

# Revue de presse américaine

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



**Jeudi 6 juillet 2017, réalisation : Samuel Tribollet**



## **FRANCE - EUROPE .....3**

|  |    |
|--|----|
| Simone Veil to Be Laid to Rest in Panthéon, Among France's Revered .....           | 3  |
| FORTUNE : France Will Bury Its Abortion Rights Champion As a 'National Hero' ..... | 3  |
| What to Expect From Trump's Europe Trip.....                                       | 3  |
| President Snowflake: Trump Needs a Safe Space in Europe.....                       | 4  |
| 'Trump needs some nice pictures from Europe,' and Poland will likely oblige .....  | 5  |
| Poland Prepares 'Absolutely Huge' Welcome for Trump .....                          | 6  |
| Poland Is Way Too Happy About Donald Trump's Visit.....                            | 7  |
| China Sees Opening Left by Trump in Europe, and Quietly Steps In .....             | 8  |
| Germany Bolsters China Ties as Trump Policies Raise Concern.....                   | 8  |
| European Nuclear Weapons Program Would Be Legal, German Review Finds .....         | 9  |
| Britain Debates Saudis' Ties to Extremism, With May in an Uneasy Spot .....        | 10 |
| Low Pound Could Constrain British Defense Spending                                 | 10 |

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

|   |    |
|---|----|
| As the Battle for Mosul Nears End, Civilians Struggle to Survive—and Flee ..... | 11 |
|---|----|

|  |    |
|--|----|
| Tillerson Says U.S. Is Ready to Talk to Russia About No-Fly Zones in Syria.....                      | 11 |
| Russia Deploys a Potent Weapon in Syria: The Profit Motive .....                                     | 12 |
| U.S. prepared to hold joint operations with Russia in Syria, Tillerson says .....                    | 13 |
| No end in sight to Arab crisis as Qatar rejects demands amid blockade .....                          | 13 |
| Qatar's Gulf Neighbors Vow to Press Blockade After a Deadline Passes.....                            | 14 |
| Qatar Lashes Back at Demands by Saudi-Led Group...   | 14 |
| Varadarajan : Modi and Netanyahu Begin a Beautiful Friendship.....                                   | 15 |
| Editorial : Trump's Putin Test.....  | 15 |
| Klaas : Putin should send Trump a thank you note before they meet. Here's a draft.....               | 16 |
| What's Worse: If Trump and Putin Get Along, Or If They Don't? .....                                  | 17 |
| Trump Aides' Biggest Worry About Europe Trip: Meeting With Putin (UNE) .....                         | 17 |
| A Cold War Summit Offers Lessons for Trump Before Putin Meeting.....                                 | 18 |
| Trump Attacks U.S. Spies, Says 'Other People' Could've Hacked 2016.....                              | 19 |
| Editorial : There's No Alternative to Patience With North Korea.....                                 | 20 |
| China's Strongman Has a Weak Point: North Korea ...  | 20 |
| Kang : Accepting North Korean Realities.....   | 21 |
| Editorial : What Trump can do about North Korea.....   | 22 |
| In North Korea, 'Surgical Strike' Could Spin Into 'Worst Kind of Fighting' (UNE).....                | 22 |
| Sullivan : The right way to play the China card on North Korea.....                                  | 23 |
| U.S., Russia Spar Over Approach to North Korea Threat (UNE) .....                                    | 24 |
| Use of Force Against North Korea Carries Risk of Catastrophic War.....                               | 25 |
| U.S. diplomat blasts China and Russia for 'holding the hands' of North Korean leader (UNE) .....     | 26 |
| Editorial : North Korea's missile test was ominous, but a military response could be disastrous..... | 27 |
| 11,155 Dead: Mexico's Violent Drug War Is Roaring Back (UNE).....                                    | 27 |
| Government supporters attack Venezuelan congress, injure opposition lawmakers .....                  | 28 |

Maduro Supporters Storm Venezuela’s Congress .....29  
 Editorial : Showdown in Hamburg .....30  
 World leaders signal free-trade plans — whether  
 Trump joins or not (UNE).....30  
 Trump May Find Some Allies on Climate Change at  
 G-20 Meeting .....31  
 Editorial : The G-20 should put climate change at the  
 top of its list .....32  
 Editorial : The G-19 Must Prove Trump Wrong.....32

***ETATS-UNIS..... 33***  
 Jolly: Just ignore this President.....33  
 Trump’s voter data request poses an unnoticed danger 33  
 Why almost every state is partially or fully rebuffing  
 Trump’s election commission (UNE) .....34  
 Penn and Stein: Back to the Center, Democrats.....35  
 Dionne : Trump has made our politics ridiculous .....36  
 Editorial : Work and Reward: The Great Disconnect ...36

# FRANCE - EUROPE

The  
New York  
Times

## Simone Veil to Be Laid to Rest in Panthéon, Among France's Revered

Aurelien Breeden

PARIS — [Simone Veil](#), a Holocaust survivor and former health minister who championed France's legalization of abortion, will be laid to rest in the Panthéon alongside dozens of the country's most revered figures, President Emmanuel Macron said on Wednesday.

The honor will make Ms. Veil, who died last week at 89, one of the few women placed in the Panthéon, which holds many of France's greatest politicians, scientists and writers.

Mr. Macron made the announcement at a ceremony in Paris that paid tribute to Ms. Veil with military honors. He praised her for making France "better and more beautiful."

"Just as you leave us, Madame, please receive the immense thanks of the French people to one of its

much cherished children, whose example will never leave us," Mr. Macron said in front of Ms. Veil's coffin, which was draped with a French flag at the center of the Invalides courtyard.

Two of Ms. Veil's sons also spoke, praising their mother for her feminist and European values. The ceremony was attended by Holocaust survivors, politicians and dignitaries.

Several online petitions calling for Ms. Veil's placement in the Panthéon had gathered thousands of signatures since her death, with support from politicians across the spectrum. Opinion polls over the years have routinely shown that Ms. Veil was one of the most admired figures in France.

Mr. Macron said that Ms. Veil's family had agreed to the placement in the Panthéon and that she would be laid to rest with her husband,

Antoine, who died in 2013. French presidents have the prerogative to name entrants to the Panthéon.

The vast majority of those laid to rest in the monument, which has an imposing dome overlooking the Fifth Arrondissement of Paris, are men.

They include Voltaire, the philosopher and author; Victor Hugo, the writer; and Jean Moulin, a leader of the French Resistance to the Nazis during World War II.

There have been calls over the last few years to include more women. Only four of the nearly 80 people there today are women.

In 1907, Sophie Berthelot was laid to rest alongside her husband, the chemist Marcellin Berthelot, but it was not until 1995 that a woman — Marie Curie, the renowned physicist — was placed there on her own merits.

Germaine Tillion and Geneviève de Gaulle-Anthonioz, two figures of the Resistance who survived the Ravensbrück concentration camp in northern Germany, were awarded the honor in 2014 by François Hollande, then president.

Ms. Veil was best known in France for championing a 1975 law that legalized abortion and that is often referred to as the "Veil law." She was also the first woman to be chosen as president of the European Parliament. Born to a Jewish family in Nice, she was deported during World War II but survived the Holocaust.

"This tribute is your ultimate victory on the death camps," Pierre-François Veil, a lawyer and one of Ms. Veil's three sons, said at the ceremony on Wednesday.

## FORTUNE : France Will Bury Its Abortion Rights Champion As a 'National Hero'

Claire Zillman

At a funeral ceremony with military honor at Les Invalides in Paris on Wednesday, President Emmanuel Macron paid respects to a woman who represented "the best of what [the country] can achieve."

He praised feminist icon Simone Veil, who died last week at age 89, for making France "better and more beautiful" and announced that the politician who crusaded for the legalization of abortion in the 1970s will be buried alongside the nation's most revered figures in Paris's Panthéon.

Veil, widely admired in France, will become just the fifth woman laid to rest in the grand mausoleum. The Panthéon, which also houses the remains of 76 men, is where writer Victor Hugo and scientist Marie Curie are buried.

Online petitions calling for Veil to be placed in the Panthéon attracted thousands of signatures as they circulated after her death. Her interment there is reliant on a parliamentary act for "national heroes," according to the BBC.

Veil survived Auschwitz as a child—"I am still haunted by the images, the odors, the cries, the humiliation," she said in 2005—and went on to become one of France's most respected politicians.

After her concentration camp was liberated, Veil studied law and worked as a judge before becoming France's first female general secretary of the Council of Magistrates in 1970. The role, *Agence France-Presse* reports, "served as a springboard for a political career that fundamentally changed France."

*Subscribe to The World's Most Powerful Women, Fortune's daily must-read for global businesswomen.*

The next year, Veil threw herself behind a feminist campaign to overturn France's ban on abortion, a movement that sought to reverse the stigma of pregnancy termination and reduce the number of women dying from back-alley operations. While she pushed for decriminalizing abortions, she maintained that the practice should be the exception; "the last resort for desperate situations."

She continued her crusade after being named health minister, enduring insults from colleagues who compared abortions to the Nazis' mass murder of Jews. One lawmaker accused Veil of "genocide" and another spoke of embryos "thrown into the

crematorium ovens," according to AFP.

"I did not imagine the hatred I would stir up," Veil said decades later.

The legislation legalizing abortion that eventually passed parliament in 1974 is known as the Veil law and is—even today—considered a pillar of women's rights in France.

But Veil's legacy reaches beyond women's reproductive rights; she is also credited with pushing open a door for female politicians. When she fought for the legalization of abortion before parliament in 1974, there were just nine women the 490-seat chamber; today there are 224.



## What to Expect From Trump's Europe Trip

Derek Chollet

A president usually never gets a second chance to make a first impression, but President Donald Trump intends to test that proposition over the next few days in Europe.

Trump's first overseas tour was a mixed bag of style and substance — a symbolically successful visit to Saudi Arabia and summit with Gulf Cooperation Council partners, a positive stop in Israel, yet uncomfortable friction with democratic European allies, several instant meme moments (the glowing

orb, the Montenegro shove, and the white-knuckled handshake with French President Emmanuel Macron), and a fumbled policy pronouncement on NATO's Article 5. For the past several weeks, Trump's team has been forced to do cleanup, from having to explain that America first does not mean

America alone, to reassuring European partners that the United States does indeed stand by its commitments and explaining that Trump did not provide the Saudis and Emiratis with a green light to impose a total embargo on Qatar.

So what can we expect on this trip? Here are four things to look out for.

**Poland uses the Saudi playbook.** This trip will have a familiar arc: By starting with Poland, Trump is visiting a country that is desperate for U.S. support and determined to make the trip a success. Polish leaders are already boasting that other countries “envy” Trump’s visit to Warsaw, and they will roll out the red carpet, even by busing people into the capital to ensure that the president is met by throngs of cheering crowds (this kind of crowd building is a tactic from Soviet days). There is a lot Trump will like there — Poland punches above its weight on defense, and it too has a nationalist government skeptical of immigrants, in love with coal, unhappy with an independent judiciary, eager to make enemies in the press, and that enjoys antagonizing the European Union. Although Warsaw does not have Riyadh’s ostentatious wealth and gilded palaces, Trump will feel at home.

Trump’s speech in Warsaw should be a rousing reaffirmation of the U.S. commitment to Article 5 — and if he whiffs on this, it will be big news. Also look for new announcements on energy cooperation and security issues, from new weapons sales to a formal roadmap for defense cooperation.

**The return of “old Europe” versus “new Europe.”** Trump will leave the warm embrace of a country determined to make him happy to face a far more skeptical audience that is willing to stand up to him in

Germany. Chancellor Angela Merkel has made no secret of her frustrations with Trump, speaking with surprising candor about policy differences and the fact that Europe may have to rely less on the United States. Trump is deeply unpopular in Germany — if the Germans wanted to bus in cheering crowds, they would have to get folks from Poland.

The policy agenda of the G20 leaders summit is also less congenial for Trump. For example, expect fundamental disputes on trade and a sharp debate on climate change, where the United States finds itself alone — at one point the German government toyed with the idea of having a session on the Paris climate accords in a “19+1” format, but were talked out of it for being too confrontational.

The contrast between the visits to Poland and Germany could spark the reemergence of the “old Europe” versus “new Europe” narrative that soured transatlantic relations over a decade ago. After a rousing stop in Warsaw, it is easy to see the Trump team pushing this line, explaining away its problems with Europe as not part of some broader problem, but an issue specifically with France and Germany. This would be bad for the United States and Europe — it took years to dig out of the previous old/new Europe hole — but watch out for it.

**Reset 2.0?** Trump’s meeting with Russian President Vladimir Putin will be the main event. On style, look for an Olympian level of macho

posturing. Trump and Putin have very similar conceptions of what it means to be a great country, a strong leader, and a man. They both see the world — and every personal interaction — in zero-sum terms. And in their own ways, both are masters of the dark arts of deception, misdirection, and nationalist symbolism. So while we may see the blossoming of an authoritarian bromance, it is just as likely the two repel each other.

On substance, Trump has always said he wants to get along with Putin. That’s reasonable, and actually easy. You just do what Putin wants. So the questions are: What might Putin offers as part of a “deal,” what might he ask for in exchange, and would Trump find that tempting enough to do anything. The obvious card Putin could play would be to offer something on the Islamic State and Syria. But what would he demand in return? Lifting Ukraine-related sanctions? Pulling troops out of the Baltic states — Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania? And would Trump take the bait? Neither leader has an incentive to make a major concession right now, so instead of a diplomatic breakthrough, expect an announcement for follow-up talks by specially designated presidential envoys.

Most important, the world will be watching what, if anything, Trump says to Putin about Russian efforts to undermine democracy, in the United States and around Europe. Or does Trump agree with Putin that these efforts are a hoax? Perhaps

more than anything else, how the White House reads out this part of the discussion will shape how this first encounter is perceived.

**The wildcards.** Presidential trips are always remembered for moments, whether scripted or not (see above: the orb, the shove, and the handshake). Trump’s body language is always revealing, and it will be interesting to see how he handles the mixed company of the G20 summit. Will he seem chummier with his illiberal pals (from China, Russia, Turkey, and Saudi Arabia) than democratic partners?

On substance, it’s likely that the most important news of the trip will have nothing to do with transatlantic relations, Russia, or anything on the G20 agenda, but rather what’s next with North Korea following its successful test of an intercontinental ballistic missile.

Finally, it’s a good bet that Trump has a surprise up his sleeve — so don’t be shocked if he ends up visiting Afghanistan or Iraq (or both) during this trip. He has never been to either country, and with critical military decisions looming in both theaters, adding these stops would be smart. For security reasons, presidential visits to such places are never announced in advance, so this could be how Trump fills the mystery gap in his schedule between the stop in Germany and his July 14 visit to Paris for Bastille Day.



## President Snowflake: Trump Needs a Safe Space in Europe

Erin Gloria Ryan

“Fuck your feelings” was a resonant refrain among many Trump supporters during the 2016 campaign.

In their view, we were living in a country where the coddling of youthful sensitivities had run amok, and Donald Trump was the unvarnished antidote to the left’s assault on American toughness. Can’t handle it? Then leave, snowflake.

But President Trump, champion of fuck your feelings, has proved to be the most delicate snowflake of all. While every modern president has favored sympathetic media outlets and friendly crowds, Trump is different in the degree to which his promises differ from his actions. Unlike his predecessors, his appeal is built around a bravado he won’t or can’t exhibit.

In the first six months of his presidency, the self-professed brawler has dodged the press, favoring pillow fights with *Fox & Friends* over substantive exchanges with critical journalists.

He’s lived in denial of his unpopularity, choosing instead to fluff his insatiable ego before campaign-style rallies where he makes wild claims he then sends his unprepared lackeys to defend.

He pulled out of the Paris climate deal reportedly because his feelings were hurt by French President Emmanuel Macron’s handshake snub.

He responds to negative news coverage with tantrums and personal insults on social media, where he can duck behind his army of anonymous affirmers.

He fired the FBI director and a U.S. attorney after both reportedly rebuffed his inappropriate overtures.

His closest aides fear exposing him to unflattering news coverage, lest they bruise their boss’ ego.

The man never apologizes.

The president’s true-believing base and the suckling underlings who see him as a means to an end still publicly express support for him. His social media coordinator and barking sons, loyal to Trump as a trio of undersocialized rescue dogs, have never met a pro-Trump conspiracy theory they wouldn’t help spread.

But beyond that, the number of people who are willing to tell Donald Trump that he is wonderful is dwindling. Stateside, all the polling has him at a sub-40 percent approval rating, with no rally in sight. Internationally, it’s worse. In Europe, it’s abysmal.

Get The Beast In Your Inbox!

**Daily Digest**

Start and finish your day with the top stories from The Daily Beast.

**Cheat Sheet**

A speedy, smart summary of all the news you need to know (and nothing you don’t).

Thank You!

You are now subscribed to the Daily Digest and Cheat Sheet. We will not share your email with anyone for any reason.

Given Trump’s complete inability to process dissent, this week’s G-20 summit in Hamburg, Germany, puts President Snowflake directly in harm’s way. Thankfully, there’s Poland.

Poland is not on the way to Hamburg from the United States. It’s an overshoot. But it’s the closest place to the G-20 the president could land with the reasonable expectation that he wouldn’t be triggered by hordes of protesters the second he landed.

Just to be on the safe side, Polish officials bused extra Trump fans into Warsaw from across the countryside, armed with cheers and enthusiasm, and none of that scary dissent that frightens Donald so very much. Just what a brave president would want.

Who knows what would have happened if the president had visited, say, Stockholm or Nice. Feelings could have been hurt! Feelings with nuclear launch codes!

The rest of this week promises to be even rougher for President Trump and his eggshell emotions. At the G-20, he'll have to face the aforementioned Macron, the rude handshaker, and German Chancellor Angela Merkel, a mean lady who refuses to praise him even though he has done everything he is capable of as president, which is

nothing.

Trump will have to face a harsh world, one far from the safe space of his office with the enormous TV screen and the approving hedgehog face of Sean Hannity.

Trump will also have a meeting with Russian President Vladimir Putin, whom Trump once halfway invited to a Miss Universe pageant in Moscow. Apart from governing from the same city where a Miss Universe pageant once occurred, Putin is also a tiny despot, the sort of man Trump believes himself to be in the same way a cat watching a nature show on TV believes itself to be a lion. Incidentally, Russia is one of the only places in the world where Trump is popular.

Putin is also the sort of man most of America would hope the president would have the stones to confront, if

given the opportunity. Putin is also behind an attempt to meddle in the 2016 American presidential election, according to every intelligence organization.

Trump will not be dwelling on this fact, according to *The New York Times*, because Russia meddling in the U.S. election undermines Trump's electoral win, which he is apparently more proud of than he is in the continued integrity of the American electoral system. His fear of the disapproval of a masculine caricature is greater than any feeling of obligation to serve the interests of the country that elected him.

A normal person would take mass disdain—of the U.S., of Europe, of the industrialized world as a whole—as a clue that they, perhaps, are personally doing something wrong.

Not Donald Trump. Trump could drive northbound in the southbound lane of an expressway and interpret the other drivers' honks as affronts to his inherent rightness, so fearful is he of being wrong.

It's hard to fathom a person who demands so much personal toughness of those around him yet displays so little. Trump's critics have called this behavior childlike, immature, id-driven. Even his supporters would find fault in a man so frightened by confrontation that he's willing to fly several hundred miles out of the way to avoid it.

Trump is a wimp, a baby, a wuss, a chicken, a cupcake. To borrow from the vocabulary of the "Fuck your feelings" crowd: a puppet. Or something else that starts with a "p."



## 'Trump needs some nice pictures from Europe,' and Poland will likely oblige

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

WARSAW — President Trump arrived here late Wednesday in a country where the ruling Law and Justice party has called for Poland to "rise from its knees" — a phrase that carries echoes of Trump's "Make America Great Again" slogan. The populist, nationalist government has also spurned calls for European nations to welcome in Muslim asylum seekers, just as Trump has sought to halt the flow of Syrian refugees to America.

Government leaders have even promised to bus in throngs of people from rural Poland — the heart of the ruling party's support — to cheer the American president as he delivers a speech Thursday in the less-supportive capital city of Warsaw.

Trump's decision to visit Poland ahead of a Group of 20 meeting in Hamburg this week is widely viewed as a pointed embrace of his ideological allies here — and a shot across the bow at Europe's establishment forces, led by Germany and France.

For both governments, the visit is a chance to bolster their alliance at a time of heightened tensions with the rest of Europe. Trump has raised hackles with his friendly posture toward Russian President Vladimir Putin and his rejection of the Paris climate deal, while Polish President Andrzej Duda is in the midst of a roiling debate over controversial constitutional changes spearheaded by the Law and Justice party.

"Trump needs some nice pictures from Europe and the Polish government promised him that there would be cheering crowds in Warsaw," said Piotr Buras, head of the Warsaw office of the European Council on Foreign Relations. "The Polish government also needs nice pictures. . . . It needs certain high-level events which would show that Poland is not isolated in Europe and isolated in the world."

*[What Russia hopes to gain from this week's Putin-Trump meeting]*

The leader of Law and Justice, Jaroslaw Kaczynski, played up the significance of Trump's visit ahead of the G-20 summit and bragged that it has made Poland the "envy" of other nations such as Britain, which has yet to play host to the U.S. president.

"We have new success — Trump's visit," Kaczynski said over the weekend. Others "envy it; the British are attacking us because of it."

Yet for some Poles, the prospect that Trump might use his visit to bolster the ruling party fills them with dread.

"I don't want him to feel welcome here," said Paulina Skolasinska, 24, a student at the University of Warsaw, who criticized Trump and the Polish ruling party for their "fearmongering." "I feel like a lot of Poles support him because he is very similar to the Law and Justice party here. . . . He speaks to the base instincts. He wants people to fear other people — other nationalities, other ethnicities."

Especially among college students and other younger Warsaw residents, Trump's visit has left a bad taste, even while it is viewed as a potential positive for Poland's security.

"I don't like him, actually," said another student, Magda Stanczuk, 27. "He is not as good a person as he could be. I don't like such people."

Michal Pawtowski, 21, added: "I think that it is good that he's coming because we can't change here in Poland that he's the president of the United States, but he is the president and we must keep good relations with the United States."

For decades, the United States and Poland have maintained close ties. The Polish people are widely viewed as being positively inclined toward Americans, and many Americans trace their ancestry to Poland.

But Trump's presidency has proved to be a polarizing issue here, mirroring the degree to which Poland's domestic politics have exposed rifts in the society. Since Law and Justice took power in 2015, the party has been accused of pushing anti-democratic changes, engaging in press restrictions, moving to constrict women's reproductive rights and stifling the teaching of evolution and climate change in schools.

Trump's rhetoric against the media and refugees and his criticism of global institutions such as NATO and the European Union are similarly viewed negatively by Polish people, especially those in major cities like Warsaw. Although he is

viewed far more positively among Poles than among other Europeans, just 23 percent of Polish people said they had confidence in Trump, a decline of nearly 40 percent compared with their view of Barack Obama at a similar point in his presidency, according to a recent Pew Research Center poll. And a survey ahead of Trump's visit by an independent Polish news organization found that most felt a sense of "indifference," "amusement" and "fear" at the thought of Trump's presence here.

*[Months of Russia controversy leaves Trump 'boxed in' ahead of Putin meeting]*

"There is a lot of this what I would call ideological affinities between the Law and Justice party in Poland and Mr. Trump, not only in terms of ideology and political worldview but also some of the methods of doing politics are strikingly similar to my mind," said Jacek Kucharczyk, president of the Institute of Public Affairs, a Warsaw think tank. "No wonder the Polish ruling party has embraced this visit and is doing all they can to welcome Mr. Trump with open arms and also to glow in his light."

For Trump, it will be an opportunity to be embraced by a pro-American crowd in his first public address overseas.

On Thursday, at a monument dedicated to Poland's 1944 uprising against Nazi occupation, Trump will deliver what his aides have billed as a major speech in front of a crowd that will include many rural residents transported into the city free of charge by Law and Justice.

National security adviser H.R. McMaster said in a briefing ahead of the trip that Trump will “lay out a vision, not only for America’s future relationship with Europe, but the future of our transatlantic alliance and what that means for American security and American prosperity.”

For Poland’s governing party, Trump’s visit is being characterized as an unequivocal victory in the international arena and a potential turning point for the country’s efforts to gain energy independence from Russia.

Poland also remains a strategically critical European nation that is particularly sensitive to the threat of rising Russian power. Despite Trump’s efforts to pursue warmer relations with Putin, the Polish government expressed optimism that Trump remains committed to the security of Central and Eastern Europe.

## THE WALL STREET JOURNAL

WARSAW—Like many of his fellow Polish pro-government lawmakers, Dominik Tarczynski is sending a busload of constituents to Warsaw on Thursday to cheer for President Donald Trump. The buses are being provided by a foundation close to the governing party.

“It’s going to be huge—absolutely huge,” Mr. Tarczynski said of the coming welcome for Mr. Trump. “They just love him, the people in Poland—they just really love him.”

Poland was working to put on a hero’s welcome for Mr. Trump, who arrived late Wednesday for a brief visit that includes a speech Thursday in a Warsaw square.

President Barack Obama formed a close bond with German Chancellor Angela Merkel and backed her liberal worldview, her acceptance of immigrants, and her support for a deeply integrated European Union. Now it is nationalist governments such as Poland’s that hope Mr. Trump will see them as ideological kindred spirits and back their push to loosen the European Union and rebalance it away from Berlin.

“There’s this new success—Trump’s visit,” Jaroslaw Kaczynski, chairman of Poland’s ruling Law and Justice party, said at a party congress over the weekend. Tweaking European officials who are nervous that Mr. Trump’s visit could deepen the divide on the continent, Mr. Kaczynski went on: “They’re envious of it!”

Poland, where the conservative Law and Justice government took over in 2015, is locked in an escalating feud

*[It looks more and more like Trump against the world at the G-20 summit]*

“It’s important that the president will be there and he will hopefully confirm again the U.S. commitment to NATO and to our cooperation,” said Piotr Wilczek, Poland’s ambassador to the United States. “For us, his visit to Poland before meeting with President Putin sends a very strong message.”

And despite widespread concerns about Trump’s personality and politics, many Poles view Trump’s visit as a reassuring sign that the United States will not pull back on its commitment to Poland’s security under his leadership.

“Poles were really afraid that it would be President Trump having a very successful summit with President Putin and sitting at the table together with Putin and making divisions or [establishing] a new

order for this part of the world — that was a real threat here,” said Michal Kobosko, director of the Atlantic Council’s Warsaw office. “This has not materialized yet, so Poles are looking with some optimism toward Trump.

### Local Politics Alerts

Breaking news about local government in D.C., Md., Va.

“They believe the decision to have him present in Warsaw really means that even though it’s ‘America First,’ it’s not to say it’s Central Europe second,” he added.

But with this stop, Trump risks being accused of exacerbating rifts within Europe, which have only grown as populist political movements like Law and Justice have come to power.

Among some in Poland and elsewhere in Europe, the visit is being watched closely for signs that Trump will use it as an opportunity to undermine the European Union or castigate America’s NATO allies for failing to “pay their fair share” by spending 2 percent of gross domestic product on their own defense budgets.

“The Polish government has a strained relationship with Germany, too,” said Buras, of the European Council on Foreign Relations. “The Germans will be listening carefully to what Trump says and what the Polish reaction is.”

“If he wants to humiliate Germany and deepen the divisions within the European Union, he could use this visit very much to this purpose,” he added. “The divisions are already there.”

## Poland Prepares ‘Absolutely Huge’ Welcome for Trump

Anton Troianovski

with the EU’s executive body in Brussels and with Western European capitals. The European Commission has said the government’s changes to the Polish judicial system, including appointing its own judges to the Constitutional Court, undermine the rule of law.

French President Emmanuel Macron suggested Poland was rejecting European democratic principles and treating the bloc like “a supermarket,” implying it is taking advantage of the EU without following all of its norms.

German politicians often slam Poland for failing to take in refugees and for reducing press freedoms.

In Mr. Trump, some Polish politicians and commentators see a leader who has campaigned against accepting refugees and criticized the EU and Germany’s influence in the bloc.

“Regarding refugees, the Polish government has the same position as Americans—we want strict restrictions on refugees,” said Krzysztof Mróz, a Law and Justice lawmaker who plans to dispatch two buses full of Trump fans—98 people—from his district at 2 a.m. on Thursday morning for the 300-mile drive to Warsaw.

In lobbying for Mr. Trump’s visit in recent months, Polish officials made a promise of a positive reception for the president part of their pitch. Polish Foreign Minister Witold Waszczykowski said in an interview Wednesday with The Wall Street Journal that he told Mr. Trump, on the sidelines of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization summit in

Brussels in May: “Please visit us, your soldiers are already here, you can follow, and you can visit a country which is friendly.”

Mr. Trump responded, according to Mr. Waszczykowski, that “Polish Americans helped him win” the presidential election.

“I said, ‘Well, we can help you once again... if you visit us and cooperate with us,’” Mr. Waszczykowski recalled.

