigation into possible coordination between his campaign and the Russian government, according to current and former officials.

Trump made separate appeals to the director of national intelligence, Daniel Coats, and to Adm. Michael S. Rogers, the director of the National Security Agency, urging them to publicly deny the existence of any evidence of collusion during the 2016 election.

Coats and Rogers refused to comply with the requests, which they both deemed to be inappropriate, according to two current and two former officials, who spoke on the condition of anonymity to discuss private communications with the president.

Trump sought the assistance of Coats and Rogers after FBI Director James B. Comey told the House Intelligence Committee on March 20 that the FBI was investigating "the nature of any links between individuals associated with the Trump campaign and the Russian government and whether there was any coordination between the campaign and Russia's efforts."

Trump's conversation with Rogers was documented contemporaneously in an internal memo written by a senior NSA official, according to the officials. It is unclear if a similar memo was prepared by the Office of the Director of National Intelligence to

document Trump's conversation with Coats. Officials said such memos could be made available to both the special counsel now overseeing the Russia investigation and congressional investigators, who might explore whether Trump sought to impede the FBI's work.

Team Trump's ties to Russian interests

*[Flynn takes the Fifth, declines to comply with Senate Intelligence Committee subpoena]*

White House officials say Comey's testimony about the scope of the FBI investigation upset Trump, who has dismissed the FBI and congressional investigations as a "witch hunt." The president has repeatedly said there was no collusion.

Current and former senior intelligence officials viewed Trump's requests as an attempt by the president to tarnish the credibility of the agency leading the Russia investigation.

A senior intelligence official said Trump's goal was to "muddy the waters" about the scope of the FBI probe at a time when Democrats were ramping up their calls for the Justice Department to appoint a special counsel, a step announced last week.

Senior intelligence officials also saw the March requests as a threat to the independence of U.S. spy agencies, which are supposed to remain insulated from partisan issues.

"The problem wasn't so much asking them to issue statements, it was asking them to issue false statements about an ongoing investigation," a former senior intelligence official said of the request to Coats.

The NSA and Brian Hale, a spokesman for Coats, declined to comment, citing the ongoing investigation.

The turmoil surrounding former FBI Director James Comey and President Trump started long before Comey was fired on May 9. Here are the pivotal moments in Comey's time as head of the agency. The turmoil surrounding former FBI Director James Comey and President Trump started long before Comey was fired on May 9. (Jenny

Starrs,Julio Negron/The Washington Post)

(Jenny Starrs,Julio Negron/The Washington Post)

"The White House does not confirm or deny unsubstantiated claims based on illegal leaks from anonymous individuals," a White House spokesman said. "The president will continue to focus on his agenda that he was elected to pursue by the American people."

In addition to the requests to Coats and Rogers, senior White House officials sounded out top intelligence officials about the possibility of intervening directly with Comey to encourage the FBI to drop its probe of Michael Flynn, Trump's former national security adviser, according to people familiar with the matter. The officials said the White House appeared uncertain about its power to influence the FBI.

"Can we ask him to shut down the investigation? Are you able to assist in this matter?" one official said of the line of questioning from the White House.

Rep. Adam B. Schiff (Calif.), the ranking Democrat on the House intelligence committee, said the report is "yet another disturbing allegation that the President was interfering in the FBI probe." Schiff said in a statement that Congress "will need to bring the relevant officials back to testify on these matters, and obtain any memoranda that reflect such conversations."

The new revelations add to a growing body of evidence that Trump sought to co-opt and then undermine Comey before he fired him May 9. According to notes kept by Comey, Trump first asked for his loyalty at a dinner in January and then, at a meeting the next month, asked him to drop the probe into Flynn. Trump disputes those accounts.

Current and former officials said that Trump either lacks an understanding of the FBI's role as an independent law enforcement agency or does not care about maintaining such boundaries.

Trump's effort to use the director of national intelligence and the NSA director to dispute Comey's statement and to say there was no evidence of collusion echoes

President Richard Nixon's "unsuccessful efforts to use the CIA to shut down the FBI's investigation of the Watergate break-in on national security grounds," said Jeffrey H. Smith, a former general counsel at the CIA. Smith called Trump's actions "an appalling abuse of power."

Trump made his appeal to Coats days after Comey's testimony, according to officials.

That same week, Trump telephoned Rogers to make a similar appeal.

In his call with Rogers, Trump urged the NSA director to speak out publicly if there was no evidence of collusion, according to officials briefed on the exchange.

Rogers was taken aback but tried to respectfully explain why he could not do so, the officials said. For one thing, he could not comment on an ongoing investigation. Rogers added that he would not talk about classified matters in public.

While relations between Trump and Comey were strained by the Russia probe, ties between the president and the other intelligence chiefs, including Rogers, Coats and CIA Director Mike Pompeo, appear to be less contentious, according to officials.

Rogers met with Trump in New York shortly after the election, and Trump's advisers at the time held him out as the leading candidate to be the next director of national intelligence.

The Washington Post subsequently reported that President Barack Obama's defense secretary and director of national intelligence had recommended that Rogers be removed as head of the NSA.

Checkpoint newsletter

Military, defense and security at home and abroad.

Ultimately, Trump decided to nominate Coats, rather than Rogers. Coats was sworn in just days before the president made his request.

In February, the Trump White House also sought to enlist senior members of the intelligence community and Congress to push back against suggestions that Trump associates were in frequent

contact with Russian officials. But in that case, the White House effort was designed to refute news accounts, not the testimony of a sitting FBI director who was leading an open investigation.

Trump and his allies in Congress have similarly sought to deflect scrutiny over

Russia by attempting to pit U.S. intelligence agencies against one another.

In December, Trump's congressional allies falsely claimed that the FBI did not concur with a CIA assessment that Russia intervened in the 2016 election to help Trump win the White House.

Comey and then-CIA Director John Brennan later said that the bureau and the agency were in full agreement on Moscow's intentions.

As the director of national intelligence, Coats leads the vast U.S. intelligence community, which includes the FBI. But that does not mean he has full visibility into the

FBI probe. Coats's predecessor in the job, James R. Clapper Jr., recently acknowledged that Comey did not brief him on the scope of the Russia investigation. Similarly, it is unclear to what extent the FBI has brought Coats up to speed on the probe's most sensitive findings.

## THE WALL STREET JOURNAL

7-9 minutes

Updated May 22, 2017 7:30 p.m. ET

WASHINGTON—Former National Security Adviser Michael Flynn said Monday he would refuse to cooperate with a congressional subpoena, invoking his constitutional right against self-incrimination and setting off a legal showdown with Congress over a key witness in its investigation of alleged Russian interference in the 2016 presidential election.

The retired three-star Army general said through an attorney that he wouldn't comply with the Senate Intelligence Committee's demand for documents, citing his Fifth Amendment protection, according to a copy of the letter reviewed by The Wall Street Journal.

Mr. Flynn's short-lived tenure as national security adviser and mounting legal woes have weighed heavily on President Donald Trump's young administration. Mr. Flynn went from being a high-profile campaign supporter, giving Mr. Trump credibility and advice on security issues, to a continuing source of negative publicity for the administration on Russia and other issues.

Mr. Flynn was forced to resign as national security adviser in February after acknowledging that he had misled White House officials about the nature of his phone conversations with the Russian ambassador to the U.S. during the presidential transition.

His business ties and lobbying work are under scrutiny from congressional investigators, military officials and federal prosecutors in overlapping probes.

Another potential problem for Mr. Flynn arose Monday when Rep. Elijah Cummings (D., Md.), the top Democrat on the House Oversight and Government Reform Committee, alleged that Mr. Flynn had misled federal investigators when he told them during his security-clearance renewal last year

that he had received no foreign money. Mr. Flynn had been paid by a Russian state-funded television network for a speech in Moscow in 2015, according to a financial disclosure form.

"General Flynn had a duty to be truthful on his security clearance renewal form and during his interview with security clearance investigators," wrote Mr. Cummings. "General Flynn did not tell security clearance investigators about any relationships with foreign government officials or foreign businesses."

Mr. Flynn's attorney declined to respond to a request for comment.

Previously, Mr. Flynn has said through an attorney that he was willing to cooperate with congressional investigations in exchange for some guarantee that he could avoid criminal prosecution. No such immunity has been granted by Congress. Mr. Flynn's decision to invoke Fifth Amendment rights could give him leverage to seek immunity from Congress.

The Fifth Amendment of the U.S. Constitution typically allows a witness broad latitude to refuse to testify in a matter that is potentially incriminating, but it doesn't offer the same level of protections for documents and other physical evidence.

Beyond Mr. Flynn, a widening circle of aides and associates of Mr. Trump have been asked by congressional investigators to provide interviews or documents.

Former Trump campaign aide Michael Caputo received a letter this month from the House Intelligence Committee asking for a private interview and documents. He is expected to cooperate with the request for documents but will insist that any hearing be public, according to a person familiar with the matter.

Mr. Caputo, who in the 1990s conducted public relations and political work in Russia, was a senior communications adviser to Mr. Trump's campaign.

"The only time the president and I talked about Russia was in 2013,

when he simply asked me in passing what it was like to live there in the context of a dinner conversation," Mr. Caputo wrote to the leaders of the House Intelligence Committee.

Both the House and Senate intelligence panels are conducting probes into alleged Russian interference in the 2016 election on behalf of Mr. Trump against Democratic candidate Hillary Clinton, including whether there was any collusion between Russia and his campaign. Russia has denied any interference in the election, and Mr. Trump has called the investigation a "witch hunt."

Mr. Flynn is the only Trump associate who has been subpoenaed by Congress. Grand jury subpoenas also have been issued as part of the expanding Federal Bureau of Investigation probe of alleged Russian interference.

As part of its own Russia investigation, the Senate Intelligence Committee has been seeking documents from Mr. Flynn since late April, first asking for voluntary cooperation and then sending a subpoena on May 10.

The Senate now has several options to try to enforce its subpoena and assert its authority to conduct oversight and investigations of the executive branch. It could vote to hold Mr. Flynn in contempt and take the matter to civil court, or it could ask the Justice Department to consider criminal prosecution. A rarely used procedure allows Congress to jail an uncooperative witness.