But some critics of Poland’s government are wary of Mr. Trump’s trip. Bartosz Wielinski, foreign editor of the liberal Gazeta Wyborcza newspaper, said the government appeared to be turning Mr. Trump’s speech into a “partisan spectacle” and that his public reception would amount to a “Potemkin village.”

“This visit, I think, is a kind of opportunity for the ruling government party to show that Poland is not completely isolated internationally,” said Rafal Pankowski, a Warsaw political scientist.

In Western Europe, some officials worry that Mr. Trump will fan the flames of anti-immigrant, anti-European Union sentiment just like he endorsed Brexit ahead of the British referendum on leaving the EU last summer.

“It’s clear that what the Poles want is to turn their back on France and Germany,” a senior EU official said. “Trump is surely not helping.”

Polish officials say Mr. Trump’s visit isn’t about deepening the east-west gulf in the EU, but about backing up Poland on issues including

countering Russia and on energy security.

“I don’t think there is a justification to connect the visit of President Trump in Poland to the concept of dividing Europe,” Mr. Waszczykowski said. “He’s going, just by his presence, to appreciate our efforts, appreciate our achievements.”

To be sure, many Poles are wary of Mr. Trump, in part because of his calls for closer cooperation with Russia—a country that some of them see as an existential threat.

According to a Pew Research Center survey conducted this spring, 23% of Poles are confident that Mr. Trump will do the right thing in world affairs, compared with 11% across the border in Germany.

While low compared with his U.S. numbers (which hover between 35% and 40%), Mr. Trump’s ratings in Poland are among the highest in Europe. While Britons and Italians rank Mr. Trump at about the same level, only 7% of Spaniards, 10% of Swedes, and 14% of French have confidence in the U.S. president, according to the survey. Among members of the European Union included in the poll, Hungary gave Mr. Trump his best rating, with 29% expressing confidence—still far lower than the 53% of Russians who see Mr. Trump positively.

The preparations for Mr. Trump’s visit—a welcome that Mr. Tarczynski said will be far more “emotional” than Warsaw’s receptions for Mr. Obama—are the latest example of countries jockeying for advantage as the U.S. president puts past American foreign-policy tenets into

question. In addition to speaking to Poles at a public square, Mr. Trump will address 12 central European, Baltic, and Western Balkan leaders who are gathering in Warsaw.

Several organizations close to the Law and Justice party are also drumming up supporters to cheer for Mr. Trump. One of them, the nationalist Gazeta Polska Clubs, is touting Mr. Trump's address in Warsaw on Thursday as

comparable to John F. Kennedy's "Ich bin ein Berliner" speech of 1963.

Mr. Kaczynski, Poland's most powerful politician, even posed in a red "Make America Great Again" baseball cap in April, a Trump trademark. He did so in a meeting with Matthew Tyrmand, a Polish-American journalist who has written about Poland for the conservative U.S. outlet Breitbart News.

"You're dealing with a political dynamic in Poland on the ground that understands Trumpian populism," Mr. Tyrmand said. Mr. Trump's trip, Mr. Tyrmand said, "has huge implications for reshaping the geopolitics in a new presidential era."

U.S. officials say Mr. Trump's trip will be about strengthening trans-Atlantic bonds and supporting one of America's staunchest allies. Poland

is one of the few North Atlantic Treaty Organization allies to meet the organization's target of spending 2% of its gross domestic product on defense, White House national security adviser H.R. McMaster said last week.



## Poland Is Way Too Happy About Donald Trump's Visit

Wojciech Przybylski

The enthusiasm in Poland about the pending visit of the president of the United States Wednesday is palpable.

A group calling itself "Poland for Donald Trump" has launched a Facebook event in order to welcome Donald Trump to Warsaw. There are posters up around town advertising a celebratory picnic, sponsored by several of the country's major publicly-owned companies. There are reports that members of the ruling Law and Justice Party (PiS) have been asked to bring up to 50 members of their extended circles to a planned presidential speech so that Trump feels like he's received a warm Polish welcome. Realistically, however, such efforts are likely to be unnecessary: the excitement from Poland's truly pro-American, pro-Trump and anti-immigrant public about the pending visit is real, and they are likely to turn up in greater numbers in Warsaw than Americans did in DC on Trump's inauguration day.

Trump's visit ahead of the G20 meeting in Hamburg is being treated in Poland as a diplomatic coup. In a limited sense, that's fair: The visit will coincide with a meeting of the Three Seas Initiative, an effort to develop cooperation among the EU's eastern states established by Polish President Andrzej Duda less than a year ago, in August 2016. Nabbing a visit from a U.S. president this early on is a genuine P.R. triumph for an obscure regional grouping whose economies put together make up less than 10 percent of the EU's GDP.

But it's undeniable that some members of the Polish government also see the Trump visit – his first stop on only his second time overseas since assuming office – as both an implicit endorsement, and a chance to thumb their noses at the European elites based in Brussels and other capitals of western Europe. (The visit comes less than a month after the EU launched legal proceedings against three member

states, Poland, Hungary and Czechia over their unwillingness to accept refugees, and takes place against the backdrop of Poland's ongoing feud with French President Emmanuel Macron, who recently chastised eastern Europe for treating the EU as a supermarket.) And it's here where Poland's enthusiasm about Trump is not just misplaced, but dangerous.

American presidents have previously found that exploiting European divisions is useful for the United States, precisely because it undermines Europe's collective interests.

American presidents have previously found that exploiting European divisions is useful for the United States, precisely because it undermines Europe's collective interests.

The idea of "New Europe" was a term coined by the George W. Bush administration. When the United States decided to invade Iraq in early 2003, the term was deployed by Donald Rumsfeld to differentiate, and celebrate, the solidarity of new NATO members – the 13 countries which sent letters supporting U.S. policy on Iraq, which included Poland, the Czech Republic, Hungary, Slovakia, Latvia, and others – from the reluctance of the U.S.'s old allies, Germany and France. This American-drawn distinction between the Old Europe and the New not only signaled problems within the U.S.-EU security arrangements, it also created serious diplomatic tensions ahead of EU enlargement decisions over the next two months. French President Jacques Chirac at the time declared it a moment where his fellow Europeans had "missed the opportunity to keep silent."

In the years since, intra-European politics has only grown more intricate; the continent is now crisscrossed by smaller groupings like the Three Seas Initiative and larger regional alliances like the Visegrad Group, the Benelux Union, the Nordic Council. Other countries see in these regional unions a chance to weaken Europe's position and

potential on the global stage, by exploiting divisions. China, for instance, has developed its own 16+1 format, that groups together EU and non-EU countries from central and eastern Europe, including, among others, Poland, Hungary, Serbia and Belarus. Beijing sees an opportunity to undermine EU unity by offering investment funds to certain countries hungry for new roads to prosperity. Russia, meanwhile, is weaponizing culture to deepen European divisions; a recent study by the think tank Political Capital based in Budapest concluded that the Kremlin purposefully deploys notions about "traditional" society to sow divisions between eastern Europe and the nihilistic and decadent West. Feeding these divisions for domestic political purposes is something all leaders on the continent should be wary of; they can quickly be turned against us.

Trump's European visit this week is only going to highlight current differences of opinion. The trip is likely to be one of stark contrasts: He will move from Warsaw, where he is expected to be greeted with crowds of supporters and cordial, back-slapping meetings, to Hamburg, where he is almost sure to be met with street protests, and where German Chancellor Angela Merkel has promised there will be difficult conversations.

It would be one thing if the risks of a Trump visit had a chance of being offset by great potential benefits. But realistically, Poland, and central Europe more broadly, have little material to gain from the United States at the moment. The U.S. has already increased its military presence in the region, with about 900 troops stationed on Polish soil, even more than had been originally promised by the Obama administration. The LNG terminal in Świnoujście – a strategically important facility allowing for more energy independence in the region – has only recently celebrated the arrival of its first shipment from the USA and awaits further shipments from, among others, Qatar. Poland

will likely take the opportunity to support the recent sanctions that were proposed by the U.S. Senate on contractors for the Nord Stream 2 (NS2) project as well as other significant Russian businesses, but this, too, is divisive: The proposal that has been denounced by Germany and Austria, whose companies and economies would also be hurt.

The visit, in other words, is solely a PR exercise for both sides, where very little of significance will transpire: Trump gets to make a triumphant return to the continent to waving crowds, having skulked away last time after losing a handshake-off to Macron; the Polish government gets to demonstrate that there are other governments out there – big ones! – that share its skepticism of refugees (with a little bit of publicity for a regional cooperation initiative as a bonus).

It should go without saying, however, that a bit of goodwill from a troubled U.S. administration can hardly compensate for a healthy relationship with Brussels. Poland's economy depends on the EU not only because of major investment money that has flowed in from Brussels (and which has vastly exceeded the scale of the U.S. Marshall Plan for Europe after World War II). Its main trade partner by far is the EU: Germany accounts for 26 percent of exports; Czechia 6.7 percent; the U.K. 6.5; France 5.2. The U.S. accounts for just 2.5-3 percent, according to the 2015 Harvard Atlas of Economic Complexity. Poland's laws are shaped by the laws prepared by the European Commission and voted on by the European Parliament in Brussels. While NATO might be the source of Poland's hard security – what protects it against potential aggressors – the EU forms the backbone of its soft security: its support against economic and resource pressures from Russia. The very worst thing that Warsaw could do, once all the pomp and ceremony of a presidential visit is over, is to view a little bit of attention from the White House as a license

to grow even bolder in its fights closer to home.

## The New York Times

# China Sees Opening Left by Trump in Europe, and Quietly Steps In

Steven Erlanger

LONDON — Much of the world's attention at the Group of 20 economic summit on Friday and Saturday will be on President Trump's first meeting with his Russian counterpart, Vladimir V. Putin, with strenuous efforts to decipher the nature of the long-distance bromance between them.

But the leader of the world's other superpower, Xi Jinping of China, will also be in Hamburg, Germany, ready to slip quietly into the widening gap between Mr. Trump and longtime European allies and to position Beijing as the globe's newest, biggest defender of a multilateral, rules-based system.

Mr. Xi will have just concluded a state visit with Germany, including bilateral meetings and a small dinner Tuesday night in Berlin with the summit host, Chancellor Angela Merkel, who has made no secret of her differences with Mr. Trump.

Having helped Ms. Merkel open the Berlin Zoo's new \$10 million panda garden (complete with two new Chinese pandas), and watched a German-Chinese youth soccer match, Mr. Xi will have already made a mark.

He has cemented his closeness to Germany and Ms. Merkel, the woman many consider not just the most important leader in Europe, but also the reluctant, de facto leader of the West.

"The election of Trump has facilitated China's aims in Europe," said Angela Stanzel, an Asia scholar at the European Council on Foreign Relations in Berlin.

"Trump facilitates China's narrative of being the new defender of multilateralism and especially global free trade, and China sees Germany as defending that, too, as a kind of sidekick," she added. "And it fits into the Chinese idea of creating an alternative leadership to the United States."

Even before this week, Mr. Xi has tried to take advantage of Mr. Trump's nationalist and protectionist policies and open disdain for multilateral institutions, using a much-publicized speech in Davos, Switzerland, in January to proclaim himself a champion of global trade, much as the United States used to do.

Export-dependent Germany shares China's view, with Mrs. Merkel defending everything from trade deals to the United Nations and the Paris climate accord, from which Mr. Trump has withdrawn.

And China recognizes how important Germany has become in influencing European Union policies toward China, including trade and human rights, especially after Britain's vote to quit the bloc.

Speaking to Mr. Xi in Berlin on Wednesday, Mrs. Merkel said tellingly: "I am delighted to be able to welcome you in a period of unrest in the world, where China and Germany can make an effort to soothe this unrest a bit and to make a somewhat quieter world out of it." The two countries have "a comprehensive strategic partnership," she said.

Mr. Xi's state visit follows another high-level trip to Germany, at the end of May, by the Chinese prime minister, Li Keqiang.

His visit also comes just after Mrs. Merkel, who is up for re-election in September, said that Mr. Trump's America was no longer a reliably close ally and that Europe must "really take our fate into our own hands."

In a measure of Mr. Trump's increasing unpopularity in Germany, her party's election material now refers to the United States as a "most important partner outside Europe" rather than, as four years ago, its "most important friend."

There are tensions, of course, between China and Germany, and China and Europe, too, but largely over trade and access to markets.

In the last year especially, Ms. Stanzel said, German officials and the German public have become "more critical of Chinese economic patterns and investments in Germany, especially in key technologies and industries where Germany is known to have a global edge."

Mrs. Merkel was particularly upset last year, German officials have said, when China bought the cutting-edge German robotics firm so important to manufacturing, Kuka Robotics. The Germans see China moving from demanding technical know-how from European investors to wanting to own the technology outright.

But these problems pale next to Mr. Xi's fraught relations with Mr. Trump, whose public estimates of their relationship swing wildly.

The latest North Korean missile test is another strain, given Mr. Trump's public desire that China and Mr. Xi restrain Pyongyang's nuclear ambitions through stepped-up economic sanctions.

Only last week, Mr. Trump angered China by approving a \$1.4 billion arms sale to Taiwan, sanctioning a Chinese bank for evading sanctions on North Korea, warning that America would act to restrict Chinese steel imports and sending an American warship off the coast of contested islands in the South China Sea that Beijing claims.

For all those reasons, suggested Robin Niblett, director of Chatham House, a research group based in London, Mr. Xi is likely to keep a low profile in Hamburg.

"While China would like to gradually ramp up the idea of its global leadership, it would be better in Hamburg to keep the attention on Trump and Putin and the aftermath of Brexit," he said.

"The timing for Xi is not good," Mr. Niblett said. "He will feel the risk that Trump may use foreign policy as a more fruitful appeal to his base. China-bashing, though it has some risks, is a pretty safe bet for rallying forces in the U.S."

The world has shifted since Mr. Xi's Davos speech, he said. "Xi would prefer nice clear water between a munificent China and an America focused on itself," he said. "But there's a lot of trouble out there, and China is getting wrapped up in Trump's drama, while China likes minimal drama."

Despite new worries in Europe about China becoming more of a competitor than a partner, Mr. Xi sees another advantage, and a challenge, in keeping the European Union sweet.

China favors regional hegemonies rather than American hyperpower and sees a world of regions, where China, Russia and Europe dominate their respective areas, Mr. Niblett said.

While trying to be dominant in East Asia, China has no interest in ruffling Russia's feathers, especially with Mr. Putin in an election year and Russia as a permanent member of the United Nations Security Council.

So China will take a more watchful role in Hamburg, eager to get along with everyone, but especially the Europeans.

The Chinese see the European Union as "an essential partner for the kind of multilateral, globalized world China wants to see, where each region looks after itself and comes together flexibly to meet global challenges, like climate," Mr. Niblett said.

"The last thing China wants," he added, "is to get on worse with the E.U. now that the U.S. relationship is so fickle."

## THE WALL STREET JOURNAL

# Germany Bolsters China Ties as Trump Policies Raise Concern

Andrea Thomas

BERLIN— German Chancellor Angela Merkel and China's President Xi Jinping pledged to boost economic cooperation between their countries as they met ahead of what is expected to be an unusually tense international summit on Friday.

"We are very happy to see that thanks to efforts from both sides, Chinese-German relations have entered a new phase," Mr. Xi said Wednesday, according to a German translation of his remarks.

U.S. President Donald Trump's "America First" policies, his threats to crack down on abuse of free trade, and his withdrawal from the

Paris climate change accord have brought Germany and China, two of the world's largest exporters and both defenders of the climate agreement, closer together.

This new closeness is expected to feature prominently later this week when Ms. Merkel chairs this year's G-20 summit of the world's largest economies, which will force her into

a delicate balancing act between her commitment to the Western alliance and her professed aversion to Mr. Trump's international agenda.

"Economic relations between China and Germany are of course very important," Ms. Merkel told a joint press conference with Mr. Xi. "We don't only exchange goods, but



we're also cooperating more and more in technological areas."

If the value of exports and imports are combined, China beat the U.S. and France to become Germany's leading trading partner for the first time last year. Germany exported €76.1 billion (\$86.4 billion) of goods to China, making the Asian giant its fifth-largest export partner, and imports from China reached €93.8 billion, making it Germany's biggest supplier.

The two-day G-20 summit starts Friday in Hamburg. European delegates have said they would confront Mr. Trump on his trade stance and on his decision to withdraw from the Paris accord.

Ms. Merkel said she expected difficult negotiations.

"It's not easy to bring together all 20 countries with all their developments and positions," she said. "I don't know yet what the final result will look like."

Apart from conflicting views on free trade, climate protection is seen as the main stumbling block at the G-20 meeting. China, the world's largest emitter of carbon ahead of the U.S., has said it would stick to its commitments under the Paris deal, which saw more than 190 countries pledge to cut greenhouse-gas emissions.

In separate comments published Wednesday, Ms. Merkel also took

direct aim at Mr. Trump's trade policy.

The U.S. view of globalization, she told the Die Zeit weekly, was "not about a win-win situation but about winners and losers... Not just the few should benefit from economic progress. Everybody should participate."

Several commercial deals were signed on Wednesday, timed to the meeting between Ms. Merkel and Mr. Xi. These included an agreement between car maker Daimler AG and BAIC Motor Corp. to develop electric cars; strategic partnerships between industrial conglomerate Siemens AG and Chinese companies; and a Chinese

order for 140 aircraft from Airbus SE. No figure was given for the value of the contract.

Ms. Merkel also pledged that Germany would participate in China's planned revival of ancient Silk Road trading routes from China to Europe if the tendering process was transparent. Ms. Merkel didn't elaborate on what form this participation would take.

The project to improve infrastructure along China's main international trade channels is expected to generate more than \$900 billion in investments in roads, ports, pipelines and other projects.

## **The New York Times** European Nuclear Weapons Program Would Be Legal, German Review Finds

Max Fisher

A review recently commissioned by the German Parliament has determined that the country could legally finance the British or French nuclear weapons programs in exchange for their protection. The European Union could do the same if it changed its budgeting rules, the study found.

The German assessment comes after months of discussion in Berlin over whether Europe can still rely on American security assurances, which President Trump has called into question. Some have called for considering, as a replacement, a pan-European nuclear umbrella of existing French and British warheads.

The assessment provides a legal framework for such a plan. Britain or France, it finds, could legally base nuclear warheads on German soil.

The document states that "President Trump and his contradictory statements on NATO" have led to fears "that the U.S. could reduce its nuclear commitment" to Europe.

While the review is only an endorsement of the plan's legality — not a determination to take action — it is the first indication that such an idea has escalated from informal discussion to official policy-making channels.

Few analysts believe that Germany or the European Union is on the verge of pursuing a replacement nuclear umbrella. Most German officials still oppose such a plan, which would face steep public opposition and diplomatic hurdles. Even proponents consider it a last resort.

Nonetheless, analysts say, the review indicates the growing seriousness with which Germany is preparing for the possible loss of the American guarantees that have safeguarded and united European allies since World War II.

"Someone wanted to see whether this could work," said Ulrich Kuhn, a German nuclear analyst at the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace. "It suggests people consider this a possibility."

While few are convinced Germany could overcome its taboo against nuclear weapons anytime soon, the existence of the assessment suggests that under pressure from Mr. Trump and growing Russian aggression, the taboo has eroded to an extent.

"The fact that they're asking the question in itself is pretty important," said Vipin Narang, a Massachusetts Institute of Technology political scientist who studies nuclear states.

"What's the line? 'Amateurs worry about strategy, professionals worry about logistics,'" Mr. Narang added, saying that the assessment, by evaluating fine-grain legal questions, "is getting into the logistics" of a European nuclear program.

Germany, the assessment finds, could be granted shared control over deploying those warheads under something called a "dual key" system, an arrangement that currently applies to American warheads based there. This would be intended to signal that the weapons would be used to protect all of Europe.

The legal review was requested last year by Roderich Kiesewetter, a

lawmaker, a former colonel and a foreign policy spokesman with Germany's governing party. Mr. Kiesewetter's office said it was unclear why the assessment was made only now, months later.

Mr. Kuhn suggested that the timing could be related to the French presidential election, which elevated Emmanuel Macron, a pro-European centrist who has advocated closer defensive cooperation between France and Germany.

Mr. Macron was elected on May 7. The legal review was concluded on May 23. It is unclear how long after that the findings were made public.

Any version of this plan would likely hinge on French-German cooperation. Britain's nuclear program is small and submarine-based. Its pending exit from the European Union could also preclude British involvement.

France's nuclear program, larger and more advanced, would be better suited to replace American capabilities, particularly the small, battlefield warheads that would be most useful in repelling a potential Russian invasion.

German financing and basing for the program would be intended to demonstrate its function as a guarantor of European security. Officials in Poland, an informal security leader among Eastern European states, have expressed support in public comments.

Some versions of the plan, including one floated by Mr. Kiesewetter this winter, would see the European Union co-finance the French nuclear umbrella in order to demonstrate France's commitment to use the

warheads in defense of all member states.

Still, analysts say that securing legal authority is only a small, initial step, and one that might suggest Germany's desire to avoid, more than pursue, such a drastic option.

Mr. Narang compared the document to a review by the Japanese government in the 1960s. Tokyo, fearing the United States might withdraw its protection, issued a report outlining how Japan could build a small nuclear arsenal of its own.

Mr. Narang said the Japanese study was intended both to dissuade the Americans from withdrawing and to prepare a fallback in case they did. Germany, he added, today faces a similar dilemma.

While it is unclear whether Japan would have really followed through, the country did develop something called a "turnscrew" capability, which left it only a few months from converting civilian nuclear materials into warheads.

"These legal findings are part of that insurance hedging," Mr. Narang said, referring to the technical term for when countries seek alternatives to existing alliances.

Even if allies have little intention of breaking from the status quo, he added, the act of planning for a worst-case situation makes it easier to imagine and, if necessary, pursue.

## Britain Debates Saudis' Ties to Extremism, With May in an Uneasy Spot

David D. Jazeera.  
Kirkpatrick

LONDON — As Saudi Arabia accuses Qatar, a Persian Gulf neighbor, of spreading Islamist extremism, British politicians are debating whether the Saudis themselves may deserve more of the blame.

The government of Prime Minister Theresa May has acknowledged in recent days that it is withholding a study on the Saudi role in fostering extremism in Britain, and opponents have accused her of pandering to the Saudi royals to protect British trade deals.

On Wednesday, a report from a hawkish think tank in London called new attention to the debate by arguing that Saudi Arabia had, in fact, played a singularly important role in promoting extremist strains of Islam in British mosques and religious schools — including the training of British preachers who have advocated jihadist violence.

Over the last 30 years, “Saudi Arabia has spent at least £67 billion,” or about \$87 billion, on this endeavor around the world, said the think tank, the Henry Jackson Society, named for a United States senator from the Cold War era.

At the same time, Saudi Arabia has led an international campaign to primarily blame its neighbor Qatar for the surge in extremist violence in recent years. Saudi Arabia, the United Arab Emirates and several Arab allies have cut off travel, trade and diplomatic relations with Qatar as punishment, and they set a deadline of Wednesday night for Qatar to comply with a sweeping list of demands aimed at curtailing its influence and independence, including shutting down its pioneering Arab news network, Al

“It is complete, utter hypocrisy,” said Tom Wilson, the author of the Henry Jackson Society report.

The report set off new debate here only in part because of its implications for the feud in the Persian Gulf, which threatens to divide the Western-backed alliance against the militants of the Islamic State, also known as ISIS or ISIL. Britain is also reeling from a string of deadly terrorist attacks by Islamist extremists in recent weeks, including a suicide bombing in May at an Ariana Grande concert in Manchester and an attack last month on and around London Bridge.

The attention to Saudi Arabia also comes at a time when Ms. May’s political opponents are ratcheting up their denunciations of her Conservative government’s support for the two-year Saudi-led war in Yemen, which has plunged that impoverished country into a humanitarian catastrophe of disease and famine with no end in sight. (Saudi Arabia says the campaign there is essential to keep power away from the Houthis, a Yemeni faction aligned with Iran.)

The study of Saudi extremism was initiated more than a year ago by Ms. May’s predecessor, Prime Minister David Cameron, also a Conservative. He agreed to it partly to win the support of another party, the Liberal Democrats, for airstrikes against the Islamic State in Syria, and on Wednesday the Liberal Democrats accused Ms. May of putting Saudi business deals ahead of public safety by declining to disclose the study’s findings.

“We hear regularly about the Saudi arms deals or ministers going to Riyadh to kowtow before their royal family, but yet our government won’t

release a report that will clearly criticize Saudi Arabia,” Timothy Farron, the leader of the Liberal Democrats, said in a statement.

Britain is “cozying up to one of the most extreme, nasty and oppressive regimes in the world,” he said. “You would think our security would be more important, but it appears not.”

The Home Office, which conducted the study, denied that the government had withheld it to avoid offending or embarrassing the Saudis. But a spokesman declined to comment on whether the findings of the study had highlighted a Saudi role in spreading extremism. “Ministers are considering advice on what is able to be published in the report and will update Parliament in due course,” the office said in a statement.

The Saudi Embassy in London did not respond to telephone calls.

The debates pointed to what Mr. Wilson called “two different, competing ideas about what is extremism.”

British policy defines extremism as an ideology opposed to liberal democracy, and the government has kept the definition loose in part to avoid disputes with disparate Arab allies, said Jane Kinninmont, a scholar at Chatham House, another think tank, who has written about the definition of extremism in the Persian Gulf as “a moving target.”

For the monarchs of Saudi Arabia and the United Arab Emirates, for example, “the Muslim Brotherhood are extremists because they seek the overthrow of monarchies,” Ms. Kinninmont said. An alliance with the Muslim Brotherhood is the main reason Qatar’s neighbors accuse it of extremism, “but that is not a definition of extremism that the U.K. or the U.S. or France can share.”

Critics of Saudi Arabia, on the other hand, denounce its promulgation of a more austere, conservative and intolerant version of Islam, even though the Saudi religious establishment preaches obedience to rulers and discourages insurrection. Mr. Wilson, the author of the report about Saudi extremism, acknowledged in an interview that he meant mainly nonviolent extremism.

“They are not jihadists,” he said. “It is the usual illiberal, hard-line conservative, rather than radical, in that respect.” Still, he said, individual clerics who studied in Saudi Arabia have gone on to call for jihad or to “glorify violence” from British mosques.

After the Egyptian military overthrew an elected president from the Muslim Brotherhood in 2013, Saudi Arabia and the United Arab Emirates pressed the British to designate the Brotherhood a terrorist organization, and Mr. Cameron agreed to commission a study by the Foreign Office.

Officials familiar with the resulting report said it read like a prosecutor’s brief against the Brotherhood, but it nonetheless concluded that the organization did not meet the criteria for a terrorist designation. Such a move would have angered both the Gulf monarchs and the Brotherhood’s sympathizers. That study, too, has remained withheld.

The British government “finds it very difficult to make public statements about the Persian Gulf,” Ms. Kinninmont said, without offending the monarchs of the region or risking its credibility with citizens at home.

## Low Pound Could Constrain British Defense Spending

Jenny Gross and  
Stephen Fidler

LONDON—The sharp slide in the British pound’s value against the dollar since the U.K. voted to leave the European Union could pose difficulties for Britain’s defense budget, British Defense Secretary Michael Fallon said.

“If that lower rate persists, then obviously that is a challenge,” Mr. Fallon said in an interview.

“I don’t know how permanent that is, but that is clearly a change” since Britain last reset its defense strategy in 2015, he added.

His comments came ahead of a trip to Washington, where he will meet with Defense Secretary Jim Mattis to discuss improving collaboration between the U.S. and the U.K. and also promote Britain as America’s most dependable and highest-spending defense partner in Europe.

As the U.K. prepares to leave the EU, it has sought to strengthen ties with the U.S. in areas including defense, security and trade. While the slump in sterling since June 2016 has boosted exporters, it has also increased the cost of imports, such as dollar-denominated arms purchases from the U.S.

Britain has bought billions of dollars of equipment from U.S. manufacturers, including F-35 Joint Strike Fighters from Lockheed Martin Corp. and P-8 maritime patrol planes and AH-64E Apache attack helicopters from Boeing Co.

The pound has slumped 14% against the dollar since June 2016, when the U.K. voted to leave the EU amid uncertainty about the effect of Brexit on trade and investment. The U.K. defense ministry has in the past said it hedged in the short term against the weakness in sterling ahead of the vote, but the

currency’s decline in sterling has put new projects in question.

A report published this week by the Royal United Services Institute, an independent think tank on defense and security, said the British military is facing an estimated £20 billion (\$26 billion) “black hole” to plug, or about 5% of projected spending commitments over the next 10 years. The defense ministry will need more cash from the Treasury or will have to significantly curtail spending programs or forces, the report said.

Underscoring the close ties the U.K. government seeks to foster with the

Trump administration, Mr. Fallon defended Washington's decision to add troops in Afghanistan. He said former President Barack Obama's plan to cut troops there was wrong and praised the approach of President Donald Trump's administration.

Secretary of State Rex Tillerson's plans for Afghanistan came under criticism this week after a group of U.S. senators visiting Kabul, including Republican John McCain, said the lack of a clear strategy could undermine the expected surge of U.S. troops there.

Mr. Fallon said local forces needed the support of troops from the U.S. and the U.K., which will boost its troop numbers in Afghanistan to 550 troops over the summer. The U.S. currently has more than 8,500 troops in the country.

"It would've been a mistake to cut numbers as Obama was threatening last summer," Mr. Fallon said. "We've increased last summer, and we've increased again. We think what's important—the lesson of Iraq—is you support local forces and you supply the enablers that they simply don't have."

Mr. Fallon also said the West need to do more to cut North Korea off from the international finance system, after Pyongyang launched a ballistic missile with the capacity to reach the U.S.

"We need to make sure North Koreans are not accessing any part of the financial system that might contribute to the missile program," he said, adding the EU and other international organizations should consider putting new sanctions on North Korean individuals and entities and enforce current ones. "Clearly the sanctions are not yet biting sufficiently hard," he said.

The U.K. remains committed to the defense of Europe and won't try to use security as a bargaining chip in Brexit negotiations with the EU, Mr. Fallon said.

The defense secretary also announced the U.K. would host a summit with France in London in the fall to discuss security cooperation.

"This is our continent. We're going to go on defending it," Mr. Fallon said. "It just won't be in the EU context."

## INTERNATIONAL

### THE WALL STREET JOURNAL.

## As the Battle for Mosul Nears End, Civilians Struggle to Survive—and Flee

Asa Fitch and Ali A. Nabhan

MOSUL, Iraq—Thousands of Iraqi civilians have emerged thirsty and starving from Mosul's Old City in recent days, many after hiding out in basements, as the eight-month battle to remove Islamic State from Iraq's second-largest city nears its end.

Backed by a U.S.-led coalition carrying out airstrikes, government forces have cornered what Iraqi military officials say are about 200 Islamic State fighters remaining in the city, now hemmed into a tiny patch of territory on the western bank of the Tigris River.

The doomed Islamic State militants are mostly foreigners refusing to surrender, Sabah al-Numan, a spokesman for Iraqi counterterrorism forces, told state television. They have turned to last-gasp measures—including the use of women as suicide bombers—as Iraqi forces close in.

"This is evidence that the terrorists are desperate now," he said. "The ideology of such foreign [fighters] is well known to us. They fight until the end, until they get killed."

Islamic State has held Mosul since June 2014, when its forces swept across large swaths of Iraq and Syria.

Since then, government forces and their allies militias, backed by the U.S.-led coalition fighting Islamic State, have

whittled down the territory controlled by the jihadist group to less than 40% of what it presided over at its peak, according to an estimate by IHS Markit.

The Iraqi army seized eastern Mosul in January, and is now battling to complete its takeover of the west of the city, whose total prewar population numbered about 1.8 million people. An assault on the Syrian city of Raqqa, Islamic State's de facto capital, is also under way.

Islamic State militants have trapped thousands of civilians to the labyrinthine neighborhoods of Mosul's Old City, using them as human shields in an attempt to discourage artillery shelling and bombing.

As Iraqi forces closed in on Islamic State holdouts this week, civilians poured out of hiding and fled west out of Mosul, joining what the International Organization for Migration estimates are 818,000 Iraqis—or nearly half of the city's prewar population—already uprooted by the fighting.

Many of those escaping carried suitcases full of clothes and what little food they had left. Some were wounded, while others walked barefoot in midday heat that reached almost 120 degrees Fahrenheit, their faces dirty and lined with exhaustion.

Reaching government checkpoints on the outskirts of the Old City after

trekking down dusty streets lined with destroyed buildings, they asked for food and water.

"We haven't had food or water for four days," said Zahdiya Ali, who traveled with two of her girls, Zainab, 6, and Zahra, 5. "There were three to five [Islamic State] members in the area [in which we live]. They threatened that if we left they would shoot us in the legs, and told us that all the roads were planted with [improvised explosive devices] so we stayed in a small basement."

Other families were separated amid the confusion and chaos of flight.

Umeir Yousif, 17, and his brother Urwa, 16, arrived at one checkpoint barefoot and shirtless, calling for their mother. They said their home had been surrounded by Islamic State fighters for four days before they escaped the Old City through small alleyways.

"We were starving," Umeir said. "We hope to go to the east side of the city. We have relatives there."

Military forces are monitoring the fleeing civilians for suspected Islamic State members attempting to blend in among them. Men are often asked to remove their shirts as they approach government checkpoints to demonstrate that they aren't carrying weapons or encased in an explosives belt.

After they are screened by the military, the ill and the injured are

sent to get medical treatment. Many will eventually go to live with relatives elsewhere in the country or find refuge in a tent in one of the sprawling temporary encampments near Mosul.

The fighting has become more difficult as the battle for Mosul nears an end, partly because of the concentration of civilians in the area, said Lt. Gen. Abdul Ghani al-Asadi, the general commander of Iraq's counterterrorism forces who on Monday put the number of Islamic State fighters left in Mosul at some 200.

The casualty toll among civilians, government forces and Islamic State fighters in the battle for the city isn't entirely known.

The government of Prime Minister Haider al-Abadi hasn't recently released such figures for civilians and government forces, and the U.S. said in March that 774 Iraqi troops had been killed in the operation to retake the city.

The U.S.-led coalition said in June that its airstrikes in Iraq and Syria alone had likely and unintentionally killed 484 civilians, including a strike in March in Mosul that killed more than 100.

### THE WALL STREET JOURNAL.

## Tillerson Says U.S. Is Ready to Talk to Russia About No-Fly Zones in Syria

Felicia Schwartz

WASHINGTON—Secretary of State Rex Tillerson said the U.S. was prepared to hold discussions with Russia on setting up no-fly zones in Syria, describing prospects for cooperation with Moscow in markedly optimistic terms despite tense relations between the two countries.

Mr. Tillerson's comments, in a statement issued late Wednesday, come as he is leaving to meet President Donald Trump at a summit of leaders from the Group of 20 leading nations in Hamburg, Germany, where Mr. Trump and Russia's president Vladimir Putin will meet face-to-face for the first time.

The chief U.S. diplomat said Mr. Trump would tell Mr. Putin that the U.S. was prepared to cooperate with Moscow to end more than six years of civil war in Syria.

"The United States and Russia certainly have unresolved differences on a number of issues, but we have the potential to appropriately coordinate in Syria in order to produce stability and serve our mutual security interests," Mr. Tillerson said in a statement.

The Russian embassy in Washington, D.C., didn't respond to a request for comment.

Offering to discuss no-fly zones is a significant step by the Trump administration toward expanded cooperation with Russia. No-fly zones have long

faced opposition from U.S. military officials, who see them as risky and expensive and could potentially drag U.S. forces further into the conflict.

But Mr. Tillerson cited progress in efforts between the U.S. and Russia on avoiding accidents between their militaries in Syria as evidence that they could collaborate further. Russia backs the regime of Syrian President Bashar al-Assad.

"This cooperation over deconfliction zones process is evidence that our two nations are capable of further progress," he said. "The United States is prepared to explore the possibility of establishing with Russia joint mechanisms for ensuring stability, including no-fly zones, on the ground cease-fire observers, and coordinated delivery of humanitarian assistance."

There are multiple "deconfliction zones" in Syria where U.S. and Russian militaries have been working to avoid mishaps, including one around a base near the Syrian town of Al Tanf close to the Iraqi border. U.S. forces and their allies are operating near the zone.

The U.S. has warned Mr. Assad and his forces to steer clear of the area and has alerted the Russian government that it seeks to avoid mishaps but will take defensive action as needed, and American forces have taken several actions against allies of the Syrian government.

The U.S. and Russia have been meeting secretly over the past several months to set up a "de-

escalation zone" in southwest Syria, where Moscow and Washington would agree to keep their proxies away from each other. If that effort is successful, officials said that the U.S. would look to set up other such zones around Syria to try to wind down the conflict.

A no-fly zone would involve a commitment both to refrain from flights in a given area and to shoot down planes that enter secure areas. Officials have said no-fly zones would require increased military resources from the U.S.

Mr. Tillerson's olive branch to Russia on Syria comes amid a recent rise in battlefield confrontations between the Syrian regime and American forces battling Islamic State in Syria, which threaten to widen into a direct clash with the regime.

In recent weeks U.S. forces have shot down a Syrian regime warplane as well as two Iranian-made drones viewed as threatening to American forces and Syrian fighters they are working with. The U.S. also has carried out airstrikes on Syrian government forces and their Iranian-backed allies in southern Syria.

Mr. Tillerson said the U.S. is committed to fighting Islamic State in Syria but also wants to see stability in Syria once areas are liberated from the hold of the terrorist group.

"While there are no perfect options for guaranteeing stability, we must explore all possibilities for holding the line against the resurgence of

ISIS or other terrorist groups," Mr. Tillerson said. "The United States believes Russia, as a guarantor of the Assad regime and an early entrant into the Syrian conflict, has a responsibility to ensure that the needs of the Syrian people are met and that no faction in Syria illegitimately retakes or occupies areas liberated from ISIS' or other terrorist groups' control."

Mr. Trump's scheduled meeting Friday with Mr. Putin has drawn international interest, given U.S. findings of Russian interference in the 2016 election on Mr. Trump's behalf and the president's longstanding reluctance to criticize Russia or Mr. Putin.

Speaking to reporters at Joint Base Andrews in Maryland on Wednesday before leaving to join Mr. Trump in Germany, Mr. Tillerson said the Trump administration hoped the meeting would be the start of broader cooperation between Moscow and Washington.

"We're at the very beginning...at this point it's difficult to say exactly what Russia's intentions are in this relationship," he said. "That's the most important part of this meeting, is to have a good exchange between President Trump and President Putin over what they both see as the nature of this relationship between our two countries."

## The New York Times

### Russia Deploys a Potent Weapon in Syria: The Profit Motive

Andrew E. Kramer

MOSCOW — The Kremlin is bringing a new weapon to the fight against the Islamic State militant group in Syria, using market-based incentives tied to oil and mining rights to reward private security contractors who secure territory from the extremists, Russian news outlets have reported.

So far, two Russian companies are known to have received contracts under the new policy, according to the reports: Evro Polis, which is set to receive profits from oil and gas wells it seizes from the Islamic State using contract soldiers, and Stroytransgaz, which signed a phosphate-mining deal for a site that was under militant control at the time.

The agreements, made with the Syrian government, are seen as incentives for companies affiliated with Russian security contractors, who reportedly employ about 2,500

soldiers in the country, to push the Islamic State, also known as ISIS or ISIL, out of territory near Palmyra, in central Syria.

Most Middle Eastern wars are suspected of having some variant of this deal, but it is seldom made as explicit as in the Russian contracts.

"It's all very simple," Ivan P. Kononov, director of the Center for Strategic Trends Studies, said by telephone of the deals, struck in December but just recently reported. "If a company provides security, then the country getting that service should pay. It doesn't matter how the payment is made."

In the petroleum deal, Evro Polis, a corporation formed last summer, will receive a 25 percent share of oil and natural gas produced on territory it captures from the Islamic State, the news site Fontanka.ru reported.

The website has a record of accurately reporting about private security companies in Russia, and just last month Washington

appeared to corroborate one of its earlier reports by imposing sanctions on a Russian whose activities first came to light in the publication.

Fontanka's latest article on the topic, published last week, detailed how Evro Polis was cooperating with a shadowy Russian private security group called Wagner, which American sanctions suggest has also provided contract soldiers to the war in Ukraine.

The deal is distinct from the common practice of oil majors and other corporations outsourcing security in hot spots in the Middle East and elsewhere. Under the contract, the wells are not just to be guarded, but to be captured first, the article said.

"The arrangement returns to the times of Francis Drake and Cecil Rhodes," it noted, referring to two figures from British history whose careers mixed warfare and private profit.

Evro Polis, according to Fontanka and public company records in Russia, is part of a network of companies owned by Evgeniy Prigozhin, a St. Petersburg businessman close to President Vladimir V. Putin and known as "the Kremlin's chef" for his exclusive catering contracts with the administration. His company, Concord Catering, also supplies food to many of Moscow's public schools, according to Russian news reports.

Journalists have reported that Mr. Prigozhin engaged in another recent Russian experiment in restoring influence abroad while keeping costs down: He set up a factory of so-called internet trolls in St. Petersburg, an office packed with low-paid people posting online under assumed identities to influence public opinion in foreign countries, including the United States.

Last month, the Treasury Department in Washington imposed

sanctions on Dmitri Utkin, the founder of Wagner, the private security group the report said would capture the Syrian oil and gas wells for Evro Polis. Fontanka first linked Mr. Utkin to Wagner in an article in 2015.

In the other deal, the Russian energy company Stroytransgaz won rights to mine phosphate in central Syria under the condition it secure the mine site, the Russian news outlet RBC reported.

Stroytransgaz, which is majority owned by another Russian under United States sanctions, Gennady Timchenko, signed a deal with the Syrian government to resume mining at the Sharqiya phosphate deposit, which was under Islamic State control at the time, RBC

reported. Under the agreement, an unidentified Russian private military contractor would guard the site.

In this instance, however, Russian, Iranian and Syrian soldiers — rather than private contractors — conducted the operations in May that expelled Islamic State militants from the mining site, RBC reported.

In anticipation of the commercial payoff, the report said, a Russian ship laden with mining equipment docked at the Syrian port city of Tartus, where Russia has a naval base, even before the military operation began.

Russian officials have not commented publicly on either deal.

The Russian Energy Ministry did not respond to written questions about

the reported oil and gas deal. The owner of Evro Polis did not reply to an email sent to an address listed on company records.

Asked on a conference call with journalists about the Syrian oil deal, the Kremlin press secretary, Dmitri S. Peskov, said, "We do not monitor some entrepreneurial activity" of Russian companies abroad.

Mr. Konovalov, the military analyst, said the Syrian government was more than willing to strike such deals, trading natural resources for security.

"They get the better side of this contract," he said. "They get our participation in the security sector in Syria, which is very valuable."

The Fontanka report suggested that Russian security contractors had already put the agreement to work, fighting to expel the Islamic State from natural gas fields near Palmyra.

The Russians are training and fighting alongside a unit of the Syrian Army called ISIS Hunters, whose exploits are widely promoted in the Russian state news media. The Fontanka report linked to a video filmed from a body camera worn by a Russian-speaking soldier with ISIS Hunters during a firefight in the desert.

"Friendly, don't shoot!" the soldier yelled in Russian, apparently to other Russian soldiers nearby.

**The  
Washington  
Post**

## U.S. prepared to hold joint operations with Russia in Syria, Tillerson says

DeYoung

By Karen

The Trump administration is prepared to consider joint stability operations with Russia in Syria, including no-fly zones, cease-fire observers and coordinated deliveries of humanitarian aid, Secretary of State Rex Tillerson said late Wednesday.

In a statement issued as he departed for Europe, where he will join President Trump in Germany on Thursday, Tillerson said that the United States and Russia have successfully cooperated in establishing deconfliction areas in Syria to avoid contact between their air operations.

Trump plans to meet Friday with Russian President Vladimir Putin outside a Group of 20 summit that both are attending in Hamburg. Tillerson's statement appeared designed to set an agenda for that meeting, framing the discussion in ways that the White House has declined to do in public.

In brief remarks at Joint Base Andrews before taking off, Tillerson recalled his own characterization of U.S. relations with Russia as being "at a very low point."

"We're at the very beginning," he said of Trump's first face-to-face meeting with Putin, and "at this point it's very difficult to say what Russia's intentions are in this relationship. And I think that's the most important part of this meeting, is to have a good exchange between President Trump and President Putin over what they both see as the nature of this relationship between our two countries."

U.S.-backed local ground forces fighting the Islamic State and forces backing Syrian President Bashar al-Assad that are supported by Russia have moved increasingly closer to one another in southern Syria, bringing U.S. and Russian warplanes into closer proximity. In recent weeks — although Moscow has claimed to have cut deconfliction contacts with Washington — U.S. officials have said significant progress has been made between them in drawing lines to avoid one another.

"Our military leaders have communicated clearly with one another to make sure no accidents occur between our two countries in the Syrian theater," Tillerson said. "This cooperation over deconfliction zones process is evidence that our

two nations are capable of further progress."

Separate from the fight against the militants, Russia, Iran and Turkey have called for the establishment of four safe zones in the western part of the country where Assad's forces, with Russian and Iranian assistance, are fighting Syrian rebels. The United States is not a formal participant in those talks, but U.S. officials have said they may be willing to take over monitoring of one of the zones in Syria's southwest corner where the borders of Jordan and Israel are endangered.

Although Trump, like President Barack Obama before him, has said he is not interested in a direct U.S. role in Syria's civil war, the administration has become increasingly convinced that the permanent defeat of the Islamic State there is not possible while that war continues.

"With the liberation of Raqqa now underway," Tillerson said, "ISIS has been badly wounded, and it could be on the brink of complete defeat in Syria if all parties focus on this objective. In order to complete the mission, the international community, and especially Russia, must remove obstacles to the defeat

of ISIS and help provide stability that prevents ISIS from rising anew from the ashes of their failed and fraudulent caliphate." ISIS is an acronym for the Islamic State.

Military, defense and security at home and abroad.

Raqqa, the militants' de facto Syrian capital, has been under assault by U.S. aircraft and artillery, and the U.S.-backed Syrian Democratic Forces, since late spring. On Monday, U.S. officials said the SDF had achieved a "key milestone."

Having decimated much of the heavily populated west, Assad and his backers have begun heading eastward through the desert toward Islamic State fighters south of Raqqa. U.S. military officials have said they welcome any contribution to the anti-ISIS fight, as long as it does not impede or conflict with U.S. operations.

Following the G-20 summit, Tillerson will travel to Ukraine and to Turkey.

Carol Morello contributed to this report.

**The  
Washington  
Post**

## No end in sight to Arab crisis as Qatar rejects demands amid blockade

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

CAIRO — A four-member Arab bloc said Wednesday it will press ahead with efforts to isolate Qatar after the nation delivered a "negative" response to a list of demands that included cutting ties to Islamist

groups and closing the Al Jazeera network.

The foreign ministers of Saudi Arabia, the United Arab Emirates, Egypt and Bahrain said they would maintain the month-old air, land and sea blockade of Qatar that is undermining the nation's wealthy economy and fueling regional tensions.

The ministers did not announce any new measures aimed at forcing Qatar to comply, leaving room for the continuation of a flurry of diplomatic efforts aimed at containing the crisis.

There was also, however, no indication that they were preparing to relax their stance. "It is no longer

possible to forgive the sabotaging role of Qatar," they said.

Kuwait has been at the forefront of the outreach in the region. President Trump also called Egyptian President Abdel Fatah al-Sissi to discuss the crisis ahead of the conclusion of the meeting in Cairo.

The Arab rift over Qatar has come at a time when Trump is seeking to rally Arab support against the Islamic State and Iran. Instead, Saudi Arabia and its regional allies have joined forces against small but powerful Qatar, which has long irked its neighbors by pursuing a foreign policy that contradicts their interests.

The list of 13 demands issued last month included an end to Qatari support for political Islamist movements, including the Muslim Brotherhood, and the severing of contacts with Iran.

## The New York Times

DOHA, Qatar — A deadline passed and nobody blinked, so now a high-stakes geopolitical feud in the Middle East looks set to stretch further into the summer.

The confrontation between Qatar and its neighbors worsened on Wednesday as four Arab nations vowed to press ahead with the punishing air, sea and diplomatic blockade they imposed one month ago after they accused Qatar of financing terrorism and working too closely with Iran. Qatar rejected an ultimatum that expired on Tuesday to meet a long list of demands.

Meeting in Cairo, foreign ministers from the four blockading countries — Saudi Arabia, Egypt, the United Arab Emirates and Bahrain — said they were “disappointed” by the response to their demands, and stepped up their criticism of Qatar, which they say is meddling in the affairs of their countries.

“Qatar’s role as a saboteur can no longer be forgiven,” said Egypt’s foreign minister, Sameh Shoukry.

The four countries have issued 13 demands, including the closing of Al Jazeera, Qatar’s influential television channel, and, more broadly, the abandonment of Qatar’s

Qatar’s response was delivered on Monday to Kuwait, which passed it on to the four nations. Though the contents of the response have not been disclosed, comments by Qatari officials ahead of the meeting made it clear that Qatar does not intend to meet the demands.

Speaking at the London-based Chatham House think tank earlier Wednesday, Qatar’s foreign minister, Mohammed bin Abdulrahman al-Thani, accused the four Arab nations of “clear aggression and insult.” In Doha on

foreign policy, which includes support for a wide variety of Islamist factions.

In London, Qatar’s foreign minister, Sheikh Mohammed bin Abdulrahman al-Thani, accused his country’s foes of “clear aggression” and said Qatar was ready for a lengthy standoff, having developed new supply routes for food, construction materials and other imports. He singled out Saudi Arabia and the Emirates as the main foes of Qatar, accusing them of seeking to make it surrender its sovereignty.

That, he said, “Qatar will never do.”

The uncompromising statements offered little hope for a speedy resolution to a rift that opened up on June 4 with the sudden blockade on Qatar. The crisis has worried many Western countries that are concerned about critical military, business and energy interests, and are fearful that the region is tipping into a dangerous and unpredictable situation.

The confrontation on Wednesday could have grown even more serious. But defying expectations, the ministers gathered in Cairo avoided imposing new sanctions on Qatar, and instead sought to reframe their demands as a series of broad principles about combating

Monday, he called them “unrealistic and not actionable.”

What’s most important from where the world meets Washington

The joint statement by the four foreign ministers expressed “regret” for Qatar’s refusal, which it said “shows a lack of seriousness in dealing with the roots of the problem.” Qatar, the statement warned, has failed “to understand the importance and danger of the situation.”

extremism and not destabilizing each other’s government.

Confusion over the United States’ stance on the dispute may be exacerbating the problem.

President Trump called leaders on both sides of the ill-tempered dispute on Sunday, but he has left little doubt that he is siding firmly with Qatar’s opponents. American officials say that Mr. Trump sees the crisis as an opportunity to force changes in Qatar’s maverick foreign policy, and to bolster his close alliance with the rulers of Saudi Arabia and Egypt. In Cairo on Wednesday, the ministers thanked Mr. Trump for his “firm stance on extremism and terrorism.”

But Mr. Trump is at odds with Secretary of State Rex W. Tillerson, who has relationships with Persian Gulf leaders on all sides of the dispute from his time as the chief executive of Exxon Mobil, and who has been skeptical of the demands being pressed by the Saudis and Emiratis. Another complicating factor is the American air base in Qatar, which plays a central role in the war against the Islamic State in Syria and Iraq.

The tension between Mr. Trump, who appears determined to make an example of Qatar, and Mr. Tillerson,

Taking questions at a news conference, the ministers did not rule out that they would impose further sanctions. But they also emphasized that they intend to solve the crisis “peacefully.” Their next step, the statement said, would be to hold another meeting in Bahrain, but they did not say when that would be.

who has taken a more pragmatic stance, has hobbled efforts by American officials to resolve the dispute. Mr. Trump, some officials say, seems intent on helping the Saudis as they press their demands for action against Al Jazeera and the Muslim Brotherhood in Qatar, even if Qatar is unlikely to ever agree to them.

The Saudis and their allies could step up the sanctions against Qatar by seeking to expel it from regional bodies like the Gulf Cooperation Council or the Arab League, or by forcing banks and other businesses in the gulf to choose sides.

Qatar seems intent on leveraging its immense wealth to ride out the storm. On Tuesday, it said that it was significantly increasing its production of natural gas, the fuel that has made it rich, over the next five years.

In Cairo, the blockading countries said they would meet in Bahrain soon to consider their next steps. “Such significant decisions cannot be taken swiftly,” said the foreign minister of Bahrain, Khalid bin Ahmed al-Khalifa. “The decision will be taken at the right time.”

people. Qatari officials have consistently denied the allegations.

On Wednesday, Qatar’s foreign minister, Sheikh Mohammed bin Abdulrahman Al-Thani, lashed back, saying in London that the allegations by Saudi Arabia and its allies were “clearly designed to generate anti-Qatar sentiment in the West” and that their demands didn’t represent “reasonable and actionable grievances.”

“Qatar continues to call for dialogue despite the siege that is a clear aggression and an insult to all international treaties bodies and

## Qatar’s Gulf Neighbors Vow to Press Blockade After a Deadline Passes

Declan Walsh

foreign policy, which includes support for a wide variety of Islamist factions.

In London, Qatar’s foreign minister, Sheikh Mohammed bin Abdulrahman al-Thani, accused his country’s foes of “clear aggression” and said Qatar was ready for a lengthy standoff, having developed new supply routes for food, construction materials and other imports. He singled out Saudi Arabia and the Emirates as the main foes of Qatar, accusing them of seeking to make it surrender its sovereignty.

That, he said, “Qatar will never do.”

The uncompromising statements offered little hope for a speedy resolution to a rift that opened up on June 4 with the sudden blockade on Qatar. The crisis has worried many Western countries that are concerned about critical military, business and energy interests, and are fearful that the region is tipping into a dangerous and unpredictable situation.

The confrontation on Wednesday could have grown even more serious. But defying expectations, the ministers gathered in Cairo avoided imposing new sanctions on Qatar, and instead sought to reframe their demands as a series of broad principles about combating

extremism and not destabilizing each other’s government.

Confusion over the United States’ stance on the dispute may be exacerbating the problem.

President Trump called leaders on both sides of the ill-tempered dispute on Sunday, but he has left little doubt that he is siding firmly with Qatar’s opponents. American officials say that Mr. Trump sees the crisis as an opportunity to force changes in Qatar’s maverick foreign policy, and to bolster his close alliance with the rulers of Saudi Arabia and Egypt. In Cairo on Wednesday, the ministers thanked Mr. Trump for his “firm stance on extremism and terrorism.”

But Mr. Trump is at odds with Secretary of State Rex W. Tillerson, who has relationships with Persian Gulf leaders on all sides of the dispute from his time as the chief executive of Exxon Mobil, and who has been skeptical of the demands being pressed by the Saudis and Emiratis. Another complicating factor is the American air base in Qatar, which plays a central role in the war against the Islamic State in Syria and Iraq.

The tension between Mr. Trump, who appears determined to make an example of Qatar, and Mr. Tillerson,

## THE WALL STREET JOURNAL

Sarah Kent in London and Dahlia Kholaif in Cairo

Qatar and the four Arab nations seeking to isolate it exchanged bitter recriminations, with Doha accusing the Saudi Arabian-led bloc of waging a smear campaign and Cairo declaring that its energy-rich neighbor isn’t serious about resolving the worst diplomatic crisis in the Persian Gulf in decades.

Meeting in Cairo on Wednesday, the foreign ministers of Saudi Arabia, Egypt, Bahrain and the United Arab Emirates discussed Qatar’s latest

## Qatar Lashes Back at Demands by Saudi-Led Group

Sarah Kent in London and Dahlia Kholaif in Cairo

Qatar and the four Arab nations seeking to isolate it exchanged bitter recriminations, with Doha accusing the Saudi Arabian-led bloc of waging a smear campaign and Cairo declaring that its energy-rich neighbor isn’t serious about resolving the worst diplomatic crisis in the Persian Gulf in decades.

Meeting in Cairo on Wednesday, the foreign ministers of Saudi Arabia, Egypt, Bahrain and the United Arab Emirates discussed Qatar’s latest

response to their 13-point list of demands, which include curbing diplomatic ties with Iran, severing links with the Muslim Brotherhood and closing the Al Jazeera television network.

Egyptian Foreign Minister Sameh Shukri said after the gathering that Qatar’s reply had been “negative,” adding that it “reflects negligence and lack of seriousness in dealing with the origins of the problem as well as unawareness of the gravity of the situation.”

Qatar is facing a potential volley of new punitive measures from the four

nations after signaling its rejection of the demands.

Saudi Arabian Foreign Minister Adel al-Jubeir told reporters in Cairo that further measures against Qatar will be taken as needed. The “political and economic blockade will continue until Qatar revises its policies,” he said.

Accusing Qatar of supporting extremist groups and meddling in their domestic affairs, the four Arab states severed diplomatic relations on June 5 and imposed a transport ban on the nation of 2.2 million

organizations," Mr. Al-Thani told a gathering at the London-based think tank Chatham House. He said his country is more progressive and open than are others in the region, and its principles have made it a target.

"Unlike many states in the Middle East, Qatar was not built on oppression, fear and censorship," Mr. Al-Thani said.

When they issued their demands to Qatar on June 22, the four Arab states boycotting Qatar gave it 10 days to comply. That deadline was extended on Sunday and expired early Wednesday. Doha has responded to the demands through Kuwait, but the details of its reply haven't been made public.

The steps under consideration by the four nations at their gathering in Cairo on Wednesday weren't known. U.A.E. Minister of State for Foreign Affairs Anwar Gargash has said Qatar could be expelled from the Gulf Cooperation Council, a six-

member political and economic bloc that includes Saudi Arabia, the U.A.E., Bahrain, Qatar, Kuwait and Oman. Mr. Al-Thani said Qatar's rivals in the group couldn't suspend it because such a decision would have to be taken by consensus.

Bahrain's foreign minister, Sheikh Khalid bin Ahmed al-Khalifa, said in Cairo that Qatar's future as part of the GCC would be reviewed by the council when its six members meet, but didn't say when. "Decisions are studied carefully," he said.