Senators of both parties said Mr. Flynn's refusal to comply wouldn't affect the ultimate outcome of the congressional probes into Russian interference.

The whole matter has taken on a new urgency in the past two weeks with Mr. Trump's dismissal of FBI Director James Comey and the appointment of former FBI Director Robert Mueller III as special counsel handling the Justice Department's criminal inquiry.

"While we recognize General Flynn's constitutional right to invoke

the Fifth Amendment, we are disappointed he has chosen to disregard the Committee's subpoena request for documents relevant and necessary to our investigation," Sen. Richard Burr (R., N.C.), the Intelligence Committee chairman, and Mark Warner (D., Va.), its top Democrat, said in a joint statement.

"We will vigorously pursue General Flynn's testimony and his production of any and all pertinent materials pursuant to the Committee's authorities," the senators said.

Congressional subpoenas have often proven difficult to enforce, and some are tied up in civil litigation for years. On the criminal side, the Justice Department rarely acts on congressional contempt referrals.

Several information technology experts who worked on Mrs. Clinton's private email server refused to cooperate with a House investigation into the Democrat's email use while in government. So far, none have faced legal consequences.

In addition to being sought as a witness in several congressional probes, Mr. Flynn has been under scrutiny by federal investigators for lobbying work he performed before joining Mr. Trump's administration.

Mr. Flynn was hired by a Turkish businessman on a lobbying contract. He later registered with the Justice Department under the Foreign Agent Registration Act, an acknowledgment that some of his work might have been on behalf of the Turkish government.

As an adviser to Mr. Trump's presidential campaign, and later one of Mr. Trump's top aides in the White House, Mr. Flynn was privy to sensitive foreign-policy deliberations and was directly involved in discussions about the possible lifting of sanctions on Russia imposed by the Obama administration.

Mr. Flynn has declined to comment on the Turkish matter.

—Natalie Andrews contributed to this article.



**The  
New York  
Times**

Rosenberg

7-9 minutes

## Michael Flynn Misled Pentagon About Russia Ties, Letter Says

Mark Mazzetti  
and Matthew

lawyers said that the accusations against him, as well as the appointment of a special counsel to oversee the Justice Department investigation into Russian election interference, gave him "reasonable cause to apprehend danger" should he comply with the subpoena.

"He is the target on a nearly daily basis of outrageous allegations, often attributed to anonymous sources in Congress or elsewhere in the United States government, which, however fanciful on their face and unsubstantiated by evidence, feed the escalating public frenzy against him," his lawyers wrote.

They also reiterated his willingness to testify in exchange for immunity. A lawyer for Mr. Flynn, Robert Kelner, did not respond to a request for comment about Mr. Cummings's letter.

The controversies surrounding the Trump White House's ties to Russia have overshadowed the early months of the new administration, and Mr. Flynn has been at the center of the maelstrom. He is under scrutiny both by congressional committees and by federal law enforcement agencies for his ties to Russia and his business dealings with Turkey.

In February, Mr. Trump asked James B. Comey, then the F.B.I. director, to end the bureau's investigation into Mr. Flynn, a request some legal experts have said amounts to obstruction of justice.

Lawmakers previously said that Mr. Flynn had failed to disclose the income he received for the Moscow trip when he was seeking clearance to work in the White House. The letter released Monday showed that he had misled investigators during a previous attempt to renew his clearance, months before Mr. Trump was elected.

Mr. Cummings's letter indicated that Mr. Flynn misled Pentagon investigators during the clearance process, including during an in-person interview in February 2016. Mr. Cummings quoted directly from the Pentagon report detailing Mr. Flynn's clearance process. The document itself was not included with his letter, sent to Representative Jason Chaffetz, the Utah Republican who is the chairman of the oversight committee.

As Mr. Flynn's legal problems have accumulated, White House officials have tried to distance themselves from him. They have also tried to shift blame, pointing out that it was during the Obama administration that his security clearance was renewed. Mr. Flynn, a former three-star general, ran the Defense Intelligence Agency from mid-2012 until 2014.

The House committee has asked the White House to turn over all documents used by Mr. Trump's transition team to vet Mr. Flynn, as well as any communications among Mr. Trump's top aides about Mr. Flynn's contacts with foreign officials.

The White House has thus far refused to comply with the request. Mr. Cummings has been pushing Mr. Chaffetz to issue a subpoena demanding the documents.

"In refusing our requests for a subpoena, you have made the same argument as President Trump — that you believe the White House bears no responsibility for vetting General Flynn for the position of national security adviser because he received his latest security clearance renewal under the Obama administration in early 2016," Mr. Cummings wrote to Mr. Chaffetz.

Previous documents released by the oversight committee revealed that Mr. Flynn was paid more than \$65,000 by companies linked to Russia in 2015. In addition to RT, he received \$11,250 from a Russian cargo airline, Volga-Dnepr Airlines, which had been implicated in a bribery scheme involving Russian officials at the United Nations. In October 2015, he was paid another \$11,250 by Kaspersky Government Security Solutions, the American branch of a Russian cybersecurity firm.

Retired generals are ordinarily allowed to keep a clearance as a courtesy, but they must report all income from foreign sources to the Pentagon. Possessing a security clearance opens up potentially lucrative jobs with government contractors, who prize contacts and insider knowledge.

In a letter to Congress last month, the Pentagon's acting inspector general, Glenn A. Fine, said his office had opened an investigation into whether Mr. Flynn failed to properly report income from foreign governments.

As for his refusal to comply with the Senate's subpoena, it is up to lawmakers to decide whether to hold him in contempt of Congress. Mr. Flynn said in March that he would talk to congressional investigators in exchange for immunity from prosecution. Lawmakers declined his offer, though they did not rule out the possibility of revisiting the issue.

Senators Richard M. Burr of North Carolina and Mark Warner of Virginia, the committee's Republican chairman and Democratic vice chairman, vowed in a statement to continue seeking the documents, as well as Mr. Flynn's testimony.

Two other people in Mr. Trump's orbit during the campaign — Roger Stone, a longtime adviser, and Paul Manafort, his former campaign chairman — have provided some documents requested by the Senate Intelligence Committee, a person close to the investigation said Monday.

Mr. Flynn's decision was first reported by The Associated Press.

His assertion of the Fifth Amendment may not hold up in court. Raymond Granger, a New York-based lawyer and former state and federal prosecutor, said it was "a common mistake" for witnesses to try to apply their right to protect themselves against self-incrimination to documents.

"However, if they try to litigate this, they would lose quickly and badly," Mr. Granger said of Mr. Flynn's lawyers. He said the Fifth Amendment generally does not apply to documents because it is intended to shield Americans from having their compelled statements used against them — not statements made voluntarily, such as on a document, or supplied by a third party.

Mr. Flynn's lawyers disputed that notion in their letter, referring to producing the documents as "a testimonial act" that would be protected by the Fifth Amendment.

Should he testify before the committee, Mr. Flynn could invoke his Fifth Amendment right at that time.

Gov. Chris Christie of New Jersey, who ran Mr. Trump's transition team until a few days after the election, said publicly for the first time Monday that he had advised Mr. Trump against selecting Mr. Flynn for a White House position.

WASHINGTON — Michael T. Flynn, President Trump's former national security adviser, misled Pentagon investigators about his income from companies in Russia and contacts with officials there when he applied for a renewal of his top-secret security clearance last year, according to a letter released Monday by the top Democrat on the House oversight committee.

Mr. Flynn, who resigned 24 days into the Trump administration, told investigators in February 2016 that he had received no income from foreign companies and had only "insubstantial contact" with foreign nationals, according to the letter. In fact, Mr. Flynn had sat two months earlier beside President Vladimir V. Putin of Russia at a Moscow gala for RT, the Kremlin-financed television network, which paid him more than \$45,000 to attend the event and give a separate speech.

His failure to make those disclosures and his apparent attempt to mislead the Pentagon could put Mr. Flynn in further legal jeopardy. Intentionally lying to federal investigators is a felony punishable by up to five years in prison. Separately, he also faces legal questions over failing to properly register as a foreign agent for lobbying he did last year on behalf of Turkey while advising the Trump campaign, which is also a felony.

The House letter, written by Representative Elijah E. Cummings of Maryland, was made public hours after Mr. Flynn formally rejected a subpoena from senators investigating Russian interference in the 2016 election and chose to instead invoke his right against self-incrimination, a person familiar with his decision said.

Mr. Flynn had been ordered by the Senate Intelligence Committee to hand over emails and other records related to any dealings with Russians as part of that panel's investigation into Russian meddling in the 2016 election. His decision to invoke his Fifth Amendment right puts him at risk of being held in contempt of Congress, which can also result in a criminal charge.

In a letter to the heads of the Intelligence Committee, Mr. Flynn's

"It's safe to say that General Flynn and I didn't see eye to eye," Mr. Christie told reporters during a news conference in Trenton. "And that I didn't think that he was someone who would bring benefit to the

president or to the administration. And I made that very clear to candidate Trump, and I made it very clear to President-elect Trump."

Separately, Mr. Chaffetz said he had decided to postpone a potential

oversight committee hearing with testimony from Mr. Comey after the two spoke Monday.

"He wants to speak with special counsel prior to public testimony," Mr. Chaffetz said on Twitter,

referring to Robert S. Mueller III, who was appointed last week to lead the federal investigation into Russian election meddling.



## Gerson : In Trump's house of betrayal, leaks are business as usual. That's a big problem.

By Michael

Gerson

6-7 minutes

It is another stomach-turning development in the vast, unfolding scandal that is the Trump administration: President Trump's denigration of former FBI director James B. Comey to Russian Foreign Minister Sergei Lavrov in the Oval Office. In a New York Times article, Trump is quoted as saying, "I just fired the head of the FBI. He was crazy, a real nut job." Aside from the irony of the statement itself, it is appalling that an American president should be caught boasting about obstructing justice to the representative of a power that is so expert on the topic. Such is the mind-set of our *Erdogannabe*.