Mr. Al-Thani of Qatar said its rivals in the group couldn't suspend it because such a decision would have to be taken by consensus.

Doha is seeking help from the U.S. to resolve the dispute, while Abu Dhabi and Riyadh want the U.S. to back their efforts to isolate their neighbor. The response has been mixed, stoking fears of a prolonged diplomatic crisis.

President Donald Trump has taken up the allegations against Qatar's ties to terrorism funding. Meanwhile, Secretary of State Rex Tillerson has sought to defuse the standoff, urging the two sides to use the list of demands as a starting point for negotiations.

Mr. Tillerson said in June that the embargo on Qatar, which hosts 10,000 American troops at the largest U.S. military base in the region, was beginning to interfere in a U.S.-led military campaign against the jihadist group Islamic State.

"The blockade is hindering U.S. military actions in the region and the campaign against ISIS," Mr. Tillerson told reporters at the State Department.

Mr. al-Jubeir of Saudi Arabia said it is committed in its fight against terrorism but can't have Qatar as an ally that also "turns a blind eye towards terrorism financiers who operate openly [there]" and toward "extremists."

Qatar's economy has been resilient so far but could begin to suffer deeply if the transport ban remains in place and other economic sanctions are imposed.

Mr. Al-Thani said the country is paying 10 times its normal rate to ship food and other goods into the country via alternative routes. This week, Moody's Investors Service changed its outlook on Qatar's credit rating to negative, citing the likelihood of a "prolonged period of uncertainty."

A similar diplomatic standoff in 2014 over Qatar's alleged support for Islamist organizations that Saudi Arabia, the U.A.E. and Bahrain deemed terrorist organizations ended after eight months, with the three nations agreeing to return their ambassadors to Doha. Qatar said at the time that it made no concessions to resolve the dispute.

## THE WALL STREET JOURNAL

# Varadarajan : Modi and Netanyahu Begin a Beautiful Friendship

Tunku Varadarajan

being colonial interlopers on Palestinian land.

When you hear the prime minister of one country tell his counterpart from another that their nations' friendship is "a marriage made in heaven, but we are implementing it here on earth," your first reaction is likely to be: Get this man a new speechwriter! Yet, had you been following Indian Prime Minister Narendra Modi's Israel visit, which concludes Thursday, you'd understand that those words, spoken by Benjamin Netanyahu, were euphoric and not cloying.

Mr. Modi's visit to Israel is the first by an Indian prime minister in the 70 years since India's independence. The countries have had diplomatic relations for a quarter-century, but no Indian premier considered visiting Israel for fear of upsetting India's Arab allies—and thereby, its supply of oil—as well as its sizable Muslim population, for whose political leaders Israel has always been anathema. India also turned its back on Israel as a result of its commitment to a dishonest "anticolonial" foreign policy—that of nonalignment—under which it was kosher to berate the Israelis for

In truth, India and Israel have long done clandestine business. Israel helped India with weapons in its war with Pakistan in 1965. India returned the favor in 1967 when it gave Israel spare parts for its Ouragan and Mystere fighter planes. Mossad and RAW—the Research and Analysis Wing, India's intelligence agency—worked closely for many years before diplomatic relations began in 1992. Israel played a key role in helping India win its war with Pakistan in 1999, with its supply of Searcher-1 drones. These enabled India to detect, and destroy by air, Pakistani troops entrenched in mountain fastnesses.

India has reciprocated diplomatically, particularly since the election of Mr. Modi's nationalist BJP government in 2014. New Delhi has abstained in recent United Nations resolutions critical of Israel, remarkable for a nation that has had a near-perfect record of anti-Israeli voting at the U.N. There is every indication, now, that these abstentions will turn into votes in Israel's favor.

The Israelis see Mr. Modi's BJP as an Indian version of the Likud Party, and they are not wrong. The parties and their leaders share a determination to yield nothing to Islamist terrorism. The uninhibited warmth between the two prime ministers has been on full display on Mr. Modi's visit—as of this writing, the two men have embraced each other five times in 24 hours. A new fast-growing breed of chrysanthemum was unveiled by Israeli agronomists. Its name? The Modi.

The florid stuff aside, this visit marks a diplomatic coming of age for India and Israel: India because it has now shed the last of its dead skin of nonalignment. Remarkably, India is the only major power that can claim to have excellent relations with every country in the Middle East.

With the global surplus in oil and gas, India no longer fears an Arab backlash to its embrace of Israel. After the Yom Kippur War of 1973, the Saudis had ordered India to shut down Israel's Consulate in Bombay or face a cutoff of oil. Indira Gandhi refused, and the country had to resort to a deal with the shah's Iran that involved paying huge sums into

a slush fund for a senior member of the shah's household.

The present Indian government is—to put it delicately—less mindful of the Indian Muslim vote-bank than its Congress Party predecessors were. There is still leftist Indian opposition to Israel, but these are irrelevant groups that also reject the strengthening of ties with the U.S.

This is also a defining moment for Israel, and there is a reason why Mr. Netanyahu's entire cabinet turned out to welcome Mr. Modi at the Tel Aviv airport on July 4. The world's biggest democracy is now unabashedly, unequivocally in Israel's corner. Israel's ties with India, unlike with China, aren't purely transactional. Messrs. Modi and Netanyahu have formally acknowledged a civilizational bond between two peoples that share many of the same values and all of the same fears. India and Israel are allies for the long haul.

*Mr. Varadarajan is a fellow in journalism at Stanford University's Hoover Institution.*

## THE WALL STREET JOURNAL

# Editorial : Trump's Putin Test

Donald Trump thinks of himself as a great judge of character and master deal-maker, and that could be a dangerous combination when the President meets with Vladimir Putin for the first time Friday during the G-20 meeting in Germany. The

Russian strongman respects only strength, not charm, which is what Mr. Trump will have to show if he wants to help U.S. interests abroad and his own at home.

The meeting comes amid the various probes of Russian meddling

into the 2016 election, and Mr. Trump's curious refusal to denounce it. There's no evidence of Trump-Russia campaign collusion, nor that Russian interference influenced the result. But the Kremlin's attempt was a deliberate affront to democracy and it has done considerable harm

to Mr. Trump's Presidency. Mr. Trump should be angry at Mr. Putin on America's behalf, and his apparent insouciance has played into Democratic hands.

The irony is that on policy Mr. Trump has been tougher on Mr. Putin than

either of his two predecessors. Over Kremlin objections, the U.S. President has endorsed Montenegro's entry into NATO and new NATO combat deployments in Eastern Europe. He has approved military action against Russian ally Bashar Assad in Syria even after Russian threats of retaliation.

The White House was also wise to visit Poland a day before he meets Mr. Putin. In Warsaw on Thursday he can reinforce traditional American support for Polish freedom and assert his personal and public support for NATO's Article 5 that an attack on one alliance member is an attack on all.

Perhaps most important, Mr. Trump has unleashed U.S. oil and gas production that has the potential to weaken Mr. Putin at home and in Europe. The Russian strongman needs high oil

prices and wields the leverage of natural-gas supplies over Europe, and U.S. production undermines both.

Yet Mr. Putin will be looking to see if he can leverage Mr. Trump's desire for better U.S.-Russia relations to gain unilateral concessions. One Kremlin priority is easing Western sanctions for the invasion of Ukraine and President Obama's December 2016 sanctions for its election interference. The Russian foreign ministry is in particular demanding that the U.S. let Russia reopen compounds in Maryland and New York that Mr. Obama shut down.

Mr. Trump will be tempted to oblige because the compounds are ultimately of no great consequence, but the political symbolism of reopening them would still be damaging if the President gets nothing in return. Mr. Putin still

denies any Russian election hacking, and to adapt Michael Corleone's line to Carlo in "The Godfather Part II," he should stop lying because it insults our intelligence. Mr. Trump should at least follow French President Emmanuel Macron's precedent and issue a face-to-face public rebuke unless Mr. Putin apologizes.

Mr. Putin, the former KGB man, concluded early that Barack Obama could be pushed around because he bent to the Russian's demands on nuclear arms and missile defenses in Europe. This week he'll be looking to take Mr. Trump's measure.

The American can quickly show he's not Mr. Obama by suggesting he'll sell lethal military aid to Ukraine if Mr. Putin refuses to implement the Minsk accords that call for defusing the military conflict. Mr. Putin knew he could get away with violating

Minsk because he judged, correctly, that Mr. Obama would never risk confrontation.

Mr. Trump says he wants good relations with Russia, but the question as always in foreign affairs is on what terms? Mr. Putin wants to push the U.S. out of Eastern Europe and the Middle East, and he will be looking to exploit any presidential weakness toward that goal. No single meeting will determine the Trump-Putin relationship over four years, but first impressions matter. Mr. Trump will have a better chance at a better relationship if he shows Mr. Putin that the price of improved ties is better Russian behavior.



## Klaas : Putin should send Trump a thank you note before they meet. Here's a draft.

Brian Klaas

President Trump's first meeting with Russian President Vladimir Putin this week at the Group of 20 summit in Hamburg will set the tone for the future of Russo-American relations. To start the relationship off right, Putin should hand Trump a gracious thank you note. In less than six months on the job, Trump has already given him a cornucopia of major foreign policy gifts.

Here's what that note might look like.

Dear Donald,

Wow, what a year, huh?

It's been a while since I last saw you. Or maybe I've never met you? Your story about whether we have a relationship has changed more times than a dissident undergoing enhanced FSB interrogation! I'm not sure which story I'm supposed to go with. If the press reports the wrong version of whatever truth you prefer, you can just call them "the enemy of the American people" again — like Stalin.

Not long ago, many were laughing up their sleeves at you. They said you had just as much of a chance to win as an opposition candidate who criticizes me (may they rest in peace).

And then, just under a year ago, you turned to the fake news television cameras and made a simple request: that we hack Hillary Clinton's e-mails! Patriotic Russians tried their best to help you win, but

never in my wildest dreams did I imagine you actually would.

But since then, Donald, you have made my wildest dreams come true. You have praised me while saving your criticism for the real villains, like Meryl Streep or Nordstrom. I can't thank you enough.

I cannot tell you how much I appreciate you blaming the (alleged!) Russian meddling on an obese person on a bed. When your intelligence agencies told you it was clearly me, you showed some real loyalty to Russia. Thank you.

Beyond the election, we both know NATO is my biggest enemy. Every time I annex territory or invade a neighbor, it's NATO that complains. They are the worst. For decades, the Kremlin has been trying to figure out ways to drive a wedge between NATO members. How can we get them to splinter, we wondered? How can we get them to doubt their commitment to one another, so that the alliance is weakened and Russia is strengthened?

We tried everything. Nothing worked. Year after year, president after president, NATO members clung to Article 5 like a drunk to a bottle of cheap vodka. We couldn't get anyone to doubt the commitment of mutual defense at the heart of NATO's power.

But it never occurred to us that we could just help elect a businessman-turned-reality-television star with pro-Russian sympathies who could do our dirty work for us! How could

we have missed that obvious strategy? How many years were wasted while our Apprentice was right in front of us?

Thank you, Donald, for splintering NATO. I fantasized that a U.S. president would go to Brussels and fail to mention Article 5. You not only did that, you actually removed a reference to it in your speech! Be still my heart, like the heart of Alexander Litvinenko.

And then, if that weren't enough, you literally shoved the prime minister of Montenegro at the summit. What a show of strength! We tried to oust his predecessor in a coup. We failed, sadly, but at least you put the new one in his place just as he was joining NATO.

Your efforts have paid off. Now, just 35% of Germans, 46% of Frenchmen and 50% of Brits have a favorable view of the United States — sharply down from just months ago. And 42% more Russians like you than the weakling Barack Obama. I couldn't be happier. To top it all off, more people in the world now have confidence in me than you "to do the right thing regarding world affairs." Me! Vladimir Putin! What a beautiful poll. I'm certain it's not one of the fake polls you must deal with.

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

Your airstrike in Syria annoyed us more than Obama's inaction. But thank you for ensuring that it was mostly symbolic and didn't change the balance of forces on the ground.

Finally, Donald, thank you for putting all those annoying human rights and democracy activists in their place. Lecture after lecture. No more! I loved how you congratulated President Recep Tayyip Erdogan of Turkey for rigging a referendum that dismantled democracy in his country. And the sword dance and the glowing orb in Saudi Arabia! Marvelous. My friend Rodrigo Duterte sends his regards from the Philippines too, and appreciates that you've endorsed his death squads. Plus, your admirable crusade against the fake media has sent such a wonderful signal to all of us who jail or kill journalists. I must try wrestling one of them before I put them in jail.

Anyway, Donald, I look forward to seeing you again, or for the first time.

Vlad

P.S. Give us back our spy havens and lift the sanctions.

P.P.S. Sorry to hear about the special prosecutor.

*Brian Klaas is a fellow in comparative politics at the London School of Economics and Political Science and author of The Despot's Accomplice: How the West is Aiding and Abetting the Decline of Democracy. Follow him on Twitter @brianklaas.*



## POLITICO What's Worse: If Trump and Putin Get Along, Or If They Don't?

By William  
Taubman

It seems unlikely, given the American uproar about Russia's interference in the 2016 election, and signs in the Russian media that Vladimir Putin is souring on Donald Trump, that the two presidents will make any major agreements when they meet Friday on the sidelines of the G-20 summit in Hamburg.

What is most likely to emerge is a sense of how much, if any, of their autumn bromance remains. But that raises key questions: What determines whether personal relations between presidents are good or bad? How important are the effects of good or bad chemistry? The answer, past summits suggest, is that coziness with Russian leaders is not necessarily nefarious and that it can help to keep the peace with Moscow, but that good personal chemistry is hard to come by and that bad personal relations can be positively dangerous. In the case of Trump and Putin, both good and bad chemistry could be dangerous.

Story Continued Below

The case of Franklin Delano Roosevelt and Josef Stalin demonstrates the dangers of trying to cultivate good relations with a paranoid Russian leader. To Roosevelt, Stalin resembled a no-nonsense American politician with whom he thought he could business. He tried to win over the Soviet leader at the 1943 Tehran conference by teasing British Prime Minister Winston Churchill, and the more Churchill scowled, FDR later told his Labor Secretary Frances Perkins, "the more Stalin smiled." After "Stalin broke into a deep, hearty guffaw," Roosevelt continued, "I kept it up until Stalin was laughing with me and it was then that I called him 'Uncle Joe.'" After that, "our relations were personal." The "ice was broken and we talked like men and brothers."

In fact, Stalin saw through Roosevelt's charm and took it to be trickery, which only made him more, not less, suspicious of FDR.

Churchill, Stalin later told the Yugoslav politician Milovan Djilas, "is the kind who if you don't watch him, will slip a kopeck out of your pocket! And Roosevelt? Roosevelt is not like that. He dips in his hand only for bigger coins. Despite this mistrust, the two leaders were able to hold the Grand Alliance together until the end of the war. But their agreement on the outlines of the postwar order contained the seeds of the Cold War.

The case of John F. Kennedy and Nikita Khrushchev suggests what can happen when personal chemistry is bad. Kennedy and Khrushchev were as different personally as their countries were opposed politically at the height of the Cold War. Kennedy—young, rich and highly educated—constituted a personal challenge to the ill-educated, uncultured, former peasant who now led the USSR. But in Khrushchev, Kennedy was facing a rough, tough older man who in some ways resembled the father who had dominated his childhood. Ignoring the advice of his chief advisers on the USSR, Kennedy tried at the June 1961 Vienna summit to engage Khrushchev in a candid but calm exchange about their ideological differences. But when Khrushchev, who was as explosive as he was impulsive, erupted in a defensive harangue he intimidated his young counterpart. "Roughest thing in my life," JFK told *New York Times* columnist James Reston afterward. Khrushchev's impression of Kennedy: "This man is very inexperienced, even immature." The encounter encouraged Khrushchev to send Soviet missiles to Cuba, bringing the world closer than it has ever been to nuclear war.

Boris Yeltsin resembled Khrushchev: boisterous, boastful, blowing hot and cold at his many summits with Bill Clinton. But thanks partly to the personal chemistry between them, Clinton reacted to Yeltsin's fireworks much more calmly than Kennedy had to Khrushchev's. Clinton had high hopes for Russia and for Russian-American relations following the

collapse of the Soviet Union. He hoped to see Russia adopt Western-style political and economic institutions while becoming a genuine ally of the West. In theory, Yeltsin was open to both these outcomes, but in practice, as Russia suffered through terrible troubles at home, including an economic crash combined with raging inflation and an explosion of corruption, he chafed at the arrogance of American advisers promoting democratic capitalism while Washington helped to expand NATO and tried to dictate the outcomes of wars in Bosnia and Kosovo.

The fact that a weakened Russia was more a supplicant than a threat to the United States helped keep relations on track. But so did the way Clinton took Yeltsin's explosions in stride. Clinton saw in Yeltsin an "ol' boy" like himself, referring to him in conversations with advisers as "ol' Boris." That helped him to roll with Yeltsin's punches and laugh off Yeltsin's excesses, in which Clinton seemed to recognize parallels to his own gigantic appetites. But in retrospect, Clinton underestimated the depths of Moscow's brewing resentment.

On the surface, the case of Ronald Reagan and Mikhail Gorbachev looks most like that of Trump and Putin. When Gorbachev became Soviet leader in March 1985, the two countries seemed to be, as they do now, in a new Cold War. And the Geneva summit that November produced little or nothing in the way of concrete agreements. But both leaders regarded the personal chemistry they achieved at Geneva as a breakthrough that nearly led a year later to an agreement to eliminate nuclear weapons. In June 1988, when Gorbachev's transformation of Soviet domestic politics and foreign policy was accelerating, Reagan declared in during the Moscow summit that the USSR was no longer the "evil empire" it had been in "another time, another era."

The fact that Reagan and Gorbachev had so much in common helped to produce the personal

bond between them. Both came from "small farming communities," Reagan said afterward, and yet here they were at Geneva "with the fate of the world in their hands." Both had mostly happy childhoods in harsh times. But the content of what they had in common was particularly important: both were innately optimistic, convinced that people were basically good and could be trusted to do what was right.

Trump and Putin have much in common, too, beyond their obvious authoritarian bent. Both came to power without the support of a political party establishment. Both seem to understand capitalism (in words used by Russia analysts Fiona Hill and Clifford Gaddy about Putin) as "wheeling and dealing," as "about finding and using loopholes in the law, or creating loopholes." Both rely disproportionately on small inner circles of close advisers. Both use profanity to mobilize the masses. These similarities help to account for their mutual attraction.

But other parallels portend mutual enmity and may have already begun to drive them apart. In contrast to Reagan and Gorbachev, Trump and Putin both believe in what the *New Yorker* writer Ken Auletta once summarized as the philosophy of Trump's mentor, lawyer Roy Cohn: "Everyone lies, smears, covers up protects their friends. The rules of the game don't count as much as winning." And Putin's grade school teacher's description of him seems to fit Trump, as well: "Volodya never forgives people who betray him or are mean to him."

If Trump and Putin get along too well in Hamburg, that could come at the expense of American allies in Ukraine and Syria. If they don't, and if each man blames the other for their split, their tendency to lash out at those who betray them could eventually lead to a dangerous confrontation.

## The New York Times Trump Aides' Biggest Worry About Europe Trip: Meeting With Putin (UNE)

Julie Hirschfeld Davis and Glenn Thrush

WARSAW — President Trump arrived in Europe on Wednesday for three days of diplomacy that will culminate in a meeting with President Vladimir V. Putin of Russia, which has the potential for

global repercussions and political fallout back home.

Even his top aides do not know precisely what Mr. Trump will decide to say or do when he and Mr. Putin meet face to face on Friday on the sidelines of the Group of 20 economic summit gathering in

Hamburg, Germany. And that is what most worries those advisers as well as officials across his administration as Mr. Trump begins his second foreign trip as president, stopping first in Warsaw to give an address on Thursday and then heading to Hamburg.

The highly anticipated conversation with Mr. Putin is in many ways a necessity, given the critical disputes separating the United States and Russia. But it also poses risks for Mr. Trump, who faces a web of investigations into his campaign's possible links to Russia, as well as

questions about his willingness to take on Moscow for its military aggression and election meddling on his behalf. The air of uncertainty about the meeting is only heightened by the president's propensity for unpredictable utterances and awkward optics.

And it is not the only charged encounter awaiting Mr. Trump this week. Following North Korea's launch on Tuesday of an intercontinental ballistic missile, he also faces new pressure to act on a threat from Pyongyang that has long confounded American presidents, and that he has few appealing ways to address. He is scheduled to meet in Hamburg with President Xi Jinping of China, as he complains that Beijing has not done enough to rein in North Korea.

If Mr. Trump's first foreign trip, in May, was a chance for him to escape turmoil at home — staff infighting, a stalled agenda and the Russia-related investigations — his second will thrust him into the maelstrom. And at the center of it, Mr. Putin awaits.

"There's a fair amount of nervousness in the White House and at the State Department about this meeting and how they manage it because they see a lot of potential risks," said Steven Pifer, a former ambassador to Ukraine who has worked for the National Security Council and the State Department. "There is this gray cloud for the president of the investigations about collusion, so any kind of a deal is going to get the micro-scrutiny of, 'Is this a giveaway to the Russians?'"

Mr. Trump himself does not appear to be troubled by the meeting. He has told aides he is more annoyed by the prospect of being scolded by the German chancellor, Angela Merkel, and other leaders for pulling out of the Paris climate accords and for his hard line on immigration.

Mr. Trump's team said he might bring up Russia's documented meddling in the 2016 election, but he is unlikely to dwell on it: Doing so would emphasize doubts about the legitimacy of his election. Aides expect him to focus on matters involving Syria,

including creating safe zones, fighting the Islamic State and confronting Mr. Putin's unwillingness to stop the government of President Bashar al-Assad from using chemical weapons against civilians.

Before the meeting between the American and Russian presidents, Secretary of State Rex W. Tillerson said late on Wednesday that the United States "is prepared to explore the possibility" of expanded cooperation with Moscow in Syria, including a discussion of establishing no-fly zones.

The official statement listed several potential "joint mechanisms" with Russia, including "no-fly zones, on the ground cease-fire observers and coordinated delivery of humanitarian assistance."

Mr. Tillerson cautioned, though, that the United States and Russia "certainly have unresolved differences on a number of issues" regarding Syria, and warned that no faction — presumably including the Assad government — would be allowed to "illegitimately" retake or occupy areas liberated in the current offensives.

A day before Mr. Trump left Washington, the White House announced that the meeting would be a formal bilateral discussion, rather than a quick pull-aside at the economic summit gathering that some had expected.

The format benefits both. Mr. Putin, a canny one-on-one operator who once brought a Labrador to a meeting with Ms. Merkel because he knew she was afraid of dogs, will be able to take the measure of Mr. Trump.

Mr. Trump's aides are seeking structure and predictability. They hope that a formal meeting, with aides present and an agenda, will leave less room for improvisation and relegate Russia's meddling in the campaign to a secondary topic, behind more pressing policy concerns that the president is eager to address.

"Nobody has found the slightest evidence of collusion, any evidence the vote was tampered with, so now

they have turned their obsession to Russian "interference," said Kellyanne Conway, the president's senior counselor and former campaign manager. "I don't think that's what the American people are interested in."

Still, lawmakers in both parties are pressing the president to stand tough. They signaled their wariness last month with a 98-2 vote in the Senate to codify sanctions against Russia and require that Congress review any move by the president to lift them, a step the White House is resisting.

"Let's be clear: The Russians interfered in our election and helped elect Donald Trump president," said Senator Jack Reed, Democrat of Rhode Island and the ranking member of the House Armed Services Committee. "There is a serious, ongoing criminal investigation into this matter. And President Trump must refrain from any unilateral concessions to Russia."

Cognizant of the perils, the White House has planned Mr. Trump's itinerary to counter the perception that he is too friendly with Moscow. In Warsaw on Thursday, he will deliver a major speech and meet with Central and Eastern European allies, activities calculated to demonstrate his commitment to NATO in the face of Russian aggression. But there, too, Mr. Trump will be under pressure to do what he refused to in Brussels during his first trip: explicitly endorse, on European soil, the Article 5 collective defense principle that undergirds NATO.

His advisers say that he is eager to meet with President Andrzej Duda of Poland, a center-right politician who shares Mr. Trump's skepticism about migration, and that he sees a chance to make lucrative energy deals with Mr. Duda's government — perhaps at the expense of Russia.

But the substance and body language of his encounter with Mr. Putin will draw the most scrutiny.

"I expect an Olympian level of macho posturing between these two

leaders, who both understand the power of symbolism," said Derek Chollet, a former assistant secretary of defense. "Putin will be very prepared for this meeting. He's someone who is a master at manipulation."

Mr. Putin has signaled that he will press Mr. Trump to lift sanctions imposed on Russia for its annexation of Crimea, its interference in Ukraine and its election meddling, and to hand over Russian diplomatic compounds on Long Island and in Maryland that the United States seized last year.

The potential pitfalls are more than theoretical. White House officials recall with dread the images that emerged from Mr. Trump's May meeting with Foreign Minister Sergey V. Lavrov and Ambassador Sergey I. Kislyak of Russia in the Oval Office, which showed the president grinning, laughing and clapping hands with the Russian officials.

The biggest concern, people who have spoken recently with members of his team said, is that Mr. Trump, in trying to forge a rapport, appears to be unwittingly siding with Mr. Putin. Like Mr. Trump, Mr. Putin has expressed disdain for the news media, and he asserted in a recent interview that secretive elements within the United States government were working against the president's agenda. Two people close to Mr. Trump said they expected the men to bond over their disdain for "fake news."

"You don't want to come out of there saying, 'We're friends, and the enemy is the deep state and the media,'" said Michael A. McFaul, a former ambassador to Russia. "If it were somebody else other than Trump, you could imagine a tough conversation about Ukraine and election meddling, but that's probably too optimistic. Politics does constrain, I think, the parameters of the possible for any kind of major breakthrough."

**The  
New York  
Times**

## A Cold War Summit Offers Lessons for Trump Before Putin Meeting

David E. Sanger

A new president inexperienced in the intricacies of superpower politics meets his Russian rival for the first time. There are disputes over Crimea, nuclear weapons and completely different conceptions of an acceptable status quo as Washington and Moscow vie for global influence. The Americans

arrive with an unclear agenda; the Russians have a very clear one.

While it sounds like the coming encounter between President Trump and the current Russian leader, Vladimir V. Putin — scheduled for Friday — this actually was a description of President John F. Kennedy's first face-to-face session with Premier Nikita S. Khrushchev of the Soviet Union in June 1961.

"You know, Mr. Kennedy, we voted for you," Khrushchev said, as he recalled in his 1970 memoir. It is a line that, if one believes American intelligence reports, Mr. Putin could repeat, but probably will not.

But it is the other lessons of that meeting in Vienna — which stretched over two days, three meals, a clumsy effort by Khrushchev to charm Jackie

Kennedy and a tough one to threaten her husband — that might be useful to the Trump White House. It was one of the most remarkable leader-to-leader encounters of the Cold War, a story of caution about the dangers of walking into such a session without clear strategic goals.

Minutes after the meeting was over, Kennedy told James Reston of The

New York Times that it had been an incredibly rough session, for which he had been ill-prepared.

"Worst thing in my life," Kennedy said, according to later histories of the event. "He savaged me." (Mr. Reston, perhaps protecting the background nature of the conversation even long after Kennedy's death, did not quote the conversation directly in his memoir, "Deadline.")

Mr. Reston expressed surprise that the young president came out of the meeting — then, as now, in a time of deteriorating relations with Moscow — determined to show his toughness, someplace. "And the place to do it, he remarked to my astonishment, was Vietnam!" Mr. Reston recalled.

How much of this history is known to Mr. Trump and his aides is a mystery. Both Lt. Gen. H. R. McMaster, the president's national security adviser, and Stephen K. Bannon, one of Mr. Trump's closest political advisers, are steeped in both ancient and American history — and General McMaster wrote a book about the flawed decision-making in Washington over the war in Vietnam.

Still, General McMaster sent a bit of a shiver through Washington last week when he said that the meeting with Mr. Putin on Friday had "no specific agenda." He added, "It's whatever the president wants to talk about."

Historians who have focused on the Kennedy-Khrushchev interaction say the lesson of the encounter is that having no agenda is a bad idea.

The presidential historian Michael Beschloss, who has written extensively on the meeting, said that one lesson from the Vienna encounter "is that when two leaders of important world powers have their first meeting as heads of state, the results can be very dangerous unless the agenda has been carefully planned by both sides, and unless each leader has a number of experienced officials in the room who are a significant part of the discussions."

There are differences, to be sure.

Kennedy entered the meeting as a hawk, after warning of a nonexistent "missile gap" between the United States and the Soviet Union. Mr. Trump enters after more than a year in which he has never had an unkind word to say about Mr. Putin, or his authoritarian rule — and has disputed the accounts of American intelligence officials who say the evidence is beyond doubt that Mr. Putin himself ordered the meddling in the American election.

Kennedy did start with a theme that it is easy to imagine Mr. Trump adopting: that the United States and its adversary have to understand each other's views. But one of the many heated debates between Kennedy and Khrushchev was over the question of meddling in the affairs of other countries.

According to Arthur M. Schlesinger Jr., the historian who was given notes of the meeting for his book "A Thousand Days," the two leaders argued about which one spent more time manipulating elections and other leaders.

"How could we work anything out when the United States regarded revolution anywhere as the result of Communist machinations?" Khrushchev was paraphrased as telling the president. "It was really the United States which caused revolution by backing reactionary governments," he said in comments that Kennedy took as part warning, part lecture.

In response, Kennedy noted Khrushchev's pledge to back wars of national liberation — something the Soviet Union, like Russia today, attempted through tools including the kinds of "information operations" conducted more recently in the United States and Europe. That was the beginning of a lengthy, often ideological debate. The gruff Kremlin leader believed the United States was out to humiliate the Soviet Union and to contain Communist power. Each viewed the other as the aggressor.

"I want peace," Mr. Schlesinger quoted Khrushchev as saying, "but if you want war, that is your problem."

Kennedy responded, "It is you, and not I, who wants to force change." The two men then got into a spat about the Western protection of Berlin, and the benefits of capitalism versus Communism.

Mr. Trump's past comments suggest that he is unlikely to engage in similar discussion. Neither he nor Mr. Putin wants to waste much time on ideological debate. Mr. Trump has expressed doubt that Russia is trying to settle old scores in the region, or restore its past influence.

And in an interview that Mr. Trump gave to The New York Times last year, when he was a presidential candidate, he said he was not especially inclined to continue sanctions over Russian activity to destabilize Ukraine, or its seizure of Crimea. In fact, the White House has been looking to weaken sanctions against Moscow.

One of the big questions is whether Mr. Trump will press for the return of Crimea to Ukraine and an end to Russian activity to destabilize the Ukrainian government — regular talking points for the past several years. And Mr. Trump and his secretary of state, Rex W. Tillerson, seem unlikely to press Russia on its military support of the Syrian government.

What that 1961 summit meeting was really about, of course, was each man taking the other's measure — and this one will be, too. Khrushchev was uncertain whether Kennedy "intended to be more belligerent toward the Soviet Union than Eisenhower had been, or not," Mr. Beschloss said. "Kennedy studied for it but went in with excessive faith in his ability to think on his feet."

Mr. Trump clearly shares that self-confidence. And no one should expect Mr. Trump to declare that he was savaged, or to admit that the meeting went badly, even if it turns out that way. After all, Mr. Trump always talks about his ability to make a deal.



## Trump Attacks U.S. Spies, Says 'Other People' Could've Hacked 2016

Olivia Messer

President Trump announced his arrival in Eastern Europe on Thursday by attempting to deflect the election meddling blame away from Russia in a rant that pointed the finger at Obama and suggested other countries may have been involved in a plot to subvert U.S. democracy.

"I think it was Russia, and I think it could've been other people and other countries," Trump said, of the Kremlin's potential interference in the 2016 presidential election.

The commander-in-chief appeared with Polish President Andrzej Duda in Warsaw en route to the G-20 summit, where Trump is set to have his first face-to-face meeting with Russian President Vladimir Putin.

"Nobody really knows for sure," Trump continued. "A lot of people

interfere. It's been happening for a long time," he said.

Independent cybersecurity firms, relying on a host of technical indicators, began fingering the Russian government for the hack of the Democratic National Committee in the summer of 2016. Putin has even admitted that 'patriotic' Russian hackers may have been behind the breach.

U.S. intelligence agencies released their conclusions in January of this year, concluding that Russia interfered in the election with the goal of electing Trump. Since then, top officials have repeatedly warned that Moscow will likely interfere in the American political process again unless appropriately deterred.

Speaking in Poland, Trump cast doubt on the word of the U.S. intelligence agencies. He contested how many U.S. intelligence agencies had contributed to a joint

report saying Russia was behind the election-related hacks. "We did some heavy research," Trump said. "It turned out to be three or four. It wasn't 17." It is unusual for a president to attack his own intelligence agencies, who are responsible for guarding against overseas threats, on foreign soil.

Trump also erroneously claimed the U.S. press corrected their reporting after his supposed "research," another virtually unprecedented action overseas. The unsubstantiated attack on the press was made next to the chairman of Poland's Law and Justice party, which "transformed the public broadcaster into a propaganda mouthpiece for the government," according to the Economist.

Remarkably, Trump did not mention whether he planned to discuss the issue with Putin in Hamburg, Germany on Friday.

Trump has consistently refused to blame the Kremlin for interfering in the election that landed him in the White House, but he did point fingers at former President Barack Obama on Thursday.

"Why did he do nothing about it?" Trump asked. "He was told it was Russia by the CIA, as I understand it. He did nothing about it. They say he choked. Well, I don't think he choked. I think what happened is he thought Hillary Clinton was going to win the election and he thought 'well, let's not do anything about it.'"

"He did nothing about it," Trump repeated. "Why did he do nothing?"

Get The Beast In Your Inbox!

**Daily Digest**

Start and finish your day with the top stories from The Daily Beast.

**Cheat Sheet**

A speedy, smart summary of all the news you need to know (and nothing you don't).

Thank You!

You are now subscribed to the Daily Digest and Cheat Sheet. We will not share your email with anyone for any reason.

"Mistakes have been made," he continued. "I agree, I think it was Russia, but I think it was probably other people and other countries. Nobody really knows. Nobody really knows for sure."

On Wednesday, Secretary of State Rex Tillerson said the U.S. may begin working with the Russians to stem the loss of blood in Syria's civil war.

Trump also used the opportunity to slap down CNN.

He noted that the network "has some pretty serious problems."

"They have been fake news for a long time," he continued.

"They've been covering me in a very dishonest way. Do you have that also, by the way, Mr. President?" he asked Duda.

"NBC is equally as bad, despite the fact that I made them a fortune with The Apprentice, but they forgot that," he said.

"We want to see fair press. We don't want fake news."

The commander-in-chief also addressed—for the first time—North Korea's intercontinental ballistic missile launch on Tuesday. Officials believe the weapon is capable of striking Alaska.

"It's a shame they're behaving this way—they're behaving in a very,

very dangerous manner and something will have to be done about it," Trump said.

"I don't know, we will see what happens," he said, refusing to elaborate. "I have some pretty severe things that we are thinking about. That doesn't mean we are going to do it. I don't draw red lines."

In a turnaround from the joint press conference, Trump targeted Russia during his speech to a raucous crowd just hours later, calling out the Kremlin for "destabilizing activities in Ukraine and elsewhere and its support for hostile regimes, including Syria and Iran."

He publicly asked that Russia "instead join the community of responsible nations in our fight against common enemies and in defense of civilization itself."

Trump also said that NATO must "meet new forms of aggression, including propaganda, financial crimes and cyber warfare," adding that the alliance "must adapt our alliance to compete effectively in new ways and on all new battlefields."

He reiterated that more member countries must contribute more money, while at the same time affirming that the U.S. stands behind Article 5.

"To those who would criticize our tough stance, I would point out that the United States has demonstrated not merely with words, but with its actions, that we stand firmly behind Article 5," he said.

Even still, he added: "Europe must do more."



## Editorial : There's No Alternative to Patience With North Korea

North Korea's test of an intercontinental ballistic missile changes the strategic landscape in Asia -- yet the options for dealing with Pyongyang are as ugly as ever. The overriding need is to exploit these limited possibilities more thoroughly and creatively.

The Hwasong-14 ballistic missile launched earlier this week could be capable of reaching Alaska, and a missile that can hit the continental U.S. is only a matter of time. One day soon, defending Seoul or Tokyo could put U.S. cities at risk.

The Trump administration's original hope -- that China would use its economic leverage to make Kim Jong Un back down -- wasn't thought through. China's fear of a collapse that would result in a unified Korean peninsula, dominated by South Korea and hosting U.S. troops, far outweighs its annoyance with Kim. Absent the threat of overwhelming economic pressure,

China's ability to influence the Pyongyang regime is limited.

### North Korea's Nukes

The White House's apparent fallback -- raising the possibility of a preemptive military strike -- is no more plausible than before. There's little chance the U.S. and South Korea could take out the full nuclear arsenal Kim is thought to have built; retaliation by the North, which has hundreds of artillery pieces aimed at Seoul and huge stocks of chemical and biological weapons, could cause unthinkable casualties. A more limited attack -- say, an attempt to take out an ICBM being readied for a test launch -- risks an escalatory spiral that can't be contained.

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

Share the View

China has urged the U.S. and South Korea to suspend their joint military exercises in exchange for the North freezing its missile and nuclear tests. The U.S. should tell China it's willing to discuss this, but only if China helps pressure North Korea into real compromise. One possibility would be to leak word of U.S.-China talks about the future of the peninsula, which should concentrate minds in Pyongyang.

To concentrate them further, China should step up the economic pressure on Kim. Further measures could include cutting financial links and fuel shipments to the North (this may already have begun). If China balks at this, the U.S. could impose further secondary sanctions on Chinese banks and companies that do business with the North.

The U.S. should also work harder to help smaller countries in Asia and Africa close loopholes in existing sanctions, support NGOs and international organizations that

shine light on the North's deplorable human-rights record, and promote the supply of uncensored information into North Korea.

With all this in place, a verifiable nuclear and missile freeze may be achievable -- though in the short term, full denuclearization probably isn't. That's a tough pill to swallow. So is suspending joint exercises and training as the price of a freeze, because that would affect U.S. and South Korean military readiness.

Yet the situation isn't hopeless. There are signs that the North may be ready to negotiate and turn to the task of revamping its basket-case economy. What the U.S. and South Korea need above all is time, in hopes that greater openness will eventually undermine the regime from within. Patience in the face of Kim's crimes and provocations is a deeply unappealing option, and far from risk-free. Unfortunately, it's the best available course.



## China's Strongman Has a Weak Point: North Korea

Jane Perlez

BEIJING — Xi

Jinping, China's leader, is known as the Chairman of Everything. He makes decisions daily on the economy, the military, foreign policy, human rights and more.

Yet on North Korea he is stuck. A strongman who usually acts with precision and boldness, Mr. Xi has been reluctant to take on the North's leader, Kim Jong-un, ostensibly a Chinese ally, whom he privately

disparages to Western leaders as young and reckless.

The July 4 test of the North's first intercontinental ballistic missile has raised the question of what is China's red line for its ally, and whether the test will force Mr. Xi to act decisively against North Korea as the Trump administration is asking him to do.

The answer? He will probably do little, if anything.

As much as Mr. Xi disapproves of North Korea's nuclear program, he fears even more the end of Mr. Kim's regime, a unified Korea with American troops on his border and a flood of refugees from the North into China. And despite North Korea's missile advancement on Tuesday, Mr. Xi still has some breathing room, Chinese military and strategic experts said.

Chinese military experts are assessing the launch more conservatively than their American counterparts, saying they were not

convinced the missile was actually an intercontinental ballistic missile.

"This test may or may not be an ICBM," said Wu Riqiang, associate professor of international affairs at Renmin University. He said the missile was "probably unable to hit Alaska."

In contrast, American experts said the North Koreans had crossed a threshold, if only just, with a missile that appeared able to reach Alaska. While the missile traveled only about 580 miles, it did so by reaching

1,700 miles into space and re-entering the atmosphere, North Korean, South Korean and Japanese officials said.

South Korea's Defense Ministry suggested on Wednesday that the North's missile had the potential to reach Hawaii, about 4,780 miles from Kusong, the North Korean town from where the missile was fired, and farther than Alaska.

On Wednesday, the top American general in South Korea, Gen. Vincent K. Brooks, said that self-restraint was all that kept the United States and South Korea from going to war with the North.

Mr. Wu said the North's long-range missile capabilities were less threatening to China than to the United States. China would be more concerned if the North had tested a short- or medium-range ballistic missile, he said.

China has always considered itself to be less threatened by North Korean nuclear capabilities than the United States, but it does fear American countermeasures, like its recent deployment of an antimissile system on South Korean soil to deal with the threat from the North. South Korea's new president, Moon Jae-in, recently suspended deployment of that system, and there was no sign after the North's missile launch that he was changing that position.

China may be increasingly frustrated by the North's behavior, but it has never been the target of Mr. Kim's weapons. The United States is the North's declared enemy and the ultimate target of its nuclear arsenal.

## The New York Times

David C. Kang

BEIJING — North Korea is not a problem that can be solved. As much as the West may engage in wishful thinking about a revolution, the Kim family regime has survived far longer than almost anyone predicted. Even today, it shows no signs of collapsing, and the North Koreans show no signs of rebelling en masse.

Does anyone actually think that with another round of sanctions the country's leader, Kim Jong-un, will suddenly give up power and North Koreans will all become liberal democrats? Or that somehow Washington could brandish enough aircraft carriers that the North Korean military and political establishment will surrender?

The widespread mocking of Kim Jong-un as a freakish buffoon is a sign of our misguided approach.

More worrisome to China than the missile advances was the prospect of North Korea's sixth test of a nuclear bomb, Mr. Wu and other experts said. China's northeast, a depressed area of smaller cities and rusted industries, runs along the border with North Korea, not far from the tests. The nuclear testing site at Punggye-ri in North Korea is so close to the Chinese border that residents in the city of Yanji have complained that their windows rattled during the last several tests.

When the North tested a nuclear weapon in September 2016, local residents said they were afraid of large-scale leaks of radioactive material. Some said they were concerned that the North may actually use the bomb against China. There have been fears in the last few years of soil contamination in the northeast from the North's nuclear testing.

"For China, a sixth nuclear test represents a graver threat than an ICBM test," said Feng Zhang, a fellow in political science at the Australian National University. "North Korea's ICBMs threaten the U.S. more than China, but North Korea's nuclear weapons and the testing of them near the Chinese border are a strategic and environmental threat to China."

Mr. Wu said, "The missile launch just isn't as pressing for China as a nuclear test might be."

But no matter the North's behavior, it would be very difficult for Mr. Xi to declare a red line with Pyongyang, either officially or unofficially, said Cheng Xiaohu, associate professor of international relations at Renmin University.

Viewing him as a joke is a mistake not because it's rude, but because it contributes to a dangerous underestimation of his power. Mr. Kim has managed to rule for almost six years as a brutal totalitarian dictator. He may be many things, but he is not a lightweight. Leaders do not survive under such circumstances without being superb politicians.

Sanctions and threats haven't worked in the past, and more of the same most certainly will not work in the future. As his father and grandfather did, Mr. Kim meets pressure with pressure. It is no surprise that a surge in missile tests came as the Trump administration has made threats about sending aircraft carriers and potential preemptive strikes. North Korea isn't unpredictable; rather, it is the most predictable country on earth.

"The ICBM is not a Chinese red line — even the U.S. does not draw that line clearly and unequivocally," Mr. Cheng said. If China did draw such a red line, he said, "China or the U.S. must automatically take retaliatory actions," such as Beijing cutting off oil supplies to North Korea.

But China cannot afford to squeeze the North so hard — by cutting off fuel, for example, or basic trade — that the country destabilizes, sending refugees pouring over the border.

Mr. Xi is at least publicly expressing disapproval of North Korea's latest actions. He was in Russia visiting President Vladimir V. Putin when the North announced it had successfully tested an ICBM. The two leaders issued a joint statement calling for negotiations that would aim to freeze the North's arsenal in exchange for limitations on the American military posture in South Korea.

Instead of penalizing North Korea, China has been calling for such negotiations for many months, but the Trump administration has declined.

Beyond cracking down on trade between the two nations, Mr. Xi holds very few cards against North Korea, and he has little choice but to rely on a kind of strategic hesitation, said a Chinese analyst of foreign affairs who sometimes advises the government.

"Xi as a strategist is facing an anguished choice to use up his means on Kim Jong-un while having no confidence at all that it would be effective," said the analyst, Shi

The North Koreans are also very calculating. By aiming test missiles at Japan, Pyongyang is sending a clear signal: Take a preventive shot at our missile sites, and we will take a shot at Japan, most likely at the roughly 50,000 American military personnel stationed at United States bases there. It would not be the start of a second Korean War, but rather a poke for a poke. Would the United States really want to up the ante a second time? Would Japan, China and South Korea want to?

Nuclear weapons are almost useless for coercion, but they are great for deterrence. They are designed to ensure the survival of the country and the regime. The more pressure the United States puts on the North Koreans, the more likely they are to continue perfecting their missiles and nuclear weapons. In short, deterrence works, and neither North Korea nor the rest of

Yinhong, a professor of international relations at Renmin University. "What can this strategist do? A sort of hesitation is unavoidable."

Mr. Xi is facing an increasingly "determined and decisive" Mr. Kim, and he is also confronted by an American president who is not easy to deal with, Mr. Shi said. "Xi and Trump are unable to see eye to eye for long, and even if they were it would be extremely difficult to thwart Kim for long," he said.

In Washington, Mr. Trump repeated his impatience with Mr. Xi. In a post on Twitter on Wednesday, the president said China's trade with North Korea had grown by almost 40 percent in the first quarter. "So much for China working with us — but we had to give it a try," he said.

It was not clear where Mr. Trump got his 40 percent figure. A South Korean trade group said on Monday that China had imported much more iron in the last few months than previously. But the group also said that the North was a long way from making up the lost revenues from China shutting down its North Korean coal imports.

China's trade with the North grew 37.4 percent during the first three months of the year, compared with the same period in 2016, Chinese trade data released in April showed. China said the trade grew even as it stopped buying North Korean coal.

the world is in danger of forgetting that.

Twenty years ago, there might have been an opportunity for the two sides to reach a deal. But both Washington and Pyongyang have had years of evidence to back their claims that the other side will never live up to its word. This is a classic paradox: Actions one side takes to make itself safer prompt a response by its adversary, making both sides less safe.

Given this pessimistic perspective, what is the way forward?

The good news is that deterrence is effective both ways. North Korea poses almost no threat to South Korea as long as the United States-South Korea alliance remains ironclad. Kim Jong-un may be many things, but he is not suicidal. Deterrence will continue to work.

But the North Korean problem is far bigger than its nuclear program. The country is experiencing a humanitarian disaster. The number of people trying to flee the country could soar in a crisis. It's also an economic and environmental black hole that limits trade and travel throughout Northeast Asia. While the political challenges that come

with the nuclear weapons program are unavoidable, the West should continue putting effort into solving these other problems.

Politicians in the United States and South Korea may not want to admit that the North Korean nuclear arsenal is a reality, but Washington has a history of coming around. The

United States spent more than a decade ignoring the situation in South Asia before finally acknowledging that India and Pakistan had nuclear weapons.

North Korea is in a class of its own. But we ignore that it is a real country with a functioning government at our peril. For the United States, making

steady progress in alleviating the humanitarian and economic problems, while maintaining strong deterrence against the nuclear program, is the only way forward.

**The  
Washington  
Post**

## Editorial : What Trump can do about North Korea

IT WOULD be difficult to overstate the danger posed by North Korea's launch of an intercontinental ballistic missile potentially capable of reaching U.S. territory. The exercise brought this country, and the world, that much closer to the moment — perhaps only a couple of years away — when the Pyongyang regime may be able to arm such a missile with a nuclear warhead and threaten not only Alaska and Hawaii but also Washington, Oregon and California. Against that deeply destabilizing threat, the Trump administration must now rally not only Republicans and Democrats within this badly polarized country but also the widest possible range of like-minded countries around the world.

Is President Trump capable of doing that? He deserves credit for restoring urgency about North Korea's weapons programs, having

openly disavowed his predecessor's ineffectual stance of "strategic patience," before the latest missile test. Mr. Trump was also well-advised to seek help from China, Pyongyang's sponsor, in reining in the North, even if that is not exactly a new idea. Less admirable, alas, was the manner of his outreach to Beijing — a series of tweets about President Xi Jinping that ranged from embarrassingly fawning to prematurely frustrated. This is no way to conduct diplomacy, but then again, Mr. Trump has not yet even nominated anyone to fill key State Department positions for East Asia, international security and nuclear proliferation issues.

Mr. Trump is an unlikely orchestrator of a multilateral approach, given both his erratic conduct and his off-putting rhetoric about "America first." Still, other countries might yet be induced to follow his lead if he can convince them both that he has a

credible plan and that the alternative might be far worse — war in Northeast Asia. The third way between more fruitless talks and a catastrophically risky preemptive war would be to impose on the North, for the first time, truly stringent economic sanctions, comparable to the ones that brought Iran to the nuclear bargaining table.

Most popular stories, in your inbox daily.

To be sure, that could be a recipe for short-term tension with China, because it's Chinese banks that help North Korea trade in U.S. dollars and Chinese companies that continue to supply North Korea with food, energy and "dual-use" materiel that helps its nuclear program. And China might not be the only nation inconvenienced if there were a serious effort to choke off the North's supply of hard currency; North Korean workers have been

contracted out in Russia, Qatar and, until last year, even democratic Poland. Early indications were not auspicious for such an effort; on Tuesday, Russia and China jointly called on the United States and South Korea to abandon military exercises in return for a suspension by North Korea of missile testing.

Washington and Seoul rejected the false equivalence of that approach, demonstrating that their essential solidarity is intact despite recent disagreements between the new presidents in each capital — and Pyongyang's obvious efforts to shake it. From this, Mr. Trump must construct a widening circle of cooperation against the North, a long-term effort that will require overcoming the resistance of skeptical governments — and his own most impulsive tendencies.

**The  
New York  
Times**

## In North Korea, 'Surgical Strike' Could Spin Into 'Worst Kind of Fighting' (UNE)

Motoko Rich

SEOUL, South Korea — The standoff over North Korea's nuclear program has long been shaped by the view that the United States has no viable military option to destroy it. Any attempt to do so, many say, would provoke a brutal counterattack against South Korea too bloody and damaging to risk.

That remains a major constraint on the Trump administration's response even as North Korea's leader, Kim Jong-un, approaches his goal of a nuclear arsenal capable of striking the United States. On Tuesday, the North appeared to cross a new threshold, testing a weapon that it described as an intercontinental ballistic missile and that analysts said could potentially hit Alaska.

Over the years, as it does for potential crises around the world, the Pentagon has drafted and refined multiple war plans, including an enormous retaliatory invasion and limited pre-emptive attacks, and it holds annual military exercises with South Korean forces based on them.

On Wednesday, the Trump administration made a point of threatening a military response. Gen. Vincent K. Brooks, commander of the American forces that conducted a missile exercise with South Korea, said the United States had chosen "self-restraint" with the North. Nikki R. Haley, the American ambassador to the United Nations, said her country's "considerable military forces" were an option. "We will use them if we must, but we prefer not to have to go in that direction," she told the Security Council.

But the military options are more grim than ever.

Even the most limited strike risks staggering casualties, because North Korea could retaliate with the thousands of artillery pieces it has positioned along its border with the South. Though the arsenal is of limited range and could be destroyed in days, the United States defense secretary, Jim Mattis, recently warned that if North Korea used it, it "would be probably the worst kind of fighting in most people's lifetimes."

Beyond that, there is no historical precedent for a military attack aimed at destroying a country's nuclear arsenal.

The last time the United States is known to have seriously considered attacking the North was in 1994, more than a decade before its first nuclear test. The defense secretary at the time, William J. Perry, asked the Pentagon to prepare plans for a "surgical strike" on a nuclear reactor, but he backed off after concluding it would set off warfare that could leave hundreds of thousands dead.

The stakes are even higher now. American officials believe North Korea has built as many as a dozen nuclear bombs — perhaps many more — and can mount them on missiles capable of hitting much of Japan and South Korea.

Earlier in his term, President Trump tried to change the dynamics of the crisis by forcing the North and its main economic benefactor, China, to reconsider Washington's willingness to start a war. He spoke bluntly about the possibility of a "major, major conflict" on the Korean Peninsula, ordered warships into

nearby waters and vowed to "solve" the nuclear problem.

But Mr. Trump has backed off considerably in recent weeks, emphasizing efforts to pressure China to rein in Mr. Kim with sanctions instead.

After all, a pre-emptive American attack would very likely fail to wipe out North Korea's arsenal, because some of the North's facilities are deep in mountain caves or underground and many of its missiles are hidden on mobile launchers.

The North has warned that it would immediately retaliate by launching nuclear missiles. But predicting how Mr. Kim would actually respond to a limited attack is an exercise in strategic game theory, with many analysts arguing that he would refrain from immediately going nuclear or using his stockpile of chemical and biological weapons to avoid provoking a nuclear response from the United States.

Assuming Mr. Kim is rational and his primary goal is the preservation of his regime, he would only turn to

such weapons if he needed to repel a full-scale invasion or felt a nuclear attack or other attempt on his life was imminent, these analysts say.

But anticipating what the North might do with its conventional weapons in the opening hours and days after an American attack is like trying to describe a “very complex game of three-dimensional chess in terms of tic-tac-toe,” said Anthony H. Cordesman, a national security analyst at the Center for Strategic and International Studies in Washington.

The problem, Mr. Cordesman said, is that there are many ways and reasons for each side to escalate the fighting once it begins.

Stopping it would be much more difficult.

### Opening Salvos

North and South Korea, separated by the world’s most heavily armed border, have had more than half a century to prepare for a resumption of the war that was suspended in 1953. While the North’s weaponry is less advanced, the South suffers a distinct geographical disadvantage: Nearly half its population lives within 50 miles of the Demilitarized Zone, including the 10 million people in Seoul, its capital.

“You have this massive agglomeration of everything that is important in South Korea — government, business and the huge population — and all of it is in this gigantic megalopolis that starts 30 miles from the border and ends 70 miles from the border,” said Robert E. Kelly, a professor of political science at Pusan National University in South Korea. “In terms of national security, it’s just nuts.”

North Korea has positioned as many as 8,000 artillery cannons and rocket launchers on its side of the Demilitarized Zone, analysts say, an arsenal capable of raining up to 300,000 rounds on the South in the first hour of a counterattack. That means it can inflict tremendous damage without resorting to weapons of mass destruction.

Mr. Kim could order a limited response, by hitting a base near the Demilitarized Zone, for example, and then pausing before doing more. But most analysts expect the North would escalate quickly if attacked, to inflict as much damage as possible in case the United States and South Korea were

preparing an invasion.

“North Korea knows it is the end game and will not go down without a fight,” said Jeffrey W. Hornung of the RAND Corporation, adding, “I think it is going to be a barrage.”

The North has often threatened to turn Seoul into a “sea of fire,” but the vast majority of its artillery has a range of three to six miles and cannot reach the city, analysts say.

The North has deployed at least three systems, though, that can reach the Seoul metropolitan area: Koksan 170-millimeter guns and 240-millimeter multiple-rocket launchers capable of hitting the northern suburbs and parts of the city, and 300-millimeter multiple-rocket launchers, which may be able to hit targets beyond Seoul.

There are perhaps 1,000 such weapons near the Demilitarized Zone, many hidden in caves, tunnels and bunkers. But under a traditional artillery strategy, the North would not fire them all at once. Instead, it would hold some in reserve to avoid giving their positions away and to conserve munitions.

How much damage an initial attack would inflict depends on how many are used and on how much of the ordnance explodes. In 2010, North Korean forces fired about 170 shells at an island in the South, killing two civilians and two soldiers. Analysts later concluded that about 25 percent of the North’s shells failed to detonate.

A study published by the Nautilus Institute for Security and Sustainability in 2012 accounting for these and other factors such as population density concluded that the initial hours of an artillery barrage by the North focused on military targets would result in nearly 3,000 fatalities, while one targeting civilians would kill nearly 30,000 people.

The North could compound the damage by also firing ballistic missiles at Seoul. But Joseph S. Bermudez Jr., a North Korea expert at AllSource Analysis, a defense intelligence consultancy, said it was more likely to use missiles to target military installations, including American bases in Japan.

### The Defense

United States and South Korean forces could be put on alert and bracing for retaliation before any

attempt to knock out North Korea’s nuclear program. But there is little they can do to defend Seoul against a barrage of artillery.

The South can intercept some ballistic missiles, with the recently installed Terminal High Altitude Area Defense system, as well as Patriot and Hawk systems. But it does not have anything like Israel’s Iron Dome that can destroy incoming artillery shells and rockets, which fly at lower altitudes.

Instead, South Korean and American troops would employ traditional “counterbattery” tactics — using radar and other techniques to determine the location of the North’s guns when they are moved out of their bunkers and fired, and then using rockets and airstrikes to knock them out.

David Maxwell, associate director for the Center for Security Studies at Georgetown University and a veteran of five tours in South Korea with the United States Army, said the Pentagon was constantly upgrading its counterbattery capabilities. But he added, “There is no silver bullet solution that can defeat North Korean fire before they inflict significant damage on Seoul and South Korea.”

Based on counterbattery efforts in the Iraq war, the Nautilus Institute study estimates that North Korea might lose about 1 percent of its artillery every hour to American and South Korean counterbattery fire, or more than a fifth of its arsenal after a day of fighting.

What makes the situation so dangerous is how easy it would be for either side to take action that leads the other to conclude an all-out war is imminent and escalate the battle. The United States and South Korea could hit targets besides artillery, including supply lines and communication facilities, for example. The North could send tanks and troops across the border and drop special forces into the South’s ports.

Especially perilous would be any hint that the United States and South Korea were preparing a “decapitation” strike against the North Korean leadership, which could lead a desperate Mr. Kim to turn to nuclear or biochemical weapons.