"I faced great pressure because of Russia," Trump went on. "That's taken off." So the president is delusional as well as dishonorable.

And yet. How in God's name did the reporter gain access to a discussion in the Oval Office? According to the article, the "memcon" — the memorandum of conversation — was "read to The New York Times by an American official."

Opinions newsletter

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

Let that sink in. This is a document of very limited distribution. According to sources I consulted, it

typically would not have even been given to the director of the CIA. This was a leak of an extremely sensitive and highly classified document by a very senior person.

There are a number of explanations for why leakers leak. They may be trying to kneecap a rival. Sometimes leakers are embittered or just want to look and feel important. The "nut job" leak suggests something different: a real attack on the president from within his inner circle. It was designed to reveal Trump as a foolish figure and expose him to charges of obstruction. Whoever read this material over the telephone to a reporter was playing for the highest stakes.

Since President Trump fired FBI Director James Comey on May 9, the explanations for the dismissal have been getting murkier. Now Trump has tweeted a threat to cancel press briefings and a suggestion about "tapes" of his private conversations with Comey. Now President Trump has tweeted a threat to cancel press briefings and a suggestion about "tapes" of his private conversations with Comey. (Jenny Starrs/The Washington Post)

(Jenny Starrs/The Washington Post)

He or she was also risking not only a career, but a prison term. If the leaker is exposed, this administration will give no quarter.

As someone who handled classified material during the George W. Bush

administration, I can attest to the deadly seriousness of these matters. This type of high-level leak leaves the president and his inner circle unable to trust his team. It leaves foreign officials unable to feel confident in the confidentiality of the highest-level diplomatic discussions. And it points to a foreign policy establishment that is making political judgments, which involve serious dangers.

I have no doubt that Trump himself created the snake-pit atmosphere in which leaks are incessant. He raises questions about his own staff in public, presumably to keep them on their toes. He sends out representatives to provide cover — putting their own credibility on the line — and then undermines them (see H.R. McMaster). He is, according to press accounts, a yeller who has staff hiding in their offices. He fires people in a humiliating fashion (see Comey). He belittles proud professionals (see the whole CIA). His administration is comprised of fiefdoms engaged in more-or-less open warfare. It is likely that some on the White House staff are staying only to collect material for the inevitable tell-all books.

The moral tone of the Executive Office of the President is set by the president, and this one is morally stunted. In Trump's house of betrayal, leaks must seem the normal way of doing business. And leaks against the president probably come from officials reaching the limits of their patience with dysfunction.

All true. But still: A leak of classified material to damage the president is the abrogation of a professional standard, and the arrogation of democratic authority. It can lead to a very bad place, in which national security and law enforcement officials are engaged in payback or (worse) pursuing political goals beyond their remit. This undermines the authority of the institutions they serve by confirming the view, held by a significant number of Americans, that the "system" is somehow rigged.

We can all imagine circumstances in which whistleblowing is justified, involving the prevention of immediate and irreparable damage to the country. But there is a proper sequencing for such actions. They should come after normal processes fail. The United States has regular-order processes — involving a special counsel and congressional investigations — in place. We are at the start of Trump's reckoning, not the end.

Public officials should not respond to the fraying of democratic norms by further unraveling them. The proper answer to Trump's assault on institutions is to adhere to them more strongly. And the proper response of a staffer pressed beyond the limits of his or her conscience is not to leak but to resign.

*Read more from Michael Gerson's archive, follow him on Twitter or subscribe to his updates on Facebook.*



## Palmieri: Robert Mueller will force Donald Trump to reckon with the truth on Russia

Jennifer Palmieri, Opinion contributor 3:16 a.m. ET May 23, 2017

5-7 minutes

The White House on May 17, 2017. (Photo: Pablo Martinez Monsivais, AP)

The appointment of Robert Mueller as a special counsel investigating the Trump team's connections with Russia has put the

president on a path he has never traveled: a collision course with the truth.

Firing an FBI director investigating your associates, and maybe you, is a perilous act that could put any presidency in jeopardy. It's not certain what it will ultimately mean for President Trump. After all, he came to power by defying nearly all conventional rules of politics. Missteps and lies that would doom any other politician seemingly have no impact on him.

Trump creates his own world, comprised of his own facts and his own rules.

But Trump now faces an unprecedented test in the form of a special counsel investigation. Mueller inhabits a very different world than Trump — a world built on a foundation of facts, in which Mueller can prosecute anyone who lies to him.

I was working in the White House when Ken Starr was appointed

independent counsel to investigate Bill Clinton's investment in the Whitewater real estate development. I was also there four and a half years later when Clinton was impeached as a result of charges stemming from that investigation. As we learned, these investigations can take on a life, direction and scope of their own.

The president will find that Mueller isn't just an investigator. He will be a shadow tracking Trump and his staff's every move. He is charged

with investigating links with Russia, and any matters that "arose or may arise from the investigation." This means Mueller will look into Trump's firing of James Comey and have the latitude to pursue, and prosecute, any wrongdoing he may encounter along the way.

I have worked in a White House that's under investigation. It is even more disorienting than it appears. No one in a position of authority at the White House tells you what is happening. No one knows. Your closest colleague could be under investigation and you would not know. You could be under investigation and not know. It can be impossible to stay focused on your job.

There will be other collateral damage. In the Clinton White House we tried hard to isolate the team of lawyers working on impeachment, so President Clinton and his staff could continue advancing their policy goals. Yet Congress was consumed with impeachment for months and it was

nearly impossible to get anything done.

Similarly, it is hard to imagine the Trump White House making much progress on health care or tax legislation. Leaks from the investigation will continue to happen, there will be hearings with Comey and others on Capitol Hill, and the president himself seems determined to exacerbate his problems with ill-considered tweets, statements and actions.

Mueller's investigation may force reckonings Trump has long managed to escape. He is the only president in the last four decades who has refused to make his tax returns public. As establishing the extent of his financial connections to Russia will be an issue in the investigation, it seems likely those returns will have to be handed over. Of more consequence, Trump will likely be interviewed by Mueller. If Trump lies in an interview — and let's be real, based on history the chances are high that he will — he can be prosecuted.

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

The parallels to Nixon's situation abound. But it would be a mistake to assume Trump is in the same peril as Nixon of being forced from office. When Nixon was revealed to be a liar, his supporters abandoned him and he had to resign. Trump's supporters aren't likely to do that. If Trump gets caught in a jam between Mueller and the truth, Trump will cast Mueller as another member of the political establishment trying to take down Trump the outsider. His supporters will cheer. But that won't stop Mueller from prosecuting him if wrongdoing is found.

The question at the heart of Trump's investigation is whether he and his campaign colluded with a foreign power to undermine the most fundamental tenet of our democracy — the sanctity of our elections. Trump's refusal to accept Russia's role in the elections and his seemingly endless ability to escape consequences for telling lies has made millions of us doubt

whether the rules of the republic matter anymore. Does truth even matter anymore?

I am not sure if the Founders imagined a figure like Trump, but they did embed a fealty to truth in the Constitution that Trump swore to uphold. The Constitution provides the means to address Russia's interference in our elections with the gravity it deserves, and to hold a president who refuses to adhere to the truth accountable. How damaging this investigation will ultimately be to Trump remains to be seen. But it is thanks to the genius of our system of checks and balances that, at a minimum, we know this president will be forced to reckon with the truth.

*Jennifer Palmieri was director of communications for Hillary Clinton's 2016 presidential campaign and in the Obama White House, and was a deputy press secretary in the Clinton White House. Follow her on Twitter: @jmpalmieri*



## Trump's budget proposal slashes spending by \$3.6 trillion over 10 years (UNE)

<https://www.facebook.com/costareports>  
10-13 minutes

President Trump on Tuesday will propose cutting federal spending by \$3.6 trillion over 10 years, a historic budget contraction that would severely ratchet back spending across dozens of programs and could completely reshape government assistance to the poor.

The White House's \$4.094 trillion budget request for fiscal 2018 calls for cuts that hit Medicaid, food assistance and other anti-poverty programs. It would cut funding for the Children's Health Insurance Program (CHIP), which provides benefits to the poor, by roughly 20 percent next year.

All told, the budget would reduce spending on safety-net programs by more than \$1 trillion over 10 years.

Details of the budget circulating in Washington on Monday drew outrage from Democrats and a mix of anxiety and praise from Republicans, illustrating the political minefield that policymakers face as they debate whether to turn the proposals into law.

Mick Mulvaney, director of the Office of Management and Budget, said the spending plan, titled "A New Foundation for American

Greatness," is focused on protecting taxpayer money and cutting spending on programs that are ineffective or encourage people not to work.

What Trump's budget cut in the social safety net

He singled out the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program (SNAP), the modern version of food stamps, which grew rapidly after the financial crisis and had 44 million beneficiaries in 2016.

"We need people to go to work," Mulvaney said. "If you are on food stamps and you are able-bodied, we need you to go to work. If you are on disability insurance and you are not supposed to be, you are not truly disabled, we need you to go back to work. We need everybody pulling in the same direction."

Democrats and anti-poverty advocates decried the changes, saying that Trump is seeking to strip support for the most vulnerable Americans while cutting taxes for the wealthiest.

"This would pull the rug out from so many Americans who need help: those suffering from opioid and heroin addiction, people in nursing homes and their families who care for them, the elderly, the disabled and children," Senate Minority Leader Charles E. Schumer (D-N.Y.) said.

The proposed budget refocuses decades of U.S. spending — both foreign and domestic — to reflect Trump's belief that too much taxpayer money is simply given away.

For example, the president will propose changing foreign aid programs in a way that no longer delivers much of the money as grants and instead extends loans to foreign governments that must be repaid, Mulvaney said. Special exemptions would be made for Israel and Egypt.

The budget would also impose a 2 percent cut to all spending that must be approved by Congress each year for the next decade, excluding military programs. Spending for these programs tends to increase each year under Democrats and Republicans. Separately, the budget would eliminate all federal support for Planned Parenthood, the health-care provider that conservatives often attack.

In writing the budget, White House officials were forced to walk a tightrope.