### Civilian Preparation

All things considered, analysts say, it could take American and South

Korean forces three to four days to overwhelm North Korea’s artillery.

How much damage North Korea inflicts in that time depends in part on South Korea’s ability to get people to safety quickly. As more of the North’s guns are destroyed and people take cover, the casualty rate would fall with each hour.

The Nautilus Institute study projects 60,000 fatalities in the first full day of a surprise artillery attack on military targets around Seoul, the majority in the first three hours. Casualty estimates for an attack on the civilian population are much higher, with some studies projecting more than 300,000 dead in the opening days.

The Seoul metropolitan government says there are nearly 3,300 bomb shelters in the city, enough to accommodate all 10 million of its residents. In Gyeonggi Province, which surrounds the capital like a doughnut, the provincial government counts about 3,700 shelters. Many train stations in the region double as shelters, and most large buildings have underground parking garages where people fleeing artillery attacks can seek cover.

But critics say that the local authorities are unprepared for the chaos an artillery attack would cause and that the public is nonchalant about the prospect of war.

The South Korean government conducts emergency drills only five times a year, and they are fairly desultory affairs that last about 20 minutes, with people hunkering in buildings or stopping in their cars on the roads after sirens go off. Many residents have no idea where their nearest shelter is.

Few people keep stockpiles of food and water, for example, and while the government has indicated it may buy about 1.8 million gas masks for use in the event of a chemical attack, that would not be nearly enough to protect the population.

“For the first 72 hours,” said Nam Kyung-pil, governor of Gyeonggi Province, “each individual will have to save their own lives or be prepared by themselves.”



## Sullivan : The right way to play the China card on North Korea

Jake Sullivan was national security adviser to Vice President Joe Biden and director of policy planning in the Obama administration. Victor Cha is former director for Asian affairs on the National Security Council and served as deputy head of the U.S. delegation for the six-party talks in the George W. Bush administration.

North Korea's July 4 intercontinental ballistic missile test raises hard questions for the Trump administration: Is there any path forward that does not lead either to war or to living with a nuclear North Korea that can hit the continental United States? Can effective diplomacy prevent the "major, major conflict" that President Trump has talked about?

There is growing recognition that the old playbook won't work. Reviving old agreements North Korea has already broken would be fruitless. The Chinese won't deliver on meaningful pressure. And a military strike could lead to all-out war resulting in millions of casualties. We need to consider a new approach to diplomacy.

That means playing the China card, but not the way it has been played until now. It's not enough to ask China to pressure Pyongyang to set up a U.S.-North Korea negotiation. China has to be a central part of the negotiation, too. China, rather than the United States, should be paying for North Korea to halt and roll back its nuclear and missile programs. Here's the logic.

Today's Headlines newsletter

The day's most important stories.

The best option would be for China to agree to work with us and South Korea toward getting new leadership in North Korea that is less obsessed

**THE WALL  
STREET  
JOURNAL.**

Farnaz Fassihi at the United Nations, Gordon Lubold in Washington and Jonathan Cheng in Seoul

The U.S. and Russia clashed at the United Nations Security Council over how to respond to North Korea's nuclear-weapons program, a confrontation throwing into doubt U.S. hopes for an international diplomatic solution to the burgeoning crisis.

The standoff between diplomats on Wednesday came just two days before President Donald Trump and Russian counterpart Vladimir Putin plan to hold their first meeting during the summit of the Group of 20 leading nations in Germany, raising the stakes for both leaders as well as China, which will attend the international gathering.

Following North Korea's July 4 launch of its first intercontinental ballistic missile, deemed by U.S. officials to be capable of reaching Alaska, U.S. officials invoked direct

with weapons of mass destruction. But this is unlikely to happen in the foreseeable future for a litany of reasons: China's historical ties to its little communist brother; its concerns about regime collapse; its uncertainty about alternative viable power centers to the Kim family; its mistrust of U.S. motives; and its strained relations with South Korea.

The next option would be for China to cut off, or at least severely curtail, its commerce with North Korea, which accounts for 85 to 90 percent of North Korea's trade, to restrain Pyongyang. But as Trump has recognized in recent tweets, China is unlikely to go this far right now, for the same reasons.

So we are left with a less dramatic form of carrots-and-sticks diplomacy, backed by increasing pressure. But it can't be a repeat of previous rounds.

In the past, China has largely left it to the United States to put inducements on the table. Together the nuclear agreements executed by the Clinton and George W. Bush administrations cost the United States a half-billion dollars for denuclearization via monthly energy-assistance payments to Pyongyang. (Japan and South Korea also paid their fair share; China paid only a small amount in the Bush agreement.) Meanwhile, China continued to enjoy its trade relationship with North Korea, extracting mineral resources at a fraction of world market prices.

threats of military action as they tried to marshal coordinated international action.

At the U.N., U.S. Ambassador Nikki Haley warned diplomats that "time is short" for diplomatic action and said the Trump administration would be willing to use military force if punitive restrictions failed to deter North Korea from its plans to perfect a weapon that can strike the U.S.

In Seoul, Gen. Vincent Brooks, the top American military commander in South Korea, said the U.S. and South Korea were prepared to go to war with the North if given the order.

"Self restraint, which is a choice, is all that separates armistice and war," Gen. Brooks said. "We are able to change our choice when so ordered....It would be a grave mistake for anyone to believe anything to the contrary."

U.S. officials for years have said an attack on North Korea would have devastating results in the form of a

Now China is back, pushing us to the bargaining table, as evidenced by its statement with Russia after Tuesday's missile test calling for the United States to give up military exercises in exchange for a missile-testing freeze.

We should reject the freeze-for-freeze. But beyond that, we should tell China that it has to pay to play. The basic trade would be Chinese disbursements to Pyongyang, as well as security assurances, in return for constraints on North Korea's program. China would be paying not just for North Korean coal, but for North Korean compliance.

In a Chinese freeze-and-rollback agreement, the International Atomic Energy Agency would monitor compliance. If North Korea cheated, China would not be receiving what it paid for. The logical thing would be for it to withhold economic benefits until compliance resumed.

Of course, China might continue to fund the regime anyway. Or North Korea could very well reject such a deal from the start. But these scenarios would leave us no worse off than we are now. And it might well put us in a stronger position. Because China didn't get what it paid for, or got the cold shoulder from Pyongyang, it might become more receptive to working with us and our allies on other options.

Why would China agree to this plan, given that it has never been willing to put its economic leverage to real use before?

counterattack on South Korea and possibly Japan.

Military action, some analysts say, could take a number of forms. Most likely among them: a limited airstrike on North Korea's nuclear infrastructure or missile facilities. How successful such an attack would be in derailing North Korea's nuclear program would depend in large part on the quality of U.S. and allied intelligence on the nuclear and missile sites. Far less likely, but also possible, would be an attack designed to target the country's leadership.

U.S. military officials on Wednesday said North Korea's latest weapons test featured a new type of missile fired from a mobile launch site, two factors propelling the view in Washington that the isolated country's nuclear-weapons program is a growing threat.

Pentagon officials, briefing reporters on Tuesday's launch, described the potential weapon as a new kind of missile U.S. officials haven't seen

Beijing wants a diplomatic off-ramp to the current crisis. President Xi Jinping is still seeking a good relationship with Trump in this critical year of China's 19th Party Congress. Furthermore, Chinese frustrations with North Korean leader Kim Jong Un have grown after his execution of family members and regime figures close to China. All this may give the Trump administration marginally more leverage than its predecessors had.

We also have an important stick. If China refuses to proceed along these lines, we would be better positioned to pursue widespread secondary sanctions against Chinese firms doing business with North Korea beyond the Treasury Department's sanctioning of a Chinese bank last week. We would be left with little choice.

Of course, this idea is no silver bullet. It doesn't answer the question of how to get verifiable, enforceable, durable constraints on North Korea. It won't go very far if what North Korea really cares about is extracting something from the United States. But North Korea is the land of lousy options. We should be looking for a strategy that gives us not only a better chance of success but also some advantages if it fails.

launched from North Korea before. The two-stage missile was launched from a location known as the Banghyon Aircraft Plant, about 60 miles north of Pyongyang, said Capt. Jeff Davis, a Pentagon spokesman.

At the emergency session of the Security Council on Wednesday, the U.S. said it would introduce a new Security Council resolution within days to tighten and expand economic and diplomatic sanctions in response to North Korea's ICBM launch.

However, Russia and China formed a united front against the U.S. and its allies, saying they would strongly oppose new sanctions or military action, and offering a joint plan that called for dialogue and a parallel halt in military operations and exercises by all parties, including the U.S., in the Korean Peninsula. Both Russia and China have veto power, as permanent members of the Security Council, and hold considerable sway over North Korea.



Ms. Haley fired back, indicating the U.S. would be willing to put the resolution to a vote even in the absence of a consensus, an unusual move in a diplomatic body that usually takes care to coordinate texts of resolutions behind closed doors to appear united.

"If you are happy with North Korea's actions, veto it," she told them. "If you want to be a friend of North Korea, veto it." She added that if they were to block the U.S. proposal, "then we will go our own path."

Any overt military action would run the risk that the North Korean regime would interpret the attack as an existential threat and respond with force that could kill millions of people on the Korean peninsula, including some of the 28,500 U.S. troops stationed in South Korea. Secretary of Defense Jim Mattis has warned that a military solution would be "tragic on an unbelievable scale."

Seoul, a city of more than 10 million, sits just 35 miles from the North Korean border, where Pyongyang has assembled artillery that could inflict devastating damage on the densely populated South Korean capital.

South Korean President Moon Jae-in, who has called for more dialogue and closer economic ties with North Korea, on Wednesday called on global leaders to step up sanctions against North Korea, urging a peaceful resolution to the conflict.

He was speaking during joint statements in Berlin with Chancellor Angela Merkel, who said North

Korea "poses a big threat to global peace."

If attacked by the U.S., North Korea could also likely fire on U.S. ally Japan, which is within range of many of Pyongyang's missiles. During one launch in March the North fired four missiles at once toward Japan, which some analysts interpreted as a warning that it could overwhelm any Japanese missile defense.

The odds of a U.S. military strike on North Korea remain low—about a 10% probability—Meredith Sumpter, director of Asia for Eurasia Group, wrote in a note on Tuesday, adding it would probably be well-signaled by the U.S. and "clear to outside observers in advance of any military move."

U.S. officials monitoring Tuesday's launch operation made a determination of the missile's trajectory within minutes after takeoff, concluding quickly that it didn't pose a threat to the U.S. or its allies. The U.S. maintains missile-defense systems based in South Korea, at sea and in ground installations in the U.S.

U.S. officials said the mobile nature of the launchpad used by Pyongyang contributed to the element of surprise that the North possessed an ICBM.

North Korea on Wednesday touted another achievement of the test launch: It claimed that its missile warhead—the forward section, which carries the explosive—can withstand the extreme heat and pressure of re-entering the earth's

atmosphere. If true, that would clear another hurdle in developing a nuclear-tipped missile that can reach American cities.

U.S. defense officials said they were still assessing the re-entry vehicle and couldn't confirm North Korea's claims of the missile warhead's effectiveness. Officials determined that the missile was capable of traveling more than 3,400 miles.

Following the North Korean test, the U.S. and South Korean armies conducted a rare unscheduled live-fire drill, launching tactical surface-to-surface missiles off the east coast of Korea—an action they said was aimed directly at "countering North Korea's destabilizing and unlawful actions on July 4."

The drill and tough language appeared to be meant to reassure Seoul after North Korea's successful ICBM test.

Secretary of State Rex Tillerson described the development as an escalation of the threat to the U.S. It came despite years of sanctions and warnings aimed at preventing Kim Jong Un's regime from reaching the milestone.

The U.S. had sought Beijing's help in pressuring North Korea, but recently President Trump indicated that route had been fruitless. "Trade between China and North Korea grew almost 40% in the first quarter. So much for China working with us - but we had to give it a try!" he said in a tweet on Wednesday.

A Chinese customs official told a news conference in April that China's bilateral trade with North

Korea in the first quarter had increased by 37.4% to 8.4 billion yuan (about \$1.2 billion). He didn't specify if that was a year-to-year comparison.

Chinese customs figures show that bilateral trade continued to expand in April and May on a year-on-year basis, but that doesn't mean more revenue for North Korea: The second-quarter increase was driven by China's exports. Its imports from its neighbor declined in April and May, compared with those months last year, due in large part to Beijing enforcing a ban on North Korean coal.

The U.S. has been making shows of force in recent months in response to perceived increases in tension on the Korean Peninsula. In April, it said it was sending the USS Carl Vinson carrier strike group to the western Pacific to underscore Washington's commitment to the region. In that case, the announcement instead raised questions about U.S. credibility after it came to light that the aircraft carrier was thousands of miles away.

Twice in May, the U.S. sent B-1B bombers on flyovers near the Korean Peninsula. Each came shortly after a North Korean missile test.

—Jeremy Page and Paul Sonne contributed to this article.

## THE WALL STREET JOURNAL

# Use of Force Against North Korea Carries Risk of Catastrophic War

Paul Sonne

WASHINGTON—North Korea's provocative July 4 test of an intercontinental ballistic missile comes as the Trump administration faces an uncomfortable reality: Any use of force against North Korea carries the risk of a catastrophic war and could still fail to stop the regime from wielding a nuclear arsenal.

A recent review of the issue at the White House provided American officials with possible options on North Korea, including the outside possibility of using force against the regime or its nuclear facilities with the aim of derailing Kim Jong Un's quest for weapons of mass destruction. U.N. Ambassador Nikki Haley warned Wednesday the U.S. is willing to use military force against North Korea "if we must."

Military action, according to analysts, could take a number of forms. Most likely among them: a

limited airstrike on North Korea's nuclear infrastructure or missile facilities. How successful such an attack would be in derailing North Korea's nuclear program would depend in large part on the quality of U.S. and allied intelligence on the nuclear and missile sites. Far less likely, but also possible, would be an attack designed to target the country's leadership.

But any overt military action would run the risk that the North Korean regime would interpret the attack as an existential threat and respond with force that could kill millions of people on the Korean Peninsula, including some of the 28,500 U.S. troops stationed in South Korea. Secretary of Defense Jim Mattis has warned that a military solution would be "tragic on an unbelievable scale."

"The secretary of defense and the commander of U.S. Forces Korea have both stressed the high degree of risk involved in the use of force,"

said Patrick Cronin, senior director in the Asia-Pacific security program at the Center for a New American Security. "And that's because Kim Jong Un has never experienced a military attack, however limited, on his soil, and there is a risk that he would see any use of force as the opening salvo in an attempted regime change in which he would have nothing to lose."

North Korea over the years has built up formidable capabilities and created one of the world's most militarized societies, with an active-duty military of some 1.19 million people, compared with 630,000 in South Korea, according to the International Institute for Strategic Studies.

Long-range artillery that North Korea has situated as close as 35 miles from Seoul could drop as much tonnage of lead on the South Korean capital in 24 hours as Germany dropped on England

during the entire London Blitz during World War II, if uncontested, one U.S. military official said last year.

North Korea also possesses tens of thousands of special operations commandos, which Pyongyang could insert covertly into South Korea by submarine and plane to sabotage critical infrastructure, cripple the economy and stymie a military offensive, according to a U.S. military official. North Korea could also respond with formidable cyberwarfare capabilities, chemical weapons and bombings, analysts warn.

There is likely to be limited appetite for military actions in South Korea, where a newly elected liberal government has just replaced a more hawkish one, and where the population would be loath to jeopardize economic prosperity that has come with decades of peace. Even the installation of Thaad, an antiballistic missile defense system

the U.S. recently sent to South Korea, has provoked controversy in the country, where many are old enough to remember the trauma of the Korean War.

South Korean President Moon Jae-in called Wednesday for more sanctions against North Korea, but said he believes the issue should be resolved peacefully.

Meanwhile, the window for any military strike that would seriously damage the North Korean nuclear

program may be closing.

"You have reached the point where it's less and less clear that you will have any opportunities in the future," said Anthony Cordesman, a defense expert at the Center for Strategic and International Studies. "One thing you have to consider very explicitly is that the further North Korea proceeds, the harder it is to have any kind of option."

Still, Mr. Cordesman said the Trump administration, before pursuing any

military alternatives, should consider a comprehensive package of policies including stricter sanctions, information warfare campaigns and military buildup in the region to pressure North Korea.

Another question facing the U.S. is whether it is better to risk all-out war with North Korea to rid the country of nuclear weapons or to accept Pyongyang as a nuclear power and concentrate instead on deterring the regime from using its new nuclear arsenal.

"We can continue to effectively deter the use of those weapons," Mr. Cronin said. "The problem is the American body politic is not ready to accept a nuclear-armed North Korea that can strike U.S. soil. We haven't had to make that judgment yet but we are right on the cusp of having to make that."

## The Washington Post U.S. diplomat blasts China and Russia for 'holding the hands' of North Korean leader (UNE)

[https://www.facebook.com/emilyrau\\_hala?fref=ts](https://www.facebook.com/emilyrau_hala?fref=ts)

The top U.S. diplomat at the United Nations blasted Russia and China on Wednesday for "holding the hands" of North Korean leader Kim Jong Un, as the Trump administration struggled to respond to Pyongyang's latest ballistic missile test.

U.N. Ambassador Nikki Haley chided Moscow and Beijing over their opposition to a Security Council resolution condemning North Korea and imposing greater economic sanctions for what she called its "sharp military escalation."

She also said Pyongyang was "quickly closing off the possibility of a diplomatic solution" and suggested the United States would continue to consider military action if necessary.

"One of our capabilities lies with our considerable military forces," Haley said during a Security Council meeting in New York. "We will use them if we must, but we prefer not to have to go in that direction."

Haley's pointed speech marked the latest effort by the Trump administration to rally allies and rivals around a common agenda to blunt North Korea's progress, days after Kim's regime tested an intercontinental ballistic missile with a range that experts said would put it within reach of Alaska.

But her remarks also illustrated the limits of the White House's options and lacked specifics about what concrete steps the administration is considering. The missile test marks a new level of advancement in Kim's pursuit of a nuclear weapon that could strike the continental United States. Analysts said a military confrontation could escalate quickly into a mass-casualty war across the Korean Peninsula and Japan, where the United States has stationed tens of thousands of troops.

The standoff cast a shadow as President Trump prepared for his

first meeting with Russian President Vladimir Putin and his second with Chinese President Xi Jinping on the sidelines of the Group of 20 summit, which opens Friday in Hamburg. Trump also will meet with Japanese Prime Minister Shinzo Abe and the heads of U.S. allies Britain and Germany.

*[Analysis: Trump has never had a plan for dealing with North Korea]*

"We've been pretty consistent that we are never going to broadcast next steps," deputy White House press secretary Sarah Huckabee Sanders told reporters aboard Air Force One as the president traveled Wednesday to a short stop in Warsaw.

Before leaving Washington, Trump revealed more frustration with Xi, whom he has personally lobbied to enact sanctions on Chinese banks that do business with North Korean companies. The U.S. Treasury Department announced last week that it would block the Bank of Dandong, along the border region between China and North Korea, from accessing U.S. markets. Officials said this was the first of potentially greater sanctions by the United States.

On Twitter, Trump wrote: "Trade between China and North Korea grew almost 40% in the first quarter. So much for China working with us — but we had to give it a try!"

Chinese data released in April showed that China's trade with North Korea grew 37.4 percent during the first three months of the year compared with the same period in 2016. China said then that overall trade grew even as it complied with U.N. sanctions and stopped buying North Korean coal.

Russian and Chinese diplomats used the U.N. Security Council meeting to push their joint proposal for a suspension of North Korean nuclear and missile testing in exchange for a suspension of U.S. and South Korean military

exercises. Both countries also condemned the U.S. antimissile system being deployed in South Korea and called for it to be removed.

Early Wednesday in Asia, U.S. and South Korean forces fired missiles in joint military exercises that the U.S. Pacific Command cast as a show of "ironclad" resolve.

*[U.S. and China split on North Korea]*

Daniel Pinkston, a lecturer in international relations at Troy University in Seoul, said he saw no chance that Washington and Seoul would agree to halt joint exercises, calling it "a non-starter."

During the U.N. meeting, a Russian official questioned whether North Korea's missile was an ICBM, suggesting it was an intermediate-range weapon.

That prompted Haley to request a second turn at the microphone, during which she said: "If you see this as a threat, if you see this for what it is, which is North Korea showing its muscle, then you need to stand strong. . . . If you choose not to, we will go our own path."

Danny Russel, who served as senior Asia director at the National Security Council under President Barack Obama, said Trump has a "rare blue moon" opportunity this week to meet with and rally the major players — China and Russia on one side and Japan and South Korea on the other — toward some sort of unified display of condemnation of North Korea.

"What the administration needs to do is get China and Russia around an approach, even if it is not as testosterone-rich and muscular as the U.S. would like, so that the basic geometry is five on one, not three on three," said Russel, now a diplomat in residence at the Asia Society in New York. "There is no formula, no path forward, other than war, that

isn't built on some degree of common cause between Washington and Beijing."

Victor Cha, who served as senior Asia director at the NSC under President George W. Bush, said the U.S. sanctions on the Dandong bank were "a shot across the bow at the Chinese that what is happening is not working for us. It arguably gives [Trump] a stronger position going in" to the meeting with Xi.

The missile the Kim regime launched had been in the works for years. It flew higher and remained in the air longer than previous attempts, in what experts called a milestone for North Korea

*[U.N. Ambassador Haley's complaint: 'Spending my 4th in meetings']*

South Korean authorities described North Korea's test as a two-stage missile with a range of about 4,300 to 5,000 miles — enough to reach Alaska and other parts of North America.

South Korean Defense Minister Han Min-koo said there is a high probability that Pyongyang will stage another nuclear test and noted gains in its efforts to miniaturize a warhead — steps toward developing nuclear-tipped weapons capable of hitting the mainland United States.

### National News Alerts

Major national and political news as it breaks.

Pyongyang's test appeared to catch the United States by surprise. The Pentagon initially mislabeled the activity as a test of an intermediate-range missile before reclassifying it Wednesday as an ICBM with a range of at least 5,500 kilometers.

Navy Capt. Jeff Davis, a Pentagon spokesman, said that the missile "is not one we have seen before" and

that it was launched from a site — the Panghyon airfield about 90 miles north of Pyongyang — that has not been used to test missiles before.

He emphasized that North Korea still has a number of steps to meet before a threat to North America is imminent, noting that Pyongyang has not yet demonstrated the ability

to mount a nuclear warhead on an ICBM or show the lateral range necessary.

“But clearly, they are working on it,” he said.

Rauhala reported from Beijing. Anne Gearan and Dan Lamothe in Washington contributed to this report.

Los Angeles Times

## Editorial : North Korea’s missile test was ominous, but a military response could be disastrous

North Korea’s testing of a missile capable of reaching U.S. soil is an ominous development. For residents of Los Angeles — which is routinely cited as a potential target for such a weapon — it is especially so.

For the time being, North Korea does not appear to have a missile that can reach this city, nor has it figured out how to equip one with an effective nuclear warhead. But we have to face facts. North Korea’s capabilities are growing rapidly, and efforts by successive U.S. administrations, the United Nations Security Council and even China have failed to restrain the nuclear ambitions of Kim Jong Un and his predecessors.

Given that reality, President Trump might be tempted to give up on diplomacy and take preemptive military action to destroy North Korea’s nuclear program and perhaps the communist government along with it.

There is no guarantee that diplomacy will solve this problem; but a reckless military response will surely make it worse.

After all, the president declared last week that “the era

of strategic patience with the North Korean regime has failed.” On Wednesday, U.S. Ambassador to the United Nations Nikki Haley said: “The United States is prepared to use the full range of our capabilities to defend ourselves and our allies. One of our capabilities lies with our considerable military forces.”

But military action could be disastrous, leading to war on the Korean peninsula and the death of thousands of people. As the president’s military advisors will surely tell him, even “surgical” airstrikes designed to destroy North Korea’s nuclear weapons probably would trigger retaliation by the North against South Korea, using conventional weapons already amassed on the border. Secretary of Defense James N. Mattis has warned that the result “would be probably the worst kind of fighting in most people’s lifetimes.”

Some who argue for a preemptive strike justify it on the grounds that Kim is irrational and that once North Korea is capable of launching a nuclear weapon — against South Korea or a distant target in the United States — it won’t be deterred by the certainty of massive retaliation. But while Kim is a tyrant, there’s no indication that he doesn’t

respond rationally to incentives and disincentives. (That doesn’t mean his possession of nuclear weapons isn’t dangerous. They allow him to consolidate his power and intimidate other nations and they increase the possibility of a nuclear arms race in the region.)

If military action is off the table, what should the United States do?

First, the U.S. should continue to lean on China to press North Korea to rein in its nuclear ambitions. Trump once held out great hope for Chinese intervention, but lately has expressed disillusionment. On Wednesday he tweeted: “Trade between China and North Korea grew almost 40% in the first quarter. So much for China working with us — but we had to give it a try!”

But Trump shouldn’t give up. The truth is that China has made some efforts to pressure North Korea, supporting sanctions at the Security Council and restricting imports of coal from North Korea. But it should be pressed to do more, including support the new Security Council resolution Haley said the U.S. would introduce.

Second, the administration should leave the door open to negotiations with North Korea — including direct

talks. It’s understandable that the administration would be reluctant to sit down with the North Koreans. Not only is it distasteful because the Kim regime is a egregious violator of human rights, but in the past, North Korea has made commitments to the U.S. and other nations and then reneged on them.

The administration seems to have ruled out participating in any negotiations that would result in a freeze on nuclear or missile tests by North Korea as opposed to a dismantling of that country’s nuclear weapons program. On Tuesday Secretary of State Rex Tillerson reiterated that the U.S. “will never accept a nuclear-armed North Korea.” But perhaps there is a way for talks to take place without either side insisting on preconditions. If nothing else, a continuing channel of communication might reduce tension and prevent events from spiraling out of control.

There is no guarantee that diplomacy will solve this problem; but a reckless military response will surely make it worse.

THE WALL STREET JOURNAL

## 11,155 Dead: Mexico’s Violent Drug War Is Roaring Back (UNE)

Robbie Whelan  
CHIHUAHUA, Mexico—On the morning of March 23, gunmen here fired eight shots into a cherry-red Renault Duster SUV, killing newspaper reporter Miroslava Breach as she waited outside her home to drive her 14-year-old son Carlos to school.

A hand-painted sign at the scene said the journalist—known for her investigations into ties between drug gangs and local political machines—was murdered “for having a loose tongue.”

After a few years of declining violence under Mexican President Enrique Peña Nieto, the drug war has come roaring back to life.

Ms. Breach was one of 11,155 people murdered in Mexico in the first five months of 2017, according to government statistics. The pace of murders—about one every 20

minutes—represents a 31% jump from a year earlier, and, by year-end, could rival 2011’s 27,213 homicides for the worst body count in Mexico’s peacetime history.

“The momentum of reducing violence in recent years has clearly broken down,” said Earl Anthony Wayne, who served as U.S. ambassador to Mexico from 2011 to 2015. “It’s hardly in the interest of the U.S. to have this violence going on near our borders, both for the effect it could have on U.S. citizens in those areas and for the effect it could have on commerce.”

Many of the causes of the resurgence are long standing, including the growing market for opioids in the U.S. and a bloody competition among rival trafficking groups touched off by the death or arrest of senior leaders.

There is also a counterintuitive dynamic at work, say scholars of the drug trade: In recent months, voters have thrown out of office allegedly corrupt state and local leaders of President Peña Nieto’s ruling Institutional Revolutionary Party, or PRI. That, in turn, has led to the breakdown of unofficial alliances between drug gangs and politicians—what some are calling a *pax mafiosa*—that had kept the killings in check.

“The local and state governments of the PRI controlled the violence and crime using informal rules,” said Jorge Chabat, a professor who focuses on security issues and international relations at Mexico City’s nonpartisan CIDE research center. “They would say, ‘You can traffic drugs, as long as you don’t kill too many people.’”

Mexico’s earlier peak in violence started in 2006, when rival cartels

began turf wars that eventually claimed more than 100,000 lives. Then-President Felipe Calderón of the National Action Party, or PAN, deployed the armed forces against powerful drug lords who had grown influential enough to challenge government power and control large swaths of the country.

The troops managed to cut some cartels down to size, but homicides continued to rise, and the military drew accusations of human-rights abuses, including the killing of innocent civilians and summary execution of suspected gang associates.

Six years later, Mr. Peña Nieto’s PRI returned to power by branding itself as the party of efficiency. Rather than emphasizing drugs—and risking the parade of horrific headlines that swamped his predecessor—Mr. Peña Nieto focused instead on revamping

education policy and the energy and telecommunications industries.

At a dinner with reporters during the 2012 campaign, Aurelio Nuño, who would go on to become Mr. Peña Nieto's chief of staff and education minister, said that the new government would "change the narrative."

One of Mr. Peña Nieto's first acts as president was to eliminate Mexico's Public Security Ministry, an agency founded in 2000 by a PAN president to create a more professional federal police force to crack down on drug-related crime. Mr. Peña Nieto folded its responsibilities into the Interior Ministry.

The PRI has been plagued by corruption scandals since Mr. Peña Nieto took office. Nearly a dozen former PRI governors in Mexico are under investigation, serving time or being prosecuted for corruption, and three fled the country to escape prosecution. Two have since been captured in recent months. All deny the charges against them.

In late March, Edgar Veytia, the top prosecutor in the Pacific coast state of Nayarit and a close ally of its PRI governor, was arrested at the U.S. border on drug-trafficking charges. He has pleaded not guilty.

Alejandro Hope, a prominent Mexico City security expert, predicted in an April newspaper column that murders could approach a record 30,000 by the end of 2017, based on the fact that initial numbers tend to be revised upward by Mexican government statisticians.

Mr. Peña Nieto "thought that Mexico did not have a structural problem that needed to be tackled," Mr. Hope said. "They tried to change the narrative," he said. "But they didn't try to change the reality."

In a lengthy response to a list of questions from The Wall Street Journal, Mr. Peña Nieto's office acknowledged an uptick in murders beginning in 2015 that has continued into this year, and said the government has implemented a new, long-term anticrime strategy as one of its top priorities. It said the new program includes a broad overhaul of Mexico's justice system and moves to strengthen national-security institutions.

It blamed Mexico's local law enforcement for failing to do its job. "The lack of

professional, trustworthy and efficient institutions at the local level has opened up spaces for organized crime to operate with impunity," the statement said.

Here in Chihuahua—Mexico's largest state by area, which borders Texas and New Mexico—the killing of Ms. Breach took place in an atmosphere of mounting violence and political intrigue.

In October, voters elected Javier Corral, a former journalist who had been friends with Ms. Breach for more than 25 years, as Chihuahua's new governor. Chihuahua was one of seven states where PAN governors swept to victory last year, including some of the country's most violent, such as Tamaulipas, Veracruz and Quintana Roo.

Late last year, Chihuahua's former governor, César Duarte, fled to El Paso, Texas, not long before an arrest order was issued in Mexico alleging that he had embezzled hundreds of millions of dollars from the state. The new governor has declared Mr. Duarte a fugitive from justice. Mr. Duarte's attorney didn't return calls seeking comment.

Chihuahua has long been a coveted territory for drug traffickers. The state's largest city, Ciudad Juárez, was ground zero for cartel violence during the last drug war, suffering one of the highest murder rates in the world.

Joaquín "El Chapo" Guzmán, leader of the Sinaloa Cartel, sent gunmen to try to take over the city's drug trade from the powerful Juárez Cartel and its armed wing, known as La Línea. Mr. Guzmán recruited two street gangs, the Artistic Assassins and the Mexicles, to help. More than 9,000 people were killed there between 2007 and 2011.

Today, Mr. Guzmán is in jail in Manhattan, facing federal drug charges. In Ciudad Juárez, the atmosphere is tense. On Monday, the army deployed soldiers to carry out regular patrols of the city alongside state and local police for the first time in five years, after a paroxysm of violence killed 29 people over the course of five days.

Across the state, violence has become more diffuse and unpredictable as smaller gangs compete for influence and control of the drug trade, according to the state attorney general's office, the

governor's office and security experts. Early Wednesday, at least 14 more people died in a shootout between two armed groups in the rural community of Las Varas, about 250 miles southwest of El Paso.

"No one person has established himself as the outright leader of La Línea or the Juárez Cartel," said Will R. Glaspy, a special agent in charge of the U.S. Drug Enforcement Administration's El Paso division.

Ms. Breach often wrote about the growing links between politics and the drug trade in the area where she grew up, in the rugged hills of the Sierra de Chihuahua.

In March of last year, Ms. Breach wrote a series of articles about alleged family connections between organized crime and candidates for local political office. In one article, she revealed that the mother-in-law of Carlos Arturo Quintana, an alleged gang leader also known as "El 80," had registered with the PRI as a primary candidate to be municipal president of the town of Bachíniva.

In her hometown of Chínipas, the nephew of two alleged former lieutenants to Mr. Guzmán registered in PRI party primaries to run for mayor. After Ms. Breach's articles were published, the PRI renounced both candidates. Neither candidate could be reached for comment.

Soon after, Ms. Breach began receiving death threats, according to her family. When she was killed, the hand-scrawled message next to her body was signed "El 80."

One person rattled by Ms. Breach's murder was Mr. Corral, the new governor. In an interview, Mr. Corral said that before he took office the state prosecutor's office had been "totally dismantled" and thousands of open criminal investigations filed away and forgotten, including crimes of murder, rape and kidnapping.

Mr. Corral said the previous state administration under the PRI made deals with drug gangs to relocate some of them to rural areas, where they were allowed to operate.

"They were sent to the Sierra de Chihuahua, and they began to take control of the towns, the local police forces, and they became bosses of the whole territory," Mr. Corral said.

A spokesman for the PRI's state committee in Chihuahua didn't respond to multiple requests for comment.

César Peniche, a former federal security official appointed by Mr. Corral to be the state's top prosecutor, has pledged to rebuild his office and solve Ms. Breach's murder. Police say they have identified two suspects but have yet to make any arrests.

In March, a human head, believed by law-enforcement officials to belong to one of the bodyguards of Mr. Quintana, the purported La Línea capo, was found in a cooler by the side of the road in the city of Álvaro Obregón.

A day later, police killed another purported cartel gunman, a rival of El 80, believed to be responsible for the decapitation. On a recent Saturday night, gunmen killed six people and injured 22 in a bar in the semirural town of Ciudad Cuauhtémoc.

In late May, state police officer Jesús Pérez was on patrol in Ciudad Juárez with a reporter and photographer from The Wall Street Journal when a distress call blared out from shortwave radio: Gunmen had attacked a state police command post in the rural town of Villa Ahumada, about 90 minutes' drive away.

The gunmen strafed the local police post with hundreds of .50 caliber rounds using a military-grade machine gun, killing one officer and critically injuring three more, before fleeing to the countryside.

A spokesman for the state prosecutor's office identified the suspected gunmen as members of La Línea, and later said that the shooting was retaliation for an investigation the state police were carrying out into cattle theft and extortion by organized crime groups in the area. Days later, two local police commanders were arrested on suspicion of collaborating with the attackers.

—José de Córdoba and Dudley Althaus in Mexico City contributed to this article.



## Government supporters attack Venezuelan congress, injure opposition lawmakers

CARACAS, Venezuela — Venezuelan lawmakers who oppose President Nicolás Maduro were

beaten and bloodied in the halls of congress Wednesday as a pro-government mob stormed the

building, apparently facing little or no resistance from security guards.

The attack left at least 15 people injured, according to opposition leaders, including one lawmaker

who was rushed to the hospital with broken ribs and a head wound.

Scenes of the melee shared on social media showed masked pro-Maduro assailants kicking and punching lawmakers in the chambers of congress and in the streets outside. Reporters inside the building were also attacked and robbed of their equipment.

The assault appeared to mark a dangerous new escalation of violence against opponents of the leftist government, although it was not the first time lawmakers have been bloodied by the pro-Maduro gangs, known as "colectivos."

*[Opposition lawmakers accuse Maduro of a 'coup']*

Groups of government supporters burst into Venezuela's opposition-controlled National Assembly on July 5, injuring several lawmakers and journalists, according to witnesses. Groups of government supporters burst into Venezuela's opposition-controlled National Assembly on July 5, injuring several. (Reuters)

(Reuters)

The armed gangs move around the city on motorcycles and often work closely with Venezuelan security forces, which direct them to attack protesters and intimidate others to keep them from joining the demonstrations, according to human rights groups and opponents of the government.

Maduro frequently depicts his opponents in the National Assembly as traitors and terrorists responsible for inciting violence, while insisting that he is working to "restore peace" to Venezuela.

Late last month, a similar pro-Maduro mob gathered outside congress and prevented lawmakers from leaving for several hours. That group did not force its way inside, however.

Video footage of Wednesday's mayhem showed pro-government attackers streaming through the gates unimpeded, with a clear path straight into the halls of congress.

Opposition leaders blamed the breach on the Venezuelan national guard officers who are responsible for protecting the building.

Shortly before 10 a.m., a crowd of 80 to 100 pro-government demonstrators began throwing rocks at the building and shooting fireworks, then forced their way through a gate left unattended by national guard troops, according to Jennifer Lopez, a staffer in the National Assembly press office who was reached by phone Wednesday afternoon.

*[Was Venezuela helicopter 'attack' an act of rebellion or a ruse?]*

She said she was standing with other staffers on an outdoor patio when the mob burst in, some carrying clubs and pipes.

"The colectivos came in hitting everyone in the gardens," she said.

"A photographer was knocked to the ground and his camera was taken. Several people were hit in the head with blunt objects."

Then the attackers began shooting, Lopez said. "There are bullet holes in the windows and in the walls of the palace," she said.

Opposition candidates won control of congress in a landslide in 2015, but their attempts to steer the country out of its political and economic crisis have been systematically blocked by the unpopular Maduro and supreme court judges loyal to him.

On Wednesday, opposition lawmakers had gathered to commemorate Venezuela's independence day and organize a campaign opposing Maduro's plans to convene a special "constituent assembly" this month in an attempt to rewrite the country's constitution.

*[Why Maduro has called for a new constitution]*

The attackers were eventually cleared out of the building Wednesday by security forces using tear gas and fire extinguishers. Opposition lawmakers remained in the building. They sang the country's national anthem and said they would continue with their legislative meetings.

Some held up bullet casings they said were found on the floor, although there were no immediate reports of gunshot victims. Photos from the hallways outside the

legislative chambers showed walls smeared with blood.

"Nearly 100 young people have been killed in this mess," said opposition deputy Armando Armas, referring to a running tally of Venezuelans who have died in more than three months of unrest.

PowerPost's must-read morning briefing for decision-makers.

"A few punches are nothing," Armas told reporters, as blood streamed from his head and stained his collar.

Maduro and other government officials said they have ordered an investigation into Wednesday's incident. But a hostile, menacing crowd remained outside the congress building after the attack, launching fireworks and throwing rocks while keeping lawmakers trapped inside for more than eight hours.

Venezuelan security forces appeared to be in no hurry to clear the area or make the mob leave, let alone arrest anyone.

"This is Venezuela today," the assembly's vice president, Freddy Guevara, told reporters inside the building. "Criminals attack the National Assembly, the armed forces are complicit in this madness, but the people and the lawmakers resist and advance."

**THE WALL  
STREET  
JOURNAL.**  
Kurmanaeve

## Maduro Supporters Storm Venezuela's Congress

Kejal Vyas and Anatoly

critics say is a last-ditch effort by the unpopular leader to forgo elections.

CARACAS—Government supporters armed with pipes and sticks burst into Venezuela's congress on Wednesday and severely beat several opposition lawmakers, as the nation's political crisis grows more inflamed ahead of a contested effort to redraft the constitution.

The violence started after dozens of backers of the president stormed the opposition-controlled National Assembly in downtown Caracas ahead of a legislative session to mark Venezuela's independence day.

Some 300 congressional workers and journalists sought protection by barricading themselves for several hours inside the assembly, where lawmakers also were organizing an unofficial July 16 ballot to counter President Nicolás Maduro's plan to rewrite the constitution, which his

"The dictatorship's attack cannot go against a people decided on regaining freedom," opposition lawmaker Armando Armas said in a post on social media after he was left bloodied by protesters, according to witnesses.

The attack drew swift international censure. "My absolute condemnation of the violent assault on Venezuelan parliament," Spanish Prime Minister Mariano Rajoy said in a message posted on his Twitter profile.

The U.S. State Department in a statement called the attack "an assault on the democratic principles cherished by the men and women who struggled for Venezuela's independence 206 years ago."

Venezuela's government said in an emailed statement it would investigate the attack.

A 58-year-old lawmaker, Américo De Grazia, was taken away in an

ambulance after receiving injuries to the head, according to lawmakers. His son Federico told local media the politician was in stable condition. Photographs showed a seemingly unconscious Mr. De Grazia covered in blood on the lawn on the National Assembly.

Another congressman, José Guerra, posted photos on social media of what appeared to be a bullet hole in a window of the building. "Fortunately, no one was hit," he said in the post.

Scuffles inside the legislature aren't uncommon in Venezuela, which has bounced from one political crisis to another in recent years. But violence has increased with almost daily street demonstrations calling for Mr. Maduro's ouster. In the past three months, at least 91 people have been killed amid fears the nation could descend into civil war.

Mr. Maduro has stepped up heated rhetoric in recent weeks, implying his government would cling to power by any means necessary. "We

would never give up, and what couldn't be done with votes, we would do with weapons," he said at a rally last week.

Mr. Maduro's ruling Socialist Party lost control of congress in late 2015 amid a crippling economic crisis. Since then, the president has sought to neutralize the assembly by stripping it of basic powers.

His recent attempts to seize these powers and give them to his allies in the Supreme Court have drawn rare voices of dissent from people in his party, most notably Attorney General Luisa Ortega.

Ms. Ortega and the political opposition are now fighting hard to stop a July 30 vote called by Mr. Maduro to elect a new assembly that would be tasked with rewriting Venezuela's constitution. The effort has drawn the condemnation of international human-rights groups as well as the U.S. and the European Union, all of whom say it is the latest example of the president's embrace of authoritarian rule.

"This is a coup," Ms. Ortega said Tuesday of the bid to rewrite the constitution.

Mr. Maduro's allies have sought this week to fire the renegade top prosecutor. Legal experts said doing so would be unconstitutional

because by law only the National Assembly has the authority to appoint or remove the attorney general.

Write to Kejal Vyas at kejal.vyas@wsj.com and Anatoly

Kurmanaev at Anatoly.kurmanaev@wsj.com

at Appeared in the July 6, 2017, print edition as 'President's Backers Assault Lawmakers in Venezuela.'

**Corrections & Amplifications**  
The first name of photographer Miguel Gutierrez was incorrectly left out of a photo credit in an earlier version of this story. (July 5, 2017)

## The New York Times Editorial : Showdown in Hamburg

Stopping over in Poland on his way to the Group of 20 summit meeting in Germany gives President Trump a chance to briefly bask in the acclaim of a right-wing, illiberal Polish leadership before he starts taking flak from more powerful allies like Germany and France. The host of the gathering, Chancellor Angela Merkel, has made clear that she intends to focus on issues on which Mr. Trump has sharply parted ways with much of the European Union, including trade, climate change and migration.

Mr. Trump's first visit to Europe in May left plenty of bruises, raising serious doubts among European leaders about his commitment not only to old and valued alliances but also to America's traditional leadership role in the world, and it will be interesting to see whether he is in healing mode this time around. In Brussels, speaking at NATO headquarters, Mr. Trump lectured allies on their financial contributions and failed to reaffirm NATO's mutual defense pledge. The Group of 7 meeting in Sicily

shortly thereafter exposed further divisions over policy, and a week later Mr. Trump announced he was pulling the United States out of the landmark Paris agreement on fighting global warming.

Ms. Merkel, who declared after the G-7 meeting that American leadership can no longer be relied on, has been marshaling her forces, in tandem with President Emmanuel Macron of France, for the meeting of the G-20, a larger and more powerful grouping consisting of the leaders of 19 major powers and the European Union. In a speech to her Parliament last week she declared, in an unmistakable allusion to Mr. Trump, that "anybody who believes the problems of the world can be solved with isolationism and protectionism is making a big mistake."

There could well be fireworks outside the meeting halls as well. Thousands of protesters have descended on Hamburg — a city with a long history of protests and riots, where the meeting will be held Friday and Saturday — to

demonstrate against everything from globalization and capitalism to the controversial leaders who will be there, most notably Mr. Trump, President Vladimir Putin of Russia and President Recep Tayyip Erdogan of Turkey.

Side meetings are also expected to generate heat. The most keenly watched will be the first formal meeting of Mr. Trump and Mr. Putin. Though the White House says there is no formal agenda, the investigations underway in Washington into Russia's election meddling, the continuing sanctions against Russia and differing goals in the Syrian war are potential minefields. Mr. Trump also faces ticklish encounters with the Chinese, Japanese and South Korean leaders over the North Korean nuclear threat, especially after its first successful test of an intercontinental ballistic missile.

But the overriding question is whether Mr. Trump can reach some sort of détente with other leaders, and not just the Europeans — the Chinese president, Xi Jinping, has

come out in favor of climate controls and open trade. Mr. Macron, though closely aligned with Germany on all major issues, has argued against isolating Mr. Trump in Hamburg, and in fact has invited him to Paris for Bastille Day celebrations on July 14.

A lot depends, of course, on Mr. Trump. No embrace from Poland's leaders can hide the fact that, at least so far, he has rejected American leadership and participation in a rules-based, forward-looking world order striving to safeguard the planet, expand global trade and find room for the "homeless, tempest-tost." The best outcome of the summit meeting would be for him to "return to reason," as Mr. Macron recently put it. But with Mr. Trump or without him, the rest of the leaders should make abundantly clear that they remain fully committed to the Paris agreement on climate change and to what Ms. Merkel calls a "networked world."

## The Washington Post World leaders signal free-trade plans — whether Trump joins or not (UNE)

In a pointed challenge to President Trump's "America first" agenda, leaders of the world's biggest economies this week are touting an approach that breaks with the past 20 years of global trade — sidestep the United States entirely.

In the days leading up to this week's Group of 20 summit in Hamburg, leaders from Germany, Japan and elsewhere are discussing new free-trade agreements that exclude U.S. automakers and manufacturers. Their leaders are vigorously pushing back against Trump's threat of new U.S. tariffs or regulations on imported steel. And many are making public comments that affirm their commitments to fashioning pacts with or without the United States.

German Chancellor Angela Merkel, who faces elections in September in a country where Trump is deeply unpopular, has been among the most outspoken and is expected to push Trump this weekend over his trade threats and his recent decision

to withdraw from the Paris climate agreement that aimed to curb greenhouse gas emissions.

Your daily policy cheat sheet from Wonkblog.

"Those who think that the problems of this world can be solved with isolationism or protectionism are terribly wrong," Merkel told the German parliament last week.

The divergent approaches have set up the G-20 as a potential crossroads for the world's new economic order. Trump is attempting to leverage the United States' economic power to negotiate deals in the country's favor, but foreign leaders appear increasingly ready to bypass Trump in favor of a global trade network that is not U.S.-centered.

"It is important for us to wave the flag of free trade in response to global moves toward protectionism by quickly concluding the free-trade agreement with Europe," Japanese Prime Minister Shinzo Abe said

Tuesday as he touted a new potential Japan-E.U. trade pact that would lower tariffs for automobiles between Europe and Japan. If signed, the free-trade agreement would rival the size of the one created in 1994 when the North American Free Trade Agreement lowered barriers between the United States and its neighbors.

"There was a question mark there, as to whether or not the E.U. would be able to continue signing free trade agreements in the future," said André Sapir, an international trade expert and a former economic adviser to the European Union's director general for economic and financial affairs. "Going into the G-20, [the proposed trade pact is] demonstrating that indeed the E.U. and Japan want to continue to have a liberal trade agenda and show that there are other countries able to pursue this agenda without the United States."

While other countries explore new economic ties, Trump is threatening

to pull the United States further back.

"The United States made some of the worst Trade Deals in world history. Why should we continue these deals with countries that do not help us?" he wrote in a Wednesday morning Twitter post.

As well as threatening to rip up existing agreements, the White House is also considering placing new taxes or restrictions on imported steel. Some Trump advisers say the restrictions are needed to protect the domestic steel industry from what they allege are trade practices by China, but international allies, including Germany and Canada, have opposed the new restrictions, arguing it will punish their nations' industries and raise the global price of steel.

At the G-20 summit, Trump's team plans to push countries to agree to crack down on Chinese steel exports, people briefed on the planning said.

"The United States stands firm against all unfair trading practices, including massive distortions in the global steel market and other nonmarket practices that harm U.S. workers," National Economic Council Director Gary Cohn said. "We ask the G-20 economies to join us in this effort and to take concrete actions to solve these problems."

In advance of the G-20 summit, Merkel and Trump discussed "global steel overcapacity" during a phone call Monday.

Germany is a large exporter of steel, and officials there worry they could be caught in a U.S. crackdown.

China makes more than half of the world's steel, and U.S. officials have accused it of "dumping" excess steel on global markets in a way that drives down prices. The United States imports very little steel from China, but Trump administration officials say the way China produces and exports steel still hurts the U.S. steel industry, as it sells the metal to other countries at low prices, driving global prices below a point where many U.S. firms can compete.

U.S. companies say that the Chinese steel boom is also due to unfair government subsidies and state ownership, which protects steel mills from market forces and causes them to produce much more steel than the world needs. In 2015, China produced 10 times as much crude steel as the United States.

Trump's administration is divided over whether to

impose new steel trade barriers. The Commerce Department was close to recommending new restrictions, but other top Trump advisers warned it could lead to major economic fallout — including for U.S. industries.

Trump took a combative posture with China ahead of the meeting, ripping the country for its ties to North Korea at a time when dictator Kim Jong Un is developing long-range missiles and threatening U.S. allies. "Trade between China and North Korea grew almost 40% in the first quarter. So much for China working with us — but we had to give it a try!" Trump wrote in another Wednesday morning Twitter missive.

Trump had taken a more conciliatory approach with China in recent months, backing away from a threat to label Beijing a currency manipulator and saying he thought both countries could work closely together. But relations appear to have soured in recent weeks, and his Wednesday accusation that China has enabled North Korea's missile programs marks a low point between his administration and Chinese President Xi Jinping.

If Trump is able to use the summit to negotiate a united front against Chinese steel, he could boost the U.S. industry without straining ties with foreign allies. But the strategy could backfire if other nations reject Trump's entreaties and further isolate the United States.

## The New York Times

Lisa Friedman

### Trump May Find Some Allies on Climate Change at G-20 Meeting

Western European efforts to isolate President Trump for rejecting the Paris climate change agreement appear to be faltering as leaders gather for a summit meeting in Hamburg, Germany, at the end of the week.

The gulf between Mr. Trump's worldview and that of most European leaders on topics from trade to immigration will be on display in the coming days. But nowhere is the difference as stark as it is on climate change, which Mr. Trump has mocked as a hoax.

In announcing last month that the United States would withdraw from the Paris agreement, the president portrayed the pact signed by 194 nations to cut planet-warming emissions as a bad deal for America.

The German chancellor, Angela Merkel, has cast the agenda of the Group of 20 summit meeting as a stark contrast to Mr. Trump's America First approach, particularly

on climate change. She has called the Paris accord "irreversible," and diplomats have expressed hope that the 19 other countries would make it clear that their support is unwavering. Environmental activists, hoping to highlight America's status as an outlier, also are pushing hard for a united front against Mr. Trump.

In recent days, however, those aiming to isolate the United States on climate issues have softened their language to say they hope an "overwhelming majority" embrace the Paris agreement. Saudi Arabia has indicated it is unlikely to climb on board and Russia, Turkey and Indonesia are sending mixed signals about how forcefully they will declare their support for the Paris deal.

"Huge efforts are underway now to make sure as many countries as possible hold the line and compensate for America's withdrawal by redoubling their efforts. How far this goes, I have my doubts," said Dennis Snower, president of the Kiel Institute for the

Trade experts said it remains unclear whether Trump is simply threatening tariffs as a way to lure other countries to offer him concessions, or if he will follow through on new restrictions. He has taken steps to renegotiate NAFTA, and he has also said he wants a new trade deal with South Korea. But so far, those efforts are only in initial stages. Global leaders have seen an opening in persuading Trump to change course, as he made a last-minute decision to renegotiate, rather than withdraw from, NAFTA after intense pressure from Canada and Mexico.

"There's a big difference between being unpredictable with your adversaries and being erratic with your friends and allies," said Daniel Price, former international economic affairs adviser to President George W. Bush, who helped organize the first G-20 summit in 2008.

The E.U.-Japanese deal, which has only been negotiated in broad terms thus far, would lower barriers to exports of cars flowing in both directions, as well as reduce Japanese barriers to imports of trains and agricultural products, including cheese and chocolate.

Japan was a party to the now-aborted Trans-Pacific Partnership, a broad trade arrangement negotiated under President Barack Obama that would have lowered trade barriers between the United States and many Asian countries, with the notable exception of China. But the deal faced opposition in Congress,

and Trump formally ended its chances when he withdrew the United States from the deal upon taking office.

Now, the E.U.-Japan pact underscores the economic risks for the United States if the country is bypassed in global economic pacts.

"Any trade agreement that's lowering barriers between other countries ultimately hurts U.S. exporters, because they still face those tariff barriers others don't," said Chad Bown, a senior fellow at the Peterson Institute for International Economics.

Trump left for the G-20 meeting on Wednesday, with a pre-meeting stop scheduled in Poland.

G-20 meetings, which are held once a year in a rotation of countries, typically end with a joint statement from every nation about a range of issues that can include economic policy, international assistance and security. Officials are likely to face strains as they try to cobble together the joint statement — known as the "communiqué" — for this meeting, because Trump could easily block any language he feels tries to box him in.

James McAuley contributed reporting from Paris.

World Economy, a leading German think tank advising the European Commission ahead of the summit meeting.

"It doesn't look good," Mr. Snower said. "It does not look like we are going to have 19 countries and the United States against."

The Group of 20 meeting is the first high-level diplomatic gathering since Mr. Trump announced last month that America would exit the Paris agreement. How full-throated a case other rich nations are willing to make for the climate deal now could set the tone for years to come.

Some fear the future of the Paris agreement itself could be at stake. At a minimum, a weak statement or one that fails to clearly cast the United States as a renegade on climate change would signal that leaders are reluctant to jeopardize deals on trade or security by antagonizing the Trump administration over climate issues.

"This is a litmus test. How does the world behave?" said Jonathan

Pershing, former special envoy for climate change under President Barack Obama and now director of the William and Flora Hewlett Foundation's environment program.

Climate change policy is playing out in two places at the Group of 20. The first is in a document currently titled "G20 Action Plan on Climate and Energy for Growth," which tells how nations can make good on their pledges. A May 5 draft obtained by The New York Times calls for nations to meet the emissions goals they set as part of the Paris agreement. A footnote explains the United States is reviewing its policies.

An important second place is the Group of 20 communiqué, the leaders' official report of the summit meeting, and how it will address the Paris agreement. The Trump administration clearly will not accept language that commits the Group of 20 nations to the Paris agreement, but France and Germany are indicating they will not accept anything less.

"It would be great to have a clear message that everyone understands we need to be taking action on climate change, and the Paris agreement is critical to that. Canada is really pushing for that," said Catherine McKenna, the Canadian minister of the environment.

A proposal by Germany says leaders "take note of the decision of the United States of America to withdraw from the Paris agreement. The United States affirms its strong commitment to a global approach that lowers emissions while supporting economic growth and improving energy security needs." The other countries, it says, agree that the Paris accord is "irreversible."

A Trump administration official declined to say whether that language would be accepted, but

maintained the United States was not trying to pull other countries away from the Paris agreement.

"From a high level, what we're looking for is a positive outcome, one in which the chancellor and the president can walk away happy," the official said. "We're very much committed to a unity document."

That is a way of saying the administration would prefer not to be left as a footnote again the way it was in the recent statement by the Group of 7's environment ministers. The Trump administration refused to support language calling the Paris agreement "irreversible" and central to the "security and prosperity of our planet." If the Trump administration and other leaders cannot agree on a way to sum up their divergent opinions on climate change, trade

and other issues, Ms. Merkel might be forced to simply write a summary of where various countries stand.

"A collision course is unavoidable, but the chancellor is doing her very best to avoid one," Mr. Snow said.

It is not at all clear at this point what will emerge. Tensions are high between Turkey and several European nations, including Germany, where officials have refused to allow a demonstration of ethnic Turks at the summit meeting. Indonesia has ratified the Paris agreement but has been silent in more recent discussions, one diplomat said. Russia is similarly not showing its hand.

Saudi Arabia is a wild card. Fresh off a \$500 million arms deal with the United States that narrowly escaped Senate opposition, the Saudis are eager to keep Mr. Trump's support

for the kingdom's crackdown against Qatar. Saudi Arabia, one of the world's largest per capita emitters of planet-warming emissions, has always been a reluctant participant in climate discussions.

Conservatives in the United States say Europeans should know by now that goading Mr. Trump is likely to fail.

"It's like trying to poke a bear," said Nicolas Loris, a research fellow in energy and environmental policy at the Heritage Foundation. "President Trump will stick to his convictions. I don't think any type of pressure from Merkel or any of the other 19 countries is going to change that."



## Editorial : The G-20 should put climate change at the top of its list

AS WORLD leaders prepare to meet at the Group of 20 conference this week, a slew of recently released research confirms that climate change is an immediate and critical problem that must be at the top of the list of global priorities. No matter how irresponsible President Trump's behavior on this matter, the world cannot afford to lose four years. The effort must press on.

Evidence continues to pile up that the effects of climate change are measurable and getting worse. A study published in Nature Climate Change last week revealed that sea levels have been rising more rapidly in recent years. One culprit appears to be the melting of the massive Greenland ice sheet, an effect that scientists had not anticipated would be such a substantial cause of sea-level rise already,

indicating once again that scientific uncertainty is at least as likely to lead experts to underestimate as to exaggerate the climate threat.