Trump insisted that they could not cut retirement benefits for Social Security or health benefits for Medicare, two of the most expensive parts of the federal budget. White House officials also

were committed to protecting military spending.

To preserve those items and eliminate the budget deficit over 10 years, officials had to deliver major cuts across the rest of the budget. The budget also relies heavily on assumptions that economic growth will soar under tax cuts and regulatory reductions that Trump has promised to deliver.

"You have to understand that for Trump, growth is populism, so he doesn't see this as a budget of cuts but a budget for growth," said Sam Nunberg, a longtime Trump associate who worked on his campaign in 2015. "What he's trying to do is work with Congress, where a lot of these ideas started, and put something together."

The budget, in its deeply conservative framework, risks alarming some of the president's supporters.

"I'm not sure the White House understands who their base is," Patrick H. Caddell, a veteran strategist who works with Breitbart News, said. He cited Democrats and working-class independents as key parts of Trump's political coalition. "Where's the outreach to them?" he asked.

But a White House official, who was not authorized to speak publicly, said Trump saw the shrinking of the

"welfare state" as a necessary component of his nationalist, working-class appeal and part of his pledge to "drain the swamp."

Meanwhile, Trump's critics in the GOP shrugged at the president's overture to the budget-cutting wing of the party.

"I don't take it as a sign he's more ideological," said Peter Wehner, a veteran Republican policy hand. "He's like a needle spinning around a broken compass, and we're not sure where he'll land. This week he's more ideological, next week he could be less ideological."

One of the biggest surprises in the budget is that defense spending remains relatively flat, after months of promises from Trump that he would completely rebuild the military.

The plan proposes a \$43 billion increase in defense spending next year, but in subsequent years the budget is almost identical to what it would be without any changes. A White House official said that is because the military is still planning spending priorities for those years and that the budget would eventually change.

For anti-poverty programs, the White House proposes shifting some of the financial costs to states, giving them a financial stake in deciding whether to permit people to receive benefits.

On Medicaid, Trump wants states to choose between agreeing to a cap based on how many people are enrolled or a "block grant" structure that delivers funds to states and gives them more flexibility in how it is spent.

A number of key Republicans have expressed concern about the approach.

Even some congressional

conservatives warned that there is such a thing as too many cuts. "There will be some concerns if we go too deep in some of these areas," said Rep. Mark Walker (R-N.C.), chairman of the Republican Study Committee, referring to the cuts to the children's health care program.

Rep. Mark Meadows (R-N.C.), chairman of the hard-line House Freedom Caucus, said he was encouraged by early reports of new curbs on SNAP and other spending, but said he drew the line on cuts to Meals on Wheels — a charity that Mulvaney suggested was ineffective earlier this year.

"I've delivered meals to a lot of people that perhaps it's their only hot meal of the day," Meadows said. "And so I'm sure there's going to be some give and take, but to throw out the entire budget just because you disagree with some of the principles would be inappropriate."

On Medicaid, Trump wants to transform the way the program's funding works, moving away from its half-century history of giving each state a certain share of the program's cost, no matter how many are on the rolls. Instead, the administration is proposing to give states a choice between a financial cap based on how many people are enrolled or a "block grant" that would allow more latitude over how the money were spent. Three health-policy experts said Monday night that the block grants envisioned in the budget would go beyond those that would be allowed under the American Health Care Act, which narrowly passed the House last month.

The administration wants to allow a state to move everyone on Medicaid into a block-grant system, while the House bill would not permit that for elderly or disabled people, who tend

to have the highest Medicaid expenses

For SNAP, the White House is proposing changes that would force states to pay a portion of the benefits, which could put more pressure on them to prevent people from enrolling.

On CHIP, the White House would propose eliminating a 23 percentage point increase in federal contributions and would cap other assistance to the program to limit federal payments to children from families with incomes of no higher than 250 percent of the federal poverty level. The White House contends that would make sure the program helps only the neediest children.

However, Diane Rowland, executive vice president of the Kaiser Family Foundation, pointed out that 18 states, plus the District of Columbia allow the children of families with incomes of more than 300 percent of the poverty line into their programs. For such states, Rowland said, "this is a big hit."

"We are no longer going to measure compassion by the number of programs or the number of people on those programs," Mulvaney said. "We are going to measure compassion and success by the number of people we help get off of those programs and get back in charge of their own lives."

But Jared Bernstein, who served as a top economic adviser to former vice president Joe Biden, called the scale of Trump's cuts "otherworldly." He said that even if Senate Republicans are able to scale back the cuts, they could still have a major impact on government programs.

"At the end of the day, they may settle for something that's huge and egregious but less than the cosmic

number they are throwing around" in the budget proposal, he said.

## Economy & Business Alerts

Breaking news about economic and business issues.

Many of the programs targeted by Trump's budget provide health, housing or other assistance to millions of Americans, including a large number of Trump voters.

There are 74.6 million Americans who receive Medicaid or CHIP, according to the Kaiser Family Foundation. Almost 11 million receive Social Security Disability Insurance payments, and 8.3 million receive Supplemental Security Income, a small cash benefit for the poor and those with disabilities.

Many of these programs have rigorous screening mechanisms, and it is very difficult for people who are unemployed, childless and able to work to collect benefits for long. But Trump administration officials believe the rules should be even stricter, with the goal of pushing more people back into the workforce so that the economy can strengthen and create more growth.

Former House speaker Newt Gingrich, who engaged in numerous budget battles during the Clinton administration, said that Trump must steel himself against attacks and emphasize his insistence on how much he "values work."

"If the Trump people sell it as genuine reform that's getting rid of people who should be at work or are cheating, getting rid of redundancy and making the bureaucracy dramatically leaner, then it will be successful," Gingrich said. "People actually resent neighbors who are getting goodies they haven't worked for. It's going to be a huge fight. How this plays out will depend on how he handles it."

## THE WALL STREET JOURNAL

and Nick Timiraos

7-9 minutes

## Trump's Budget Seeks Cuts to Taxes, Safety-Net Programs

Peter Nicholas,  
Kate Davidson

student loans. The White House says the planned tax cuts can generate more revenue for the government rather than reduce it.

Mr. Trump's budget proposal—the clearest window yet into the new president's expectations and priorities—now goes to Congress, which will decide whether to turn the vision into reality. It is sure to face a difficult road on Capitol Hill, despite Republican control, given competing factions within the GOP and the near certainty of blowback from Democrats.

"It'll face a tough sled over here," Rep. Hal Rogers (R., Ky.), a former chairman of the House

Appropriations Committee, said of the Trump budget.

Budget director Mick Mulvaney, briefing reporters on Monday, described how Mr. Trump arrived at the blueprint, personally going over proposed cuts line by line and delivering a verdict: "Yes" or "No."

Mr. Trump himself won't be on hand to sell the plan in Washington. He is on his maiden overseas trip as president, traveling through the Middle East and Europe.

"I can't remember a major budget submission that wasn't scheduled around a presidential availability and the president using it as an opportunity to drive his message

forward," said Jason Furman, a senior fellow at the Peterson Institute for International Economics and a former top Obama administration economic adviser.

The budget would cut overall spending by \$4.5 trillion over a decade. That includes reductions to decades-old safety-net programs most identified with Lyndon Johnson's Great Society push of the 1960s. Those cuts would more than offset a short-term boost in funding to the military, \$200 billion on infrastructure investment and \$19 billion on a new parental leave program.

Among the reductions, the president's budget proposes \$250

Updated May 22, 2017 9:16 p.m. ET

President Donald Trump on Tuesday will propose a plan he says will balance the federal budget in a decade on the strength of substantially faster economic growth and cuts to taxes and government safety-net programs.

Programs that would see dramatic cuts include Medicaid, food stamps, disability benefits, welfare and



billion in saving over a decade through the repeal and replacement of the Affordable Care Act, President Barack Obama's signature legislative policy. Those savings would come largely through reductions to Medicaid, the federal-state health insurance program for low-income people. Other unspecified reforms to Medicaid and the federal Children's Health Insurance Program would shave another \$616 billion from government spending through 2027.

As a candidate, Mr. Trump promised not to cut Medicaid. Asked about that pledge, Mr. Mulvaney said that much of the Medicaid cuts spring from changes included in the health-care overhaul that has passed the House and which Mr. Trump favors.

"It probably is the most conservative budget that we've had under a Republican or Democrat administration in decades," said Rep. Mark Meadows (R., N.C.), chairman of the House Freedom Caucus, a group of roughly three-dozen conservative House GOP lawmakers.

Some budget analysts said Republicans may resist spending cuts for safety-net programs, particularly as they pursue tax cuts that would lower rates for businesses and high-income households.

"Politically that is extremely difficult," said William Hoagland, a former congressional Republican budget

aide who is now at the Bipartisan Policy Center in Washington. "You're talking about tax reform that would appear on the face of it to benefit the upper-income brackets while you're reducing support to the lower-income groups."

Underlying the plan to eliminate the budget deficit, the White House is projecting a decade of rosy economic conditions—3% growth, steady inflation of 2%, the jobless rate rising slightly to 4.8% and modest interest rate increase—the kind of environment that would typically go in hand with strong worker productivity growth and a pickup in the labor force.

"The ugly truth is this: You can never balance the budget at 1.9% growth," Mr. Mulvaney said. "It's just not going to happen."

One big question is whether much faster growth is achievable; the U.S. is already nearly eight years into an economic expansion with a low unemployment rate of 4.4% and the Federal Reserve raising short-term interest rates, which tends to curb growth. No expansion in history has lasted longer than 10 years. Moreover the economy has been held back by slow productivity growth and declining labor-force participation as the baby boom generation retires.

The Fed projects the economy will grow at a 1.8% annual rate in the coming years and the Congressional Budget Office projects 1.9% growth.

The administration is counting on tax and regulatory changes to stimulate growth. Faster growth, in turn, is projected to help reduce demand for safety-net programs such as food stamps and welfare.

Taken together with aggressive spending cuts the Trump administration says it can balance the budget by reducing outlays by \$4.5 trillion over 10 years and increasing revenues—even with cuts in tax rates—by \$1 trillion. Republicans have yet to coalesce around a common plan for cutting corporate and individual tax rates and face procedural hurdles to advancing a program, leaving the tax strategy a work in process.