Global warming's effects will be deadly to human beings. Another new paper in Nature Climate Change found that 30 percent of the planet's population is exposed to deadly levels of heat and humidity for at least 20 days a year. Even if Earth-warming emissions are cut back drastically, nearly half of humanity will face this misery by 2100. Without emissions cuts, three-quarters will suffer.

Read These Comments

The best conversations on The Washington Post

Scientists are getting better at quickly attributing the role human activity may have played in real-life weather disasters. Experts with World Weather Attribution, a global scientific effort, found that the record heat in Europe last month, which caused temperature-related deaths and costly forest fires, was up to 10 times more likely in some places because of climate change. Experts predict these sorts of events will become more frequent.

Global warming will also punish economies in areas least able to withstand the harm. Scientists have long warned that those most vulnerable to the effects of climate change are also among the poorest. That turns out to be true in the United States, too. A study in the journal Science found that "warming causes a net transfer of value from Southern, Central and Mid-Atlantic regions toward the Pacific

Northwest, the Great Lakes region, and New England," which means that "because losses are largest in regions that are already poorer on average, climate change tends to increase preexisting inequality in the United States."

Even though the amount of carbon dioxide that humans emit has leveled off lately, "the excess carbon dioxide scorching the planet rose at the highest rate on record in 2015 and 2016," the New York Times reported last week. "A slightly slower but still unusual rate of increase has continued into 2017." It is not clear what is behind this phenomenon. Scientists speculate that carbon "sinks," such as the oceans and forests that absorb carbon dioxide, may be getting worse at doing so. It is one more ominous sign.



## Editorial : The G-19 Must Prove Trump Wrong

America's new unwillingness to cooperate with the world on vital international issues will be the main theme at this week's meetings of the Group of 20. Especially on climate change and trade, U.S. President Donald Trump has adopted zero-sum competition -- we win, you lose -- as his guiding principle. Where he sees conflict, his predecessors rightly saw opportunities, under U.S. guidance, for great mutual gain.

The president's dangerous and impoverished approach is a test for the other leaders attending the summit in Germany. How can they best respond to this disturbing withdrawal of U.S. leadership?

Competing to fill the vacuum would hardly be productive. The same goes for grumbling, or venting righteous indignation, or trying to embarrass the American president for the sake of headlines back home. Any of that would harden Trump in his belief that the world is out to get the U.S.

Instead, Germany, Japan, China, India and the others should resolve to make progress where they can. Calmly demonstrating the power of mutual advantage is the best way to prove Trump wrong -- and to bring domestic pressure to bear so that, unlikely as it may seem, he's made to think again.

On climate change, international efforts to cut greenhouse-gas emissions can go forward regardless of Trump's reluctance to cooperate. Other governments can still build on the Paris accord framework and make their individual commitments clearer and more effective. Doing less because of U.S. lassitude would lend credence to Trump's cynical assessment of other governments' motives.

It's important for the other governments to bear in mind, as well, that this lassitude is confined to just one level of the U.S. government. With or without the Trump administration, American efforts on climate change will persist and even increase.

States, cities and enlightened corporations will maintain their push for clean energy, knowing that such efforts typically make sense in other ways as well. Energy efficiency cuts costs, boosts growth and raises living standards; low-carbon energy means cleaner air and better health. The U.S. will continue to be a leader in this endeavor regardless of Trump.

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

Share the View

On trade, other nations can likewise work around Trump's uncooperativeness -- by demonstrating that mutual



advantage works. Japan and the European Union are already poised to agree on a new free-trade pact. Signatories of the Trans-Pacific Partnership, abandoned by the U.S. even before Trump arrived in the White House, should press on to conclude that deal. And as soon as that is done, talks to move China toward membership should commence.

Other new agreements on trade that gather together Europe, Asia and the Americas can and should move forward without the U.S. The goal in this should always be made plain -- not to freeze the U.S. out, but to ensure that American disengagement, for as long as it lasts, doesn't block further progress.

As the scope of international competition widens, the benefits of

trade integration will be increasingly difficult for the White House to deny. U.S. businesses, fearing they'll be left out, will press more forcefully for a smarter U.S. approach -- and American consumers, facing higher prices and subdued economic growth, will better understand the economic costs of Trump's narrow trade policy.

The other leaders can leave the posturing and low-brow tweeting to the U.S. president. Prove him wrong, instead, by making cooperation work.

## ETATS-UNIS



### Jolly: Just ignore this President

David Jolly is a former Republican congressman from Florida. The opinions expressed in this commentary are solely those of the author.

(CNN)With President Donald Trump's nonsensical Twitter approach to both domestic and foreign policy, his tweets regularly descending into depravity, congressional Republicans often find themselves facing the question: "Do you agree with the President's irreverence and self-contradictions, and if not, what will you do to restore sanity -- to restore credibility, dignity?"

We have seen too many of them answer by remaining silent, or dodging, or merely offering their own 140-character criticism that distances themselves from the President. At best, those are attempts to quell the American people's anxiety over the President's behavior. At worst, they come across as affirmations of the public's suspicion that the GOP is only interested in self-preservation.

But in the eyes of many, to simply criticize the President and then immediately return to working with him is a tacit acceptance of his approach to a free press -- which smacks of authoritarianism -- his subtle misogyny, and his perversion of what was once respected conservative

ideology: He has turned it into a platform for self-promotion that draws its strength from our country's darkest angels.

It is fair for both the media and concerned voters to demand more: a tangible, substantive GOP strategy that honestly confronts the President's waywardness in policy and personal integrity.

Congressional Republicans' response should be this: Ignore the President. Isolate him.

You see, when members of Congress condemn a tweet and then fall in line with the President's awkward leadership of domestic and foreign policy -- such as when they race to be his guest at a South Lawn ceremony celebrating passage of a flawed health care bill that even the President himself now disowns -- all their condemnation, and congressional resolve itself, is exposed as meritless.

This Republican Congress needs to take a stand for the party and for the country. It must rise to the responsibility and the privilege that Article I of the Constitution vests in Congress as a co-equal branch, the first branch envisioned by the founders, even ahead of the Presidency.

Consider for a moment the congressional elections of 2016. The vast majority of Republican

candidates ran on their own agenda, not Trump's. Remember that, after the "Access Hollywood" tapes confirmed the candidate's (potentially criminal) arrogance,

Speaker of the House Paul Ryan told House members

, myself among them: Do what you have to do to get re-elected. And so Republican candidates presented their platform to their constituencies, and steered away from their party's presidential nominee.

So if you were a Republican elected to Congress on your own platform, distancing yourself from Donald Trump before the election, why would you fall subservient to his agenda and his moral failings now?

Recall that Republican members of Congress were not elected on the platform of President Barack Obama, and understandably never fell in line with his agenda. Well, this Republican Congress largely wasn't elected on Trump's platform either, yet today engages in subordination to a President who appears to have no understanding of policy nor traditional Republican orthodoxy.

So to my former colleagues -- good people, so many with very honest and sacrificial intentions on behalf of their country and constituent -- the prescription for dealing with this President is simple.

Ignore him.

No more trips to the White House. No more flights on Air Force One. No more accepting his gratuitous offers of signing ceremonies, White House cocktails, or meetings with his children. No more asking the White House for permission, for policy advice, or for the President's priorities.

Honor your oath as a fiduciary of Article I, who holds the public trust. Strike out with your own bold agenda that wins the hearts and minds of the American people. And leave this President behind. Leave him to his Twitter account and to placating his base with disgusting Tweets.

Tell the President of the United States that Congress will do its job. He can do his. And the next time the speaker of the House will need the President is when he's dropping legislation on the Resolute desk, handing the President one of the speaker's own pens, and saying, "Here Mr. President, sign on the dotted line."

The President can own his own legacy. It's time for Republicans in the House to once again own theirs.



### Trump's voter data request poses an unnoticed danger

Michael Chertoff, U.S. homeland security secretary from 2005 to 2009, is executive chairman of the Chertoff Group, a security and risk-management advisory firm.

The Trump administration's Presidential Advisory Commission on Election Integrity is asking states for voter-registration data from as far back as 2006. This would include names, dates of birth, voting

histories, party registrations and the last four digits of voters' Social Security numbers. The request has engendered controversy, to put it mildly, including refusals by many states and a caustic presidential tweet.

But whatever the political, legal and constitutional issues raised by this data request, one issue has barely been part of the public discussion: national security. If this sensitive

data is to be collected and aggregated by the federal government, then the administration should honor its own recent cybersecurity executive order and ensure that the data is not stolen by hackers or insiders.

We know that voting information has been the target of hackers. News reports indicate that election-related systems in as many as 39 states were penetrated, focusing on

campaign finance, registration and even personal data of the type being sought by the election integrity commission. Ironically, although many of these individual databases are vulnerable, there is some protection in the fact that U.S. voting systems are distributed among thousands of jurisdictions. As data-security experts will tell you, widespread distribution of individual data elements in multiple

separate repositories is one way to reduce the vulnerability of the overall database.

The best conversations on The Washington Post

That's why the commission's call to assemble all this voter data in federal hands raises the question: What is the plan to protect it? We know that a database of personal information from all voting Americans would be attractive not only to adversaries seeking to affect voting but to criminals who could use the identifying information as a

wedge into identity theft. We also know that foreign intelligence agencies seek large databases on Americans for intelligence and counterintelligence purposes. That is why the theft of more than 20 million personnel files from the U.S. Office of Personnel Management and the hacking of more than half a billion Yahoo accounts were such troubling incidents.

Congress and the states need to be advised on how any data would be housed and where. Would it be encrypted? Who would have

administrative access to the data, and what restrictions would be placed on its use? Would those granted access be subject to security background investigations, and would their behavior be supervised to prevent the kind of insider theft that we saw with Edward Snowden or others who have released or sold sensitive data? What kinds of audit procedures would be in place? Finally, can the security risk of assembling so much tempting data in one place be mitigated by reducing and anonymizing the

individual voter information being sought?

In May, President Trump signed the executive order on cybersecurity to instill tough security in federal offices that handle critical government data. That order is a commendable initiative to hold officials accountable for safeguarding sensitive personal information, such as voter information. The president's election integrity commission should live up to the president's own directive.



## Why almost every state is partially or fully rebuffing Trump's election commission (UNE)

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

Officials in nearly every state say they cannot or will not turn over all of the voter data President Trump's voting commission is seeking, dealing what could be a serious blow to Trump's attempts to bolster his claims that widespread fraud cost him the popular vote in November.

The commission's request for a massive amount of state-level data last week included asking for all publicly available information about voter rolls in the states, such as names of all registrants, addresses, dates of birth, partial Social Security numbers and other data. It immediately encountered criticism and opposition, with some saying it could lead to an invasion of privacy and others worrying about voter suppression.

The states that won't provide all of their voter data grew to a group of at least 44 by Wednesday, including some, such as California and Virginia, that said they would provide nothing to the commission. Others said they are hindered by state laws governing what voter information can be made public but will provide what they can.

Pushback has swept across red and blue states alike, drawing in Democratic critics of the president and Republicans uneasy about a broad federal request they suggest intrudes on states' rights. That sentiment has been notable for including Republicans such as Arizona Secretary of State Michele Reagan, who called the commission's request a "hastily organized experiment," and Louisiana Secretary of State Tom Schedler, who described it as "federal intrusion and overreach."

*[Trump's voting commission asked states to hand over election data. Some are pushing back.]*

The backlash cast a shadow over a probe Trump said could lead officials to "strengthen up voting procedures." In his executive order, Trump said the group would issue a report identifying "vulnerabilities ... that could lead to improper voter registrations and improper voting." He named Vice President Pence as the chair and Kansas Secretary of State Kris Kobach (R), a leading conservative voice on concerns about voter fraud, as vice chair.

The Trump administration has bristled at some of the recent criticism and media coverage. In a statement Wednesday, Kobach assailed media reports describing states as refusing to hand over data, calling them "more 'fake news.'"

"Despite media distortions and obstruction by a handful of state politicians, this bipartisan commission on election integrity will continue its work to gather the facts through public records requests to ensure the integrity of each American's vote because the public has a right to know," Kobach said in the statement, released by the White House. He also emphasized that the commission's letters had asked only for publicly available data and that many states are complying. "At present, only 14 states and the District of Columbia have refused the Commission's request for publicly available voter information."

More than two dozen states said they will provide some of the requested information, according to interviews, public statements and media accounts. Others have not announced decisions or elaborated on what they plan to provide.

President Trump signed an executive order on May 11, initiating

an investigation into voter suppression and election fraud. Here's what we know so far. President Trump signed an executive order on May 11 initiating an investigation into voter suppression and election fraud. Here's what we know so far. (Patrick Martin/The Washington Post)

Marc Lotter, a spokesman for Pence, said the commission will work with remaining states to obtain data through public-records requests or other means. He would not rule out the commission purchasing data from states, if such policies are consistent with how other parties seeking such information are treated.

Lotter said commission members knew from the outset that state laws vary and would affect their data collection.

"They've always known this is going to be a longer process in terms of doing the analysis," Lotter said, noting that this is just one aspect of the commission's work, which will also include looking at voter suppression and cybersecurity as it affects elections.

*[Trump's voter-fraud commission wants to know voting history, party ID and address of every voter in the U.S.]*

Partial responses from the states could lead to further problems, experts say, because the commission could assemble disparate — and incomplete — information in an effort to draw a national picture. The partial data could make it all largely worthless or misleading.

"There's going to be a whole problem of uniformity and consistency that could create a lot of problems, even with the compiling of publicly available data," said Vanita Gupta, former head of

the Justice Department's civil rights division during the Obama administration. "It's hugely problematic to do this kind of thing and to do it with at least no explicit regard for existing privacy laws and concerns and no explicit mention of how this data will be used."

Some experts and voting rights advocates have called the voting commission a "sham," saying they fear it will lead to increased voting restrictions. It is unclear what the states' actions could mean for the panel's report, expected in 2018.

"What it says is some Republicans actually still believe in federalism and that our constitution still governs the way states hold their elections," still Rick Wilson, a longtime GOP strategist and frequent Trump critic who called the resistance by Republican state-level officials "commendable." He also pointed to the commission's origins in Trump's repeated — and unsubstantiated — claims that voter fraud is widespread and cost him the popular vote.

"If Trump's theory is correct, that means these states allowed voter fraud to occur," Wilson said. "By definition, it will have to include a bunch of Republican states, and they don't like that. ... Most elections in the states are run beautifully."

The commission's request also has been targeted by a lawsuit filed in federal court this week. In a complaint filed Monday, the Electronic Privacy Information Center (EPIC), a Washington-based nonprofit focusing on privacy and civil liberties issues, asked a federal court to prevent the commission from collecting state voter roll data. The Justice Department filed a response Wednesday saying that because the commission "has only requested public information from the states, EPIC could never show that a constitutional right to

informational privacy – even if it were to exist – has been violated.”

Trump formed the Presidential Advisory Commission on Election Integrity in May after repeatedly suggesting that voter fraud cost him the popular vote against Democratic presidential nominee Hillary Clinton last year. Studies and state officials of both parties have found no evidence of widespread voting fraud.

*[Trump challenges states on voter fraud: 'What are they trying to hide?']*

Last week, the commission took its first public step by sending letters asking states for a wide swath of information, “including, if publicly available under the laws of your state,” names, dates of birth, addresses and political parties of voters, along with the last four digits of Social Security numbers, if available. The commission also asked officials to offer recommendations for changing federal election law, a list of convictions for election-related crimes, evidence of voter fraud and several other things, due by July 14.

Trump reacted angrily over the weekend to states refusing to provide the data, suggesting that officials might have nefarious motives and that he views the commission’s prime focus as voter fraud.

“Numerous states are refusing to give information to the very distinguished

VOTER FRAUD PANEL,” Trump wrote on Twitter. “What are they trying to hide?”

New York Gov. Andrew M. Cuomo (D) said his state “refuses to perpetuate the myth voter fraud played a role in our election.” Vermont Secretary of State James C. Condos, a Democrat, said he was bound by law to hand over publicly available information but would provide no extra information to a commission he called “a waste of taxpayer money.” Maryland will not provide data, a top state elections official said; in a statement, Attorney General Brian E. Frosh (D) called the request “repugnant,” and his campaign sent out that message in an email Wednesday along with a fundraising request.

Mississippi Secretary of State Delbert Hosemann, a Republican, had a more colorful response in a statement last week: “My reply would be: They can go jump in the Gulf of Mexico and Mississippi is a great state to launch from.”

The voting commission’s request also has been partially rebuffed by Kobach and Connie Lawson, another Republican member of the panel and secretary of state in Pence’s native Indiana, both of whom said they could not fully comply with their own request.

Kobach told the Kansas City Star that his state won’t give Social Security information to the commission, while Lawson (R)

released a statement saying state law prevented her from providing “the personal information requested by Secretary Kobach.”

Ohio Secretary of State Jon A. Husted (R) was among numerous officials saying he would provide publicly available information but not other things, such as driver’s license numbers and partial Social Security Numbers. Husted said he sees the commission as a way for state officials to tell the federal government ways they can help states conduct elections, including providing more funding for voting machines, which malfunctioned in multiple places on Election Day.

“I didn’t like it when the Obama administration wanted to use Homeland Security to declare our election system critical infrastructure,” Husted said in an interview after the commission’s letters went out. “I don’t want an increased federal role.”

“This information is ultimately in the hands of your state officials to manage,” he said. “What we will provide ... is not going to be anything that isn’t already publicly available. We’re providing nothing to the federal government that we don’t have an obligation under Ohio law to provide.”

John McKager “Mac” Stipanovich, a longtime GOP campaign operative in Florida, said states might push back against such requests from any president, but noted that the

intensity of the responses might vary.

“I think if it were a different president, you might not get a markedly different result,” Stipanovich said. “But what you would not get is some of the heartfelt explanations about why they’re not complying.”

Criticism of the commission’s requests is unlikely to sway Trump’s core supporters, he said.

“Is it a black eye for Trump? Yes, with most of America,” Stipanovich said. “But with 35 percent of America, it is another element in the vast conspiracy to subvert America and destroy the republic. ... It won’t hurt Trump with those with whom he can’t be hurt.”

The pushback from states is a reminder that state officials are still in charge of their elections, said Michael Steel, a former senior aide to former House speaker John A. Boehner (R-Ohio).

The day’s most important stories.

“They protect those prerogatives and the privacy of their citizens zealously,” Steel said. “I don’t think there’s any doubt that there’d be fierce resistance, regardless of the party of the president. I think it’s clear the commission is going to have to narrow its inquiry if it’s going to get results.”



## Penn and Stein: Back to the Center, Democrats

Mark Penn and Andrew Stein

The path back to power for the Democratic Party today, as it was in the 1990s, is unquestionably to move to the center and reject the siren calls of the left, whose policies and ideas have weakened the party.

In the early 1990s, the Democrats relied on identity politics, promoted equality of outcomes instead of equality of opportunity and looked to find a government solution for every problem. After years of leftward drift by the Democrats culminated in Republican control of the House under Speaker Newt Gingrich, President Bill Clinton moved the party back to the center in 1995 by supporting a balanced budget, welfare reform, a crime bill that called for providing 100,000 new police officers and a step-by-step approach to broadening health care. Mr. Clinton won a resounding re-election victory in 1996 and Democrats were back.

But the last few years of the Obama administration and the 2016 primary season once again created a rush to the left. Identity politics, class warfare and big government all made comebacks. Candidates inspired by Senator Bernie Sanders, Senator Elizabeth Warren and a host of well-funded groups have embraced sharply leftist ideas. But the results at the voting booth have been anything but positive: Democrats lost over 1,000 legislative seats across the country and control of both houses of Congress during the Obama years. And in special elections for Congress this year, they failed to take back any seats held by Republicans.

Central to the Democrats’ diminishment has been their loss of support among working-class voters, who feel abandoned by the party’s shift away from moderate positions on trade and immigration, from backing police and tough anti-crime measures, from trying to restore manufacturing jobs. They saw the party being mired too often

in political correctness, transgender bathroom issues and policies offering more help to undocumented immigrants than to the heartland.

Bigger government handouts won’t win working-class voters back. This is the fallacy of the left, believing that voters just need to be shown how much they are getting in government benefits. In reality, these voters see themselves as being penalized for maintaining the basic values of hard work, religion and family. It’s also not all about guns and abortion. Bill Clinton and Barack Obama both won working-class voters despite relatively progressive views on those issues. Today, identity politics and disdain for religion are creating a new social divide that the Democrats need to bridge by embracing free speech on college campuses and respect for Catholics and people of other faiths who feel marginalized within the party.

There are plenty of good issues Democrats should be championing. They need to reject socialist ideas

and adopt an agenda of renewed growth, greater protection for American workers and a return to fiscal responsibility. While the old brick-and-mortar economy is being regulated to death, the new tech-driven economy has been given a pass to flout labor laws with unregulated, low-paying gig jobs, to concentrate vast profits and to decimate retailing. Rural areas have been left without adequate broadband and with shrinking opportunities. The opioid crisis has spiraled out of control, killing tens of thousands, while pardons have been given to so-called nonviolent drug offenders. Repairing and expanding infrastructure, a classic Democratic issue, has been hijacked by President Trump — meaning Democrats have a chance to reach across the aisle to show they understand that voters like bipartisanship.

Immigration is also ripe for a solution from the center. Washington should restore the sanctity of America’s borders, create a path to work permits and

possibly citizenship, and give up on both building walls and defending sanctuary cities. On trade, Democrats should recognize that they can no longer simultaneously try to be the free-trade party and speak for the working class. They need to support fair trade and oppose manufacturing plants' moving jobs overseas, by imposing new taxes on such transfers while allowing repatriation of foreign profits. And the party seems to have forgotten that community policing combined with hiring more police officers worked in the '90s — and it will work again today. It can't be the

**The  
Washington  
Post**

**Dionne : Trump has made our politics ridiculous**  
The most corrosive aspect of Donald Trump's presidency is its rousing success in making our politics ridiculous.

The political class (yes, including columnists) is obsessed with his most unnerving statements, especially on Twitter. These are analyzed as if they were tablets from heaven or the learned pronouncements of a wise elder.

Various kinds of strategic genius are ascribed to Trump. He's getting us to focus on *this* because he doesn't want us to focus on *that*. He's shifting attention away from a Republican health-care bill that breaks a litany of his campaign vows. Maybe he posted that video of his imagined wrestling match with the CNN logo because he realized that in attacking MSNBC's Mika Brzezinski and Joe Scarborough, he strayed from his central, anti-CNN message.

The best conversations on The Washington Post

No matter how idiotic one of his tweets might be, there will always be commentators who see it as a shrewd way to charm his "base." Although Trump's core supporters constitute a static or even shrinking minority, the punditry often endows them with a hallowed status enjoyed by no other demographic.

Anyone who doesn't "get" Trump's appeal is said to live in a "bubble."

This means that a substantial

**The  
New York  
Times**

**Editorial : Work and Reward: The Great Disconnect**  
Working hard and getting ahead used to go hand in hand. But that was a long time ago, before decades of stagnating incomes and rising inequality took their toll.

A study published recently by the National Bureau of Economic Research provides an unvarnished

party that failed to stop the rising murder rates in cities like Chicago.

Health care is the one area where the Democrats have gained the upper hand and have a coherent message about protecting the working poor from losing coverage. But the Affordable Care Act needs to be adjusted to control costs better, lest employer-sponsored health care become unaffordable. For now, the Democrats are right to hold the line in defending Obamacare in the face of Republican disunity.

majority of Americans are bubble dwellers, because Trump's disapproval ratings have been hovering between 54 and 60 percent in Gallup's most recent surveys.

White House press secretary Sean Spicer said President Trump's use of Twitter "gives him an opportunity to speak straight to the American people," and is an effective tool, on June 6 at the White House. Spicer defends Trump's tweets (Photo: Jabin Botsford/The Washington Post/Reuters)

(Reuters)

The cost of all this is very high. Our political discussion is being brought down by Trump's self-involvement, his apparent belief that he can only win if he identifies an enemy to attack, and his refusal to make extended and carefully thought-through arguments about anything of substance. Spectacle drives out problem-solving. Our national attention span, never one of our strongest suits, follows Trump down to a level that, in fairness to children, cannot even be called childlike.

The health-care debate is the obvious example. The Republican Congress spotlights "repealing Obamacare." But this is simply a slogan. What Trump and his party said they'd create was a better health-care system — "something great," he enthused. The actual bills under debate add more than 20 million people to the ranks of the

look at the damage. The researchers, from the University of Minnesota, the University of Chicago, Princeton University and the Social Security Administration, analyzed the lifetime income histories of millions of workers who started working from 1957 to 1983 and the partial histories of those

Easily lost in today's divided politics is that only a little more than a quarter of Americans consider themselves liberals, while almost three in four are self-identified moderates or conservatives. Yet moderate viewpoints are being given short shrift in the presidential nominating process. So Democrats should change their rules to eliminate all caucuses in favor of primaries. Caucuses are largely undemocratic because they give disproportionate power to left-leaning activists, making thousands of Democrats in Kansas more

uninsured, which is not exactly great.

A functioning democracy would grapple in a bipartisan way with how to cover everyone more cost-effectively. This is not happening. Trump will declare anything the GOP pushes through — no matter how many of the people who voted for him lose insurance — a "win." That is all that matters to him.

If there was anything useful about the Trump campaign, it was the extent to which it forced Americans who live in thriving parts of the country to notice how badly other regions are doing and how angry many of the people who live in those beleaguered communities are.

But where are the practical remedies to help those workers find better-paying jobs? What they get from Trump are mostly symbols — and even these aren't what they're cracked up to be. For example, to great fanfare in December, Trump announced that thanks to his intervention, a Carrier plant in Indiana would keep at least 1,100 jobs in the United States. But last month, Carrier announced it was cutting 632 jobs from an Indianapolis factory and moving them to Mexico. It's not clear what Trump accomplished — or if he cares.

And, by the way, employment in the nation's auto plants is down from a peak of 211,000 last year to 206,000.

who entered the work force after that. The research thus measures not only annual ups and downs or average gains and losses, but also longer-term economic mobility.

The findings are a stark reminder that the twin scourges of poor wage growth and income inequality, left unaddressed, will only worsen.

influential than millions of people in Florida.

Americans are looking for can-do Democrats in the mold of John F. Kennedy and Bill Clinton — leaders who rose above partisanship to unify the country, who defended human rights and equality passionately, and who also encouraged economic growth and rising wages. That is the road back to relevance, and the White House, for the Democrats.

When it comes to broader plans for assisting workers, Trump's critics at the Center for American Progress note that his budget cuts could cost more than 5 million American workers access to job training, job-search assistance and career-development programs.

In the brief intervals when he is not distracting us with wrestling videos, comments on Brzezinski's appearance and the like, Trump can offer decent talking points about "workforce development" and apprenticeships. But his policies regularly undermine his promises. Nothing should be more important to Trump's presidency than keeping his commitments to workers in states such as Pennsylvania, Michigan and Wisconsin. But these don't fascinate the president nearly as much as his vendettas and his role as a cable-news critic.

The media have to cover what Trump does, but let's stop pretending that his undisciplined fixations are a form of brilliance. And Republican politicians who still spinelessly defend or minimize Trump's bizarre antics should realize that they are enabling a degeneration of politics. This enfeebls our efforts to solve problems at home and embarrasses our nation before the rest of the world.

Men have been harder hit than women, partly because they had more to lose. Lifetime income rose modestly for the typical man who entered the labor force from 1957 to 1966. But then it began to decline. In all, the median lifetime income for men who began working in 1983 was lower than for men who started

in 1967, by 10 percent to 19 percent, depending on the inflation measure used.

That works out to a total lifetime income loss of \$96,100 to \$243,350 — even after accounting for the rise in the value of nonwage benefits. The decline was mainly a result of lower pay after adjusting for inflation, and not from reductions in weekly hours or years in the work force. Over the same period, the median lifetime income of women increased by 22 percent to 33 percent, as more women spent more hours and years in the labor force. But the gains, from a very low starting point, were smaller than men's losses and were not enough

to eliminate the historic gap in hourly pay between men and women.

Will lifetime income continue to lag? The answer, unfortunately, appears to be yes. The researchers found that declining lifetime income among men after 1967 was almost entirely attributable to lower incomes at younger ages, without any offsetting increases at later ages. Similarly, among women, the gains in lifetime income had slowed over time, in large part because of slowing growth after age 45. Since today's workers face those same trends, the same downward trend in lifetime income is likely.

As workers lose ground, inequality deepens, because money that would flow to wages tends to flow instead to those at the top of the income ladder. Indeed, the researchers found that incomes of younger workers entering the labor market are more unequal than in the past, suggesting that inequality in lifetime incomes will persist and even worsen.

The study shows that stagnating wages and rising inequality are deeply entrenched. There is no cure-all, but there are policy remedies. Updated overtime pay standards would raise pay broadly in the service sector, as would closing the gender pay gap, through

better disclosure of corporate pay scales, anti-discrimination legislation and litigation. Exposure of the differences between the pay of executives and the pay of workers would shed light on some unjustifiable gaps, and call into question tactics like share buybacks that reward shareholders even as workers are shortchanged.

Reasonable people can disagree on how to approach the problem. But no one can deny that a problem exists and that it demands a response.