At Mr. Trump's direction, the budget includes no cuts to the most popular entitlement programs: Medicare and Social Security's retirement insurance program, Mr. Mulvaney said.

The president's budget would impose new work requirements for able-bodied individuals to participate in the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program, also known as food stamps. It would also phase in a requirement that states match federal funding for the program, changes aimed at saving roughly \$193 billion over the coming decade. In the recession triggered by the financial collapse in 2008 as many as 47 million people used the food-stamp program. That number has dropped by about three million as the economy has gradually recovered.

The budget would also limit eligibility for the earned-income tax credit and the child tax credit, trimming \$40 billion of spending over the next 10 years, and would slash funding for disability insurance by \$72 billion. Other spending cuts include \$143 billion from changes to student-loan programs, \$63 billion in reduced retirement benefits for federal employees, and \$38 billion to curb certain farm subsidies.

Nondefense spending as a share of the economy would fall to just 1.5% by the end of the next decade, well below the lowest level in records going back to 1962.

"There's a certain philosophy wrapped up in the budget," Mr. Mulvaney said. "And that is we are no longer going to measure compassion by the number of programs and the number of people on those programs. We're going to measure compassion and success by the number of people we helped get off those programs and get back in charge of their own lives."

—Kristina Peterson contributed to this article.

**Write to** Peter Nicholas at [peter.nicholas@wsj.com](mailto:peter.nicholas@wsj.com), Kate Davidson at [kate.davidson@wsj.com](mailto:kate.davidson@wsj.com) and Nick Timiraos at [nick.timiraos@wsj.com](mailto:nick.timiraos@wsj.com)

Appeared in the May. 23, 2017, print edition as 'Budget Aims To Cut Taxes, Programs.'

## The New York Times Trump's Budget Cuts Deeply Into Medicaid and Anti-Poverty Efforts (UNE)

Julie Hirschfeld Davis

7-9 minutes

WASHINGTON — President Trump plans to unveil on Tuesday a \$4.1 trillion budget for 2018 that would cut deeply into programs for the poor, from health care and food stamps to student loans and disability payments, laying out an austere vision for reordering the nation's priorities.

The document, grandly titled "A New Foundation for American Greatness," encapsulates much of the "America first" message that powered Mr. Trump's campaign. It calls for an increase in military spending of 10 percent and spending more than \$2.6 billion for border security — including \$1.6 billion to begin work on a wall on the border with Mexico — as well as huge tax reductions and an

improbable promise of 3 percent economic growth.

The wildly optimistic projections balance Mr. Trump's budget, at least on paper, even though the proposal makes no changes to Social Security's retirement program or Medicare, the two largest drivers of the nation's debt.

To compensate, the package contains deep cuts in entitlement programs that would hit hardest many of the economically strained voters who propelled the president into office. Over the next decade, it calls for slashing more than \$800 billion from Medicaid, the federal health program for the poor, while slicing \$192 billion from nutritional assistance and \$272 billion over all from welfare programs. And domestic programs outside of military and homeland security whose budgets are determined annually by Congress would also take a hit, their funding falling by \$57 billion, or 10.6 percent.

The plan would cut by more than \$72 billion the disability benefits upon which millions of Americans rely. It would eliminate loan programs that subsidize college education for the poor and those who take jobs in government or nonprofit organizations.

Mr. Trump's advisers portrayed the steep reductions as necessary to balance the nation's budget while sparing taxpayers from shouldering the burden of programs that do not work well.

"This is, I think, the first time in a long time that an administration has written a budget through the eyes of the people who are actually paying the taxes," said Mick Mulvaney, Mr. Trump's budget director.

"We're not going to measure our success by how much money we spend, but by how many people we actually help," Mr. Mulvaney said as he outlined the proposal at the White House on Monday before its

formal presentation on Tuesday to Congress.

Among its innovations: Mr. Trump proposes saving \$40 billion over a decade by barring undocumented immigrants from collecting the child care tax credit or the earned-income tax credit, a subsidy for low- and middle-income families, particularly those with children. He has also requested \$19 billion over 10 years for a new program, spearheaded by his daughter and senior adviser Ivanka Trump, to provide six weeks of paid leave to new parents. The budget also includes a broad prohibition against money for entities that provide abortions, including Planned Parenthood, blocking them from receiving any federal health funding.

Workers prepared copies of the 2018 budget after publishing last week in Washington. Carolyn Kaster/Associated Press

The release of the document, an annual ritual in Washington that usually constitutes a marquee event for a new president working to promote his vision, unfolded under unusual circumstances. Mr. Trump is out of the country for his first foreign trip, and his administration is enduring a near-daily drumbeat of revelations about the investigation into his campaign's possible links with Russia.

The president's absence, which his aides dismissed as a mere coincidence of the calendar, seemed to highlight the haphazard way in which his White House has approached its dealings with Congress. It is just as much a sign of Mr. Trump's lack of enthusiasm for the policy detail and message discipline that is required to marshal support to enact politically challenging changes.

"If the president is distancing himself from the budget, why on earth would Republicans rally around tough choices that would have to be made?" said Robert L. Bixby, the executive director of the Concord Coalition, a nonpartisan organization that promotes deficit reduction. "If you want to make the political case for the budget — and the budget is ultimately a political document — you really need the president to do it. So, it does seem bizarre that the president is out of the country."

The president's annual budget — more a message document than a practical set of marching orders even in the best of times — routinely faces challenges on Capitol Hill. Lawmakers jealously guard their prerogative to control federal spending and shape government programs. But Mr.

Trump's wish list, in particular, faces long odds, with Democrats uniformly opposed and Republicans already showing themselves to be squeamish about some of the president's plans.

"It probably is the most conservative budget that we've had under Republican or Democrat administrations in decades," said Representative Mark Meadows, Republican of North Carolina and the chairman of the conservative House Freedom Caucus.

But in a signal that some proposed cuts to domestic programs are likely to face resistance even from conservatives, Mr. Meadows said he could not stomach the idea of doing away with food assistance for older Americans.

"Meals on Wheels, even for some of us who are considered to be fiscal hawks, may be a bridge too far," Mr. Meadows said.

Republicans balked at Mr. Trump's demand for money for the border wall in negotiations over a spending package enacted last month. Many were deeply conflicted over voting for a health care overhaul measure that included the Medicaid cuts contained in the budget to be presented on Tuesday. Now the president is proposing still deeper reductions to the federal health program for the poor, as well as drastically scaling back a broad array of social safety net programs that are certain to be unpopular with lawmakers.

"The politics of this make no sense to me whatsoever, in the sense that the population that brought them to the dance are the populists out there in the Midwest and South who rely on these programs that he's

talking about reducing," said G. William Hoagland, a former senior Republican congressional budget aide. Referring to Representative Paul D. Ryan, he said: "I don't see how Speaker Ryan gets anywhere close to 218 votes in the House of Representatives if this is the model. It's an exercise in futility."

Senator Chuck Schumer, Democrat of New York and the minority leader, said Monday that the Medicaid cuts would "carry a staggering human cost" and violate Mr. Trump's campaign promise to address the opioid epidemic.

"Based on what we know about this budget, the good news — the only good news — is that it was likely to be roundly rejected by members of both parties here in the Senate, just as the last budget was," Mr. Schumer said on the Senate floor.

The budget itself avoids some of the tough choices that would be required to enact Mr. Trump's fiscal vision. The huge tax cut was presented but without any detail about its elements or cost. Mr. Mulvaney said the tax plan would not add to the deficit, implying that its cost would be made up with other changes, such as eliminating deductions.

To balance the budget, Mr. Trump's budget relies on growth he argues will be generated from the as-yet-unformed tax cut.

The blueprint also steers clear of changing Social Security or Medicare, steps that Mr. Mulvaney, a former South Carolina congressman who has backed entitlement cuts, said he had tried to persuade Mr. Trump to consider.

"He said, 'I promised people on the campaign trail I would not touch their retirement and I would not touch Medicare,' and we don't do it," Mr. Mulvaney said. "I honestly was surprised that we could balance the budget without changing those programs, but we managed to do that."

But budget experts argued that was little more than fiction, and the plan could never deliver the results it claims to.

"The central inconsistency is promoting a massive tax cut and spending increases in some areas and leaving the major entitlement programs alone," Mr. Bixby said. "You don't have to be an economist to know that that doesn't add up, and that's why there's a great deal of concern about the negative fiscal impact that this budget will have."

While past presidents have often launched a road show with stops around the country to promote the components of their inaugural budgets, Mr. Trump is spending the rest of the week overseas, leaving his staff to explain his plan while Republicans prepare their own response.

"This budget is dead before arrival, so he might as well be out of town," said David A. Stockman, a former budget director under President Ronald Reagan.

Mr. Stockman said both political parties had grown comfortable with running large annual budget deficits. "There's not a snowball's chance that most of this deep deficit reduction will even be considered in a serious way."

## Trump approval falls 4 points in new survey

**THE HILL**

Jonah  
an  
Easley

6-7 minutes

President Trump's job approval rating has hit a new low in the latest Harvard-Harris Poll survey, with weeks of controversy taking their toll on Trump's embattled administration.

Trump's job approval rating has fallen to 45 percent from 49 percent in March.

The approval rating is at the high end compared with other surveys, which typically survey all residents, not just voters.

In the RealClearPolitics average of polls, Trump has a 39.6 percent

approval rating and 54.7 disapproval rating.

The drop is largely due to dissatisfaction among independents. Trump's job approval rating with that group is down from 47 percent in March to 40 percent in May.

Trump's favorability rating — the measure of his overall popularity — has also declined. Trump is at 42 percent positive and 53 percent negative, down from a 44-51 split in March.

The Harvard-Harris survey, provided exclusively to The Hill, comes after a dramatic stretch of controversy and crisis for the Trump administration.

Trump is dealing with allegations of obstruction of justice from his controversial decision to fire FBI

Director James Comey, media reports that the president revealed classified information in a private meeting with Russian diplomats and the Justice Department's appointment of a special counsel to investigate Russian meddling in the 2016 presidential election, including possible ties to Trump's campaign.

"The poll, taken at the height of the Comey frenzy, shows a weakening hand as would be expected," said Mark Penn, co-director of the Harvard-Harris survey.

On the upside, the poll shows that most of those who voted for Trump are sticking with him.

"He is holding on to 90 percent of his voters and his ratings are still above approval ratings for both the Democratic and Republican parties," Penn said.

Among all Republicans, Trump's job approval is at 85 percent. A Reuters-Ipsos survey released last week showed signs that Trump's base might be cracking, with only 75 percent of Republicans saying they approve of the job he's doing.

A majority of registered voters, 54 percent, and 63 percent of independents say they disapprove of Trump's decision to fire Comey.

Fifty-nine percent say they believe Trump asked Comey to end the investigation into Michael Flynn, Trump's former national security adviser who was dismissed for misleading Vice President Pence and other White House officials about the nature of a meeting with Russian Ambassador Sergey Kislyak.

The administration has put out different stories to explain Comey's firing. Trump has said it was in part because he does not view the FBI investigation as legitimate.

The poll shows Comey is even less popular than Trump.

Only 40 percent approved of the job Comey was doing as FBI director, compared with 60 percent who disapproved. Comey's favorability rating is at 31 percent positive and 39 negative. Seventy percent disapprove of the way Comey handled the investigation into Democratic presidential nominee Hillary Clinton use of a private email server from her time as secretary of State.

"The polling on Comey shows that President Trump is more in trouble for the way he fired Comey rather than for removing him," Penn concluded.

The voting public is split on whether

it believes there was collusion between Moscow and Trump's campaign. Overall, 52 percent say they do not think there was collusion, while 48 percent say there was. Among independents, 54 percent say they don't believe there was any collusion.

Fifty-nine percent say the special counsel appointed last week would lead to an end of the Russia inquiry, while only 41 percent say it will lead to impeachment. Sixty-six percent of Democrats say they think Trump will be impeached, while a majority of independents and Republicans say he will not be impeached.

"Right now nearly 60 percent believe impeachment will go nowhere, though a majority of Democrats think it will and so either that will happen or there is great potential for a boomerang among non-Democrats and disappointment among the party base," said Penn.

In addition to investigating Russia, 73 percent said they hope the special counsel looks into allegations that the Obama administration spied on Trump and his campaign and the unmasking of Flynn's name in intelligence reports.

The Russia storyline was sent into overdrive last week after The Washington Post reported that Trump revealed sensitive information pertaining to an Islamic State in Iraq and Syria (ISIS) terror plot to Russia's top diplomats in an Oval Office meeting.

The White House denies the report, while noting that the president is free to declassify information as he sees fit.

Still, 52 percent of those surveyed said it was inappropriate for the president to reveal that information, including 56 percent of independents.

That development was the latest in a long line of damaging leaks from within the government that have undermined Trump. Seventy-four percent of those surveyed said the leaking of an Oval Office meeting with foreign officials is a serious matter that should be investigated.

The Harvard-Harris online survey of 2,006 registered voters was conducted between May 17 and May 20. The partisan breakdown is 36 percent Democrat, 32 percent Republican, 29 percent independent and 3 percent other. The poll uses a methodology that doesn't produce a traditional margin of error.

Harvard-Harris Poll is a collaboration of the Harvard Center for American Political Studies and The Harris Poll. The Hill will be working with Harvard-Harris throughout 2017. Full poll results will be posted online later this week.



## Editorial : Another bad budget from Trump targets the poor

<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 22 at 7:31 PM

PRESIDENT TRUMP released a proposal for fiscal year 2018 discretionary spending — the "skinny budget" — two months ago, and the \$1.1 trillion plan garnered deservedly poor reviews. In a nutshell, Mr. Trump would have

gutted the Environmental Protection Agency, the National Institutes of Health and similarly crucial domestic agencies to fund a big boost in defense spending and border security. On Tuesday the White House releases its ideas for the remaining \$3 trillion or so in federal spending, including large-scale entitlements such as Medicaid, and the early indications are that the priorities embodied in this sequel will be no more humane or rational.

Not surprisingly, Mr. Trump has decided to embrace the House Republican health-care bill's \$800 billion in cuts to Medicaid (over the next decade), according to The Post's Damian Paletta. To do this, he would apparently add cuts to other safety-net programs, including housing and Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program benefits, also known as food stamps. The latter could be changed by enabling states to stiffen work requirements for those who receive the assistance. Such cuts are being contemplated, of course, at a time when Mr. Trump is also promising

huge reductions in taxes, mostly for upper-income individuals and corporations. This reverse redistribution is unconscionable on its own terms. In addition, Mr. Paletta reports that the Trump budget documents may claim that tax cuts drive so much additional growth that they — plus the safety-net cuts — will restore federal budget balance a decade hence. Thus do warped budgetary priorities produce warped budgetary arithmetic.

The truth of the matter is that there can be no plan for long-term fiscal balance that does not include both enhanced revenue and reform of the two biggest entitlement programs in the federal budget, Medicare and Social Security, which together account for 39 percent of all spending. Yet Mr. Trump promised during the campaign not to touch these middle-class favorites, and his budget apparently honors that pledge — with the possible exception of Social Security's disability program, which primarily helps low-income beneficiaries.

Opinions newsletter

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

To be sure, federal safety-net programs should not be immune from pruning; we've called for many such measures in previous editorials. Social Security disability in particular could be adjusted to help people return to work sooner, without losing needed cash aid. Yet America's poorest and most vulnerable people should be the last group called upon to sacrifice for the sake of deficit reduction, not the first — and certainly not the *only*. Fortunately, presidential budgets are notoriously ephemeral, as illustrated by the fate of the "skinny budget," which was quickly dismissed on Capitol Hill. The policy vision it embodied was too upside-down, apparently, even for the conservative Republican majority. That view of the world does not improve through repetition.



## Editorial : A Budget That Promises Little but Pain

The Editorial Board

4-5 minutes

Illustration by Delcan & Company; Photographs by Doug Mills/The New York Times

If President Trump's 2018 budget, to be unveiled on Tuesday, was

worthy of praise, you can bet Mr. Trump would be in Washington to bask in it. But his overseas trip keeps him at a distance physically, if not politically.

As detailed in a preview on Monday by Mick Mulvaney, the White House budget director, the budget is a naked appeal to far-right Republicans aiming for a partisan rallying cry, even as a legislative

victory most likely remains out of reach.

Of 13 major initiatives in the budget, nine are drastic spending cuts, mostly aimed at low-income Americans. The biggest of those, by far, is an \$866 billion reduction over 10 years in health care spending, mostly from Medicaid. That would be achieved if the Senate approves the House bill to undo President

Obama's Affordable Care Act. But many Senate Republicans oppose it; Senate Democrats are dead set against it and the vast majority of Americans don't want it, and for good reason. It would deprive an estimated 10 million low-income Americans, many of them nursing home residents, of Medicaid benefits; it would also defund Planned Parenthood, reducing or

ending health services to 2.5 million people, mainly women.

The budget also calls for slashing food stamps (\$192 billion over 10 years) and disability benefits (\$72 billion over 10 years), including a big chunk from the Social Security disability insurance program. The rationale is that the cuts would force Americans back to work. But some 60 percent of food stamp recipients already work and an estimated 15 percent more work most of the time, availing themselves of food stamps only when they are between jobs or when their hours are reduced. The remainder are disabled and elderly. They will not go back to work if their food stamps are reduced. They will go hungry.

## THE WALL STREET JOURNAL

Alexander Acosta

5-7 minutes

May 22, 2017 7:00 p.m. ET

President Trump has committed—and rightly so—to roll back unnecessary regulations that eliminate jobs, inhibit job creation, or impose costs that exceed their benefits. American workers and families deserve good, safe jobs, and unnecessary impediments to job creation are a disservice to all working Americans. As the Labor Department approaches this regulatory rollback, we will keep in mind two core principles: respect for the individual and respect for the rule of law.

America was founded on the belief that people should be trusted to govern themselves. Citizens sit on juries and decide the fate of their fellow citizens. Voters elect their representatives to Washington. By the same token, Americans should be trusted to exercise individual choice and freedom of contract. At a practical level, this means Washington should regulate only when necessary. Limiting the scope of government protects space for people to make their own judgments about what is best for their families.

The rule of law is America's other great contribution to the modern world. Engraved above the doors of the Supreme Court are the words "Equal Justice Under Law." Those four words announce that no

The cuts to Social Security disability benefits would be similarly cruel. The budget assumes the cutbacks would prod disabled people back to work. That assumption ignores how severely disabled most benefit recipients are. The cuts also ignore Mr. Trump's pledge not to cut Social Security. Mr. Mulvaney walked back that pledge on Monday, saying the promise pertained only to retirement benefits.

The budget also continues the practice outlined in Mr. Trump's "skinny" budget preview from March of immense defense increases coupled with deep cuts in non-defense discretionary spending, the catchall category that includes all of the federal programs that are annually appropriated by Congress. By the end of the 10-year budget

one is above the law, that everyone is entitled to its protections, and that Washington must, first and foremost, follow its own rules. This means federal agencies can act only as the law allows: The law sets limits on their power and establishes procedures they must follow when they regulate—or deregulate.

The Administrative Procedure Act is one of these laws. Congress had good reason to adopt it: In the modern world, regulations are akin in power to statutes, but agency heads are not elected. Thus, before an agency can regulate or deregulate, it must generally provide notice and seek public comment. The process ensures that all Americans—workers, small businesses, corporations, communities—have an opportunity to express their concerns before a rule is written or changed. Agency heads have a legal duty to consider all the views expressed before adopting a final rule.

Today there are several regulations enacted by the Obama administration that federal courts have declared unlawful. One is the Persuader Rule, which would make it harder for businesses to obtain legal advice. Even the American Bar Association believes the rule goes too far. Last year a federal judge held that "the rule is defective to its core" and blocked its implementation. Now the Labor Department will engage in a new rule-making process, proposing to rescind the rule.

period, such spending — for law enforcement, diplomacy, environmental protection, scientific research, justice, arts and humanities, tax collection and entire executive branch departments — would be lower as a share of the economy than in records dating back more than 50 years.

The budget leaves Medicare spending untouched. It also promises to help finance \$1 trillion in infrastructure investments, which is likely to mean subsidizing private investors in roads, bridges and other public works in exchange for a share of what used to be thought of as public property. It lists a \$19 billion paid family leave program that appears to be supported by funds intended for unemployment benefits.

Another example of a controversial regulation is the Fiduciary Rule. Although courts have upheld this rule as consistent with Congress's delegated authority, the Fiduciary Rule as written may not align with President Trump's deregulatory goals. This administration presumes that Americans can be trusted to decide for themselves what is best for them.

The rule's critics say it would limit choice of investment advice, limit freedom of contract, and enforce these limits through new legal remedies that would likely be a boon to trial attorneys at the expense of investors. Certainly, it is important to ensure that savers and retirees receive prudent investment advice, but doing so in a way that limits choice and benefits lawyers is not what this administration envisions.

The Labor Department has concluded that it is necessary to seek additional public input on the entire Fiduciary Rule, and we will do so. We recognize that the rule goes into partial effect on June 9, with full implementation on Jan. 1, 2018. Some have called for a complete delay of the rule.

We have carefully considered the record in this case, and the requirements of the Administrative Procedure Act, and have found no principled legal basis to change the June 9 date while we seek public input. Respect for the rule of law leads us to the conclusion that this date cannot be postponed. Trust in Americans' ability to decide what is

What it lacks is any meaningful discussion of taxes. The budget asserts that any cuts would be offset by revenue from huge economic growth, unspecified loophole closings or additional spending cuts.

The truth is that trillion-dollar tax cuts, most of which would flow to the wealthy, would hurt millions of other Americans. The nation will not prosper by cutting aid to sick, hungry, disabled and low-income Americans, or by boosting military spending while devastating domestic spending, or by privatizing infrastructure.

best for them and their families leads us to the conclusion that we should seek public comment on how to revise this rule. Under the Obama administration, the Securities and Exchange Commission declined to move forward in rule-making. Yet the SEC has critical expertise in this area. I hope in this administration the SEC will be a full participant.

America is unique because, for more than 200 years, its institutions and principles have preserved the people's freedoms. From administration to administration, respect for the rule of law has remained, even when Americans have been bitterly divided. Some who call for immediate action on the Obama administration's regulations are frustrated with the slow process of public notice and comment. But this process is not red tape. It is what ensures that agency heads do not act on whims, but rather only after considering the views of all Americans. Admittedly, this means deregulation must find its way through the thicket of law. Casting aside the thicket, however, would leave Americans vulnerable to regulatory whim.

The Labor Department will roll back regulations that harm American workers and families. We will do so while respecting the principles and institutions that make America strong.

*Mr. Acosta is secretary of labor.*

Appeared in the May. 23, 2017, print edition.

## THE WALL STREET JOURNAL

# Secretary Acosta: Deregulators Must Follow the Law, So Regulators Will Too

## Many Illegal Immigrants Arrive Legally

Laura Meckler

4-5 minutes

May 22, 2017 5:57 p.m. ET



WASHINGTON—More than 700,000 foreigners who were supposed to leave the country last year stayed beyond the terms of their visas, though some of them subsequently departed, the Department of Homeland Security said Monday.

That figure represents a small slice—fewer than 1.5%—of the more than 50 million visitors whose visas directed them to depart in fiscal year 2016. Though the vast majority of visitors left on time, in conjunction with a similar report issued last year, it suggests that a substantial number of people are living in the U.S. illegally who arrived with legal papers.

Most of the attention around illegal immigration involves people who cross into the U.S. illegally, but experts say more than 40% of the estimated 11 million undocumented people overstayed their legal visas and that a majority of newly arrived illegal immigrants came legally and then stayed past their return dates.

Congress has long pressed for a biometric entry and exit system to track foreigners, but su

ccessive administrations haven't delivered. Proponents of such a system note that the terrorists who carried out the Sept. 11, 2001, attacks had come to the U.S. legally and overstayed their visas.

But only last year, for the first time, did the Obama administration feel confident enough in data available to create the first overstay report, based on information from fiscal year 2015. The report found that 527,127 of the people expected to depart in 2015 overstayed their visas, though officials said Monday that just 304,000 of them were still in the country in January 2017. That report didn't cover all visa types. Monday's report covered fiscal year 2016, which ended Sept. 30.

Biometric information is captured when people enter the U.S., but the exit data is currently based on manifests from airplanes and ships that must be cross referenced with other databases to ensure that visitors didn't obtain a new immigration status while they were in the U.S.

Meanwhile, land crossings generally aren't counted, even though they represent the plurality of arrivals.

Efforts to track air exits using biometric data such as facial recognition software are still being tested.

The Department of Homeland Security said it is committed to completing a biometric system that would cover all visitors, as President Donald Trump ordered anew in an executive order early this year. The agency said it would expand biometric exit programs to seven additional airports in the coming months.

The list of people suspected of staying past their visas is shared with the Immigration and Customs Enforcement agency on a continuing basis, officials said. ICE officers target those deemed priorities for deportation, the agency says, such as those with criminal records.

"To protect the American people from those who seek to do us harm, and to ensure the integrity of the immigration system, ICE has recently increased overstay enforcement operations," the department said in a statement.

As with last year's data set, the new Department of Homeland

Security report found many of those who stayed past their visa expiration dates subsequently departed. By the end of the fiscal year, the government counted 628,799 people it suspected remained in the U.S. without authorization and by January, the total had fallen to 544,000.

The report also tallied the number of visa overstays based on type of visa as well as country of origin. It found that rates were much lower for countries whose citizens don't need a visa to come to the U.S. for a limited time. For instance, just 0.15% of visitors from Japan who came for business or pleasure stayed past their mandated exit dates. That compares with 13.71% of similar travelers from Afghanistan and 25.14% from Bhutan.

**Write to Laura Meckler at** [laura.meckler@wsj.com](mailto:laura.meckler@wsj.com)

Appeared in the May. 23, 2017, print edition as 'Thousands Remain Beyond Visa Terms.'

**THE WALL  
STREET  
JOURNAL**

May 22, 2017  
7:13 p.m. ET 107 COMMENTS

4-5 minutes

## Editorial : Voting Rights Confusion

State legislatures have been trying to figure out how much they can or should consider race when redrawing political districts and on Monday the Supreme Court increased the confusion. In a 5-3 decision, the four liberals plus Justice Clarence Thomas struck down North Carolina's congressional map, ruling that the district lines were drawn in a way that disadvantaged black voters.

After the 2010 census, North Carolina Republicans drew up a congressional map that moved more black voters, who tend to vote Democratic, into two districts. Republicans said their motivation was partisan, with an eye toward improving Republican odds in other districts. Democrats challenged the law on grounds that by altering the concentration of black voters, the gerrymander violated the Constitution's guarantee of equal protection.

In her opinion for the Court, Justice Elena Kagan wrote that race was

the predominant factor in redrawing the maps and that "a State may not use race as the predominant factor in drawing district lines unless it has a compelling reason" (*Cooper v. Harris*).

Yet under the 1965 Voting Rights Act, state legislatures are required to take race into account when drawing district lines. When North Carolina drew its maps, it sought pre-clearance from the Obama Justice Department. In its application, the state noted that the increase of black voters in District 12 to 50.66% from 43.77% "maintains, and in fact increases, the African-American community's ability to elect their candidate of choice in District 12."

Democrats argue that those numbers are evidence of impermissible concentration of black voters. But the legal uncertainty has created a tightrope for state lawmakers, who must find a balance between impermissible black vote dilution and impermissible black vote concentration. If they fail to take race into account when redrawing districts, they can fall afoul of the 1965 Voting Rights Act. If they take

race into account too much they fall afoul of the Equal Protection Clause of the Constitution.

In his dissent, Justice Samuel Alito notes that the problem is complicated by the fact that race and political affiliation are highly correlated, making it hard to tell why a redistricting decision was made. "If around 90% of African-American voters cast their ballots for the Democratic candidate, as they have in recent elections," Justice Alito wrote, "a plan that packs Democratic voters will look very much like a plans [sic] that packs African-American voters."

Justice Thomas's vote with the liberals is an extension of his consistent and principled absolutism on issues of race. Once the state conceded it had used race, even benignly, Justice Thomas was out. "I think North Carolina's concession that it created the district as a majority-black district is by itself sufficient to trigger strict scrutiny," he wrote.

The opinion is also notable for the fact that it gets all the Court's liberal justices on board with the argument that the use of race is always subject to strict scrutiny, not merely

sometimes as they have argued in past cases. That could be tricky for liberals if a future case challenges Section 2 of the Voting Rights Act on grounds that it *requires* states to take race into account when redrawing their districts.

As Justice Thomas wrote in his magnificent 1994 opinion in *Holder v. Hall*, "few devices could be better designed to exacerbate racial tensions than the consciously segregated districting system currently being constructed in the name of the Voting Rights Act," and "our drive to segregate political districts by race can only serve to deepen racial divisions by destroying any need for voters or candidates to build bridges between racial groups or to form voting coalitions."

Meantime, the Court's decision is most likely to guarantee more litigation by Democrats, who are happy to use the courts as a way to maximize the opportunities for Democratic candidates, and race as a sword for partisan purposes.

Appeared in the May. 23, 2017, print edition.

**The  
New York  
Times**

## Brooks : The Alienated Mind

David Brooks 6-7 minutes

Supporters of President Trump waiting for him to speak at an event in Georgia in April. Jonathan Ernst/Reuters

The campaign of 2016 was an education in the deep problems facing the country. Angry voters made a few things abundantly clear: that modern democratic capitalism is not working for them; that basic institutions like the family and communities are falling apart; that we have a college educated elite that has found ingenious ways to make everybody else feel invisible, that has managed to transfer wealth upward to itself, that crashes the hammer of political correctness down on anybody who does not have faculty lounge views.

As Robert W. Merry put it recently in *The American Conservative*, "When a man as uncouth and reckless as Trump becomes president by running against the nation's elites, it's a strong signal that the elites are the problem."

The last four months, on the other hand, have been an education in the shortcomings in populism. It's not only that Donald Trump is a bad president. It's that movements fueled by alienation are bound to fail.

Alienation, the sociologist Robert Nisbet wrote, is a "state of mind that can find a social order remote, incomprehensible or fraudulent; beyond real hope or desire; inviting apathy, boredom, or even hostility."

The alienated long for something that will smash the system or

change their situation, but they have no actual plan or any means to deliver it. The alienated are a hodgepodge of disparate groups. They have no positive agenda beyond the sort of fake shiny objects Trump ran on (*Build a Wall!*). They offer up no governing class competent enough to get things done.

As Yuval Levin argues in a brilliant essay in *Modern Age*, "Alienation can sometimes make for a powerful organizing principle for an *electoral* coalition. ... But it does not make for a natural organizing principle for a *governing* coalition."

Worse, alienation breeds a distrust that corrodes any collective effort. To be "woke" in the alienated culture is to embrace the most cynical interpretation of every situation, to assume bad intent in every actor, to imagine the conspiratorial malevolence of your foes.

Alienation breeds a hysterical public conversation. Its public intellectuals are addicted to overstatement, sloppiness, pessimism, and despair. They are self-indulgent and self-lionizing prophets of doom who use formulations like "the Flight 93 election" — who speak of every problem as if it were the apocalypse.

Alienation also breeds a zero-sum mind-set — it's us or them — and with it a tribal clannishness and desire for exclusion. As Levin notes, on the right alienation can foster a desire for purity — to exclude the

foreign — and on the left it can foster a desire for conformity — to squelch differing speakers and faiths.

The events of the past four months have demonstrated that Donald Trump is not going to solve the problem he was elected to address; neither the underlying economic and social ruptures nor the alienation that emerges from them.

The events of the past four months illustrate that we do need a political establishment in this country, or maybe a few competing establishments. We need people who have been educated to actually know something about public policy problems. We need people who have had gradual, upward careers in government and understand the craft of wielding power. We need people who know how to live up to certain standards of integrity and public service.

But going forward we need a better establishment, one attuned to Trump voters, those whose alienation grows out of genuine suffering.

The first task for this better establishment is to not make the political chasm worse. As the impeachment investigation proceeds, it'll be important for us Trump critics to not set our hair on fire every day, to evaluate the evidence as if it were against a president we ourselves voted for. Would we really throw our own candidate out of office for this?

Over the longer term, it will be necessary to fight alienation with participation, to reform and devolve the welfare state so that recipients are not treated like passive wards of the state, but take an active role in their own self-government.

It'll be necessary to revive a living elite patriotism. That means conducting oneself in office as if nation is more important than party; not using executive orders, filibusters and the nuclear option to grab what you can while you happen to be in the majority. It means setting up weekly encounters to help you respect and understand the fellow Americans who reside across the social chasms.

Finally, it'll be necessary to fight alienation with moral realism, with a mature mind-set that says that, yes, people are always flawed, the country always faces problems, but that is no reason for lazy cynicism or self-righteous despair. If you start with an awareness of human foibles, then you can proceed with what Levin calls pessimistic hopefulness — grateful for the institutions our ancestors left us, and filled with cheerful confidence that they can be reformed to solve present needs.

Impeached or not, it's hard to see how Trump recovers as an effective governing force. Now is the moment for a new establishment to organize, to address the spirit of alienation that gave rise to Trump, but which transcends him.



## Editorial : The absurd conspiracy theory around Seth Rich's death causes real harm

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

3-4 minutes

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 22 at 7:30 PM

LET'S DISPENSE with calling the frenzy of reports about Democratic National Committee staffer Seth Rich's death last summer fake news. So overused and misused is the phrase — by those seeking to disparage things they simply dislike or disagree with — that it risks losing real meaning. And there must be no ambiguity or confusion about

the recent reports about Mr. Rich. They are lies. They do great harm. And those peddling them, including most recently former House speaker Newt Gingrich, are either ignorant of the facts or without scruple.

Mr. Gingrich on Sunday during an appearance on "Fox & Friends" gave a boost to conspiracy theories that Mr. Rich was not killed during a botched robbery — as D.C. police believe based on all available evidence — but rather was "assassinated" to cover up how tens of thousands of internal Democratic Party emails were leaked to WikiLeaks. Never mind that U.S. intelligence officials have conclusively determined that Russia hacked the accounts. The absurd notion that operatives working on behalf of Hillary Clinton killed the 27-year-old staffer has been a staple of far-right websites but given little acknowledgment or credence

from mainstream media. That changed last week when local Fox affiliate WTTG 5 aired a report claiming Mr. Rich had been in touch with WikiLeaks before his death.

Within a day, the story had been thoroughly debunked by reporters at NBC News, CNN and The Post. The lone "source" for the report — a contributor whose previous claim to the national spotlight was his report that pink-pistol-packing lesbian gangs were terrorizing the nation — recanted and the station issued a clarification. None of that, though, stopped Sean Hannity and then Mr. Gingrich, with no pushback from Fox News hosts, from trying to peddle the bogus story.

Read These Comments

The best conversations on The Washington Post

"Pizzagate," the insane conspiracy theory that Ms. Clinton was

operating a child-abuse ring out of a popular family pizzeria in Northwest Washington, demonstrated the damage that can be caused by lies. A North Carolina man believed the reports on social media and stormed the restaurant with an assault-style rifle. The cost this time is anguish for a grieving family as attempts are made to sully their son's memory. They have made clear they have confidence in the D.C. police. Does anyone really think that this mother and father don't want their son's murderer brought to justice or that they would be willing to look the other way to give someone political cover?

It is preposterous. Those suggesting otherwise should apologize.

## Monica Lewinsky: Roger Ailes's Dream Was My Nightmare

Monica Lewinsky  
5-6 minutes

Laura Breiling

This is not another obituary for Roger Ailes, who died last week 10 months after being ousted at Fox News. It is, I hope, instead an obituary for the culture he purveyed — a culture that affected me profoundly and personally.

Just two years after Rupert Murdoch appointed Mr. Ailes to head the new cable news network, my relationship with President Bill Clinton became public. Mr. Ailes, a former Republican political operative, took the story of the affair and the trial that followed and made certain his anchors hammered it ceaselessly, 24 hours a day.

It worked like magic: The story hooked viewers and made them Fox loyalists. For the past 15 years, Fox News has been the No. 1 news station; last year the network made about \$2.3 billion.

Some experts have noted that viewers found Fox for the first time because of the crisis. John Moody, a Fox executive editor, reflected on that period: "The Lewinsky saga put us on the news map." As he put it in another interview: "Monica was a news channel's dream come true."

Their dream was my nightmare. My character, my looks and my life

were picked apart mercilessly. Truth and fiction mixed at random in the service of higher ratings. My family and I huddled at home, worried about my going to jail — I was the original target of Kenneth Starr's investigation, threatened with 27 years for having been accused of signing a false affidavit and other alleged crimes — or worse, me taking my own life. Meantime, Mr. Ailes huddled with his employees at Fox News, dictating a lineup of talking heads to best exploit this personal and national tragedy.

For myriad reasons — information gathering, boredom (I couldn't leave my home without being trailed by paparazzi) and a touch of masochism — I watched the news around the clock. On Fox, it seemed, no rumor was too unsubstantiated, no innuendo too vile and no accusation too abhorrent.

Let's not pretend that Fox News was the only network to cover this story in the gutter. Mr. Ailes's station may have pioneered this new style of television reportage, but the other cable news channels didn't hesitate to join the race to the bottom. In fact, in late 1998, when Keith Olbermann briefly left MSNBC, he expressed disgust with the frequent Lewinsky coverage.

Just as television news was devolving into a modern coliseum, the internet came along and compounded this culture of shame

and vitriol. Remember: The story of my affair was not broken by The Washington Post, The New York Times or the networks, but online by the Drudge Report. The comments on television and online were excruciating. I ceased being a three-dimensional person. Instead I became a whore, a bimbo, a slut and worse. Just days after the story broke, Fox asked its viewers to vote on this pressing question: Is Monica Lewinsky an "average girl" or a "young tramp looking for thrills"?

Our world — of cyberbullying and chryrons, trolls and tweets — was forged in 1998. It is, as the historian Nicolaus Mills has put it, a "culture of humiliation," in which those who prey on the vulnerable in the service of clicks and ratings are handsomely rewarded.

Monica Lewinsky in Washington in 1999. Greg Gibson/Associated Press

As the past year has revealed, thanks to brave women like Gretchen Carlson and Megyn Kelly, it is clear that at Fox, this culture of exploitation wasn't limited to the screen. The irony of Mr. Ailes's career at Fox — that he harnessed a sex scandal to build a cable juggernaut and then was brought down by his own — was not lost on anyone who has been paying attention.

There are some positive signs that the younger generation at Fox — James and Lachlan Murdoch —

seem to want to change the culture Mr. Ailes created. Last week Bob Beckel, a Fox pundit who made a racist remark to an African-American Fox employee, was dismissed. Would this have happened in the Ailes era?

Although I imagine the desire by the Murdoch brothers to present a clean record to the European Commission reviewing their proposed takeover of Sky News played a role in their thinking, the Murdochs deserve praise for their part in the decision to fire Bill O'Reilly, whose show brought in \$100 million a year in ad revenue but who harassed and bullied women he worked with. I hope the Murdochs understand that Americans will no longer tolerate a corporate culture that views hate and harassment as part of running a successful news business.

None of this is to say that we shouldn't have a credible conservative point of view in our media — quite the opposite. If we've learned nothing else from the 2016 presidential election, it's that we must find a way to foster robust and healthy discussion and debate. Our news channels should be just such places.

So, farewell to the age of Ailes. The late Fox chief pledged Americans fair and balanced news. Maybe now we'll get it.